CHUNG-MING WONG BECOMES NEW DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 7, 1969

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, a very able and well-qualified American has been appointed to the directorship of the Office of Saline Water. He is Dr. Chung-ming Wong of Los Angeles. Water Desalination Report for July 31, 1959, contained the following interesting article on Dr. Wong:

CHINESE-AMERICAN WONG INSTALLED AS NEW OSW DIRECTOR

If technical qualifications are the measure, OSW's new Director, Chung-ming Wong, 49, will do well. His string of technical-management degrees is an arm long, topped off by a Ph. D. in physics earned at Columbia University. Wong, several weeks after it was learned he would become the Nixon desalting chief, the 6th Director in OSW's short history, finally arrived last week to take his seat in official Washington. His high academic-technical qualifications, accomplishments in the astronautics-space field (he contributed valuably to the Apollo moon landing by solving fundamental space vehicle re-entry problems), first time a Chinese-American has captained a major government program, all, constitute a symphony about which the new Interior Department team, from Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel on down, wouldst sing.

And sing the department's news announcement does on its new Chinese bird for the OSW job. The department press release on Assistant Secretary Carl L. Klein, the man who selected Wong, was only three paragraphs. Wong's is several times longer. It touches on exploits running from his days as a 1st Lieutenant in the Nationalist Chinese Air Force to a teaching career at U.S. colleges (he taught "18 different" engineering subjects, was Best Professor according to students at the University of Bridgeport for "4 consecutive years") to "responsible" scientific and technical positions with the aerospace companies of Avco, Republic Aviation, Lockheed, United Aircraft, TRW Systems, Northrop and his last employer, McDonnell Douglas.

POLITICAL CAMPAIGNER

References to Wong's being the Chinese American getting the highest job from the Nixon Administration didn't say it, but Wong also has great political credentials. As chairman of the Professional Citizens for Nixon/Agnew, Wong can claim to have delivered 10,000 votes in the last presidential election.

But apart from the dept.'s press agentry, Wong in an interview with Water Desalination Report showed he probably competently will direct OSW's engineering development and research activities. He said none of his experience includes work on desalting or distillation processes per se. But he pointed out distillation itself is "nothing but the basic item of using heat energy and heat transfer efficiently." These are subjects familiar to Wong, who has taught thermodynamics and heat transfer courses and whose experience extends to power plants and their heat transfer and power balances.

He has had a busy time of it since reporting last week. In briefings from the staff on all aspects of OSW activities, trying to learn and stress the programs, he said he hadn't left his office, hadn't even gone to Capitol Hill to see anybody, except Rep. Alphonzo Bell (R-Calif.) who represents Wong's home town of Bel-Air.

O'MEARA DEPUTY

Wong said he wasn't bringing anybody with him as an addition to the OSW staff. Rather, he said he was grateful for the capable OSW existing staff and the cooperation he was getting. He said he anticipated no personnel changes nor organizational shake-ups. Asked about the naming of J. W. "Pat" O'Meara, OSW information chief, as Deputy OSW Director, Wong shied off answering and neither confirmed nor denied. Reportedly, O'Meara's appointment to the deputy slot is now being processed by the Civil Service Commission.

In staff talks, Wong said his policy would be "open-minded" and that he would take a "fair look at things without contamination. Fairness is the key word." Also he asked the staff for loyalty and integrity and cautioned that OSW should speak with "one voice" to all outside sources, and indicated that voice would be his.

On the harder questions like OSW's future relations with industry and Wong's personal feelings about sharing technology from OSW programs with overseas nations, Wong begged off answering, saying it too early to express himself. But on foreign involvements he said he knew enough about it to realize OSW wasn't the only one involved, that Congress and State Dept. also have their interests. "If it's a policy matter bigger than my office, then I'll take my boss's instructions . . . I know I have to report to Capitol Hill on these matters and I will seek their cooperation and also that of the State Dept." Wong will probably get the chance to express his views to Congress soon enough. Senate Interior Committee sources have indicated hearings would be held to sound out Wong on OSW's foreign commitments and a no. of other policy questions.

Wong is actually a fourth-generation American. His great grandfather came over to work on the railroads when they were building routes to the west. His grandfather lived in Calif., but his father, Tong Wong, returned to China where he rose to be vice-pres. under Sun Yat-sen's Republic of China Govt. The father had to give up his U.S. citizenship. Wong, born in Hong Kong, returned to this country and became a naturalized citizen in 1959.

He told a story pointing to error in the commonly accepted belief that Chinese love to gamble. He said Chinese men at home in China aren't gamblers, that it's the Chinese who come to the U.S. or emigrate elsewhere who gamble. He says most of the Chinese are men when they come to this country, alone, usually live where they work, without their women and their loneliness sometimes becomes unbearable. Needing emotional outlets, hence, they turn to gambling.

THE WAGER

He himself doesn't gamble, nor smoke, nor drink. He studies for his outlet. But in his take over and future direction of OSW, there is a gamble. For Wong and several others, the stakes, the future water supply of much of the world, are quite high.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, August 11, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We take courage and say "the Lord is my helper, I will not fear what man shall do unto me."—Hebrews 13: 6

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this new day fresh from Thy hand and pray Thou wilt help us to live it well. Cleanse our hearts and clear our minds that we may walk the upward way with Thee and with our fellow men.

Grant that we may always be on the side of justice and peace and good will. In so doing may we seek to make this earth a finer planet in which men can dwell together safely and securely.

We pray for our country, gratefully for the heritage of faith and freedom which is ours, humbly that we may prove ourselves worthy of this heritage, and positively that we may be given wisdom, understanding, and a concern to lead our Nation in right paths with true faith for the good of all.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 7, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1462. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vita Cusumano;

H.R. 1808. An act for the relief of Capt. John W. Booth III;

H.R. 2037. An act for the relief of Robert W. Barrie and Marguerite J. Barrie;

H.R. 6581. An act for the relief of Bernard A. Hegemann;

H.R. 9088. An act for the relief of Clifford L. Petty; and

H.J. Res. 864. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7206. An act to adjust the salaries of the Vice President of the United States and certain officers of the Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 912. An act to provide for the establishment of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Colorado; and

S. 1611. An act to amend Public Law 85-905 to provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1373) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that Mr.

SPONG was appointed a conferee on the bill (H.R. 6508) entitled "An act to provide assistance to the State of California for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, and high waters" in lieu of Mr. GRAVEL, excused.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1108. An act to waive the acreage limitations of section 1(b) of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, with respect to conveyance of lands to the State of Nevada for inclusion in the Valley of Fire State Park;

S. 1836. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended;

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Michel M. Goutmann; and

S. 2564. An act to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to authorize an additional amount for the acquisition of certain lands for such park.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION OF STAND ON TAX REFORM

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, because of an apparent misunderstanding on the debate of Thursday last with respect to so-called tax reform, I should make clear the position of the gentleman from Indiana on his opposition to percentage depletion allowances for any mineral, including the petroleum industry. The gentleman from Indiana favors actual cost depletion and not percentage depletion allowance for all minerals under the Federal income tax.

STUDENT GUARANTEE LOAN PROGRAM

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes I will make a unanimous-consent request that it be in order at the close of business today for the House to consider under suspension of the rules the bill H.R. 13194 as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor.

I will make this request because it is essential that we act promptly to put the guaranteed loan program in the position to serve students who need loan assistance in attending school this year.

In accordance with my request, the Speaker has by letter to me, agreed that if action is not taken on H.R. 13194 before September 15, it will be scheduled under suspension on that day.

Last week, in colloquies with my colleagues, we discussed the necessity for prompt enactment of this legislation. Action in the other body late last week makes it all the more imperative that we secure passage of the committee-reported bill. The comparable bill in the other body, in addition to amending the guaranteed student loan program along lines similar to H.R. 13194, also proposes a total added authorization of $295 million for the college-based student assistance programs of NDEA student loans, educational opportunity grants, and work-study. While I personally feel that such increases are desirable I fully appreciate that many of my colleagues would be unable to accept these additions without a time-consuming conference. I am convinced that if we act today, at the latest tomorrow, the other body will go along with our bill.

Time is of the essence. Any delay will only result in possible denials of assistance to needy college students. I am most hopeful that there will be no objection to my unanimous-consent request. If there is any reason for objection to taking the bill up today, then I shall ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered tomorrow under suspension of the rules.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S WELFARE PROPOSAL

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's new welfare plan embodies two basic changes. First, liberalizing eligibility requirements so as to make 13 million more citizens eligible for relief—a sudden increase of 125 percent in the size of what he called the welfare monster.

Second, a program to encourage work and training for welfare recipients. I am concerned about the first change, but favor the second. I favor the application of work training programs to those now receiving welfare so as to move as many as possible from welfare rolls to payrolls. I supported legislation approved by Congress in 1967 to accomplish that objective, but the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the State welfare departments showed no enthusiasm for enforcing it.

I would favor guaranteed employment opportunities, but not a guaranteed income, and this, in my opinion, is part of the President's proposal. If America embarked on this guaranteed income road, it would have no end. The demands for more and more would increase with each session of Congress. More spending means more taxing.

The emphasis should be on education and job training and job opportunities and not more Government dependency.

I believe in charity for the unfortunate, the helpless, the handicapped, and the aged, but an able-bodied man cannot be encouraged to improve himself and his family by paying him for doing nothing. Such destroys his self-respect and initiative and the tendency of welfare rolls is to go up, up—never down. To obtain true economic independence, the initiative and pride of the poor must not be stifled.

Changing the name of a program does not change the fact that it is unwise to encourage our citizens to depend on the Government for support of their families.

Let us apply the work training provisions to those now on welfare and see how successful it is before adding additional millions to welfare rolls.

LARGER INTEREST PAYMENTS UNDER THE GUARANTEED COLLEGE LOAN PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, almost 220,000 students may be denied the opportunity to attend college this year unless the present law is changed to permit larger interest payments under the guaranteed college loan program. To deprive these students from obtaining a college education would seriously weaken the future of our country.

Therefore, I call upon the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, to take that short walk over to the House Rules Committee and obtain an open rule. This action will allow the House to work its will. I am sure that the distinguished chairman of one of the most important committees in Congress would not want to hold the future of almost a quarter of a million deserving college students as a pawn in the attempt of some to thwart the House in expressing the will of the people.

The American public made it clear that they do not want to subsidize student radicals. Recently the House Internal Security Committee, of which I am a member, received testimony that student radicals intend to drastically increase the level of violent activity on the Nation's campuses this fall. The time to make plans and implement preventive tools in order for all students to be guaranteed their right to an education is now.

Last Thursday over 100 Members of the House sent a letter to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) requesting an open rule in order to obtain timely passage. The answer, which I received last Saturday, indicates the gentleman will not seek an open rule because of fear that the House may adopt an amendment which could help curb student disorders this fall.

This arbitrary decision on the part of the gentleman is deeply regretted and I call upon him, in the interest of all of us who are stanch supporters of higher education, to allow the House to consider this bill. My strong support for higher education is a matter of record.

The House would welcome an opportunity to consider and pass a meaningful student disorder amendment so that it would not be necessary in the future to approach this problem on a vehicle-by-vehicle basis.

If the college administrators do not exercise more backbone this fall than they did last year not only will the taxpayers be forced to finance illegal activities but many deserving students will lose their right to attend classes and complete their education.

It is difficult to realize why anyone would fear legislation which would penalize campus radicals who forcibly deny other students an education. Why fear any reasonable punishment which would only be invoked if there is a crime?

I say to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) the decision is his, he has the key.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SCHERLE. I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me first state that I would like to see this legislation considered immediately, but I realize that the only way we can obtain passage is to consider it under suspension of the rules because of the possibility of student unrest amendments which would certainly delay final enactment. I am sure the gentleman recognizes the great urgency for immediate consideration. In my opinion if we must go to conference with the other body on this bill with student unrest provisions attached, we would be unable to agree for an inordinate period of time. It is my sincere hope that we will be able to obtain unanimous consent to consider the bill today and if not today, by all means tomorrow. In my judgment the other body will accept H.R. 13194 as reported if we act today or tomorrow.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR STUDENTS

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

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, Chairman PERKINS has indicated that he is going to seek unanimous consent to suspend the rules and take up H.R. 13194, which is a measure to give proper opportunity to students who need to borrow money to further their education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Members go along with the request of the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), on this unanimous-consent request, so that we can permit these students to borrow the money which they need to either begin their education or to further their education in September.

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, in urging that we move expeditiously now with unanimous consent for considering the bill H.R. 13194 affecting guaranteed student loans.

I agree with the gentleman from Iowa that there is no reason why the chairman of our committee could not go to the Committee on Rules. He should have gone to the Committee on Rules last week. But we only have 3 days ahead of us and he has indicated it is his intention that he is going to go for a suspension of the rules on September 15. If that is the case, all the students would have to wait until the 15th of September to secure their loans, unless we act this week.

That being the case, I would hope that we could move expeditiously now because this program has to be worked. It is certainly a lot better to pass our bill than to accept the bill from the other body where they are hanging everything on it like a Christmas tree.

I believe this is the best course we could take and I would hope that no objection will be made to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) to bring the bill, H.R. 13194, up under suspension of the rules this week.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman believe that we ought to go above the highest prime interest rate in this bill by waiving the individual right of all Members by handling this under suspension of the rules of the House resulting in no right of amendment; or, instead of 7½ percent to 10 percent, or maybe in lieu thereof write 7½ percent to 8½ percent?

Mr. QUIE. It is my understanding that they will probably make the interest 8½ percent, but they usually run a half percent at least over the prime interest rate even when they were able to make them at the statutory limit.

The question now is whether we are going to permit the banks to make these loans to students in question this fall for their education. I do not like the guaranteed student loan program the way it works since I do not like to subsidize the rates of interest. But the majority of this body and the other body decided that and now the program is not working since many banks can lend money at a higher rate of interest than 7 percent, which is the statutory limit.

Mr. HALL. Would not the gentleman agree with me that, without the right of amendment under the suspension of the rules, we are very liable to let the floor become the ceiling? This would be testamentary to and result from debate without amendment process on the part of Congress, yet work out, by acting this way, so that we have an increase in the prime interest rate. This is one of the dangers hidden herein when the House cannot work its will.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct. But the students are going to have to face the existing limit until the 15th of September. The most important factor before us during the next month is some students need for money to attend college this fall.

ROGERS SAYS HEARINGS ON FDA REPORT TO HELP CONGRESS

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Public Health will hold hearings Tuesday and Wednesday into a report submitted by a study group on Food and Drug Administration consumer protection objectives and programs.

I have read this report and find that the 45 recommendations made are quite revealing.

The Food and Drug Administration's legislative mandate to protect the American consumer from harmful, misleading or useless drugs and foods has apparently been severely compromised by a lack of funds and personnel.

As one might expect, it is the American consumer who is paying the price for this. And the public is paying through injury, illness and even death.

Such a report paints the FDA as almost impotent in many areas of surveillance and inspection. It points to a long list of inadequacies including expertise, facilities, statistics, authority and enforcement power to the degree which might even undermine our confidence in the entire agency.

I am grateful that Commissioner Ley has ordered such a report, for only through a thorough study of FDA can we determine what must be done to correct its shortcomings and failures.

And I would like to commend Commerce Committee Chairman STAGGERS and Public Health Subcommittee Chairman JARMAN for moving quickly to hold hearings into this very important area of consumer protection.

REQUEST TO PERMIT CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 13194, AMENDING HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, UNDER SUSPENSION OF RULES PROCEDURE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, today after all legislative business pending and before all special orders heretofore granted, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call up, under suspension of the rules, the bill (H.R. 13194) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal incentive payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary, in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this legislation provides for a 10-percent ceiling on interest rates on student loans. I know of no one in this Chamber who is opposed to student loans and certainly I am not opposed to these loans. But I am opposed to the procedure of calling a bill up under suspension of the rules by which Members are precluded from offering amendments.

I think there ought to be an amendment reducing the interest rate ceiling. I do not think the House has any business establishing by legislative fiat, or any other way, a 10-percent interest rate. Moreover, I think the Members ought to have an opportunity to offer an antidemonstration amendment to this bill as they have to other legislation, if they wish to do so. This they would be precluded from doing if unanimous consent is granted to suspend the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I know of effort by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, to obtain from the Rules Committee a rule for the consideration of this bill. We will be back here on September 3. There will be a meeting of the Rules Committee, I am sure, shortly after September 3, certainly before September 15, and the gentleman can very well apply to the Rules Com-

mittee for an open rule so the House can work its will upon this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I care not how thick or thin the argument is sliced—the House Committee on Education and Labor was on notice weeks ago that legislation on this subject would be necessary. It dilly-dallied. Now the chairman wants to ram a bill through the House under the brutal procedure of suspension of the rules which severely limits debate and blocks a single amendment. The chairman could have gone to the Rules Committee and obtained an open rule many days ago. He could have done so last week and we could have worked our will on this bill today or tomorrow. The committee must bear the responsibility for failure of the House to act and no amount of talk about "factions" will serve to clear the skirts of the Labor and Education Committee or shift the responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tomorrow, after all pending legislative business, to call up H.R. 13194 under suspension of the rules.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for the same reason as previously stated, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), in objecting to the unanimous-consent request, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), both referred to the bill, H.R. 13194, as a bill that would increase the student loan interest rate to 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight. The bill would not do that. The Committee on Education and Labor and the Subcommittee on Higher Education did not want to increase the maximum statutory limitation. What this bill would do, would be to allow periodic market adjustment allowances over the 7-percent statutory limit to make the return to the bank fairer considering current market conditions. The additional allowance could be as much as 3 percent, if determined by the Office of Education, which combined with the statutory rate of 7 percent could total 10 percent, but the bill does not establish a statutory rate of 10 percent, as the gentleman indicated.

I think it is unfortunate that we have one group on the Committee on Education and Labor who will do everything they can through the procedures of the House to stop this House from considering a measure relating to campus disorders. This group has made it impossible to bring this bill out under the usual procedures of granting a rule.

I think it is also unfortunate that there is another group that will not let any legislation be considered on the floor of this House unless it is subject to amendments so they can put on an amendment relating to student disorders.

These two groups are blocking what I think is an honest attempt on the part of the majority of the House to see that the student loan program can be put back in working order in time for students to have the benefit of it this fall. I think the test of power between these two groups is a disservice to the students of this country.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the bill does provide for a 3-percent increase, from 7 percent to 10 percent.

Mr. ERLENBORN. That is not true. I repeat to the gentleman it provides an allowance up to 3 percent. It could be raised 1 percent, or one-half of 1 percent, or a maximum of 3 percent, but the bill does not increase the rate to 10 percent, and it does not grant a 3-percent increase. It allows a variable increase to be determined each quarter by the Office of Education.

Mr. GROSS. What would the gentleman call it then, a bonus that permits the interest rate to go to 10 percent?

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, I believe now is not the time to debate the merits of the bill. I think it unfortunate the contest of wills between these two groups is making it impossible for this legislation to be available to help needy college students this fall.

PERMITTING CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN THE STATE OF MARYLAND TO BE USED FOR HIGHWAY PURPOSES

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 10420) to permit certain real property in the State of Maryland to be used for public purposes generally.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have one or perhaps two questions on this bill.

As I understand the bill, it would permit the transfer of 8 acres for the purpose of road or tunnel building; is that correct.

Mr. RIVERS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Will a toll be charged for the use of this road or tunnel?

Mr. RIVERS. I believe it will be.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not public land? Although the city of Baltimore presently controls it, this is public land designated as a park with a reversionary clause, that it revert to the Government if not used for park or recreational purposes.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer the gentleman.

Originally this land was deeded to the mayor and city council of Baltimore for a park, with a reversionary clause should it cease to be used for park purposes. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON) introduced a bill which would have removed the reversionary clause on the whole 45-acre tract. The GSA objected because the reversionary clause provided the land had to be used for park purposes or it would revert to the Government.

They got together with the GSA, and they agreed to transfer only 8 acres to the State of Maryland for the purpose of constructing this tunnel. Whatever the price to be paid, the money is to be used for park purposes. They will get the 8 acres in fee simple.

The answer to the question is they can use it for highway purposes only.

Mr. GROSS. Will a precedent be established here by virtue of the fact that a toll is charged?

Mr. RIVERS. No.

Mr. GROSS. Will there be any precedent established by this legislation?

Mr. RIVERS. Absolutely not. The land will be used for highway purposes. It will be used by the State highway department to serve the public interest. It is needed over there and needed very badly.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 10420

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the requirements of the proviso in section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1450), the real property consisting of approximately forty-five and five-tenths acres conveyed under authority of such Act to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, Maryland, by deed dated February 23, 1927, is subject to reversion to the United States only if such property ceases to be used for public purposes. The Administrator of General Services shall issue such deeds, documents, or other instruments as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"That notwithstanding the requirements of the proviso in section 3 of the Act of March 4, 1923 (42 Stat. 1450), the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, Maryland, are authorized to convey approximately eight acres, of the approximately forty-five and five-tenths acres conveyed under authority of such Act, to the State of Maryland, provided, however, that the conveyance of such real property to the State of Maryland shall be upon the condition and limitation that such property shall be limited to use for highway purposes and upon cessation of such use shall revert to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore and again become subject to the conditions and restrictions of the conveyance by the United States under authority of such Act and the proviso of section 3 of such Act. Any consideration received from the State of Maryland for such conveyance shall be used for the development of the remaining real property for park purposes."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10420 is a bill to authorize the mayor and city council of Baltimore to convey 8 acres of land to the State of Maryland. The reason this special legislation is necessary is due to the following circumstances:

In February 1927 a deed was executed by the Secretary of War, on behalf of the United States, conveying to the mayor

and city council of Baltimore 45.5 acres of land which was then a part of Fort Armistead. This deed was executed pursuant to an act of Congress dated March 4, 1923—42 Stat. 1450. Section 3 of that act restricted the use of the property to public park purposes and provides that the property will revert to the United States upon cessation of that use. The city of Baltimore has been using the property for public park purposes.

The State of Maryland now needs approximately 8 acres of this property in connection with the construction and operation of the Baltimore Harbor outer tunnel project.

The bill, as introduced, removed the entire reversionary interest and the General Services Administration objected to the bill and so testified. The bill, as amended, corrects the feature objected to by the General Services Administration. It allows the mayor and city council of Baltimore to convey just the 8 acres requested by the State and still retain the reversionary clause on the balance of the land.

The bill also provides that the consideration received by the mayor and city council from the State of Maryland for such conveyance is to be used for the development of the remaining real property for park purposes.

The Department of the Army, on behalf of the Department of Defense, interposed no objection to H.R. 10420.

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

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

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

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10420 is a bill that I had the privilege of introducing. It has been reported to the House by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Armed Services.

May I take this opportunity to thank all the members of the Armed Services Committee for their speedy consideration of this bill. My special thanks to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, Chairman RIVERS, for the personal interest he has taken in this matter and the expeditious manner in which he has moved it forward for consideration by the House today.

H.R. 10420 would turn over to the Maryland State Roads Commission approximately 8 acres of some 45.5 acres now held by the mayor and city council of Baltimore. The property is located within the State of Maryland at Fort Armistead, Hawkins Point, Anne Arundel County. The property in question was conveyed to the mayor and City Council of the city of Baltimore by the Department of the Army by deed dated February 23, 1927, for public park use. The deed contained a condition that the property would revert to the United States of America if it ceased to be used for public park purposes.

The property at the present time has not been developed. The bill before us does the following. One, it would authorize the conveyance by the mayor and the city of Baltimore of approximately 8 acres of the approximately 45.5 acres originally conveyed to the mayor and the city council to the Maryland State Roads Commission to be used as a needed and necessary link in the construction of the Baltimore outer tunnel project. Two, the remainder of the property retained by the mayor and the City Council of Baltimore would be held for public park purposes.

Three, the bill further provides that the consideration received by the mayor and city of Baltimore for conveyance of 8 acres of the property in question to the Maryland State Roads Commission is to be used for the development of the remainder of the property for public park purposes.

In one stroke the bill accomplishes two very necessary things for the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. It provides an integral link which is needed to develop an important part of the transportation plan for the city and county of Baltimore—the outer tunnel project, and it provides funding which will be used to develop a presently undeveloped piece of property into a public park, which will be to the benefit of all the residents of Maryland.

This is meaningful legislation. This is legislation which benefits the general public. This is legislation that helps the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. I urge its speedy passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to permit certain real property in the State of Maryland to be used for highway purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT FROM WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13, 1969, TO WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 315) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 315

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses shall adjourn on Wednesday, August 13, 1969, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday, September 3, 1969.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Wednesday, September 3, 1969, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON SEPTEMBER 3, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on September 3, 1969, may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS FOR PURPOSE OF RECEIVING APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS IN JOINT MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 10, 1969

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order that any time on Wednesday, September 10, 1969, for the Speaker to declare a recess for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the Apollo 11 astronauts, Mr. Neil A. Armstrong, Apollo 11 commander; Lt. Col. Michael Collins, U.S. Air Force, command module pilot; and Col. Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr., U.S. Air Force, lunar module pilot.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during general debate today.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, does the distinguished majority leader anticipate business on the floor of the House Wednesday?

Mr. ALBERT. As of now I do. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 150]

Abbitt	Frey	Philbin
Anderson, Tenn.	Fulton, Tenn.	Poage
Barrett	Gallagher	Pollock
Beall, Md.	Garmatz	Powell
Berry	Gettys	Preyer, N.C.
Blackburn	Goldwater	Price, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.	Griffiths	Pucinski
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Quillen
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho	Rarick
Caffery	Hansen, Wash.	Reifel
Cahill	Harsha	Reuss
Carey	Harvey	Roudebush
Celler	Hastings	St. Onge
Clancy	Hawkins	Satterfield
Clay	Hays	Scheuer
Collier	Hogan	Shipley
Colmer	Howard	Sikes
Corbett	Hull	Slack
Cowger	Jarman	Snyder
Cunningham	Jones, Tenn.	Springer
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	Staggers
de la Garza	Landrum	Steed
Delaney	Latta	Stubblefield
Diggs	Lipscomb	Sullivan
Donohue	Lloyd	Tiernan
Downing	McCarthy	Utt
Edmondson	Madden	Watkins
Esch	Mann	Weicker
Evins, Tenn.	Martin	Wolff
Fish	Mathias	Wright
Flowers	Meskill	Wyman
Flynt	Mills	Young
Ford, William D.	Moorhead	
	O'Neal, Ga.	
	Ottinger	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 333 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the voice vote and the teller vote for the Joelson amendment to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation for fiscal year 1970, I was present and voted favorably.

My duties as chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime required that I leave the floor before rollcall vote No. 131 on the Joelson amendment on July 31. Since I strongly supported this amendment, had I been present I would have voted "yea" and also would have voted "yea" on the final passage of the bill, of which this amendment was a part.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1969

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 12982) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 12982, with Mr. GIAIMO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN) will be recognized for one-half hour, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) will be recognized for one-half hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 12982, which is presented to the House today is a District of Columbia revenue bill. The District government has presented to the Congress a budget request totaling $712.2 million. This is an increase of $160.2 million above the request for the past year. The estimated deficit is $64 million. The pending bill is estimated to provide an additional $39.7 million in revenues for the District of Columbia government.

For many years, Congress expected, and the District government presented a balanced budget request to the House and Senate Appropriation Committees. The District government abandoned such budgets several years ago. This is the 4th year out of the last 6 years that the District Committee has been forced to present tax legislation. The District government has informed the committee that it intends to increase expenditures for the coming fiscal year by more than $100 million. This will mean another revenue bill next year.

Before presenting the details of this bill, I want to make one thing clear to the House—despite public statements, press stories and editorials, and some of the charges that will be made from the floor today, the District Committee and the District Subcommittee on Appropriations have been most generous, maybe too generous, to the District of Columbia government.

On the basis of the cost per pupil and the investment in new school facilities, the public schools of the District of Columbia should be the finest or at least equal to the best in the Nation. In law enforcement, no city in the Nation even approaches the District in the number of police per capita. Compared to other cities, the District has substantially more employees per capita.

As might be expected in view of the foregoing, the District has one of the fastest growing budgets in the Nation. The total appropriations for 1965 were less than $300 million. The budget for the current year is more than double that figure. If Federal grants are added, the proposed expenditures of the District exceed $1.2 billion.

Some of the demands and requests of the District of Columbia government approach reckless irresponsibility. There are requests for added personnel as high as 100 percent or more in some agencies. To illustrate, there is projected a 25-percent increase or more than 2,500 new jobs for the public schools, although there will be an estimated increase of only 151 students in the school system this fall. The skyrocketing expenditures in the District mean increased tax costs to every constituent of every Member in this House. There are some who say that the District crime rate goes up as the appropriations increase; that the more money spent on the schools, the worse the schools get; that jobs are being invented to provide employment, not public service.

I do not accept these charges. However, I believe that the House has reached the point where its Members should insist on stopping the process long enough to take a solid look at the programs and financing in the District government. This bill is designed to meet generously the basic needs in the District of Columbia without subjecting the taxpayers of the District and the Nation to excessive and unwarranted taxes.

Wasteful bureaucracy is never curbed unless the legislature interrupts the empire building process. During the last 3 years the number of jobs in the District government has increased in a progressive ratio of about 1, 2, 3, and for this fiscal year it is estimated at practically 8—an increase of nearly 8,000 employees or 20 percent in 1 year.

To halt this, the bill provides for the use of the formula contained in the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968, which curtailed Federal hiring and provided for job reductions. The District government has operated during 1969 and thus far in fiscal 1970 under a continuing resolution with the highest number of employees in its history up 2,700 above 1968. The bill would reduce the number of employees by one job out of four vacancies. Under normal circumstances this would involve about 1,000 jobs and result in a reduction of about 250 jobs or 10 percent of the jobs added in 1968.

The limitation and reduction formula does not apply to the essential services of the police and fire departments nor to the public schools. While some persons will insist that these provisions of the bill will bring the District government to a grinding halt, it is obvious that 250 employees will not result in the loss of essential or necessary services to the people of the District.

The bill also abolishes the Office of Director of Public Safety. Committee hearings relating to this office showed

substantial expenditures with no improvement to the protection of the public. The confusions produced from the operation of that office and the substantial thousands of dollars necessary for its operation would be eliminated.

The bill as reported is designed to produce about $40 million in funds for the District government. The largest single item is the increase from $90 million to $105 million, adding $15 million to the Federal payment. The use of these funds however is conditioned on progress on the District of Columbia highway program approved during the 90th Congress.

New taxes on admissions and increases in sales and use taxes would provide $8.85 million. Sales taxes on groceries would be increased from 1 percent to 2 percent. Taxes on restaurant meals and drinks would be increased from 4 percent to 5 percent. Drugs which can be purchased without prescription would be subject to 2 percent sales tax. Services for miscellaneous purposes such as duplicating, addressing, services for publication, and repairing of personal property would be taxed at the rate of 2 percent.

Excise taxes and fees for the purchase and operation of motor vehicles will bring in excess of $7 million in additional revenue. Excise taxes are increased from 3 percent to 4 percent. Registration fees on automobiles are substantially increased and the weight applicable to certain fees is changed to bring in revenues of $3.3 million. The balance of the changes in these fees relate to drivers licenses, title fees, registration transfers, and similar items.

Alcoholic beverage taxes are increased on beer and spirits to raise $1.65 million. A temporary windfall to the District government will be provided by requiring corporations to file estimated income taxes which will accelerate tax payments by 1 year. The additional tax will be spread over a period of 3 years and will produce approximately $1.6 million in revenues in each of the 3 years.

The bill provides that the Congress repeal its delegation of authority to the District of Columbia to establish the tax rates on taxable real and personal property in the District of Columbia. The bill also provides that tax rates during the tax year be $3.10 per hundred on real property and $2.40 per hundred on taxable personal property. These increased rates will produce an additional $4.3 million in revenues.

It should be mentioned that the committee in many instances treated the taxpayers better than did the District government in its recommendations. District government tax recommendations which were reduced by the committee were: 4 percent admissions tax reduced to 2 percent; 4 percent tax on service charges for repair of personal property reduced to 2 percent; 2 percent tax on commercial advertising struck from the bill; fee for duplicate auto registration certificate from $5 down to $3; special use auto certificates from $5 down to $3; drivers licenses from $4 per year down to $3; issuance of a duplicate driver's permit from $5 down to $2.

Some of the tax proposals made by the District were dropped from the bill. Among these was the so-called gross expenditures tax on nonprofit, noncommercial groups, and associations such as the American Legion, the NAACP, political parties, labor unions, and the Daughters of the American Revolution. The bigger the expenditures, including deficits, the higher the payment required under this tax.

Another tax dropped from the bill was the so-called commuters tax. This is a disguised earnings or income tax on nonresidents of the District but not subject to reciprocity treatment with the state of residence of the taxpayer.

The commitee did add some taxes not recommended in the District government proposal. Sales taxes on food were increased from 1 percent to 2 percent which is the lowest rate among 30 States using that tax. A similar tax was placed on drug store medicines except those requiring a prescription.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to endorse the bill H.R. 12982, a bill to provide additional revenues to the District of Columbia, and to recommend it for favorable action by this body.

This bill, as reported, represents many hours of diligent work and deliberation by the Committee on the District of Columbia. While all its provisions do not meet with the approval of all the members of the committee, the measure is a fair compromise of such viewpoints, and in my opinion is both generous and practical in its provisions.

The Commissioner of the District of Columbia asked for considerably more funds for the fiscal year 1970 than will be provided in H.R. 12982. This difference is presented as follows:

[In millions]

	General fund increase	Highway fund increase	Total increase
Requested by District of Columbia Commissioner	$62.3	$6.107	$68.4
Provided in H.R. 12982	34.15	5.548	39.7

While the difference between the additional revenues requested and those provided in H.R. 12982 as reported is considerable, the latter amount is both sound and adequate for the proper and prudent operation of the District of Columbia government for the present fiscal year.

In support of this view, I wish to call attention to certain facts which point up the unrealistic nature of the Commissioner's request for funds, and the need for some sort of curbs on present and future spending on the part of the District government. The truth, as these facts will clearly show, is that the District of Columbia government under the new Commissioner-Council setup, is proving to be unrealistic in its financial policies to the point of fiscal irresponsibility.

First, let us examine the total budget appropriated for the District, and the number of city government employees, for the last 3 years of administration under the former Board of Commissioners, as compared with the first 3 years of operation under the Commissioner-Council form:

Fiscal year	Total appropriation (budget)	Increase 3-year period (percent)	Number of employees	Increase over 3-year period (percent)
1965	353.7		29,342	
1966	368.7		30,161	
1967	423.2	19.6	31,944	8.2
1968	520.4		34,790	
1969	554.7		38,175	
1970	727.2	39.8	45,657	31.2

With reference to the number of employees in the District government, which the above chart shows to be ballooning beyond all reason, I wish to observe further that the vast majority of these new employees are in the high-salaried category, with very few in the lower grades.

I wish also to point to the fact that whereas the executive office of the former District of Columbia Board of Commissioners operated in fiscal year 1968 with 50 employees, the office of the present District of Columbia Commissioner, together with that of the District of Columbia Council, found it necessary to engage 227 employees in fiscal year 1969, and are proposing to increase this number to 526 for fiscal year 1970. When it is considered that these 526 employees will be engaged in the same field of administrative responsibility which was handled by 50 persons only 3 years ago, I submit that this policy is just plain indefensible.

Another instance of this same alarming trend is revealed by the figures which show an increase in the number of public school employees in the District. There were 9,898 such employees in fiscal year 1968, and the Commissioner and the Council propose to increase this number to 12,918 for the coming school year, for an increase of 30.5 percent over a period when the school population in the District of Columbia has remained nearly static.

Let us turn now to the matter of the trend in the present Commissioner-Council government to escalate its spending programs, in terms of the total expenditures per year. For this purpose, I call attention to the following figures pertaining to fiscal years 1969 and 1970 as proposed by the District of Columbia government.

Fiscal year	Total District of Columbia appropriation (budget)	Loans from U.S. Treasury	Other Federal funds [1]	Total available funds
1969	$554.7	$104.8	$351.4	$1,010.9
1970	727.2	114.8	450.2	1,292.2

[1] These include direct Federal grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia government, and to agencies having significant benefit only to the District of Columbia.

From these figures, it is seen that the total annual expenditure of taxpayers' money in the District of Columbia has soared above the billion-dollar mark, while the population of the city has not increased materially for some years. This means a total expenditure of public funds of more than $1,000 per year

per capita. I submit that this figure is unequaled anywhere else in the United States. And furthermore, the present government plans to increase these expenditures substantially in the coming years. For example, at the recent hearings conducted by our committee on this subject, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia testified that he plans to seek some $100 million of additional funds for fiscal year 1971, over the sum sought for 1970.

Mr. Chairman, these facts and figures speak eloquently for themselves. It is obvious that the present government in the District of Columbia is dedicated to a fiscal policy which will lead inevitably to financial disaster for the city. I and many of my colleagues are deeply concerned about this situation, and the time has come when firm and positive steps must be taken to curb this ruinous trend, which otherwise will result very soon in the city's expenditures exceeding the ability of the taxpayers to support.

For this reason, I strongly endorse the provisions in this bill which will impose a "ceiling" on the number of District of Columbia government employees, with the exception of the Police Department, the Fire Department, and the Board of Education. This limit is established as the number of employees on the payroll as of June 30, 1969; and there is a further stipulation that the city may fill not more than three of every four vacancies occurring in the District agencies subsequent to that date. In view of the facts and figures I have cited above, I am convinced that these limitations are vitally essential to the continued financial well-being of the District of Columbia.

During my tenure in the Congress and as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have consistently been a leading advocate of legislation designed to enhance the stature and the welfare of the District of Columbia government employees. I have sponsored or cosponsored every bill during this time to raise the salaries of the city's policemen, firemen, and teachers, as a result of which these salaries are now virtually the highest of those in any city in the United States. I am proud of this accomplishment, for I earnestly believe that our Nation's Capital should offer top salaries for top-grade employees in these vitally important fields. At the same time, I realize that these salary increases cost money, and that it is incumbent on the Congress to supply adequate means of meeting these and all other necessary expenses for maintaining the city of Washington as a place all Americans can point to with pride, as their Capital City. It is with a full realization of this responsibility that I endorse the bill H.R. 12982, and the additional revenues which it will afford to the city in the amount of some $40 million annually. I feel just as strongly, however, that this is all the additional money which the city can spend wisely in the coming fiscal year, and that the Commissioner's request for nearly $30 million more is completely untenable, and nothing more nor less than a symptom of the disregard for the financial facts of life which has typified this Commissioner-Council government since its inception.

It is my understanding that certain members of the District of Columbia Committee will propose an amendment to H.R. 12982 on the floor of the House, which will delete the provisions of the bill which will curb the powers of the District government with respect to hiring of personnel—a power which my figures show has been roundly abused, and which must be restricted if the city is to survive financially. This amendment will also seek to impose an authorization for the annual Federal payment to the District, at a fixed percentage of the city's revenues to the general fund. I wish to point out that this proposal has been considered and defeated by the House District of Columbia Committee consistently each year for the past several years, simply because there is no sound argument to justify such a system. The proponents will say that the formula will enable the city government to forecast more accurately what they may rely upon for a Federal payment for the next ensuing fiscal year, and that this system also will stabilize the authorization at a fixed point. However, since the authorization for this Federal payment is just exactly that—an authorization, within which maximum limit the Congress appropriates the actual payment—this will afford no more accurate basis for predicting the payment than will the present fixed-dollar limitation. As for the second point, there will be no stabilization as a result of such a formula, because whenever the amount resulting from the formula will not be sufficiently high to suit the District government's purposes, they will simply ask for the percentage figure to be increased.

I can see no reason whatever for altering the present system of the Congress fixing a dollar limitation on this annual Federal payment. It has resulted over a long period of years in a fair and generous payment by the Federal Government in lieu of taxes on the land which is Government-occupied in the city. Furthermore, I feel that the Congress should maintain its policy of complete control over this authorization, as a part of the exercise of its financial responsibility for the Nation's Capital.

A history of the authorization and appropriation of this Federal payment over the past 10 years follows:

Fiscal year	Federal payment authorized	Federal payment appropriated
1960	$32	$25
1961	32	25
1962	32	30
1963	32	30
1964	50	37.5
1965	50	37.5
1966	50	44.25
1967	60	58
1968	70	70
1969	90	89.4
1970	[1] 105	

[1] Proposed in H.R. 12982.

I submit that this payment historically has been both generous and adequate, and call attention to the fact that in the past 5 years, the authorization has more than doubled.

I wish at this point to call attention to section 903 of this proposed legislation, which "freezes" the appropriation of any part of this Federal payment until the Congress is assured that the District of Columbia government has committed itself, beyond recall, to fulfilling the requirements placed upon it by section 23 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968. This is the Federal law calling for the construction of four elements of the District's freeway system, including the long-delayed Three Sisters Bridge and Potomac River Freeway, and a "serious" study of another. These freeways are essential to the completion of the Federal Interstate Highway System through the Washington metropolitan area—and also are now essential to the beginning of construction on the rapid rail transit system planned for the area.

I am the author of this provision in the bill, and submit that there is no provision more vitally important to the citizens not only of the District of Columbia, but of the entire metropolitan region. All studies show that the area must have both a complete freeway system and a far-reaching subway system within the next few years, to cope with the flow of traffic which is bound to develop. All the suburban jurisdictions have held referendums, and the citizens in those communities have voted overwhelmingly to authorize the expenditure of their share of the cost of the Metro project, the planning of which is complete and ready for the construction phase to begin. Further, the President has expressed strong support for this project. And yet the matter stands on dead center because the District of Columbia Council, in deference to the clamor of a small, selfish segment of the city's population, thus far has shown no inclination whatever to comply with the 1968 Highway Act, in which the Congress directed the District explicitly to proceed with this work, 90 percent of the cost of which is to be borne by the Federal Government.

I wish to stress the simple fact that the U.S. Constitution places upon the Congress the duty of legislating for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia Council, representing only a part of the administrative entity which was heretofore comprised of a three-member Board of Commissioners, is thereby subordinate to the legislative will of the Congress. For this reason, I find the defiant attitude of the Council in this matter incomprehensible; and I and my colleagues on the District of Columbia Committee do not propose to permit this galling situation to continue. Hence, we have used this method for bringing about the compliance with Federal law which was the duty of the District of Columbia Council from the date of its enactment.

I wish to comment briefly upon a remark by the Vice Chairman of the Council, quoted in last week's newspaper, in which he called this action on the part of our committee "unmitigated arrogance." Mr. Chairman, I submit that this individual is confused—for what greater arrogance can be imagined than the action of the District of Columbia Council in defying the edict of the Congress in this matter?

Mr. Chairman, I submit that this bill, in its present form, is eminently fair and reasonable. It provides more than adequate financing for the prudent conduct of the District of Columbia government for the coming year, and at the same time it contains some restrictions which are long overdue, on the irresponsible fiscal policies of the present city government, without which only financial chaos can ensue. I urge support for this measure, without further amendment, on the part of my colleagues in the House.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I want during this short time to indicate what the position of the minority on the committee will be—and it is a bipartisan minority and it has nothing to do with partisanship.

I want to hand at this time to the chairman, so it will be available to him and to others, copies of the substitute which we will offer. I have delivered copies of this to both sides so that they are available.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute amendment will not change basically the bill so far as the compromises on taxes were concerned. We did have to compromise on many of the taxes—tax on food and on beverages and on many other things. We have done that.

Many of us do not like them, but we will not try to change them in the substitute. That part of the bill is a compromise, because taxes are always difficult.

There are two parts of the bill basically which we will offer to change, and which I urge all of you to join with us and particularly I urge my friends on this side of the aisle to look carefully at what we are proposing and to join with us, because our substitute first is a substitute which says that we believe in local government and we should not move backward.

We are moving in the substitute to remove restrictions on local government. For example, the local government, in Washington, D.C., has levied real and personal property taxes since 1922. But the bill suggested by the committee removes that power and brings it into the Congress, so that we each year, working to have a change in property taxes, would have to pass on it in Congress.

Now we cannot get out the appropriation bills to run the Federal Government each year on time, which is July 1, and look what would happen in the District of Columbia. If you do not pass the revenue bill before August 1, you cannot levy real property taxes with the increase for the whole ensuing year. You lose a year's taxes. And yet when have we passed revenue bills in Congress? In 1963, August 27; 1965, September 30; 1967, November 3; 1968, August 2—which would have meant, for example, and would mean this year we would lose $4 million worth of revenue.

Let us not move backward. We are not even asking in the substitute that we move forward. All we are saying is, let us not move in on this government and cut it. Let us try not to hurt it.

Consider the Public Safety Director. This Congress has required that the District of Columbia do something about crime. We have passed a Law-Enforcement Assistance Act. President Nixon has come here with a great reform act. Yet the positions which would be necessary to carry this out are done away with in the committee bill. In the substitute we are saying, just leave that alone. Give them a chance to put the personnel in the courts, and give them a chance to put the personnel on that are necessary to do this.

We talk about the amount of money involved—most of the increases that are involved in what we are asking for in this bill in an increase of the Federal formula are for salaries of people that we, the Congress, have demanded be put on. We cannot expand the court system and reform it here when you are rolling back personnel—not just freezing it as of June 30, but this bill takes 25 percent of the new positions away. The Washington Technical Institute will not be able to expand from 900 to 1,400 students, and yet that is vocational education, which everybody, including the President of the United States, is saying that we have to have right now. We want work-fare rather than welfare, and yet we are going to cut out the institution that will give the work-fare.

The Federal City College—instead of the Federal City College being able to expand and to give people here a chance so they can learn new work, they will not be able to expand because the positions will be removed.

We talk about voluntary programs for schools—and this will be offered by the gentleman from Virginia, but it is part of our substitute too. For the first time we are trying to make some arrangements between the districts of Maryland and Virginia to voluntarily have exchange programs for schoolchildren. The committee bill of last year prohibited this. We are just saying, "Give it a chance."

I will close my remarks in general debate in this way: We will offer a substitute that will do nothing more than try to provide the money for the jobs we have asked the District to do and to remove the restrictions. All the rest of the bill is identical to the committee bill. We have not backed up on any part of it.

The issue is not partisan. The issue is not one of liberalism versus conservatism. The issue is whether we recognize what has happened in our cities. The people have been moved in. We have to do what we can about it, to make it operate in the best possible fashion. That is all the substitute is. We hope for support from both sides of the aisle. We believe the proposal which we are making in the substitute is very moderate.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment which will be presented at a later point. I want to speak especially about the committee bill and particularly the fact that it is presented in a poor manner. We are not furnishing the House a bill which is in balance. According to the chart which appears in the minority views, this bill is out of balance by approximately $33 million. I think it is very inappropriate for the District Committee to present a bill which is not going to provide adequate finances to pay the expenses of the District government.

I want to speak in terms of the Federal payment. The substitute amendment will provide for a formula approach. President Nixon in his message to the Congress on April 28, 1969, made this statement with regard to the Federal payment, and I want particularly to call the attention of Members on the Republican side to the President's comments on the Federal payment formula. Mr. Nixon said in his message:

> The District of Columbia cannot achieve strong and efficient government unless it has ample and dependable sources of financing. Sound financing can be achieved only if the Federal Government pays its appropriate share.
>
> I therefore recommend that the Congress authorize a Federal payment formula, fixing the Federal contribution at 30 percent of local tax and other general fund revenues.
>
> This formula would equitably reflect the Federal interest in the District of Columbia at this time with respect to:
>
> —the 217,000 Federal employees who work in the District, about one-third of the local work force.
>
> —the more than 10 million Americans who visit their Nation's Capital each year.
>
> —the embassies and nationals of the foreign governments.
>
> —the land and buildings owned by the Federal Government which cannot be taxed but comprise more than 40 percent of the District's land value.
>
> Enactment of a formula approach would be a significant step toward effective government in the District. It would tie the level of Federal aid to the burden of local taxes on the District's citizens. It would also provide the District with a predictable estimate for use in the annual budget process, thus allowing it to plan its expenditures more accurately and imaginatively for the growing needs of its population. A similar formula, dealing with District borrowing authorization, was enacted by the Congress more than a year ago—and has already proven its worth in improved budgetary planning.
>
> The proposed Federal payment formula would not involve an automatic expenditure of Federal funds. The Federal payment would still have to be appropriated by Congress.
>
> By authorizing the Federal payment at 30 percent of all District general fund revenues, the Congress would allow a payment of $120 million in fiscal 1970, an increase of $30 million above the present fixed authorization. This payment is incorporated in the District's 1970 budget request.

I think it is very important for us to remember that President Nixon and President Johnson have each approached the solutions to the revenue of the District of Columbia with a Federal payment formula. The substitute does provide this formula in lieu of the lump sum payment which is in the committee bill.

I also want to refer to the fact that the President in his message of April 28—from which I was just reading—also pointed out it was necessary to strengthen the City Council and the Mayor. In other words, he was making a

very strong point for local self-government.

Mr. Chairman, in this area of demonstrated human need in our Nation's cities, and in this era of rising hopes that self-government may someday become a reality in the Nation's Capital city, I am ashamed to have to say that the committee's bill is a punitive, backward piece of legislation. Instead of providing the authorization for a practical and predictable financial relationship between the District government and the Federal Government, it continues the spoon-fed lump-sum payment approach—and in a wholly inadequate amount. Instead of building confidence in the reorganized District government, which many of us, including our President, have viewed as a stepping stone to home rule, the committee has seen fit to punish the local government by diminishing its already miniscule powers to deal with the problems of a sprawling urban area.

At a time when the Congress and the country are so concerned with the problem of crime, the committee bill denies to the Mayor, the right to organize the public safety functions of his government under a capable Director of Public Safety. At a time when our own President has risen to the need for more concentration on human needs and social needs, the committee bill slashes the revenue-raising powers of the District government, and scrimps on its financial payment from the Federal Government. It is nothing less than punitive and regressive.

This bill removes from the local government the ability to tax both real and personal property. This authority has been left with the District of Columbia since 1922. I see no justification for this Congress to remove that authority from the District of Columbia government.

In addition to this, we place a number of restrictions on the ability of the District of Columbia to employ people to do the job of government.

The gentleman from Washington just a moment ago was making the point with regard to some of the functions of the District of Columbia government which are going to be severely affected by this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes at this time to the former mayor of Dallas, the Honorable EARLE CABELL.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge overwhelming support for the bill as reported out by the committee, and rejection of the substitute which will be offered. I submit to the Members that there is nothing sacrosanct about the revenue proposals of the District government, either this year or the next year.

I also submit that there should not be left in the hands of the District Government the right, the power, year after year, to increase the property taxes on the people of the District. The District Committee can well—and therefore the Congress should well—regain that control.

The District Committee had long hearings on these various proposals and I am one of those who attended practically full time.

I am quite frank in saying that the District of Columbia officials did not satisfy me that they needed to jump their 1970 budget to $712.2 million—the highest in the city's history, and an increase of $160.2 million over the record-breaking $552 million appropriated in the current year. Neither did they satisfy a majority of the other members of the District Committee as to this point. And apparently they have not satisfied a majority of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee who have been considering this monster of a budget.

The District Committee—or a majority of the committee who sat through these hearings—feel that the bill as reported adequately provides for the District's "needs"—I emphasize "needs" as opposed to "desires"—this year, as submitted in the District budget.

Some of those signing the minority report would have Members believe that unless the Congress approves in toto the District's asking budget of $712.2 million, and unless the Congress provides $64 million through increase in taxes and a 30-percent increase in the Federal contribution to the city's revenue resources—the city will be bankrupt.

They claim all this is needed in larger part because of pay increases in the last Congress.

Let us take a look at that.

The facts are that last year we did increase the pay of police—and I supported it—by 10.1 percent, with $8,000 as a starting salary, at an annual total cost for this increase of $5.1 million.

Then we increased the teachers' pay—which I supported—by 19.2 percent with starting salary of $7,000 for 10 months' work, at a total cost of $13 million.

We then passed a revenue bill providing $46.4 million new revenues for the District—a $20 million increase in Federal payment, from $70 million to $90 million, and $26.4 from various tax increases—more than sufficient to meet the pay increases that have been referred to.

In the first session of last Congress, we earlier provided $110 million more as resources to the District government—$10 million increase in Federal payment and $100 million increase over three years in borrowing authority.

So the District has been well supplied with funds to meet current needs. Of course, if it continues to jump District of Columbia personnel as it proposes this year to 45,000-plus—a 50-percent increase over 3 years ago—then, I submit Mr. Chairman, the Congress can never keep apace the District's annual revenue demands.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate the point which was so well made by my colleague from New York (Mr. HORTON), that in essence the substitute proposal which my colleague from Washington is offering contains the principle of home rule, which is close to Republican philosophy. Before going into this I would like to reiterate what the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) said; namely, that the President in his message to the Congress recommended that the Congress authorize a Federal payment formula fixing the Federal contribution at 30 percent. That is exactly what we have in this amendment. This is what the President felt was necessary for the District of Columbia; this represented the Federal interest in the District of Columbia; and this is what President Nixon felt that the District of Columbia should have in order to achieve strong and efficient government. So I hope on my side of the aisle we will think about this very carefully.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I have a particular interest in the part of the substitute amendment which pertains to the Bannockburn-Meyer program of voluntarily taking a small number of school students from the District of Columbia and having them receive their schooling in Montgomery County. This open school project involves a total of approximately 25 students who under a voluntary arrangement between the District of Columbia school system, the Montgomery County schools, and the parents and teachers of the two schools involved are seeking to have their children attend school together. This program is small in scope but large in significance. It is completely voluntary in terms of participation but compels the minds and spirits of those of us who hope for reduced tension and greater understanding between the cities and suburbs. Its overall costs are inconsequential, but the promsied gain could never be measured in financial terms.

I certainly hope that my colleagues in the House will take a good look at this aspect of the substitute amendment. I would like to have you look at it in terms of a situation in your own district where two school boards wanted voluntarily to provide for a student exchange program with the provision that those students who participated could do it on a voluntary basis only. Would you want Congress to say "No" and let the heavy hand of the Federal Government come out and reach into the school districts in your own congressional district and direct the manner in which they wanted to conduct their own affairs?

I urge the support of the substitute proposal of my colleague from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in some sadness with reference to this bill that is now pending before the House.

I had hoped that through the years in working on the District of Columbia Committee we might find some way of arriving at balanced programs and proposals that would generally command the support of the House of Representatives. We seem to have failed in that effort. But I am sorry that we failed, because the District of Columbia is burdened with so many problems that when our committee is unable to address itself in a manner which would lead to a reasoned, balanced, and careful approach to these problems in an effort to help the

District of Columbia, then we are all the losers.

Mr. Chairman, there are two main problems with this bill. First it impairs legitimate local government authority which the District of Columbia has exercised for many years.

Second, it falls short in providing the minimum necessary revenue in order to keep the District moving.

The invasion of the District's authority occurs in four specific instances. First, the bill tells the District that no matter what its judgment may be on the matter, it may not have a Public Safety Commissioner. There has been a Public Safety Commissioner for the past several years. That Commissioner oversees the responsibilities of the Fire Department, the Police Department, the Civil Defense Agency. That Commissioner helps to make sure that Federal acts such as the Safe Streets Act and Crime Control Act are implemented. That Commissioner seeks to coordinate the various agencies concerned with crime, corrections, the juvenile program section, as well as the courts, and so on.

Why should we tell the District that it cannot have that type of position? What superior knowledge do we have which indicates that we know they have no use for a Public Safety Commissioner? They want it and they have it. Now, however, we are going to take it away.

Mr. Chairman, this question was not discussed in the hearings. One can go through all of the pages of the hearings and find not one word to the effect that the committee was going to consider such a proposal. To be frank with the members of this committee, in the mark-up of the bill itself there were 3 or 4 minutes devoted to this issue. It seems as though someone had already made up their mind.

Mr. Chairman, the second impairment of local government authority comes when the Congress strips away from the District the right to set local, personal, and real estate taxes, a right that it has exercised since 1922 or for a period of some 47 years.

Perhaps, one could argue that it does not make any difference if we take away this essentially local government prerogative, because the Congress has to approve the budget anyway. However, the practical problem is that if we do not act by August 1, there is not going to be any property tax increase because the certification has to occur that early each year for there to be a change in the tax rates.

What this means, as a practical matter, is that if we want, or somebody wanted, to defeat an increase they would not have to be against it, they can simply delay it. I think this will be very good protection to the big property owners, to those who want to resist any increase in local and State property taxes, but I do not believe it serves the interests of the people of the District at all. Certainly there is no justification advanced for this extraordinary withdrawal of a 47-year-old right.

Third, this bill puts a personnel freeze on the employment in the District. They say there are certain exceptions like firemen, policemen, and the schools——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, this is not only an employment freeze on the rest of the agencies, it is a rollback, because only three vacancies out of every four may be filled. So this means that the proposed enrollment at the Federal City College next year may not happen, cannot happen, because the additional personnel which they seek would be denied by this freeze.

The same is true of the Technical Institute. The same is true in the correctional institutions, the same is true of the General Hospital. The same is true for vocational rehabilitation.

This is one of these blunt kind of acts which cuts indiscriminately across all of the agencies.

I am sorry that this bill invades in this unfortunate way the authority of the District of Columbia to run its own affairs. I doubt that anyone's interests would be served by the passage of this kind of bill, and I urge that we support the substitute which will be offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota 1 additional minute.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

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

Mr. FRASER. I am happy to yield to the gentlemen from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman recognizes, of course, that the bill as it is reported by the committee here will permit about 3,800 new employees in the District of Columbia for the current fiscal year over what it was last year?

The provision limiting the employment to three out of four vacancies would only mean about a 10-percent reduction in the number of employees that were put on in the fiscal year that has just lapsed.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Texas tell me whether he intends that the 2,000 applicants for the Federal City College who had planned to enter this fall should be denied admission because they cannot hire the additional faculty? Is that the intention of the gentleman?

Mr. DOWDY. I would state to the gentleman from Minnesota that we had no showing in the committee hearings, as I recall it, that any of this would reduce the enrollment by 2,000. To the contrary, there is no reduction provided, and the enrollment this fall would be at least equal to last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman from Texas, if you will look at the last three pages of the hearings, you find a list of new employees which are asked for by the Federal City College, by the Technical Institute, for the transfer of employees under vocational rehabilitation, for the juvenile section, for the court system, and so on. Now, the effect of this reduction of all these new employees for the Federal City College is that the students who would hope to enroll in Federal City College or the Technical Institute will be out in the cold. I am sorry that the gentleman did not recognize this before he voted for the bill in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first may I pay my respects to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER)? The gentleman and I worked together on the last revenue bill that was passed, and I appreciate his concern, and his deep study of everything the gentleman undertakes.

And I wish to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS), who called me out in Minnesota, for his courtesy in telling me what the minority was doing on the bill. I advised the gentleman that my intelligence department had already advised me, so the gentleman could have saved the expense of the call.

Next may I pay my compliments to Mayor Washington. It has been my endeavor, as a member of this committee, to on all occasions work closely with the Mayor. I think the Mayor has done a conscientious job, and that he is a dedicated person, highly motivated. Therefore it has been my endeavor in every respect to work with the city government as closely and cooperatively as possible.

I wish to review a little of the background of laboring on the District of Columbia Committee. You know, out on the farm in the spring of the year we used to order our baby chicks, and it says "ROT" which means "record of performance."

Membership on the Committee on the District of Columbia, I can say, is a thankless job. It is politically unrewarding to be on the committee because there is little that you can do on the committee that adds any political mileage at home. But I felt being a member of the committee required that I accept the responsibility that goes with membership.

To look back for a moment, the subway system, which is having its difficulties, I offered on the Republican side. The Federal City College—which has had its difficulties—but that will shake out and after a while it will be doing the job the way it ought to be done—you have to learn to walk before you fly; and the vocational school—which is one of the greatest contributions to this city so far as the youth of this city are concerned—were both sponsored by me. I was the lone author. There was nobody else—

nobody else in this body—who joined in the authorship of those bills. The Children's Hospital and the land-grant college provisions—which gives this city a chance to use some of the money as all other cities all over the country are given—are other products of my labor on the committee.

So I am rather proud of the record of my performance on the District of Columbia Committee.

Now in this bill that is before us, the revenue bill, as was pointed out, many of the new authorities for taxation that are contained in the bill are a little controversial, but the bill is a product of committee compromises.

I must say I know of no time when there was a better atmosphere of working together in that committee, and believe me we have had some stormy sessions, than when we worked on the taxing authority granted to the District of Columbia.

Then came the final action on the bill. I am frank to say that there were areas where I disagreed with the final decision of the committee; but I am also frank to say I am of the opinion, when we go to conference, those controversial items will be ironed out to the satisfaction of everyone concerned.

The Federal payment formula has become a great rallying point for some. Had we adopted the formula in the 1968 District of Columbia Revenue Act, the city would have had less money than we give them by direct appropriation. I think the formula is perhaps a convenience, and it might be very fine and all that, but I do not think that is all important to the revenue bill.

Then getting down to some of the other things referred to in the bill, including the dollar figure, I might point out that in many cases on these estimated dollar figures that the District government provided to the House, some appear substantially overstated, some are not. For instance, I might refer to the Federal City College budget that has estimated need of $7,398,000 based on an enrollment that the District government assumes they will have.

I think it must be said that one of the greatest mistakes we could make for the Federal City College is to expand it beyond its ability to govern its own destiny. They are having problems administering the college at this time which, when resolved, and I am sure they will be, will permit further growth.

As to the vocational schools, we have youngsters up there, everyone of whom when they finish will have a job, and I have no desire to put restrictions on them. But I must say, actually, going over these figures that I come up with $40 million of budget funds affected by prior congressional enactments rather than the $54 million claimed by the District government.

I am of the opinion when we get through with consideration of the revenue bill that we are going to have a good bill. I am hopeful we might proceed on the floor here without getting into a wide variety of arguments that can be resolved in conference. As noted earlier, I have had the feeling that the restriction on the District of Columbia governments' power to tax should not have been in the bill, but should have been in the committee report.

There are other things that I would have approached differently than the manner in which this bill is drafted, but when you are on a committee—you must compromise to achieve good legislation.

Finally, when the bill comes on the floor, I, as a member of the committee, intend to support the bill the committee has reported out after extensive hearings.

So here we are at this time with this bill and I hope that on this floor there will be give and take and we will not proceed in a manner which is going to destroy the passage of a bill—the immediate passage of the bill—because every day we wait, the city government stands to lose revenue because the effective date of the bill will have been postponed and the tax revenue lost forever.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. I would ask the gentleman if it is not true that on all of the proposals that we worked on the first day that the committee had long discussions on we arrived at a compromise, and that none of those are questioned; the only items being questioned are the Federal formula, which we assume would have bipartisan support—we were surprised it did not pass; it was only narrowly defeated—and, second, a series of items of restrictions which were not discussed when we were talking about revenue matters but came up later?

Mr. NELSEN. That is exactly correct. But I might add this: The position that is taken by the minority here is not exactly a consistent one, for the reason that the so-called balanced transportation amendment is in the Adams-Fraser-Gude-Horton bill, which is a restriction on the city government, and I agree with it. I agree with it. I think it should be there. But there is a little inconsistency in that respect in that they oppose virtually all other restrictions.

I think we must also go back and review a little of the problems dealing with the Public Safety Director. You will recall that when Mr. Murphy was appointed Director, the City Police Department found itself supervised by Mr. Murphy. The history involved in the appointment of a Public Safety Director must be considered. I talked with the Mayor's Office about it, and he indicated that he had now appointed an attorney in this position rather than a policeman because he did not want to give the appearance of any interference with the Police Department.

It may well be that his position as evidenced by his appointment needs to be given attention. I certainly would not want to move in any direction that would tie the hands of the Mayor to get better law enforcement in the District of Columbia. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN), has indicated that the top priority item is law enforcement here in the District of Columbia. So my plea today is that we work things out in a manner that is going to produce good end results, and remember that we always go to conference. Remember that there are areas that you must yield back and forth on a bit, and I am sure we can finally work out a bill to the satisfaction of everyone concerned including the District of Columbia government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On August 7, 1969:

H.R. 9951. An act to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments during each taxable year; to make status of employer depend on employment during preceding as well as current taxable year; to exclude from the computation of the excess the balance in the employment security administration account as of the close of fiscal years 1970 through 1972; to raise the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the employment security administration account by the amounts so excluded; and for other purposes.

On August 9, 1969:

H.R. 10946. An act to promote health and safety in the building trades and construction industry in all Federal and federally financed or federally assisted construction projects.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1969

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, this is a revenue bill and a tax measure, one could say. I understand it is traditional in the House that such bills come to the floor of the House under a closed rule. I only regret that this one did not. The District of Columbia Committee is one of those committees on which apparently no one wishes to serve but everyone knows how the District should be run.

Before discussing the issues in the bill, I, too, wish to join in commending the work and efforts of the chairman and the ranking minority members on both sides of the aisle and all the members of the committee for the diligence they brought to this task. This is not a perfect bill, as most bills we bring in from other committees are not, either. As I understand the revenue-producing functions here, $90 million was the amount that was produced last time as the Federal share and $105 million is contained in this bill.

If the Members want to know what is

happening, that is the amount of the increase in Federal participation. As I say, there are many things that are not in the bill that I would like to see in the bill, but there are many things in that I would like to have in.

We do not have a commuter tax. Some of my friends, among the more progressive in many measures, do not want the commuter tax. It seems to me the real thing we need in the District of Columbia is the real thing they have in cities like St. Louis and New York and other parts of the country, to provide that when the sun goes down, the people who leave the city then must still pay for the things that go on there in the daytime. Of course, that is not in the bill and it has no prospects of being in the bill.

Personal property tax—we are taking away from the District the right to levy personal property tax. If I recall the hearings correctly, the personal property tax on such things as automobiles and furniture is not now levied in the District. I was surprised to find this out. In the Judiciary Subcommittee on Claims, we find occasions where a two-bedroom apartment burned down and they have suffered $18,000 worth of loss in furniture and possessions. One wonders how this could be true. But we find here many foreign service and military personnel who have traveled around the world and have many small or personal property items of much value, and this is true.

In my home State, the city might have a provision for a city license tax on personal cars, we do not have that here.

Somehow taking this power away from the District is somewhat like cutting off part of a lamb's tail. He is not using it for any useful purpose in any event.

We would like to see a great deal of improvement made in the schools of the District of Columbia. I suspect there are needs of this kind in all of our districts. If I recall correctly the Bannockburn plan involves transporting—busing—21 out of 150,000 students at a cost of $17,000. Then they ask the Federal Government to come in with that much money. Try proposing for one of your school districts the busing of that small a percentage—.00014—of the students for $17,000, in Federal money. See how far you get. Maybe they should, but I do not believe they will.

On the issue of employees and their needs, if the staff figures are correct and include the same level of personnel in all cities—such as school people, firemen, policemen, and all the city employees—the proportion of the city employees to population is in the neighborhood of—for a city of 750,000, give or take 20,000, so we are talking about the same size cities and not talking about cities of 300,000—or 2 million—the District of Columbia has two times as many employees as San Francisco, and the District has three times as many employees as the city of St. Louis, and the District has four times as many employees as Milwaukee. All being cities of about 750,000 population. I do not think a freeze on that would be the worst thing that could happen.

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

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

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have a chart here showing how many employees are in the District of Columbia government. The population of thet District of Columbia is 809,000. In the fiscal year just lapsed, they had 38,175 employees in the District of Columbia government. That is one person, out of every 21 men, women and children in the District of Columbia working for the District government. The proposal here in the substitute is to increase that number of positions of employees to 45,657, which would be one out of every 17 inhabitants of the District of Columbia, men, women, and children, who will be employees of the government. I think a limitation is timely.

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

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 1 additional minute.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, basically I have about concluded what I wanted to say. I think there are many things that should be in this bill that are not in, and some are in—such as sales taxes on food and drugs—but I think that overall the committee has done its work very well and has worked very hard. There are many changes and improvements that could be made. I believe they have done a reasonable job. I urge Members to support this bill. In the absence of supporting this bill, I do not think the work of the city council can best be done by 435 people, and I would recommend sending it back to the committee for more work, if we cannot support the bill as it is.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, my remaining time.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to provide some information on one or two statements that have been made.

As far as my position on safety director is concerned, my main concern, and that the majority of members of the committee, is that we have two chiefs of police, as long as we have a safety director.

We know what happened last year when there was this so-called riot. The safety director gave orders for no policeman to touch any looter or anyone. From that time on it seemed the safety director was running the city of Washington including the Police Department.

On this tax proposal, I feel Congress should have all the taxing authority or none. We get confused every time we try to write a tax bill, when half the taxing authority is downtown and half is here in the Congress. Either all of the tax authority shoud be given to the city, or it should be given back to the Congress.

The only means we have of holding down spending is to place a limitation on the jobs in the District of Columbia. I do not know of any other means of taking care of the spiral of spending people's money here in the Nation's Capital. If we do not do something, from now on your taxpayers and my taxpayers will pay for this, because we have gone as far as we can in taxing the people who live in the District of Columbia, if we expect to allow them to stay in business here.

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

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

Mr. CABELL. I thank the gentleman.

With reference to the director of public safety, that suprapolice chief, will the chairman of the committee not agree with me that the post of Chief of Police is sufficiently important that he should report directly to the chief executive officer and not have to go through a tenuous chain of command in order to properly discharge the duties of that important office?

Mr. McMILLAN. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Texas. I believe he should report directly to the Mayor of the city.

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments to H.R. 12982, the District of Columbia revenue bill. The bill as reported falls far short of meeting the funding needs of the District and contains a number of restrictive provisions impairing the powers of the local government.

It is indeed unfortunate that the Congress must continue to exercise the functions of a city council for the District of Columbia. Yet so long as this condition prevails it is incumbent that we exercise that responsibility realistically and responsibly.

There is a definite need for an adequate Federal contribution to the local budget and a pronounced policy for a number of years for this item. Only by such action on our part can the local government properly budget and finance its operations. Further the freeze on additional employees as provided in the bill will impede the District government's activities in a number of vital fields.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendments to the bill so as to rectify its shortcomings.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, a little less than 200 years ago our forefathers revolted against its duly constituted government because of, among other reasons, "taxation without representation." Today we are considering a tax bill without those being taxed represented.

We also are considering an area, Washington, D.C., where we work, even if all of us do not live in it, without representation of the people whose lives we are directing. I am ashamed of the recent misuse of congressional power in this District, I am ashamed of the use of blackmail, withdrawal of funds, and threats used to blackjack the City Council of Washington, D.C., into accepting a freeway plan and the Three Sisters Bridge.

I wonder if this House of Representatives might consider allowing the citizens of Washington to have their views represented in our deliberations. In particular I would suggest the Congress allow the people of Washington to vote on the freeway and on the bridge—a

referendum as has already been proposed—and that Congress abide by the wishes of the people of Washington. We are, or at least we are supposed to be, a Republic and we do, or at least we are supposed to, represent the wishes of the people.

For those who decry civil disorder, and I am one of them, I would remind them of the duties of government. In December 16, 1773, the people of Boston made known their feelings about taxation without representation. I do not recommend such a party to the people of Washington, D.C., but I do hope they will be allowed to make their wishes known to this Congress and that this Congress will respond to them.

The Washington Post this morning in an excellent editorial pointed out the needs of this district. I include it in this RECORD.

There are 800,000 people living in this district. I urge that we franchise these American citizens.

THE DISTRICT REVENUE BILL

The Capital is fortunate in its friends. A bipartisan group of them in the House of Representatives—Congressmen Adams, Diggs, Fraser, Gude, Horton and Jacobs—will make an effort on the floor today to make available to this community the funds it imperatively needs to meet its essential responsibilities. They are sponsoring a realistic and rational substitute for the District Revenue bill approved by the House District Committee.

The House District Committee, controlled by solons from such metropoli as Florence, South Carolina, Okolona, Mississippi, and Athens, Texas, has commanded, like the Pharaoh of *Exodus:* "Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick, as heretofore: let them go and gather straw for themselves." Worse, indeed, the Committee has told the people of the District to make brick without straw at all; it has so cramped and confined the resources of this community as to leave it without the means of doing what it has to do.

The substitute proposal to be presented today by the District's friends would add to the committee-approved revenue measure in some important ways. First, and perhaps foremost, it would adopt the 30 per cent federal payment formula as the fair contribution of the United States in lieu of taxes. That the Congress of the United States should want the country to deal unjustly and ungenerously with its Capital is incomprehensible. Under the substitute bill, the federal payment would be raised by about ten million dollars, in part by enabling the District to raise more revenue from its own residents, in part by an enlargement of the federal percentage.

The substitute bill would also unshackle the District in some other important ways. It would remove a foolish and despotic provision approved by the District Committee forbidding the Mayor to have a public Safety Director, an aide he very sorely needs. The substitute would additionally lift a burdensomely restrictive hiring freeze in the District Committee bill forbidding the city government to employ additional personnel for such vital functions as its Welfare and Health Departments, the Mayor's administrative staff and the faculty of the Federal City College. Another extremely irksome restraint would be removed by the substitute bill—the mean and mischievous prohibition adopted by the District Committee against the Bannockburn-Meyer Open School Project.

Like every other major city, Washington has pressing and troublesome urban ills. But it is not lacking in energy and imagination to deal with those ills. It can overcome them—if it is accorded the freedom and the means to do so. The solution of urban problems requires money, just as the making of bricks in ancient days required straw. Congress, which has insisted upon retaining in its hands complete control of the District's affairs, has a clear responsibility to enable it to function effectively.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1969".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I want the Members of the House to know that I appreciate the cooperation that our Committee on Appropriations has always received from the District of Columbia Committee. The District of Columbia Committee not only understands the problems of our Capital City, but all down through the years, has done something about them. The chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), are to be commended for their service on this committee.

I know that our Capital City has benefited as the result of the services of all of the members of this committee.

I have served as a member of the Committee on Appropriations for over 14 years and one of the subcommittees that I have served on during this period of time is the District of Columbia Budget Subcommittee. As chairman of this subcommittee, I have attempted at all times to work with the members of the legislative committee on the District of Columbia.

In 1955, which was the first year that I served as a member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget, the amount of the Federal payment was $20 million, and for fiscal year 1969 the amount of the Federal payment is $89,365,000. The total budget for the District of Columbia in the year 1955 was $171,936,114. In the fiscal year 1969 the total budget for the District of Columbia was $583,595,388 and this, added to the Federal grants to the District of Columbia of $186,857,674, make a total of $770,453,062 for the District of Columbia. No city in this country, comparable in size, has a larger budget.

For fiscal year 1970 the request is for $732,788,000. The Federal grants for fiscal year 1970 will total $133,226,000. This will make a total of $866,014,000.

The difference between the budget for fiscal year 1969 and the budget for fiscal year 1970 is $149,192,612. This is quite an increase and almost the size of the budget for fiscal year 1955.

The District of Columbia Committee has always all down through the years brought to this House the necessary authorization bills to keep our Capital City moving along.

The members of our Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget and the full Committee on Appropriations believe that there is a place for both a freeway system and a rapid rail transit system in our Capital City. We know that in order to meet the tremendous day-by-day growth of traffic, the highway program must be carried out along with the presently authorized rapid rail transit system.

The bill before the House today contains 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, secs. 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 such projects, or (2) the District of Columbia 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 any agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I will recommend to the House that all of the construction money authorized and requested of our Appropriations Committee for rapid rail transit be approved immediately, and that the rapid rail transit system go under construction when the President of the United States has reported to the Congress that the District of Columbia 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 such projects.

If the President reports that work actually has begun and is continuing on each of these projects we will recommend that the $18,737,000 deleted from the supplemental appropriations bill together with the $21,586,000 in the regular appropriations bill for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1970 be appropriated along with any other money authorized and approved for rapid rail transit construction. Our subcommittee will be called into session just as soon as this revenue legislation is enacted and we will have the official of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority before our committee. At this time we will complete our hearings on the District of Columbia budget for fiscal year 1970.

If the President does not report to Congress that work actually has begun and is continuing on the projects listed in section 23(b) of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968 and suits have been filed to stop the projects listed in section 23(b), then just as soon as such litigation is succesfully concluded with all order, decrees and judgments complied with in full by District officials, we will recommend all construction money for rapid rail transit.

If no suits are filed and the District officials proceed immediately, along with the officials of the Federal Government who must approve any and all freeway projects, to place the projects underway beyond recall as provided under the

Highway Act of 1968, then, Mr. Chairman, we will recommend all of the money authorized and requested of our Appropriations Committee for rapid rail transit construction be appropriated immediately.

If we join hands and stop all unnecessary delays and procrastinations there is no reason why rapid rail transit money should not be included in the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970. This is the goal that we should hope to achieve and I pledge that we will do everything within our power to see that it is accomplished.

Mr. Chairman, I have no right as chairman of the District of Columbia Budget Subcommittee to recommend to the full Committee on Appropriations or to the House, that the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 be ignored or bypassed. I do not intend to make any recommendations which will repudiate the Public Works Committee or the law passed by Congress designated as the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968. This is the law and it must be enforced.

If lawsuits are filed certainly Congress has the right to expect the Corporation Counsel's Office to immediately proceed to vigorously defend the District of Columbia and to see that any and all suits are brought to a final conclusion as speedily as possible. The type of suit filed and the urgency of the matter involved should mean a speedy decision by the court. Not months or years but a few weeks. Certainly not the procedure that we were confronted with in the year 1966 when we had a suit that dragged on until February 1968.

There is every reason to believe that President Nixon will continue his efforts to see that this impasse is solved and will instruct the Attorney General to assign able members of his staff to assist the Corporation Counsel's Office in successfully defending any and all litigation which may result from the action of the District officials.

Mr. Chairman, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, under the chairmanship of Mr. Babson, and under the managership of Gen. Jackson Graham, has made every effort to be of assistance in bringing about a solution to the impasse between freeways and rapid transit. The Directors and all of the employees and members of the Authority certainly have been patient during the time that we have attempted to solve this problem. At no time, Mr. Chairman, has there been any evidence presented to us which indicates that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority has made any move to stop the freeway system. Unequivocally and at all times, the Authority has publicly stated that a balanced transportation system is necessary for our Capital City.

In 1958, after a 5-year study, the freeway program was set up for the District of Columbia. Beginning in that year we started appropriating money for this system and today we have in Federal and District funds over $200 million that is available and ready to use immediately.

In the year 1962 we started having trouble over the freeway system. Each year from 1962 and up to 1966 every effort was made to destroy the freeway system. In 1966 our subcommittee on the District of Columbia budget appeared before the full committee and later before the House and recommended that the rapid transit money be deleted because the freeway system had been stopped. We stated to the Members of the House that when the freeway system started and reached the point of no recall then we would return to the House and recommend the rapid transit money. After the bill passed the House and while it was before the other body, the National Capital Planning Commission on a 6-to-5 vote approved the freeway system.

The other body included the rapid rail transit money in their bill, and in conference our committee receded and approved the rapid rail transit money. We returned to the House with the conference report and asked for approval, which was granted. After approving the conference report and shortly after the District of Columbia appropriations bill was signed by the President, the National Capital Planning Commission was called back into session and by changing one vote the freeway system was brought to an abrupt halt. Our committee and Congress understood at that time that we had been misled and that deceit of the greatest magnitude had taken place. Shortly after the National Capital Planning Commission stopped the freeway system, a suit was filed and this, Mr. Chairman, was in the year 1966. A final decision was not obtained on this suit until February of 1968. The suit was not vigorously prosecuted, and every effort was made to kill the freeway program.

Our committee made every effort to start the freeway system during the fiscal years 1968 and 1969. Notwithstanding the fact that the cost was increasing daily on each of the freeway projects, those in charge refused to settle the impasse which had developed over freeways and rapid transit, thereby increasing the cost of all of the freeway projects. For instance, in 1961 when the East Leg of the freeway system was presented to our committee, it was explained that the cost would amount to $26,100,000. Today the estimated cost is $78 million. This gives you a good understanding of what this impasse has done in regard to the freeway system here in the District of Columbia.

The suit filed in 1966 was still before the Court in February of 1968, and in August of 1968 the Public Works Committee in the House decided that it was time to solve the impasse which had developed between freeways and rapid transit and in the Highway Act of 1968 we find the following:

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 Number 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.

This act was passed by the House and the Senate and it is the law today. This is Public Law 90–495. The District Building ignored this law and refused to comply with same.

President Nixon in his message on April 28, 1969, 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.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with every word of that part of the President's message that I have just read.

In the supplemental appropriations bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, which was H.R. 11400, the sum of $18,737,000 was requested to start construction on the rapid transit system.

No action was taken by the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia on this request. The other body included this amount in the supplemental bill and in conference the Senate conferees receded. No money was included in the supplemental bill for construction of the rapid rail transit system. In the regular bill for Fiscal Year 1970 for the District of Columbia, we have the sum of $21,586,000 requested as the District's share for construction of the authorized rapid rail transit system.

The 25-mile rapid rail transit system, which is to cost $431 million, was approved by Congress in the year 1965. The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority was authorized in the year 1966 to proceed to construct a rapid rail transit system in our Nation's Capital. The system now proposed contains 97 miles and will cost $2½ billion. There is now pending before the District of Columbia Committee legislation providing for Federal grants of $1,047,000,-

000 for a regional rapid transit system. In addition to the $1,047,000,000 in Federal grants, the $100 million authorized in Federal grants in 1965 will be added to the overall amount. This would mean, Mr. Chairman, that under the bill H.R. 11193 introduced on May 13, 1969, the Federal Government's share would be $1,147,044,000. The District of Columbia, under this legislation, is authorized to borrow from the Treasury the sum of $216,500,000 including the $50 million authorized for the District of Columbia's share in 1965. The suburban jurisdictions would pay about $357 million and the balance required to construct the 97-mile system of $835 million would be raised through revenue bonds issued by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. Certainly this House would not approve over $1 billion in additional Federal grants unless the impasse that has existed for nearly 5 years is solved.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to commend the District of Columbia Committee for the position it has taken all down through the years concerning a balanced transportation system in our Capital City.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS), are to be commended for their services in bringing about a balanced system of transportation in our city.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) started with us in 1958 and has had the nerve and fortitude to stand up and be counted all down through the years.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) understands the importance of having a balanced system for the people in Maryland as well as in the District of Columbia and certainly has been diligent and fair in all of his actions concerning a balanced system for our Capital City.

Under no circumstances do we intend to make any effort to stop the authorized rapid rail transit system from going under construction. We want this to take place immediately and we want full compliance with the 1968 Federal Highway Act immediately.

Mr. Chairman, we will solve the freeway-rapid rail transit impasse and when we do it will not be cited as a victory for any Member of Congress or for the Public Works Committee, but will be recorded in history as a victory for our Capital City.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON).

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I congratulate the gentleman on the study he has made, and the work that the gentleman has done in the case for a balanced transportation system, not only for the District of Columbia, but to help the State of Virginia and the State of Maryland, and the flow of traffic that comes through the corridor from north to south and from south to north.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman one or two questions:

In the first place, in the statement made by the gentleman, did the gentleman include——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. FUQUA, and by unanimous consent, Mr. NATCHER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield further to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, did the gentleman from Kentucky include in his statement the continuation of the study under section 23(c) of the 1968 act.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman from Maryland is correct, Mr. Chairman. I called attention of the Members of the House to section 23(b). As the gentleman well knows, in his bill in 1968 we had sections 23(a), 23(b), and 23(c). Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is exactly correct that section 23(c) should be included in the statement that I have just made to the House.

Mr. FALLON. That is the study of the North Central Freeway?

Mr. NATCHER. That is correct.

Mr. FALLON. I thank the gentleman, and again congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman from Kentucky on an excellent statement, and to express my appreciation to the gentleman again for his assistance in helping us to obtain a balanced transportation system here in the Washington metropolitan area.

Mr. Chairman, many of us have been very much concerned about the delay in commencing construction of this much-needed mass rail transit system, but we also realize that unless we have commencement of the other vitally needed facilities, if we do anything to cause delay in the construction of freeways, highways, and bridges, we could very well wind up by being penny wise and pound foolish, because it could mean more years of delay in acquiring these much-needed facilities.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made a very clear statement as to his position in this matter, but in order to make certain that we do thoroughly understand his position, I wonder if the gentleman would tell the House in what way his statement differs, if any, from the language in section 903 of the legislation before us, which makes reference to the fact that the Federal payment will be held up until the President of the United States has reported to the Congress that the District of Columbia government has begun the work on these various projects as outlined in the act of 1968.

As I understood the gentleman in his statement, he pretty much gave assurance to that effect. Now, is there any difference in the position of the gentleman and that expressed in the language of this bill?

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, there is a difference.

Let me say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL), that under section 903, the first portion of part No. 1, we find the following:

> 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 such projects. That is Part No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, as I have just explained to the House, as Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia budget, I will recommend to our subcommittee and to the full committee, and then to the House, that all the construction money authorized and requested of the Committee on Appropriations for rapid rail transit be approved, and that rapid rail transit system go under construction when the President of the United States has reported to the Congress that the District of Columbia has begun work on each of the projects listed in section 23(b)—and as the distinguished gentleman from Maryland pointed out, section 23(c) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, and has committed itself to complete such projects.

Part No. 2 of section 903, as the gentleman knows, provides as follows: the District of Columbia 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 any agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States.

Now, as to that portion of the question the gentleman will recall, I stated, there is a distinction. We can solve this problem and then we can move on.

As I stated, if the President does not report to the Congress that work has actually begun and is continuing on the projects listed in section 23(b) of the Federal Aid to Highway Act of 1968, and suits have been filed to stop projects listed in section 23(b), then just as soon as such litigation is successfully concluded with any and all orders, decrees and judgments complied with in full by the District officials, we will recommend all construction money for rapid rail transit. This is the distinction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) has expired.

(Mr. NATCHER, at the request of Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, was granted permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important subject and I think it is necessary for the gentleman to have this time so that we may fully understand the situation.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Kentucky was very much concerned about releasing these

funds for construction of the subway after approval was once given by the D.C. City Council, after which some effort was made through the back door to file a lawsuit that would hold it up, and thus the buck was passed on to the court.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is exactly correct. You will remember what happened to us in 1966. We brought a bill before the House and we said to the House that we do not recommend the rapid transit money and, as soon as the freeway system starts, we will come back to this House and recommend it.

When the bill went to the other body and the National Capital Planning Commission was called back into session, they then approved of it and the other body inserted it in the bill. We came back with the conference report as the gentleman remembers and we recommended approval of rapid transit money and the conference report, after adoption of the conference report the National Capital Planning Commission was called back into session and one vote was changed. A suit followed and the impasse was on. We certainly do not want this to happen again. This suit dragged on from 1966 to February 1968.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. That was not the intent of this amendment.

I see the gentleman from Washington on his feet, and I believe he was a cosponsor on this section of the bill; but this actually has reference to the control by the President of the United States and the position of the City Council.

The act of 1968 itself does provide for the construction of these projects, notwithstanding any other provision of the law or any court decision.

Mr. NATCHER. The gentleman is right as to the provision of the Highway Act of 1968.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Actually, as I understand that act and this language in the bill, there would be no requirement in existing law that would convey a right to anyone to demand a public hearing prior to the construction of these highway facilities.

So I think it is pretty much of a moot question. Yet, it would be somewhat unfair to adopt this language with reference to the President and the City Council in good faith, and then to have a harassment suit filed by someone representing a minority group, and perhaps have some court issue a temporary injunction until the matter was properly adjudicated and thus delay the appropriation and construction of a vitally needed transportation facility where an agreement has been worked out by people in responsible positions.

I would hope that the gentleman would not be too stringent insofar as forbidding some citizen from filing a suit, even though the language is in his favor.

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say to the gentleman, certainly, I would not want to be in that position.

I agree with the gentleman from Virginia that so far as the Highway Act of 1968 is concerned, any question in court now should be a moot question and that is the reason I said not years—not months—but as a matter of a few weeks. The court should refuse to grant any injunction or any relief which would stop the freeway system from going underway. I hope we will not have any difficulty. But just as a matter of protection, if there is any change downtown, and I hope not—and when I say downtown I do not mean the White House—but if there is any change downtown, then as a matter of protection to the Congress and the law we passed in 1968, let us see that that law is complied with. I hope we will not have any trouble.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would like to say in answer to the inquiries made by the gentleman from Virginia about the continuation of the hearings and the justification of projects on the highway departments that they have already been concluded.

The dissent that has risen since the hearing is what the gentleman is discussing. Those matters have already been heard. They are presently before the Bureau of Public Roads, the highway department, with respect to the States involved in the highway system so consequently that is not a matter of importance to this discussion.

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

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to my distinguished friend from the State of Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. I appreciate very much the remarks of the gentleman, but I want to be certain, as the gentleman from Virginia does, because we have all worked very hard on this. The city government, the President of the United States, the Department of Transportation—none of these people can control the actions of an independent group of citizens, and I want to state in this colloquy that I have been personally assured, and I think the gentleman from Kentucky has, and I know the gentleman from Virginia has, that the city government will fight these suits in good faith, and that the Department of Justice, as is required, will come in to do it also. But I am worried about the position we will take if the gentleman says that we in the Congress are going to wait on a court action to be determined because it will probably be filed——

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

(On request of Mr. ADAMS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. NATCHER was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ADAMS. Because we have passed the Highway Act, which I think we all agree is valid, so the city government cannot control the language that was in that act. Neither can they control the filing of a lawsuit.

Therefore, what I am pleading with the gentleman about is that we have done certain things. The city has now complied. The city government has now voted on it. I have had assurances, as the gentleman from Alabama has had, that this is on its way up the hierarchy, so it is going to be done. They are going to be authorized. But I would plead with the gentleman that if somebody files a suit—and I am not talking about any kind of friendly suit or phony suit by the city government—but if an independent group files it, and if the President says, as does these people, that all has been authorized, and that the only reason they have not started it is that a suit has been filed, that the genleman recommend a release of the money and we would rely on the courts and the statute that has been drawn by the Public Works Committee and the actions of this Congress to be upheld, and therefore we do not put the onus on the city to do something they cannot control.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. ADAMS, as I have just explained to Mr. BROYHILL, we had the same experience in 1966. We waited patiently from the middle of 1966 until February of 1968. Why? Just because downtown in the District Building they did not intend to defend that suit as it should have been defended. They just dragged their feet during 1966 and into 1968.

Now, let me say this to the gentleman. I hope we do not have any trouble with any suit. I agree with the gentleman that the Highway Act of 1968 is the law. If a suit is filed at 3 o'clock this afternoon, it probably will be an injunctive relief suit. I do not think any court in the District of Columbia would grant an injunction. I think we are going to move. If a suit is filed and the Corporation Counsel sits on his hands and he says, "A suit is filed; we cannot move on with the freeway system"—we are sorry, Mr. ADAMS, to be very frank and in order that there will be no misunderstanding, I will never come into this House and ask that the Public Works Committee be repudiated and that we void the law of 1968. I do not intend to do it.

Mr. ADAMS. I agree with the gentleman——

Mr. NATCHER. If a suit is filed, I will join with the gentleman from Washington—and I see my good friend GLENN DAVIS sitting over there, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee on the District of Columbia budget and one of the able men in this House—I am going to ask my friend GLENN DAVIS to go with me to the White House to see the President and ask the President to have the Attorney General assign able lawyers to assist with any suit. I will recommend to our Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget that the budget for the fiscal year of 1970 be held up until the suit is determined and finally decided.

I will recommend to our Subcommittee on the District of Columbia Budget that the budget for fiscal year 1970 be held up until the suit is determined and finally decided. I will say to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) in order that there be understanding if a lawsuit is filed and probably urged on by one or two in the District Building, we are going to sit with them. I say that frankly.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would support the gentleman from Kentucky in his position. What I am asking is the other side of the coin. What if the law suit is filed and if the President of the United States assures us—I ask this so

that we not be placed in the position of hanging on some judge—if the suit is legitimately fought and the President legitimately assures this Congress that it has been—all I am asking is at that point that the Congress say we will release these funds, because we will not wait on the judiciary to tell us how to legislate.

I would plead with the gentleman from Kentucky that he leave that position, so that if the President assures the gentleman—so that the second part of this act can take effect and we not automatically assume the situation of 1966 is going to be repeated, because I do not think it will be.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NATCHER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, let me say this to my friend. If a suit is filed, I know the President of the United States will help us. I believe that with the assistance of my good friend sitting on my right, he will have the Attorney General cooperate with the Corporation Counsel's office, and we will move a suit along. I agree with the gentleman, it would be a moot question. The Highway Act of 1968 is the law, and I hope that no court would permit such a suit.

Until such a suit is moved along, I will not come to the House and ask that the Public Works Committee be repudiated and that we ignore the Highway Act of 1968. I am going to join the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL), and all the others in moving any suit along, but we had our experience in 1966, and I say to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) let us not have it again. I will do everything I can to aid the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) and all the members of his committee to see that we have a quick decision.

Mr. ADAMS. Can the gentleman from Kentucky accept our position earlier than a final decision on it? Can the gentleman accept a good faith position prior to some final order being ordered?

Mr. NATCHER. I will say this to the gentleman from Washington at this time in answer to his question. We will do all we can to help if any suit is filed but our experience of 1966 was enough. My original statement still stands, Mr. Chairman, as any or all suits and the position of our subcommittee.

We want to recommend the rapid transit money and we should all join hands and see that any suits are quickly decided.

Mr. Chairman, I will help the gentleman. I say that frankly.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point. I intend to offer an amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I did not hear whether or not the chairman had a substitute for the bill or whether this was on the bill itself, but I wanted to be certain that the Chair was aware we have a substitute we want to offer at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman is aware there will be a substitute amendment offered. We have not reached that point yet. If the request is granted, it will merely open the bill to amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, a further parliamentary inquiry. Am I correct in my understanding that the bill is open to amendment at any point, or is the committee amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. If the request is granted, the bill will be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. The request is made in order for the committee amendment to be offered at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOGGS. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) plans to offer a substitute for the bill under consideration. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington, the Chair understands, intends to offer a substitute amendment for the committee amendment which is printed in the bill.

Mr. BOGGS. Exactly. It is the present parliamentary situation that the committee is about to offer a substitute amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. First there must be consent to dispense with the reading of the bill. Then the Chair would hope that would ensue.

Mr. BOGGS. Very well. Let us proceed in that order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1969".

TITLE I AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES AND USE TAX ACTS

SEC. 101. Subsection (a) of section 114 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47 2601, par. 14(a)) is amended as follows:

(1) The first proviso in paragraph (6) of that subsection is amended to read as follows: *Provided, however,* That the gross proceeds from the rental of films, records, or any type of sound transcribing to theaters and radio and television broadcasting stations, other than for advertising purposes, shall not be considered a retail sale:".

(2) That subsection is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(8) The sale of or charges for admission to theaters and public events, including, but not limited to, movies, operas, exhibitions, concerts, carnivals, circuses, athletic or other contests, games, boxing and wrestling matches, and shows or performances of any type or nature, except that any casual or isolated sale or charge for admission made by a semipublic institution not regularly engaged in making sales or charges for admissions shall not be considered a retail sale or sale at retail.

"(9) The sale of or charges for the service of repairing, altering, mending, or fitting tangible personal property, or applying or installing personal property as a repair or replacement part of other tangible personal property, whether or not such service is performed by means of coin operated equipment or by any other means, and whether or not any tangible personal property is transferred in conjunction with such service.

"(10) The sale of or charges for copying, photocopying, reproducing, duplicating, addressing, and mailing services and for public stenographic services.

"(11) The sale or charges made by any person for the service of preparing, providing, or supplying photographs, comic strips, special feature articles, feature articles, news items, or any other similar material intended for use in newspapers, magazines, periodicals, circulars, radio, television, or any other means of publication.

"(12) The sale of or charges for the service of preparing, supplying, or providing advertising, and the sale of or charges for the service of advertising by means of television, radio, periodicals, circulars, billboards, magazines, films, motion pictures, directories, shoppers guides, and newspapers, or by any other means."

SEC. 102. Subsection (b) of section 114 is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (1),

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1) and by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (A) of that paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof ", except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section.",

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2) and by striking out the period at the end of that paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof ", except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section.", and

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

SEC. 103. Subsection (b) (3) of section 116 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2601, par. 16(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) The amount separately charged for labor or services rendered in installing or applying the property sold, except as provided in section 114(a) of this title."

SEC. 104. Section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2602) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 125. A tax is imposed upon all vendors for the privilege of selling at retail certain tangible personal property and for the privilege of selling certain selected services (defined as 'retail sale' and 'sale at retail' in this title). The rate of such tax shall be 4 per centum of the gross receipts from sales of such tangible personal property and services, except that—

"(1) the rate of tax shall be 2 per centum of the gross receipts from (A) sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, (B) sales of or charges for admission to theaters and public events, (C) sales of or charges for the services described in paragraphs (9), (10), (11), and (12) of section 114(a) of this title, and (D) sales of medicines, pharmaceuticals, and drugs; and

"(2) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the gross receipts from sales of or charges for any room or rooms, lodgings, or accommodations, furnished to transients by any hotel, inn, tourist camp, tourist cabin, or any other place in which rooms, lodgings, or accommodations are regularly furnished to transients"

SEC. 105. Paragraph (b) of section 127 of District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2604(b)) is amended (1) by

striking out "1 cent" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "2 cents", and (2) by striking out "2 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 cents".

SEC. 106. Paragraph (o) of section 128 of District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2605(o)) is amended by striking out "whether or not".

SEC. 107. (a) Subsection (a) of section 147 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2624 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 147. (a) Any person who fails to file a return, who files a false or incorrect return, or who fails to pay the tax to the District within the time required by this title shall be subject to a penalty of 5 per centum of the amount of tax due, if the failure is for not more than one month, with an additional 5 per centum for each additional month, or fraction thereof, during which such failure continues, not to exceed 25 per centum in the aggregate; plus interest at the rate of 1 per centum of such tax for each month, or fraction thereof, during which such failure continues, but the Commissioner may, if satisfied that the delay was excusable, waive all or any part of the penalty. Unpaid penalties and interest may be collected in the same manner as the tax imposed by this title. The penalty and interest provided for in this section shall be applicable to any tax determined as a deficiency."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "The certificate of the Collector or Assessor, as the case may be," and inserting in lieu thereof "The certificate of the Commissioner".

SEC. 108. Subsection (a) of section 201 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2701(a)) is amended as follows:

(1) The first proviso in paragraph (4) of that subsection is amended to read as follows: *"Provided, however,* That the gross proceeds from the rental of films, records, or any type of sound transcribing to theaters and radio and television broadcasting stations, other than for advertising purposes, shall not be considered a retail sale:".

(2) That subsection is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(6) The sale of or charges for admission to theaters and public events, including but not limited to movies, operas, exhibitions, concerts, carnivals, circuses, athletic or other contests, games, boxing and wrestling matches, and shows or performances of any type or nature, except that any casual or isolated sale or charge for admission made by a semipublic institution not regularly engaged in making sales or charges for admissions shall not be considered a retail sale or sale at retail.

"(7) The sale of or charges for the service of repairing, altering, mending, or fitting tangible personal property, or applying or installing tangible personal property as a repair or replacement part of other tangible personal property, whether or not such service is performed by means of coin-operated equipment or by any other means, and whether or not any tangible personal property is transferred in conjunction with such service.

"(8) The sale of or charges for copying, photocopying, reproducing, duplicating, addressing, and mailing services and for public stenographic services.

"(9) The sale or charges made by any person for the service of preparing, providing, or supplying photographs, comic strips, special feature articles, feature articles, news items, or any other similar material intended for use in newspapers, magazines, periodicals, circulars, radio, television, or any other means of publication.

"(10) The sale of or charges for the service of preparing, supplying, or providing advertising and the sale or charges for the service or advertising by means of television, radio, periodicals, circulars, billboards, magazines, films, motion pictures, directories, shoppers guides, and newspapers, or by any other means."

SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 201 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2701(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking out paragraph (1),

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1) and by striking out the period at the end of that paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof ", except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section.",

(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2) and by striking out the period at the end of that paragraph and inserting in lieu thereon ", except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section.", and

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

SEC. 110. Section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, see sec. 47–2702) is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The rate of tax imposed by this section shall be 4 per centum of the sales price of the tangible personal property or services rendered or sold except that—

"(1) the rate of tax shall be 2 per centum of the sales price of (A) sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, (B) sales of admission to theaters and public events, (C) sales of the services described in paragraphs (7), (8), (9), and (10) of section 201(a) of this title, and (D) sales of medicines, pharmaceuticals, and drugs; and

"(2) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the sales price of sales of any room or rooms, lodgings, or accommodations, furnished to transients by any hotel, inn, tourist camp, tourist cabin, or any other place in which rooms, lodgings, or accommodations are regularly furnished to transients."

SEC. 111. The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE II—MOTOR VEHICLE EXCISE TAX

SEC. 201. Subsection (j) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40–604(j)) is amended by striking out "3 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 per centum".

SEC. 202. The amendment made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIGARETTE TAX ACT

SEC. 301. Subsection (a) of section 603 of the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2802(a)) is amended by striking out "3 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 cents".

SEC. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided, the amendment made by section 301 shall apply with respect to cigarette tax stamps purchased on and after the effective date of this title which shall be the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) In the case of cigarette tax stamps which have been purchased prior to the effective date of this title and which on such date are held (affixed to a cigarette package or otherwise) by a wholesaler, retailer, or vending machine operator, licensed under the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act, such licensee shall pay to the Commissioner (in accordance with subsection (c)) an amount equal to the difference between the amount of tax represented by such tax stamps on the date of their purchase and the amount of tax which an equal number of cigarette tax stamps would represent if purchased on the effective date of this title.

(c) Within twenty days after the effective date of this title, each such licensee shall (1) file with the Commissioner a sworn statement (on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioner) showing the number of such cigarette tax stamps held by him as of the beginning of the day on which this title becomes effective or, if such day is a Sunday, as of the beginning of the following day, and (2) pay to the Commissioner the amount specified in subsection (b).

(d) Each such licensee shall keep and preserve for the period of twelve months immediately following the effective date of this title the inventories and other records made which form the basis for the information furnished to the Commissioner on the sworn statement required to be filed under this section.

(e) For purposes of this section, a tax stamp shall be considered as held by a wholesaler, retailer, or vending machine operator if title thereto has passed to such wholesaler, retailer, or operator (whether or not delivery to him has been made) and if title to such stamp has not at any time been transferred to any person other than such wholesaler, retailer, or operator.

(f) A violation of the provisions of subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section shall be punishable as provided in section 611 of the District of Columbia Cigarettte Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2810).

TITLE IV—FEES FOR MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION AND INSPECTION AND FOR MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS' PERMITS

SEC. 401. Section 2 of title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 (D.C. Code, sec. 40–102) is amended (1) by striking out "$1" and "50 cents" in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$2" and "$1", respectively; (2) by striking out "$1" in paragraph (4) of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$3"; (3) by striking out "ten days" in such paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty days"; (4) by inserting immediately after "Commissioners" in such paragraph (4) the following: ", except that in the event such certificate and tags are necessary for use in complying with vehicle inspection regulations made pursuant to the authority contained in section 7 of the Act approved February 18, 1938 (D.C. Code, sec. 40–207) prior to completion of the registration of such vehicle or trailer, the fee shall be $2"; and (5) by striking out "$1" each place it appears in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "$2".

SEC. 402. Section 3 of title IV at such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 40–103) is amended (1) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subsection (a) the following: ", and in the event the markings on any such tag are specially ordered by the person to whom the tag is to be issued and such markings are other than those in a regular series, a reservation fee of $25 and an annual fee of $10, in addition to all other fees which may be required, shall be charged for such specially ordered tag"; (2) by striking out "five hundred" in the paragraph designated "Class A" of subsection (b) each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place "four hundred", and by striking out "$22" and "$32" and inserting in lieu thereof "$30" and "$50", respectively; (3) by striking out, in the paragraph designated "Class B" of subsection (b), "$40", "$44", "$52", "$60", "$68", "$74", "$84", "$96", "$122", "$142", "$172", and "$202", and inserting in lieu thereof "$53", "$59", "$69", "$80", "$91", "$99", "$112", "$128", "$163", "$191", "$229", and "$269", respectively; (4) by striking out, in the paragraph designated "Class C" of subsection (b), "$8", "$12", "$20", "$32", "$46", "$60", "$74", "$92", "$122", "$152", and "$182", and inserting in lieu thereof "$11", "$16", "$27", "$43", "$61",

"$80", "$99", "$123", "$163", "$203", and "243", respectively; and (5) by striking out in subsection (d) "sixty four" and "seventy-four" and inserting in lieu thereof "forty-two" and "forty-seven", respectively.

SEC. 403. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia", approved February 18, 1938 (D.C. Code, sec. 40–201), is amended by striking out "$1" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3".

SEC. 404. Section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40–603) is amended by striking out "$5" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$10", and by striking out "$1" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "$5".

SEC. 405. Subsection (a) of section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40–301(a)) is amended (1) by striking out "$3" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "$12", and by striking out in such paragraph "three years" and inserting in lieu thereof "four years"; and (2) by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) In the event an operator's permit or a learner's permit issued under the authority of this section is lost or destroyed, or requires replacement for any reason other than through error or other act of the Commissioners not caused by the person to whom such permit was issued, such person may obtain a duplicate or replacement permit upon payment of a fee of $2."

SEC. 406. Section 3 of the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia (D.C. Code, sec. 40–419) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subsection (a) the following: ", including rules and regulations assessing reasonable fees to reimburse the District of Columbia for the cost of reinstating licenses and registrations suspended under the authority of this Act, such fees not to exceed the amount of $10 for the reinstatement of a license or registration, or both a license and registration".

SEC. 407. The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE V—TAXES ON PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY

SEC. 501. (a) The first paragraph of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes", approved June 29, 2922 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–501, 47–502, 47–503) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and that in order that the District of Columbia may be annually" and all that follows in that paragraph down to and including "during the year for which the rate is fixed; and that the" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "That there is levied for each fiscal year on real property subject to taxation by the District of Columbia a tax at the rate of 3.1 per centum on the assessed value of such property. There is levied for each fiscal year on tangible personal property subject to taxation by the District of Columbia a tax at the rate of 2.4 per centum on the assessed value of such property. The"; and

(2) by striking out ", in the discretion of the commissioners, either for the purpose of" and all that follows down through and including "and that after June 22, 1922, the agencies" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for the purpose of meeting the expenses chargeable to the District of Columbia. The agencies".

(b) Title XV of the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–501a) is repealed.

SEC. 502. The amendments made by this title shall take effect July 1, 1969.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. No funds appropriated for the government of the District of Columbia and no grant or loan by any department or agency of the United States Government to the government of the District of Columbia may be used to establish the Neighborhood Services Centers Program or any similar program under which the District of Columbia decentralizes the provision of government services through the establishment of neighborhood centers.

SEC. 602. The office of Director of Public Safety in the Executive Office of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia (created by Organization Order Numbered 8, dated April 18, 1968) is abolished. No funds appropriated for the government of the District of Columbia and no grant or loan by any department or agency of the United States Government to the government of the District of Columbia may be used to establish any similar office in the government of the District of Columbia to carry out any of the functions delegated to the Director of Public Safety by such order.

SEC. 603. (a)(1) No person shall be appointed as a full-time civilian employee to a permanent position in any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia during any month in which the number of such employees in such department or agency is greater than the number of such employees on June 30, 1969.

(2) The number of temporary and part time employees in any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia during any month shall not be greater than the number of such employees in such department or agency during the month of June 1969.

(b) Effective July 1, 1969, the head of any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia may appoint a number of persons as full time civilian employees in permanent positions in such department or agency equal to 75 per centum of the number of vacancies in such positions which have occurred on or after such date by reason of resignation, retirement, removal, or death.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term "department or agency" does not include the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, or the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 604. Except as otherwise provided in this title nothing in this Act, or any amendments made by this Act, shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or the authority vested in the District of Columbia Council by Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967. The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or in any office or agency under his jurisdiction and control, or in the District of Columbia Council, may be delegated by the Commissioner or by the council, as the case may be, in accordance with the provisions of such Plan.

SEC. 605. (a) The repeal or amendment by this Act shall not affect any other provision of law, or any act done or any right accrued or accruing under such law, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil cause before repeal or amendment of such law, but all rights and liabilities under such law shall continue, and may be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent, as if such repeal or amendment had not been made.

(b) All offenses committed, and all penalties incurred, under any provision of law hereby repealed or amended, may be prosecuted and punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1969'.

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES AND USE TAX ACTS

"SEC. 101. Subsection (a) of section 114 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2601, par. 14(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(8) The sale of or charges for admission to public events, including movies, musical performances, exhibitions, circuses, sporting events, and other shows or performances of any type or nature, except that any casual or isolated sale of or charge for admission made by a semipublic institution not regularly engaged in making such sales or charges shall not be considered a retail sale or sale at retail.

"'(9) The sale of or charges for the service of repairing, altering, mending, or fitting tangible personal property, or applying or installing tangible personal property as a repair or replacement part of other tangible personal property, whether or not such service is performed by means of coin-operated equipment or by any other means, and whether or not any tangible personal property is transferred in conjunction with such service.

"'(10) The sale of or charges for copying, photocopying, reproducing, duplicating, addressing, and mailing services and for public stenographic services.

"'(11) The sale of or charges for the service of preparing, providing, or supplying photographs, comic strips, special feature articles, feature articles, news items, or any other similar material intended for use in newspapers, magazines, periodicals, circulars, radio, television, or any other means of publication.'

"SEC. 102. Subsection (b) of section 114 is amended—

"(1) by striking out paragraph (1),

"(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1) and by inserting before the period at the end of subparagraph (A) of that paragraph a comma and the following: 'except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section',

"(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2) and by inserting before the period at the end of that paragraph a comma and the following: 'except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section', and

"(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

"SEC. 103. Subsection (b)(3) of section 116 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2601, par. 16(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) The amount separately charged for labor or services rendered in installing or applying the property sold, except as provided in section 114(a) of this title.'

"SEC. 104. Section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2602) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 125. A tax is imposed upon all vendors for the privilege of selling at retail certain tangible personal property and for the privilege of selling certain selected services (defined as "retail sale" and "sale at retail" in this title). The rate of such tax shall be 4 per centum of the gross receipts from sales of or charges for such tangible property and services, except that—

"'(1) the rate of tax shall be 2 per centum of the gross receipts from (A) sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, (B) sales of or charges for admission to public events, (C) sales of or charges for the services described

in paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) of section 114(a) of this title, and (D) sales of medicines, pharmaceuticals, and drugs not made on prescriptions of duly licensed physicians, surgeons, or other general or special practitioners of the healing art;

"'(2) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the gross receipts from sales of or charges for any room or rooms, lodging, or accommodations, furnished to transients by any hotel, inn, tourist camp, tourist cabin, or any other place in which rooms, lodging, or accommodations are regularly furnished to transients; and

"'(3) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the gross receipts from sales of (A) spirituous or malt liquors, beer, and wines, and (B) food for human consumption other than off the premises where such food is sold.'

"SEC. 105. Paragraph (b) of section 127 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2604(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) On each sale of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold where the sales price is from 13 cents to 62 cents, both inclusive, 1 cent; on each such sale where the sales price is from 63 cents to $1.12, both inclusive, 2 cents; and on each 50 cents of the sales price or fraction thereof of such sale in excess of $1.12, 1 cent.'

"SEC. 106. Paragraph (o) of section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2605(o)) is amended by striking out 'whether or not'.

"SEC. 107. (a) Subsection (a) of section 147 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2624 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 147. (a) Any person who fails to file a return, who files a false or incorrect return, or who fails to pay the tax to the District within the time required by this title shall be subject to a penalty of 5 per centum of the amount of tax due if the failure is for not more than one month, with an additional 5 per centum for each additional month or fraction thereof during which such failure continues, not to exceed 25 per centum in the aggregate; plus interest at the rate of 1 per centum of such tax for each month or fraction thereof during which such failure continues; but the Commissioner may, if he is satisfied that the delay was excusable, waive all or any part of the penalty. Unpaid penalties and interest may be collected in the same manner as the tax imposed by this title. The penalty and interest provided for in this section shall be applicable to any tax determined as a deficiency.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out 'The certificate of the Collector or Assessor, as the case may be,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'The certificate of the Commissioner'.

"SEC. 108. Subsection (a) of section 201 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2701(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(6) The sale of or charges for admission to public events, including movies, musical performances, exhibitions, circuses, sporting events, and other shows or performances of any type or nature, except that any casual or isolated sale of or charge for admission made by a semipublic institution not regularly engaged in making such sales or charges shall not be considered a retail sale or sale at retail.

"'(7) The sale of or charges for the service of repairing, altering, mending, or fitting tangible personal property, or applying or installing tangible personal property as a repair or replacement part of such tangible personal property, whether or not such service is performed by means of coin-operated equipment or by any other means, and whether or not any tangible personal property is transferred in conjunction with such service.

"'(8) The sale of or charges for copying, photocopying, reproducing, duplicating, addressing, and mailing services and for public stenographic services.

"'(9) The sale of or charges for the service of preparing, providing, or supplying photographs, comic strips, special feature articles, feature articles, news items, or any other similar material intended for use in newspapers, magazines, periodicals, circulars, radio, television, or any other means of publication.'

"SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 201 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2701(b)) is amended—

"(1) by striking out paragraph (1),

"(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1) and by inserting before the period at the end of that paragraph a comma and the following: 'except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section',

"(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2) and by inserting before the period at the end of that paragraph a comma and the following: 'except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section', and

"(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

"SEC. 110. Section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2702) is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The rate of tax imposed by this section shall be 4 per centum of the sales price of such tangible personal property or service, except that—

"'(1) the rate of tax shall be 2 per centum of the sales price of (A) sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, (B) sales of admission to public events, (C) sales of the services described in paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) of section 201(a) of this title, and (D) sales of medicines, pharmaceuticals, and drugs not made on prescriptions of duly licensed physicians, surgeons, or other general or special practitioners of the healing art;

"'(2) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the sales price of sales of any room or rooms, lodging, or accommodations, furnished to transients by any hotel, inn, tourist camp, tourist cabin, or any other place in which rooms, lodging, or accommodations are regularly furnished to transients; and

"'(3) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the sales price of sales of (A) spiritous or malt liquors, beer, and wines, and (B) food for human consumption other than off the premises where such food is sold.'

"SEC. 111. The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE II—MOTOR VEHICLE EXCISE TAX

"SEC. 201. Subsection (j) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-603(j)), is amended by striking out '3 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '4 per centum.'

"SEC. 202. The amendment made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIGARETTE TAX ACT

"SEC. 301. Subsection (a) of section 603 of the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec 47-2802 (a)) is amended by striking out '3 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '4 cents'.

"SEC. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided, the amendment made by section 301 shall apply with respect to cigarette tax stamps purchased on or after the effective date of this title, which shall be the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(b) In the case of cigarette tax stamps which have been purchased prior to the effective date of this title and which on such date are held (affixed to a cigarette package or otherwise) by a wholesaler, retailer, or vending machine operator, licensed under the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act, such licensee shall pay to the Commissioner (in accordance with subsection (c)) an amount equal to the difference between the amount of tax represented by such tax stamps on the date of their purchase and the amount of tax which an equal number of cigarette tax stamps would represent if purchased on the effective date of this title.

"(c) Within twenty days after the effective date of this title, each such licensee (1) shall file with the Commissioner a sworn statement (on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioner) showing the number of such cigarette tax stamps held by him as of the beginning of the day on which this title becomes effective or, if such day is a Sunday, as of the beginning of the following day, and (2) shall pay to the Commissioner the amount specified in subsection (b).

"(d) Each such licensee shall keep and preserve for the twelve-month period immediately following the effective date of this title the inventories and other records made which form the basis for the information furnished to the Commissioner on the sworn statement required to be filed under this section.

"(e) For purposes of this section, a tax stamp shall be considered as held by a wholesaler, retailer, or vending machine operator if title thereto has passed to such wholesaler, retailer, or operator (whether or not delivery to him has been made) and if title to such stamp has not at any time been transferred to any person other than such wholesaler, retailer, or operator.

"(f) A violation of the provisions of subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section shall be punishable as provided in section 611 of the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2810).

"TITLE IV—FEES FOR MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION AND INSPECTION AND FOR MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS' PERMITS

"SEC. 401. Section 2 of title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-102) is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$1' and '50 cents' in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) (relating to fees for duplicate registration certificates and identification tags) and inserting in lieu thereof '$2' and '$1', respectively;

"(2) by striking out '$1' in paragraph (4) of subsection (b) (relating to fees for special use certificates and identification tags) and inserting in lieu thereof '$3';

"(3) by striking out 'ten days' in such paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty days';

"(4) by inserting immediately after 'Commissioners' in such paragraph (4) the following: ', except that in the event such certificate and tags are necessary for use in complying with vehicle inspection regulations made pursuant to the authority contained in section 7 of the Act approved February 18, 1938 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-207), prior to completion of the registration of such vehicle or trailer, the fee shall be $2'; and

"(5) by striking out '$1' each place it appears in subsection (d) (relating to fee for transfer of registration) and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place '$2'.

"SEC. 402. Section 3 of title IV of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 40-103) is amended—

"(1) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subsection (a) (relating to registration fees) the following: ', and in

the event of markings on any such tag are specially ordered by the person to whom the tag is to be issued and such markings are other than those in a regular series, a reservation fee of $25 and an annual fee of $10, in addition to all other fees which may be required, shall be charged for such specially ordered tag';

"(2) by striking out 'three thousand five hundred' in the paragraph designated 'Class A' of subsection (b) (relating to registration fees for passenger motor vehicles) each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place 'three thousand four hundred', and by striking out '$22' and '$32' and inserting in lieu thereof '$30' and '$50', respectively;

"(3) by striking out, in the paragraph designated 'Class B' of subsection (b) (relating to registration fees for trucks, tractors, and certain commercial automobiles), '$40', '$44', '$52,' '$60', '$68', '$74', '$96', '$122', '$142', '$172', and '$202', and inserting in lieu thereof '$53', '$59', '$69', '$80', '$91', '$99', '$112', '$128', '$163', '$191', '$229', and '$269', respectively;

"(4) by striking out, in the paragraph designated 'Class C' of subsection (b) (relating to registration fees for trailers), '$8', '$12', '$20', '$32', '$46', '$60', '$74', '$92', '$122', '$152', and '$182', and inserting in lieu thereof '$11', '$16', '$27', '$43', '$61', '$80', '$99', '$123', '$163', '$203', and $'243', respectively; and

"(5) by striking out in subsection (d) (relating to division of registration fees between Highway Fund and General Fund) 'sixty-four' and 'seventy-four' and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty-two' and 'forty-seven', respectively.

"SEC. 403. The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia', approved February 18, 1938 (D.C. Code, sec. 40–201), is amended by striking out '$1', and inserting in lieu thereof '$3'.

"SEC. 404. Section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40–603), is amended (1) by striking out '$5' in subsection (a) (relating to fee for restoration of suspended or revoked permits and privileges) and inserting in lieu thereof '$10', and (2) by striking out '$1' in subsection (4) (relating to fees for titling and retitling) and inserting in lieu thereof '$5'.

"SEC. 405. Subsection (a) of section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40–301(a)), is amended (1) by striking out '$3' in paragraph (1) (relating to fee for operator's permit) and inserting in lieu thereof '$12', and by striking out in such paragraph 'three years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'four years'; and (2) by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(4) In the event an operator's permit or a learner's permit issued under the authority of this section is lost or destroyed, or requires replacement for any reason other than through error or other act of the Commissioners not caused by the person to whom such permit was issued, such person may obtain a duplicate or replacement permit upon payment of a fee of $2'.

"SEC. 406. Section 3 of the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia (D.C. Code, sec. 40–419) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subsection (a) the following: ', including rules and regulations assessing reasonable fees to reimburse the District of Columbia for the cost of reinstating licenses and registrations suspended under the authority of this Act, such fees not to exceed the amount of $10 for the reinstatement of a license or registration, or both a license and registration'.

"SEC. 407. The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

"SEC. 501. (a) Clauses (4) and (5) of section 23(a) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–124(a)) are each amended by striking out '$1.75' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2.00'.

"(b) Section 40(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–138(a)) is amended by striking out '$2.00' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2.25'.

"SEC. 502. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, the amendments made by section 501 shall apply with respect to—

"(1) alcohol and spirits imported or brought into the District of Columbia or manufactured, and

"(2) beer sold or purchased for resale,

on and after the effective date of this title, which shall be the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(b) In the case of alcohol, spirits, and beer which have been purchased prior to the effective date of this title and which on such date are held by a holder of a retailer's license, issued under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, such licensee shall pay to the Commissioner (in accordance with subsection (c)) an amount equal to the difference between the amount of tax imposed by such Act immediately prior to the effective date of this title on the amount of alcohol, spirits, and beer so held by him, and the amount of tax which would be imposed by the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act on such effective date on an equivalent amount of alcohol, spirits, and beer.

"(c) Within twenty days after the effective date of this title, each such license (1) shall file with the Commissioner a sworn statement (on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioner) showing the quantity of alcohol, spirits, and beer held by him as of the beginning of the day on which this title becomes effective or, if such day is a Sunday, as of the beginning of the following day, and (2) shall pay to the Commissioner the amount specified in subsection (b).

"(d) Each such licensee shall keep and preserve for the twelve-month period immediately following the effective date of this title the inventories and other records made which form the basis for the information furnished to the Commissioner on the sworn statement required to be filed under this section.

(e) For purposes of this section, alcohol, spirits, and beer shall be considered as held by a holder of a retailer's license if title thereto has passed to such holder (whether or not delivery to him has been made) and if title has not at any time been transferred to any person other than such holder.

"(f) A violation of the provisions of subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section shall be punishable as provided in section 33 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–132).

"TITLE VI—TAXES ON PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY

"SEC. 601. (a) The first paragraph of the Act entitled 'An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and for other purposes', approved June 29, 1922 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–501, 47–502, 47–503) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and that in order that the District of Columbia may be annually' and all that follows in that paragraph down to and including 'to the credit of the District for the purposes herein set out' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'That there is levied for each fiscal year on real property subject to taxation by the District of Columbia a tax at the rate of 3.1 per centum on the assessed value of such property. There is levied for each fiscal year on tangible personal property subject to taxation by the District of Columbia a tax at the rate of 2.4 per centum on the assessed value of such property. The Commissioner of the District shall cause all such taxes to be promptly collected and, when collected, to be daily deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia'; and

"(2) by striking out ', in the discretion of the commissioners, either for the purpose of' and all that follows down through and including 'and that after June 22, 1922, the agencies' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'for the purpose of meeting the expenses chargeable to the District of Columbia. The agencies'.

"(b) Title XV of the District of Columbia Public Works Act of 1954 (D.C. Code sec. 47–501a) is repealed.

"SEC. 602. The amendments made by this title shall take effect July 1, 1969.

"TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX ACT OF 1947

"SEC. 701. (a) Title XII of article I of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–1586—47–1586n) is amended (1) by redesignating sections 14 and 15 as sections 15 and 16, respectively, and (2) by inserting after section 13 the following new section:

"'SEC. 14. DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED INCOME TAX BY CORPORATIONS AND UNINCORPORATED BUSINESSES.—(a) DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED TAX.—Every corporation and unincorporated business required to make and file an income tax return under this article shall make and file a declaration of estimated tax at such time or times and under such conditions, and shall make payments of such tax during its taxable year in such amounts and under such conditions, as the District of Columbia Council shall by regulation prescribe. In the case of taxable years beginning in 1970 and in 1971, such regulations may not require payment before the last day on which a return for a taxable year is required to be filed under section 3(a) of title V of this article of an aggregate amount of estimated tax for such year in excess of—

"'(1) one-third of the estimated tax in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1970, and

"'(2) two-thirds of the estimated tax, in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1971.

"'(b) FAILURE BY CORPORATION OR UNINCORPORATED BUSINESS TO PAY ESTIMATED INCOME TAX.—(1) ADDITION TO THE TAX.—In case of any underpayment of estimated tax by a corporation or an unincorporated business, there shall be added to the tax for the taxable year an amount determined at the rate of 6 per centum per annum upon the amount of the underpayment (determined under paragraph (2) for the the period of the underpayment (determined under paragraph (3))).

"'(2) AMOUNT OF UNDERPAYMENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the amount of the underpayment shall be the excess of—

"'(A) the amount of the installment which would be required to be paid if the estimated tax were equal to 80 per centum of the tax shown on the return for the taxable year or, if no return was filed, 80 per centum of the tax for such year, over

"'(B) the amount, if any, of the installment paid on or before the last date prescribed for payment.

"'(3) PERIOD OF UNDERPAYMENT.—The period of the underpayment shall run from the date the installment was required to be paid to whichever of the following dates is the earlier—

"'(A) the 15th day of the fourth month following the close of the taxable year; or

"'(B) with respect to any portion of the underpayment, the date on which such portion is paid.

For purposes of this paragraph, a payment of estimated tax on any installment date shall be considered a payment of any previous underpayment only to the extent such payment exceeds the amount of the installment determined under paragraph (2)(A) for such installment date.

"'(c) OVERPAYMENT; CREDIT OF TAX.—Overpayment resulting from the payment of estimated tax for a taxable year in excess of the amount determined to be due upon the filing of an income tax return for such taxable year may be credited against the amount of estimated tax determined to be due on any declaration filed for the next succeeding taxable year or for any deficiency or nonpayment of tax for any previous taxable year. No refund shall be made of any estimated tax paid unless a complete return is filed.'

"(b) That part of the table of contents of such article relating to title XII is amended—

"(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 13 the following:

"'SEC. 14. Declarations of estimated income tax by corporations and unincorporated businesses.

"'(a) Declaration of estimated tax.

"'(b) Failure by corporation or unincorporated business to pay estimated income tax.

"'(1) Addition to the tax.

"'(2) Amount of underpayment.

"'(3) Period of underpayment.

"'(c) Overpayment; credit of tax.';

"(2) by striking out 'SEC. 14' and inserting in lieu thereof 'SEC. 15'; and

"(3) by striking out 'SEC. 15' and inserting in lieu thereof 'SEC. 16'.

"SEC. 702. The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

"TITLE VIII—FEDERAL PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 801. Section 1 of article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 is amended (1) by striking out 'June 30, 1969' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1970,' and (2) by striking out 'the sum of $90,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof 'not to exceed $105,000,000'.

"TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 901. The office of Director of Public Safety in the Executive Office of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia (created by Organization Order Numbered 8, dated April 18, 1968) is abolished. No funds appropriated for the government of the District of Columbia and no grant or loan by any department or agency of the United States Government to the government of the District of Columbia may be used to establish any similar office in the government of the District of Columbia to carry out any of the functions delegated to the Director of Public Safety by such order.

"SEC. 902. (a)(1) No person shall be appointed as a full-time civilian employee to a permanent position in any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia during any month in which the number of such employees in such department or agency is greater than the number of such employees on June 30, 1969.

"(2) The number of temporary and part-time employees in any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia during any month shall not be greater than the number of such employees in such department or agency during the month of June 1969.

"(b) Effective July 1, 1969, the head of any department or agency of the government of the District of Columbia may appoint a number of persons as full-time civilian employees in permanent positions in such department or agency equal to 75 per centum of the number of vacancies in such positions which have occurred on or after such date by reason of resignation, retirement, removal, or death.

"(c) For purposes of this section, the term 'department or agency' does not include the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, or the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

"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, secs. 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 those 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 any agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States.

"SEC. 904. Except as otherwise provided in this title, nothing in this Act, or any amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to affect the authority vested in the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or the authority vested in the District of Columbia Council by Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967. The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or in any office or agency under his jurisdiction and control, or in the District of Columbia Council, may be delegated by the Commissioner or by the Council, as the case may be, in accordance with the provisions of such Plan.

SEC. 905. (a) The repeal or amendment by this Act of any provision of law shall not affect any other provision of law, or any act done or any right accrued or accruing under such repealed or amended law, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil cause before repeal or amendment of such law; but all rights and liabilities under such repealed or amended law shall continue, and may be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent, as if such repeal or amendment had not been made.

"(b) All offenses committed, and all penalties incurred, under any provision of law repealed or amended by this Act, may be prosecuted and punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, is my understanding correct that the chairman did offer the committee amendment as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee substitute amendment is now pending.

AMENDMENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. M'MILLAN

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the Committee Amendment offered by Mr. McMILLAN: Page 43, line 10, strike out "or", and at the end of line 11 on that page strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, or the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions (including its Domestic Relations Branch and Small Claims and Conciliation Branch)."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept this amendment. The committee was not aware that the courts were not included in the original amendment.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I did not catch what the amendment would do to the committee amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN. It would exempt the court employees.

Mr. FRASER. This is an effort to exempt the employees in the court system from the personnel freeze?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not remember that the committee made a decision to exempt the court personnel from the personnel freeze, so I assume this is being offered by the chairman on his own behalf?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. FRASER. Does the gentleman also propose to exempt some of the other agencies, such as the Federal City College and the Technical Institute?

Mr. McMILLAN. No. All I expect to exempt are under this amendment.

Mr. FRASER. So that there will remain the freeze on the Federal City College and on the Technical Institute and on the Correction System?

Mr. McMILLAN. The courts are all that are included in this amendment. The police are already exempted.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman. I will only say, if the gentleman will yield further, the fact that he is carrying out a further exception I believe is a good indication of the damage being done by this indiscriminate personnel freeze, because there are many other agencies which are caught by this freeze and ought also to be exempted if there is to be a reasonable provision in any respect. I certainly will not object to trying to make the amendment better.

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

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I should like to ask the gentleman: Will this amendment cover the employees in the Drug Addiction Treatment Center here in the District? This is closely tied to the crime problem, and the city is trying to cope with the problem. If we are to succeed in the crime field we must have adequate personnel to deal with the drug addicts and to rehabilitate them.

Would you release the freeze on them?

Mr. McMILLAN. I presume they would be under the Police Department.

Mr. GUDE. No. I believe these employees are not under the Police Department but are under the Department of Health of the city. These are people in the drug addict centers.

Mr. McMILLAN. I understand they have a level of employment that would take care of this situation.

Mr. GUDE. But they would still have a ceiling on the number of employees they can have. Is that correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. GUDE. In other words, we could

not get additional employees for this important part of the crime picture.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ADAMS. Is the substitute which was passed by the committee, for the entire bill, presently pending before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute amendment is presently pending before the House, and that substitute has been subsequently amended by the gentleman from South Carolina in one area.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. ADAMS FOR THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ADAMS as a substitute for the committee amendment:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1969.'

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SALES AND USE TAX ACTS

"SEC. 101. Subsection (a) of section 114 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2601, par. 14(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(8) The sale of or charges for admission to public events, including movies, musical performances, exhibitions, circuses, sporting events, and other shows or performances of any type or nature, except that any casual or isolated sale of or charge for admission made by a semipublic institution not regularly engaged in making such sales or charges shall not be considered a retail sale or sale at retail.

"'(9) The sale of or charges for the service of repairing, altering, mending, or fitting tangible personal property, or applying or installing tangible personal property as a repair or replacement part of other tangible personal property, whether or not such service is performed by means of coin-operated equipment or by any other means, and whether or not any tangible personal propety is transferred in conjunction with such service.

"'(10) The sale of or charges for copying, photocopying, reproducing, duplicating, addressing, and mailing services and for public stenographic services.

"'(11) The sale of or charges for the service of preparing, providing, or supplying photographs, comic strips, special feature articles, feature articles, news items, or any other similar material intended for use in newspapers, magazines, periodicals, circulars, radio, television, or any other means of publication.'

"SEC. 102. Subsection (b) of section 114 is amended—

"(1) by striking out paragraph (1),

"(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1) and by inserting before the period at the end of subparagraph (A) of that paragraph a comma and the following: 'except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section',

"(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2) and by inserting before the period at the end of that paragraph a comma and the following: 'except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section', and

"(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

"SEC. 103. Subsection (b) (3) of section 116 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2601, par. 16(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) The amount separately charged for labor or services rendered in installing or applying the property sold, except as provided in section 114(a) of this title.'

"SEC. 104. Section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2602) is amended to read as follows:

"'Sec. 105. A tax is imposed upon all vendors for the privilege of selling at retail certain tangible personal property and for the privilege of selling certain selected services (defined as "retail sale" and "sale at retail" in this title. The rate of such tax shall be 4 per centum of the gross receipts from sales of or charges for such tangible personal property and services, except that—

"'(1) the rate of tax shall be 2 per centum of the gross receipts from (A) sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, (B) sales of or charges for admission to public events, (C) sales of or charges for the services described in paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) of section 114(a) of this title, and (D) sales of medicines, pharmaceuticals, and drugs not made on prescriptions of duly licensed physicians, surgeons, or other general or special practitioners of the healing art;

"'(2) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the gross receipts from sales of or charges for any room or rooms, lodging, or accommodations, furnished to transients by any hotel, inn, tourist camp, tourist cabin, or any other place in which rooms, lodging, or accommodations are regularly furnished to transients; and

"'(3) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the gross receipts from sales of (A) spiritous or malt liquors, beer, and wines, and (B) food for human consumption other than off the premises where such food is sold.'

"SEC. 105. Paragraph (b) of section 127 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2604(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) On each sale of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold where the sales price is from 13 cents to 62 cents, both inclusive, 1 cent; on each such sale where the sales price is from 63 cents to $1.12, both inclusive, 2 cents; and on each 50 cents of the sales price or fraction thereof of such sale in excess of $1.12, 1 cent.'

"SEC. 106. Paragraph (o) of section 128 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2605(o)) is amended by striking out 'whether or not'.

"SEC. 107. (a) Subsection (a) of section 147 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2624(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 147. (a) Any person who fails to file a return, who files a false or incorrect return, or who fails to pay the tax to the District within the time required by this title shall be subject to a penalty of 5 percentum of the amount of tax due if the failure is for not more than one month, with an additional 5 per centum for each additional month or fraction thereof during which such failure continues, not to exceed 20 per centum in the aggregate; plus interest at the rate of 1 per centum of such tax for each month or fraction thereof during which such failure continues; but the Commissioner may, if he is satisfied that the delay was excusable, waive all or any part of the penalty. Unpaid penalties and interest may be collected in the same manner as the tax imposed by this title. The penalty and interest provided for in this section shall be applicable to any tax determined as a deficiency.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out 'The certificate of the Collector or Assessor, as the case may be,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'The certificate of the Commissioner'.

"SEC. 108. Subsection (a) of section 201 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2701(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(6) The sale of or charges for admission to public events, including movies, musical performances, exhibitions, circuses, sporting events, and other shows or performances of any type or nature, except that any casual or isolated sale of or charge for admission made by a semipublic institution not regularly engaged in making such sales or charges shall not be considered a retail sale or sale at retail.

"'(7) The sale of or charges for the service of repairing, altering, mending, or fitting tangible personal property, or applying or installing tangible personal property as a repair or replacement part of other tangible personal property, whether or not such service is performed by means of coin-operated equipment or by any other means, and whether or not any tangible personal property is transferred in conjunction with such service.

"'(8) The sale of or charges for copying, photocopying, reproducing, duplicating, addressing, and mailing services and for public stenographic services.

"'(9) The sale of or charges for the service of preparing, providing, or supplying photographs, comic strips, special feature articles, feature articles, news items, or any other similar material intended for use in newspapers, magazines, periodicals, circulars, radio, television, or any other means of publication."

"SEC. 109. Subsection (b) of section 201 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2701(b)) is amended—

"(1) by striking out paragraph (1),

"(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (1) and by inserting before the period at the end of that paragraph a comma and the following: 'except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section',

"(3) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2) and by inserting before the period at the end of that paragraph a comma and the following: 'except as otherwise provided in subsection (a) of this section', and

"(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

"SEC. 110. Section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2702) is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The rate of tax imposed by this section shall be 4 per centum of the sales price of tangible personal property or services, except that—

"'(1) the rate of tax shall be 2 per centum of the sales price of (A) sales of food for human consumption off the premises where such food is sold, (B) sales of admission to public events, (C) sales of the services described in paragraphs (7), (8), and (9) of section 201(a) of this title, and (D) sales of medicines, pharmaceuticals, and drugs not made on prescriptions of duly licensed physicians, surgeons, or other general or special practitioners of the healing art;

"'(2) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the sales price of sales of any room or rooms, lodging, or accommodations, furnished to transients by any hotel, inn, tourist camp, tourist cabin, or any other place in which rooms, lodging, or accommodations are regularly furnished to transients; and

"'(3) the rate of tax shall be 5 per centum of the sales price of sales of (A) spiritous or malt liquors, beer, and wines, and (B) food for human consumption other than off the premises where such food is sold."

"SEC. 111. The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE II—MOTOR VEHICLE EXCISE TAX

"SEC. 201. Subsection (j) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-603(j)), is amended by striking out '3 per centum' and inserting in lieu thereof '4 per centum'.

"SEC. 202. The amendment made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIGARETTE TAX ACT

"SEC. 301. Subsection (a) of section 603 of the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2802(a)) is amended by striking out '3 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '4 cents'.

"SEC. 302. (a) Except as otherwise provided, the amendment made by section 301 shall apply with respect to cigarette tax stamps purchased on or after the effective date of this title, which shall be the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(b) In the case of cigarette tax stamp which have been purchased prior to the effective date of this title and which on such date are held (affixed to a cigarette package or otherwise) by a wholesaler, retailer, or vending machine operator, licensed under the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act, such licensee shall pay to the Commissioner (in accordance with subsection (c)) an amount equal to the difference between the amount of tax represented by such tax stamps on the date of their purchase and the amount of tax which an equal number of cigarette tax stamps would represent if purchased on the effective date of this title.

"(c) Within twenty days after the effective date of this title, each such licensee (1) shall file with the Commissioner a sworn statement (on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioner) showing the number of such cigarette tax stamps held by him as of the beginning of the day on which this title becomes effective or, if such day is a Sunday, as of the beginning of the following day, and (2) shall pay to the Commissioner the amount specified in subsection (b).

"(d) Each such licensee shall keep and preserve for the twelve-month period immediately following the effective date of this title the inventories and other records made which form the basis for the information furnished to the Commissioner on the sworn statement required to be filed under this section.

"(e) For purposes of this section, a tax stamp shall be considered as held by a wholesaler, retailer, or vending machine operator if title thereto has passed to such wholesaler, retailer, or operator (whether or not delivery to him has been made) and if title to such stamp has not at any time been transferred to any person other than such wholesaler, retailer, or operator.

"(f) A violation of the provisions of subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section shall be punishable as provided in section 611 of the District of Columbia Cigarette Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47-2810).

"TITLE IV—FEES FOR MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION AND INSPECTION AND FOR MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS' PERMITS

"Sec. 401. Section 2 of title IV of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-102) is amended—

"(1) by striking out '$1' and '50 cents' in paragraph (3) of subsection (b) (relating to fees for duplicate registration certificates and identification tags) and inserting in lieu thereof '$2' and '$1', respectively;

"(2) by striking out '$1' in paragraph (4) of subsection (b) (relating to fees for special use certificates and identification tags) and inserting in lieu thereof '$3';

"(3) by striking out 'ten days' in such paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof 'twenty days';

"(4) by inserting immediately after 'Commissioners' in such paragraph (4) the following: ', except that in the event such certificate and tags are necessary for use in complying with vehicle inspection regulations made pursuant to the authority contained in section 7 of the Act approved February 18, 1938 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-207), prior to completion of the registration of such vehicle or trailer, the fee shall be $2'; and

"(5) by striking out '$1' each place it appears in subsection (d) (relating to fee for transfer of registration) and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place '$2'.

"SEC. 402. Section 3 of title IV of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 40-103) is amended—

"(1) by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subsection (a) (relating to registration fees) the following: ', and in the event the markings on any such tag are specially ordered by the person to whom the tag is to be issued and such markings are other than those in a regular series, a reservation fee of $25 and an annual fee of $10, in addition to all other fees which may be required, shall be charged for such specially ordered tag';

"(2) by striking out 'three thousand five hundred' in the paragraph designated 'Class A' of subsection (b) (relating to registration fees for passenger motor vehicles) each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof in each such place 'three thousand four hundred', and by striking out '$22' and '$32' and inserting in lieu thereof '$30' and '$50', respectively;

"(3) by striking out, in the paragraph designated 'Class B' of subsection (b) (relating to registration fees for trucks, tractors, and certain commercial automobiles), '$40', $44', '$52', '$60', '$68', '$74', '$84', '$96', '$122', '$142', '$172', and '$202', and inserting in lieu thereof '$53', '$59', '$69', '$80', '$91', '$99', '$112', '$128', '$163', '$191', '$229', and '$269', respectively;

"(4) by striking out, in the paragraph designated 'Class C' of subsection (b) (relating to registration fees for trailers), '$8', '$12', '$20', '$32', '$46', '$60', '$74', '$92', '$122', '$152', and '$182', and inserting in lieu thereof '$11', '$16', '$27', '$43', '$61', '$80', '$99', '$123', '$163', '$203', and '$243', respectively; and

"(5) by striking out in subsection (d) (relating to division of registration fees between Highway Fund and General Fund) 'sixty-four' and 'seventy-four' and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty-two' and 'forty-seven', respectively.

"SEC. 403. The first section of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the annual inspection of all motor vehicles in the District of Columbia', approved February 18, 1938 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-201), is amended by striking out '$1' and inserting in lieu thereof '$3'.

"SEC. 404. Section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-603), is amended (1) by striking out '$5' in subsection (a) (relating to fee for restoration of suspended or revoked permits and privileges) and inserting in lieu thereof '$10', and (2) by striking out '$1' in subsection (d) (relating to fees for titling and retitling) and inserting in lieu thereof '$5'.

"SEC. 405. Subsection (a) of section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (D.C. Code, sec. 40-301(a)), is amended (1) by striking out '$3' in paragraph (1) (relating to fee for operator's permit) and inserting in lieu thereof '$12', and by striking out in such paragraph 'three years' and inserting in lieu thereof 'four years'; and (2) by striking out paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(4) In the event an operator's permit or a learner's permit issued under the authority of this section is lost or destroyed, or requires replacement for any reason other than through error or other act of the Commissioners not caused by the person to whom such permit was issued, such person may obtain a duplicate or replacement permit upon payment of a fee of $2.'

"SEC. 406. Section 3 of the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia (D.C. Code, sec. 40-419) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of subsection (a) the following: ', including rules and regulations assessing reasonable fees to reimburse the District of Columbia for the cost of reinstating licenses and registrations suspended under the authority of this Act, such fees not to exceed the amount of $10 for the reinstatement of a license or registration, or both a license and registration'.

"SEC. 407. The amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

"TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

"SEC. 501. (a) Clauses (4) and (5) of section 23(a) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25-124(a)) are each amended by striking out '$1.75' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2.00'.

"(b) Section 40(a) of such Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25-138(a)) is amended by striking out '$2.00' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2.25'.

"SEC. 502. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this title, the amendments made by section 501 shall apply with respect to—

"(1) alcohol and spirits imported or brought into the District of Columbia or manufactured, and

"(2) beer sold or purchased for resale,

on and after the effective date of this title which shall be the first day of the first month which begins on or after the thirtieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

"(b) In the case of alcohol, spirits, and beer which have been purchased prior to the effective date of this title and which on such date are held by a holder of a retailer's license, issued under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, such licensee shall pay to the Commissioner (in accordance with subsection (c)) an amount equal to the difference between the amount of tax imposed by such Act immediately prior to the effective date of this title on the amount of alcohol, spirits, and beer so held by him, and the amount of tax which would be imposed by the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act on such effective date on an equivalent amount of alcohol, spirits, and beer.

"(c) Within twenty days after the effective date of this title, each such licensee (1) shall file with the Commissioner a sworn statement (on a form to be prescribed by the Commissioner) showing the quantity of alcohol, spirits, and beer held by him as of the beginning of the day on which this title becomes effective or, if such day is a Sunday, as of the beginning of the following day, and (2) shall pay to the Comisisoner the amount specified in subsection (b).

"(d) Each such licensee shall keep and preserve for the twelve-month period immediately following the effective date of this title the inventories and other records made which form the basis for the information furnished to the Commissioner on the sworn statement required to be filed under this section.

"(e) For purposes of this section, alcohol, spirits, and beer shall be considered as held by a holder of a retailer's license if title

thereto has passed to such holder (whether or not delivery to him has been made) and if title has not at any time been transferred to any person other than such holder.

"(f) A violation of the provisions of subsection (b), (c), or (d) of this section shall be punishable as provided in section 33 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act (D.C. Code, sec. 25–132).

"TITLE VI—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME AND FRANCHISE TAX ACT OF 1947

"SEC. 601. (a) Title XII of article I of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–1586—47–1586n) is amended (1) by redesignating sections 14 and 15 as sections 15 and 16, respectively, and (2) by inserting after section 13 the following new section:

"'SEC. 14. DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED INCOME TAX BY CORPORATIONS AND UNINCORPORATED BUSINESSES.—(a) DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED TAX.—Every corporation and unincorporated business required to make and file an income tax return under this article shall make and file a declaration of estimated tax at such time or times and under such conditions, and shall make payments of such tax during its taxable year in such amounts and under such conditions, as the District of Columbia Council shall by regulation prescribe. In the case of taxable years beginning in 1970 and in 1971, such regulations may not require payment before the last day on which a return for a taxable year is required to be filed under section 3(a) of title V of this article of an aggregate amount of estimated tax for such year in excess of—

"'(1) one-third of the estimated tax in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1970, and

"'(2) two-thirds of the estimated tax, in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1971.

"'(b) Failure by Corporation or Unincorporated Business to Pay Estimated Income Tax.—(1) Addition to the Tax.—In case of any underpayment of estimated tax by a corporation or an incorporated business, there shall be added to the tax for the taxable year an amount determined at the rate of 6 per centum per annum upon the amount of the underpayment (determined under paragraph (2) for the period of the underpayment (determined under paragraph (3))).

"'(2) Amount of Underpayment.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the amount of the underpayment shall be the excess of—

"'(A) the amount of the installment which would be required to be paid if the estimated tax were equal to 80 per centum of the tax shown on the return for the taxable year or, if no return was filed, 80 per centum of the tax for such year, over

"'(B) the amount, if any, of the installment paid on or before the last date prescribed for payment.

"'(3) Period of Underpayment.—The period of the underpayment shall run from the date the installment was required to be paid to whichever of the following dates is the earlier—

"'(A) the 15th day of the fourth month following the close of the taxable year; or

"'(B) with respect to any portion of the underpayment the date on which such portion is paid.

For purposes of this paragraph, a payment of estimated tax on any installment date shall be considered a payment of any previous underpayment only to the extent such payment exceeds the amount of the installment determined under paragraph (2)(A) for such installment date.

"'(c) OVERPAYMENT; CREDIT OF TAX.—Overpayment resulting from the payment of estimated tax for a taxable year in excess of the amount determined to be due upon the filing of an income tax return for such taxable year may be credited against the amount of estimated tax determined to be due on any declaration filed for the next succeeding taxable year or for any deficiency or nonpayment of tax for any previous taxable year. No refund shall be made of any estimated tax paid unless a complete return is filed.'

"(b) That part of the table of contents of such article relating to title XII is amended—

"(1) by inserting after the item relating to section 13 the following:

"'Sec. 14. Declarations of estimated income tax by corporations and unincorporated businesses.

"'(a) Declaration of estimated tax.

"'(b) Failure by corporation or unincorporated business to pay estimated income tax.

"'(1) Addition to the tax.

"'(2) Amount of underpayment.

"'(3) Period of underpayment.

"'(c) Overpayment; credit of tax.';

"(2) by striking out 'Sec. 14' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Sec. 15'; and

"(3) by striking out 'Sec. 15' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Sec. 16.'

"SEC. 602. The amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

"TITLE VII—FEDERAL PAYMENT AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 701. Article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–2501a and 47–2501b) is amended to read as follows:

"'ARTICLE VI—FEDERAL PAYMENT

"'SEC. 1. A regular annual payment (hereafter in this article referred to as the "Federal payment") is authorized to be appropriated from revenues of the United States to cover the proper Federal share of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia. The Federal payment, when appropriated, shall be paid into the general fund. Subject to any adjustments required under section 3 for overpayments or underpayments, the Federal payment authorized by this article for each of the five fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, shall be an amount equal to 30 per centum of the amount of District of Columbia fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues which the Commissioner estimates will be credited to the general fund during such fiscal year and which is approved under section 2. Subject to any adjustments required under section 3 for overpayments or underpayments, the Federal payment authorized by this article for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and each fiscal year thereafter shall be an amount equal to 30 per centum of the amount of District of Columbia fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues credited to the general fund during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

"'SEC. 2. For each of the five fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, the Commissioner shall estimate the amount of District of Columbia fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues that will be credited to the general fund during such fiscal year. He shall submit such amount to the Bureau of the Budget with the regular budget of the District of Columbia for such fiscal years. The amount of such revenues and fees which is approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be submitted to the Congress.

"'SEC. 3. If the amount of the Federal payment appropriated in any of the five fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, or June 30, 1974, does not equal 30 per centum of the amount of District of Columbia fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues credited to the general fund during such fiscal year, increased or decreased as may be necessary to reflect the amount of the adjustment made under this section to the Federal payment authorization for such fiscal year, the amount of the Federal payment authorization for the second fiscal year beginning after such fiscal year shall—

"'(1) if such Federal payment appropriation exceeded 30 per centum of such fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues (so increased or decreased), be reduced by the amount of such excess; or

"'(2) if such Federal payment appropriation was less than 30 per centum of such fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues (so increased or decreased), be increased by the amount of which such appropriation was lower.

"SEC. 4. For purposes of this article—

"'(1) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

"'(2) The term "General Fund" means the General Fund of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States.

"'(3) The term "miscellaneous receipts" does not include any amounts derived from grants or loans from the Federal Government to the District of Columbia.'

"SEC. 702. This title may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Federal Payment Authorization Act of 1969.'

"TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 702. This title may be cited as the for any fiscal year under article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 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 those 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 any agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States.

"SEC. 802. Section 401(2) of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1968 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1118) is amended (1) by striking out 'and (B)' and inserting in lieu thereof ', (B)', and (2) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'and (C) any individual who, as part of a program approved by an educational agency having jurisdiction over an elementary or secondary school located outside the District of Columbia, is voluntarily enrolled in such school.'

"SEC. 803. Nothing in this Act, or any amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to affect the authority vested in the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or the authority vested in the District of Columbia Council by Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1967. The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Commissioner of the District of Columbia or in any office or agency under his jurisdiction and control, or in the District of Columbia Council, may be delegated by the Commissioner or by the Council, as the case may be, in accordance with the provisions of such Plan.

"SEC. 804. (a) The repeal or amendment by this Act of any provision of law shall not affect any other provision of law, or any act done or any right accrued or accruing under such repealed or amended law, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil cause before repeal or amendment of such law; but all rights and liabilities under such repealed or amended law shall continue, and may be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent, as if such repeal or amendment had not been made.

"(b) All offenses committed, and all penalties incurred, under any provision of law repealed or amended by this Act, may be

prosecuted and punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted."

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

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

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the substitute being offered to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DOWDY. This is to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia. In the substitute offered there is a provision seeking to amend title 31 of the District of Columbia Code, which concerns education, and thus would not be germane to the bill pending before the House.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Ninety-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 151]

Ashley	Gettys	Pollock
Berry	Goldwater	Powell
Blackburn	Griffiths	Preyer, N.C.
Byrne, Pa.	Halpern	Pucinski
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Idaho	Quillen
Caffery	Hansen, Wash.	Railsback
Cahill	Harsha	Rarick
Carey	Hastings	Reid, N.Y.
Celler	Hawkins	Reifel
Clancy	Hays	Reuss
Clark	Hogan	Roudebush
Clawson, Del	Holifield	St. Onge
Collier	Howard	Shipley
Colmer	Hull	Sikes
Corbett	Johnson, Pa.	Sisk
Cowger	Jones, Tenn.	Slack
Cunningham	Kirwan	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Ga.	Landrum	Snyder
Delaney	Latta	Stokes
Diggs	Lipscomb	Stubblefield
Donohue	Lloyd	Sullivan
Edmondson	McCarthy	Talcott
Esch	Mann	Teague, Tex.
Evins, Tenn.	Martin	Tiernan
Flowers	Mathias	Utt
Flynt	Meskill	Watkins
Ford, William D.	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
	Mills	Wilson, Bob
Fountain	Moorhead	Wolff
Frey	Nichols	Wright
Fulton, Tenn.	O'Neal, Ga.	Wyman
Gallagher	Philbin	Young
Garmatz	Poage	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GIAIMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 12982, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 335 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the point of order that a quorum was not present was made, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) had asked unanimous consent that the substitute amendment for the committee amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DOWDY. The bill is a bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia. The substitute amendment offered contains provisions which would amend title XXXI of the District of Columbia Code, which concerns education and cultural institutions; therefore, it is not germane to the bill pending before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I would point out that this particular proposal was placed in the law governing the District of Columbia by the revenue bill of last year. So it would certainly be germane to the subject in that it was put in in this fashion and so it can be taken out in the same fashion.

I would also point out that there is in the committee amendment a personnel freeze dealing with the Board of Education which provides that the personnel freeze will not apply to it. The subject has been raised in the bill.

Further, I point out that this revenue bill abolishes an office in the District of Columbia and freezes certain employees and does away with certain powers of the District Government, so that it covers matters other than revenue.

I can assure the gentleman who raised the point of order that if it were to be sustained, points of order would, of course, be raised to the original committee bill on all of the things that we are proposing to remove by this amendment.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard further?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I might say this: If there are provisions in the committee bill to which a point of order could have been raised, this point of order would still lie against the proposed substitute. The fact that this provision was put into title 31 of the District Code in a revenue bill last year has nothing to do with whether it is germane to a revenue bill this year. I remember that there was no point of order raised to it last year, but that does not void the point of order at this time, in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has had an opportunity to study the question during the quorum call and the Chair would say to the gentleman from Texas the fact that there might be other items in the bill which might be subject to a point of order, as was just stated, indicates that the committee amendment has in it items which are other than revenue matters and therefore opens the bill up to other related amendments. The fact is that the legislation before us is basically a revenue matter, but it does apply to many other sections of the District of Columbia Code. Among other things not having to do with revenue, it eliminates the office of the Director of Public Safety; it provides for a freeze on the number of personnel and employees who may be hired by the District of Columbia government. These provisions also involve the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968. The language involving education here involves a part of existing law. It seems to the Chair it is germane to the bill in toto. Therefore the Chair feels that the point of order must be overruled.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, of course I will not argue with the Chair, but I would like to say this further: The fact that there might be other provisions in the bill to which a point of order could have been raised and were not, seemingly, should not apply here.

The CHAIRMAN. The fact that the gentleman of the committee says that there are other items in the committee amendment further strengthens the argument that the bill can be opened up to additional amendments.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief in my remarks because I know the day is growing long and we hope to have as many Members as possible present for the brief debate and for the vote on the substitute. The substitute amendment which is presently pending and on which we ask for an early vote is neither a partisan amendment nor does it involve issues of liberalism or conservatism.

The basic issue involved here is whether or not the local government here shall function.

The first point is that they should have enough money with which to carry out the programs that we in the Congress have asked them to do. In other words, to fight crime, to improve the area, to do things about the highways and so forth. To do these things you have got to give them the money with which to do it. That is the first thing the substitute will do. It adopts a formula which, in effect, says that the Federal Government will pay 30 percent of what the local people pay in taxes. The reason we say 30 percent is that the President of the United States, Mr. Nixon has said that he believes the 30-percent formula is correct. President Johnson while serving as President of the United States said that we should have a 30-percent formula for the District of Columbia.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that those recommendations when they are brought here indicate that this is not a partisan argument. They indicate as reasonable position as the executive branch can produce as the amount of money which the Federal Government should pay as compared to what the local citizens should pay for the facilities which we share in this city.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any argument as to the amount of percentage, many of us would agree that this House should have the committee study the allocation between Federal and city functions. But at the present time the best evidence we have is the recommendation of two Presidents, the present District government and no question, inci-

dentally raised at the time as to whether or not 30 percent was wrong, but just simply the statement that they asked for a different percentage one time before.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out the fact that this is a limiting factor as well as a giving factor. It places this city on the same basis as every other city that exists in each Member's district. You will have now known sources of revenue and any additional moneys that come to them beyond that will have to come from Federal grants or in the usual manner in which other cities are supported.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Just on that one point, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Washington that back when I first went on the committee we talked about 15 percent in 1958. Then we talked about 20 percent. Then I remember President Kennedy and his administration talked about 25 percent. It is my understanding that based upon the request of last year they asked for 25 percent; is that right or wrong?

Mr. ADAMS. I am sorry, but I did not hear the latter part of the question.

Mr. SPRINGER. That last year the city asked for 25 percent?

Mr. ADAMS. They requested a 25-percent formula.

Mr. SPRINGER. And, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the committee gave them 25 percent and then a supplemental came in under which we gave them more than 25 percent.

Mr. ADAMS. Actually, we gave them more than 25 percent on a formula basis. The reason we are at 30 percent this year is that the general amount that has been appropriated has been running 26 percent, 28 percent and so on during the last 4 or 5 years and 30 percent was felt as being a reasonable figure for the future and we put this at that rate for a period of 5 years.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I am glad to hear the gentleman from Washington say that because all through the years the newspapers have been wanting some formula set. Personally, I agree with them. Eleven years ago there should have been a formula, but one by which we should stick. We use that kind of formula let me say in the State of Illinois in some of our operations but it has remained relatively stable. However, this thing of asking one time for 20 percent, another time at 25 percent and another time for a different percentage I do not feel is fair. Somewhere along the line we ought to determine what our fair share is and we ought to stop at that figure.

Mr. ADAMS. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois that we stop at the 30 percent and we say to them, in effect, these are your revenues with which you have to operate. It is like any other city. You have got to live within your revenue.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is there any reason why we should give them 30 percent over the 25 percent that they requested last year?

Mr. ADAMS. The only reason is that the Executive and those who prepared it, the Federal Government, have been for 30 percent and have, in effect, said, "This, gentlemen, is it" to the gentlemen who have proposed this and took that recommendation.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ADAMS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the final part of the substitute will be to simply remove what we believe represent backward steps insofar as the government of the city of Washington, D.C., is concerned.

It would do this, it would allow the city to continue to assess real estate taxes which this city has done since 1922. It would allow the city to determine whether or not it needed a public safety director. It would allow this city to hire the necessary people to carry out the Federal programs which we have—and by "we," I mean the Congress—have directed that they carry out, and not put an arbitrary personnel freeze on them.

Finally, it would allow the Board of Education of the District of Columbia and the boards of education in surrounding Maryland to work out voluntary plans for making things better for the children in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

(On request of Mr. HORTON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ADAMS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wanted to indicate to the gentleman from Washington and to the Members of the House that this is a bipartisan minority view, and included in that minority is the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. GUDE, and myself, and we have worked very closely with Mr. ADAMS and others on the other side of the aisle in putting together this substitute amendment. It is not by any stretch of the imagination the sole product of the gentleman from Washington; it is a substitute amendment of all Members in opposition, including the Members from this side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to indicate to the House that the President of the United States on April 28, 1969, in his message to the Congress, went into some detail on this matter of the Federal payment. I am sure that the gentleman from Washington will agree with me that it was one of my principal objects in the meetings preceding the minority views that we have this Federal formula, and I wish that the gentleman from Washington would acknowledge it.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would so state that. May I say that this substitute proposal was worked out by the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Maryland, and a number on this side and a number of the other side of the aisle, to try to make a package that we felt was reasonable and fair.

I think the gentleman from New York will agree that prior to this point we had worked out all of the sales taxes and the other items to try to make that a reasonable package, and we have stayed with that.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to also point out that the President in his message in April of 1969 made a very specific recommendation with regard to the Federal payment. The formula which is in this substitute is the same formula that the President recommended, and I would like to read President Nixon's words. He said in his message:

> I therefore recommend that the Congress authorize a federal payment formula fixing the federal contribution at 30 percent of the local tax, and other general fund revenue.

He also continued:

> Naturally, a formula approach would be a significant step toward effective government in the District of Columbia. It would tie the revenue and federal aid to the pertinent local taxes of the District citizens. It would also provide in the District I think a predictable estimate for use in the annual budget process, thus allowing them to plan expenditures more accurately and imaginatively for the growing needs of its population.

Then he continued:

> The proposed federal payment formula would not involve automatic expenditure of federal funds. The particular payment would still have to be appropriated by Congress.

He continued:

> By authorizing the federal payment at 30 percent of all District general fund revenues, the Congress would allow payment of $120 million in fiscal year 1970, an increase of $30 million over the past authorization.

The present authorization is $90 million. The bill proposes $105 million. It is short some $15 million. The formula approach that we are including in the substitute would provide the full amount as suggested by President Nixon; namely, of $30 million, which would bring this authorization in balance.

Will the gentleman from Washington agree with that?

Mr. ADAMS. I agree with that.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close by saying this, that the issue here is in trying to handle the problems of a metropolitan city—and even worse than that—the situation in this city where you have an overlay of the Federal Government operating in this metropolitan city so that you have 340,000 people coming in and out of the city every day to work. If you are going to handle this kind of problem, you have to have the revenues to do so.

Many of us backed off from our proposals of a commuter tax or a tax on companies doing business here with the Government that are tax exempt on the basis that the Federal Government would pay for it.

If the Federal Government is going to

pay for it, instead of putting in a commuter tax, this type of service tax, then there has to be enough money. That is the compromise that we proposed and that is why many of us feel that our proposal is the compromise that the committee should have come out with.

I would point out that it was a very narrow vote by which the committee did not come out with this compromise, and the votes from both sides of the aisle were involved in support of the compromise substitute.

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

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUDE. I would just like to ask the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, what he would feel as to the connection as to the administration and the city as to crime control, prevention of crime in the city and the recommendation of the Executive. We have this formula and adequate funds to do a job really of fighting crime and related matters.

Mr. ADAMS. There were propositions submitted. There were reform organization programs in the narcotics area, for example, proposing things that need to be done as to professional services. In jail alone, many Members here supported mandatory sentences—supported the proposition that we keep dangerous people off the street prior to trial and the jail population has gone from 2,500 to 3,000 in the last year.

You have to have money to pay for that and this money has to be provided someplace. We are suggesting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the substitute amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS) may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the request be made at the end of the first 5 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. I wish the gentleman would withhold that please because I do need 10 minutes, and I will have to make the request.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I would be constrained to object unless the request is made after the first 5 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. All right, I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to support the substitute amendment.

So far as the matter of money is concerned, it amounts to about $10 million more than the District of Columbia is now receiving.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is just $15 million off.

Mr. BOGGS. All right, let us say $25 million.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is supposed to be $30 million.

Mr. BOGGS. All right, $30 million or whatever the correct figure is.

I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN), chairman of the committee, several questions. Does the committee bill take away the Public Safety Commissioner?

Mr. McMILLAN. I hope so.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has answered my question—It does.

I have another question to ask the gentleman. Does it take away the power of the local Council to levy taxes?

Mr. McMILLAN. In my opinion, there either the Congress should——

Mr. BOGGS. Would the gentleman please answer the question "yes" or "no."

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes; yes, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. It does. The answer is "Yes."

Now, does it put an arbitrary personnel freeze across the board on personnel?

Mr. McMILLAN. It would amount to about 10 percent of any new employees.

Mr. BOGGS. The chairman of the District Committee has answered my questions. The committee bill places an arbitrary freeze across the board on personnel needed to staff many of the departments of the District of Columbia.

But it does put an arbitrary freeze on the number, does it not?

Mr. McMILLAN. Not across the board; no.

Mr. BOGGS. You exempted the Executive Office.

Mr. McMILLAN. No, we exempted the Metropolitan Police Force, the Fire Department, employees of the Board of Education, and the courts of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BOGGS. I know about that, but otherwise you did not exempt anybody, did you?

Mr. McMILLAN. Not across the board we did not.

Mr. BOGGS. Fine. I have all the answers I need. I understand the gentleman's bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell you about a wonderful experience I had. I went fishing with Speaker Sam Rayburn in the last days of his life. I went down to Tennessee with the late Representative of that State, Howard Baker, the father of the present Senator from Tennessee, and there we dedicated a dam named for Sam Rayburn in the county in Tennessee where he was born. His family left the mountains of Tennessee, where the land was poor—there was no TVA then—and went to Bonham, Tex., where the land was richer.

At that time—Speaker Rayburn, who helped rear me from the time that I first came here at the age of 26—was dying of cancer. This had been his last fishing trip. I sat with him in one of those beautiful TVA lakes and saw the pain on his face—but he never complained. Later I knew when Congress adjourned that year that I would never lay eyes on Sam Rayburn again alive. And I did not. The next time I saw his body in a coffin at his funeral attended by former President Truman and others. But let us get back to our return from Tennessee in July 1962.

As we were landing back in Washington later that day, Mr. Rayburn said to me, "Look at Washington. There is the Capital of our great country. Look at that Capitol Building. I have been here 50 years and there has never been a time that I have not looked at that dome of that Capitol that I have not said, 'I am proud to be an American.'"

But he also said, "We have neglected the Capital of our Nation—Washington, D.C. We treat her penuriously. We act like it is not the Capital of our country but some place outside our country. Look down the Potomac River, that beautiful river that flows from the Blue Ridge Mountains and comes down through our Capital City. It is polluted. One can't swim it. One can't eat the fish caught in it. One can't enjoy it. When will the time come," said Mr. Rayburn as he was dying, "when the people of America will make their Capital the first and most beautiful city on earth—the Capital of the greatest Nation in the history of mankind?"

I remember those words.

Now, only about 10 days ago, I had an invitation from Mayor Washington to come down and have breakfast with him. It was 8 o'clock in the morning. I had quite a job on my hands that day because I was trying to help our country pass a bipartisan tax bill. And if I may be permitted to digress for a minute, I would like to say a few words about that tax bill, because our Nation and particularly Washington, D.C., will greatly benefit from it.

May I say, "Thank God for JOHN MCCORMACK, GERRY FORD, LES ARENDS, CARL ALBERT, WILBUR MILLS, the rest of you in this House, and President Nixon and former President Johnson"—because they supported it and now we will see the heat go out of the inflation that was about to consume our Nation, and we will return to a healthy growth of about 4 percent of the GNP.

It might interest you to know that President Nixon, the other night was able to make that first fine speech about reforming our welfare system and sent his message today about abolishing and reforming our welfare system, because he was shown where the money would come from and where he could anticipate a balanced budget, both in the administrative and unified budgets, throughout his administration.

He learned this from three able men, whom I sent to see Arthur Burns, his chief economic adviser.

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

(On request of Mr. MCCORMACK and by unanimous consent, Mr. BOGGS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOGGS. I had heard there was serious opposition in the President's own Cabinet to his recommendation about abolishing the welfare program, which is eating us alive. Now it is better to be on welfare than it is to work for a living. I have pointed out in speeches I have made here on the floor that a man who makes $23 a week pays $42 a year

in Federal income tax. And under the present law, another man can make $10 million a year and pay not one penny to help his Government, which gives him the opportunity to make the money and also permits him to live in the freest society that mankind has ever known.

That is why I worked for months, night and day, for the surcharge bill which I managed and the reform which passed the House last week by a vote of 394 to 30.

But, I spelled out to those three people I mentioned earlier, Edwin S. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Dr. Laurence Woodworth, and a young economist named Mike Bird, who were with us in the Committee on Ways and Means, how the President's welfare program was fiscally sound, as are programs for education, airport construction, a modern merchant marine, for model cities, for air and water pollution control, and so on.

Taxes have what is called a multiplier effect. As I pointed out a moment ago, we can now anticipate, assuming Senate passage on the reform bill, surpluses in both the unified budget and in the administrative budget for the next 5 years. Incidentally, if Members will take the trouble to read my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Thursday, beginning on page 22587 and continuing through page 22600, under the title "Tax Reform Act of 1969," it is all spelled out here.

After my three friends, Secretary Cohen, Dr. Woodworth, and Mr. Mike Bird, conferred with Dr. Arthur Burns, who talked to President Nixon, the President made his speech and sent his messages on the welfare system.

I announced publicly on Friday night after the President's speech that I supported the President's program to abolish the present welfare system.

In that system we have an army of welfare people going around to check on welfare recipients every minute, and it is more profitable to be on welfare than to earn a living. Think of a woman with seven or eight dependent children being paid approximately $2,000, but if she earns $3,000 a year at this time, under the present tax law she would have had to pay taxes on the $3,000. But if she stayed on welfare for which all the taxpayers in the United States pay, she pays no taxes at all. Even worse, if she gets a job, her welfare payments are cut so there is no incentive to work.

But, until Secretary Cohen and Dr. Woodworth and the young economist, Mike Bird, spoke to Dr. Burns, President Nixon did not think he could do it. Well, he can do it, and much more and still have funds for debt retirement.

But, let me get back to Mayor Washington's breakfast. I sat there and listened to that good man—and he is a good man, and he is a black man. I decided that he needs help. Now, every man and woman in this body knows I have no prejudices.

I come from the Deep South, and I love the South, and the rest of the Nation has recently learned some of the difficulties that we have experienced in the South for many years. But this, thank God, is one country.

Thanks to a man named Abraham Lincoln who said, "The Union must be preserved." My ancestors all fought on the other side for the South, one was on the staff of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

It was a dreadful bloody war—when it was over, the South was impoverished and the Nation exhausted.

But the Union had been preserved.

Speaker Rayburn and I frequently talked about that war. He said had it not been for a dozen or two "hot heads" on both sides, it would have never happened.

But it did.

I voted for voting rights and for open housing, and I make no apologies for it.

I love the Washington, D.C., area. I have lived here for 30 years. My children have been reared here. My son lives here, and he has three children. I own property in the District of Columbia, and it is profitable property.

I want the slums cleaned up. In the bill which we passed last week, Members will find the most preferential treatment of all given to people who build houses and build apartments and build office buildings. The reason for that is Secretary Romney spoke to me and said that if we take the recommendations of the Treasury Department—the administration's Treasury Department—we could not fulfill what Congress committed the Nation to in the 1968 Housing Act, and we would have to increase Federal appropriations way beyond what the House had already approved, which was a cut of about $200 million below what President Nixon requested.

Secretary Romney said if we did it the other way, that is made it profitable for private investors and builders to build houses for the lower and middle income families, to tear down the ghettos, and to rebuild the central cities, we would not only be able to implement the 1968 acts but we would be able to carry out the Federal functions set forth in that act much more expeditiously.

So in the executive sessions of the Ways and Means Committee on the reform tax bill, I was adamantly in favor of Secretary Romney's plan. I put his letter to me in the record of the committee and it is also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The Treasury Department accepted most of what Secretary Romney recommended but let it be noted that it was this administration Treasury Department which prevented the acceptance of the whole Romney package. I hope that the Senate Finance Committee will take the whole Romney package.

Now, I want to get back to my conversation with Mayor Washington and why I was so sympathetic to him. I voted for the voting rights bill, the Federal aid to education, for the poverty program, for open housing, and I had the job—a very difficult one—of serving as chairman of the Democratic platform committee in Chicago last August.

This assured me of about the roughest campaign of any Democrat in our country. My wife and I and my friends campaigned continuously for 5 weeks. I won by a majority of 1.2 percent.

Following that campaign, Mrs. Boggs and I wanted to rest but we got a good opportunity and we took it. We went to Europe at no cost to the Government, incidentally, to see the new towns in Europe, all over Europe, to study the replanned and rebuilt old towns all over the continent, including cities and towns behind the Iron Curtain.

The man who, among others, helped organize that trip was Mayor Floyd Hyde, who had been extremely active in urban America and in the urban coalition.

Governor Romney upon assuming the position of Secretary of Housing and Urban Development appointed Floyd Hyde, the former mayor of Fresno, as the director of model cities program in that Department.

Floyd Hyde, while serving as mayor of Fresno, replanned and rebuilt the central city of Fresno. Today, he informs me that the merchants in the center city are doing 14 percent more business than they did prior to the replanning. Mayors from all over the United States go to Fresno to see what's happened there.

Mr. Hyde is a man of great vision. Now the Congress—when the Senate passes the tax reform bill—can appropriate the funds that he must have to make model cities an actuality rather than a slogan.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not, I hope, consume the additional 5 minutes.

This is the first time I have ever made a speech about the District of Columbia. But as the majority whip of the Democratic Party, I feel that I have the right. I have spoken today, however, because I love this city. It is the Capital of my country, and I love my country. When I left that breakfast with that good man, Mayor Washington, I said to myself: "The problems this man has are overwhelming. I will help him. And I will. Not only today, but as long as I serve in this body."

The mayor of every city in America today has problems. My heart goes out to John Lindsay in New York. The mayor of Detroit said, "I cannot take it anymore." Mayor Cavanaugh quit. I do not blame him.

I look about and I see the inner city here fighting the outer city, and Washington, D.C., fighting the suburbs, and Montgomery County in one position and Prince Georges County in another position, and Arlington County over here—all fighting about bridges and subways and taxes, and so forth.

We had the same situation in my city of New Orleans. We had a dispute which was eating away almost like a cancer. Its origin was the placing in the Interstate System by a former Director of the Bureau of Public Roads of an expressway which would have paralleled the Mississippi River and passed in front of the historic Jackson Square in our wonderful renowned French quarter. From then on, this proposed expressway became a cause to live in New Orleans. The central businessmen on Canal Street said that it was essential to help the French quarter and to help the central city. Both sides were in complete good faith. They believed that their cause was right.

But, like in all disputes, it soon became a bitter struggle. And it was known all over the country. Many articles were written in newspapers outside of New Orleans, the Christian Science Monitor and Washington Post, to mention two. The national preservationists fought the proposal and the President's Commission on Historic Sites disapproved the plan as submitted by the State highway commission.

Shortly after assuming office, Secretary of Transportation John Volpe, after sending his Assistant Secretary to New Orleans to hear all sides, and after his Assistant Secretary Bramen returned and reported to Secretary Volpe, said that the conflict was irreconcilable and that there was no way to build the French quarter expressway in the foreseeable future because of threatening law suits and other dilatory tactics.

Thereupon, Secretary Volpe, acting under the authority granted him by the Howard Act, canceled the French Quarter Expressway and transferred the mileage from that section, plus additional mileage, and made it possible for the metropolitan area to obtain a desperately needed outer beltway for the whole metropolitan area. This includes two free bridges across the Mississippi River and the project will cost when completed, and it is now well underway, well over $400 million.

This was an opportunity that I seized upon, Mr. Chairman.

Despite warnings from friends of mine who said, "Don't go into that hornet's nest," I called the warring factions together here in Washington for a series of meetings with Secretary Volpe, Secretary Romney, Model Cities Director Hyde, the Chief of the Army Engineers and his deputies, and the Director of the General Services Administration, Robert Kunzig, and his deputies. This required a whole day on July 22. Incidentally, this was the only day, except for the day of the launching of the moon shot, that I missed working on tax legislation from June 15 through the passage of the reform bill last week.

At the conclusion of the final meeting, on motion from the floor, an ad hoc committee was formed, made up of 100 or more people who attended the meetings, plus any other civic group who might care to become a member of that committee.

I agreed to act as temporary chairman of the ad hoc committee. In the meantime, the Regional Metropolitan Planning Commission has been meeting regularly and by the end of the current recess, I hope to have a meeting in New Orleans of the ad hoc committee, at which time a permanent chairman will be elected. The committee will serve as an advisory committee, a citizens committee, to the National Planning Committee.

I enclose herewith a copy of a letter which is going out to all members of the ad hoc committee. It is self-explanatory:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC WHIP,
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1969.

DEAR ———: I want you to know how very much I appreciate your interest in the series of productive meetings which were held in Washington recently.

The meetings brought many divergent groups together and made it possible for us to speak as one voice for our great metropolitan area—the inner city, the French Quarter, New Orleans East, and the Parishes of Plaquemines, St. Bernard, Jefferson, and St. Charles.

At the end of that busy day, July 22nd, by unanimous agreement, we created an ad hoc committee, of which you are a member. We said that others who desire to be members representing civic and similar organizations would be welcome. At the suggestion of the entire group at the meeting, I agreed to serve as temporary chairman of the ad hoc committee.

I am happy to do this but, as you know, the work that I have here in the Congress is overwhelming and I can only serve until the first meeting. It is my hope that the ad hoc committee will become a permanent committee for the advancement of our entire area, so that we will develop into the finest metropolitan area in our Nation—preserving and adding to our central business district on Canal Street, and at the same time preserving and making more beautiful our magnificent French Quarter, planning with foresight the problems of transportation, both vehicular and mass, for the French Quarter and the central business district area, and planning the thousands of acres of undeveloped land which will soon be available for development in New Orleans East, in St. Bernard, Plaquemines, Jefferson, and St. Charles Parishes.

I would hope that we would find a suitable center where various plans could be shown to all of our citizens so that they will become enthusiastic supporters of whatever is finally agreed upon. Personally, I am committed to no plan and believe we should employ the best talent in the Nation, and I believe I can obtain the necessary funds to do this.

In handling the complex economic problems which have faced our Country during the past six months, I have literally exhausted myself, so that Lindy and I and our oldest grandson, Hale III, are taking a vacation during the Congressional recess, which begins August 13th.

I have been in almost every country on earth, have traveled the length and breadth of our Nation by airplane, but I have never seen the Yellowstone Park, nor have I seen the Redwood Forest, nor have I ever seen the Grand Canyon, and many other places in our Country.

So, Lindy, Hale and I are "going to see the USA."

We also plan to visit Fresno, California, where the former Mayor of Fresno, Floyd Hyde, who now heads the Model Cities Program in HUD, replanned and rebuilt the downtown business district, so that today merchants are doing 14% more business than prior to the replanning.

And, we will have another pleasure. Our daughter, Cokie, and her husband, Steven, who heads the New York Times Bureau in Los Angeles have been there since January, and we have not seen Cokie, Steven, or our grandson, Lee, since the first of the year.

In the meantime, I would hope that you would continue to do whatever is necessary so that when I return you will be prepared to form the permanent organization.

In looking at my schedule, I would like to meet in New Orleans at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, September 12th, at a place to be selected by Senator Michael O'Keefe, the representative of Governor McKeithen. By that time, I will have for you the whole schedule of federal programs available to us. I will also be in a position to make a complete report on the progress that we have made since our meeting on the 22nd of July.

Again, expressing my gratitude and appreciation, and with best wishes for a pleasant Labor Day holiday, I am

Sincerely your friend,

HALE BOGGS,
Member of Congress.

The same thing can happen here in Washington, and it must happen. In truth and in fact, Mr. Chairman, so much has already happened in Washington. I invite my colleagues to take time out and spend an hour or two at L'Enfant Plaza, which includes the Forrestal Building and which, incidentally, was designed by New Orleans architects, Curtis & Davis. See how beautiful it is and how well designed it is, and how functional it is. And while you are at it, cross over the expressway and take a look at Southwest Washington. I remember what it was like 30 years ago—look at it now. Or, go to Georgetown. When I came here, one could buy property for very little in Georgetown. Today it is probably the most valuable property in the metropolitan area—and it was all done with private capital—not government money.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I said to Mayor Washington, "Mayor Washington, you have my support and my help," and he does. I am going to vote for this substitute and I do it with all the sincerity that I command. I hope that the majority of the Members of the House will vote for it, too.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has been recognized.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I accede to the gentleman from Louisiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi yields to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield, I just withdraw.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to waive my position and to allow my friend from Louisiana to complete his speech. He made a good speech, and I enjoyed it. The gentleman is my friend. Incidentally, he is a native of my State.

Mr. BOGGS. And I am proud of it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And he is proud of it, and we are proud of him.

There are times, though, when he is mistaken; and this is one of those times.

I served with Sam Rayburn, too, and I loved "Mr. Sam." I never went fishing with him, but I spent a lot of time in his office with him. I never asked for but one favor of him in my life, during my service here, and I have been here 27 years. I will never forget how he looked down at me and he said, "You sure have not." I got what I asked for. I loved him, too, HALE.

But when one is speaking of this Capitol dome, as was referred to by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS), "Mr. Sam" was not speaking of this revenue bill nor is there anything in this revenue bill that will improve the beauty of the dome or the city of Washington.

There is nothing in the bill that will improve the quality of the water in that wonderful Potomac River. Mr. BOGGS, you made a great speech, but you were not speaking to the right thing, the revenue bill before us.

Mr. BOGGS. Will my good friend yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will be happy to yield to you as soon as I have completed my speech.

Mr. BOGGS. You know I would give you——

Mr. ABERNETHY. No. No, let me go on, please.

Mr. BOGGS. Go ahead.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman never sat in Mr. MCMILLAN'S committee room for 1 minute.

Mr. BOGGS. Not a minute. You are right.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman please allow me to complete my statement?

Mr. BOGGS. He is right, Mr. Chairman. I will wait.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Now, he asked the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN) some questions, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN) gave straightforward and forthright answers.

He asked if the bill eliminated the Director of Public Safety. It does. And there is a good reason for it. They do not have one now. They have not had one since Mr. Murphy was lifted out of that position a good long time ago or else since he was fired—I do not know which. The position of Director of Public Safety is ostensibly being served by the Corporation Counsel, and he has all he can do to attend to the legal affairs of this city.

The next question is, is it a good thing to have a super chief looking over the shoulder of the Chief of Police. The Chief of Police should either be the Chief of Police or else he should be just a policeman, and they should take away from him the title of Chief of Police. This District has been blessed for a good many years with a fine police force.

There has been absolutely no scandal during all my time here, 27 years. It has been a good, clean, fine, intelligent, aggressive organization, and it made a fine name for itself without the benefit of someone peeping over the shoulder of the chief with the title of Director of Public Safety.

Do you remember a year or so ago they originated the idea of having a Public Safety Director. Do you remember how safe it was under his administration? Did any of you stand in your offices at about 2 o'clock in the afternoon 15 or 16 months ago, more or less, and gaze through the windows across this city of Washington and watch the smoke swirling into the sky, with death and destruction of property following? Who then gave the police orders? Who gave the orders? The Director of Public Safety. Who tied the hands of the Chief of Police? The Director of Public Safety. Now, do you think these men and women who sat in this committee room and gave the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN) the authority to bring this bill to the floor of this House did the wise thing in stating that we are going back to the old system which we had year before last and 25, 50, and 100 years before that? Let us put the Chief of Police back in charge.

Then the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS) asked if the bill did not put a ceiling on District employees. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN) said "Yes." Have you looked at the report? My friend from down on the Mississippi gulf coast, from New Orleans, Mr. BOGGS who addressed you so beautifully, so magnificently, and so eloquently never referred to the report. He just made a good speech. Now let us look at the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. And I would request that the gentleman yield to me so that I may question him when he is finished.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I will be happy to.

In 1965 the commission form of government in the District, which was both the executive and legislative, had 41 employees; in 1966 it had 43, in 1967 it had 50, in 1968 it had 56; in fiscal 1969, when the new government came in, they had 227—190 in the Mayor's office. There were 37 in the office of the City Council, for a total of 227.

Now, in fiscal 1970 the Mayor, the delightful fellow he is, wants to move the number in his office from 190 to 474. What service are they going to render?

Now, with reference to the Council, I suppose many of you saw the demonstration put on down at the Council's office the other night. Was not that great? While they were playing like they were having a legislative session down there—their visitors darn near tore up the city hall. It was nothing short of a riot. That is this new government given them in 1968.

Mr. Chairman, this new City Council wants 52 employees, a total of 526 for city hall versus a total of 50 year before last.

Now, I ask you what would make this city so beautiful and so lovely that my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana indicates would come about by just adding so many new employees?

All we are asking you to do is to just tell them to hold the line. That is all. I think this makes good sense. If they cannot operate within this limit then they can come back and make a case for more. But for the time being and with all deference, this type of accelerated employment just does not make sense.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we had another question put to the chairman about the Federal payment, as though this was something new.

Just a few years ago it was only $10 million, then it went to $20 million, then to $30 million, $40 million, $50 million, $60 million, $80 million, and last year it was kicked up again to $90 million. This year it is being kicked up to $105 million. This is in the face of the fact that they have already admitted that they will be back into the committee room next year asking us to kick it up again.

They asked for a formula a few years ago and when they found out that they received more money under the system we now have than they would under the formula, they increased the percentage they were asking for under the formula. They asked for 30 percent of the equivalent of the total revenues going into the treasury of the District instead of 25 percent. They have not only increased the percentage but they have increased the base.

Do you think it is right to once and for all obligate yourselves and the taxpayers of this Nation to make a payment from the Federal Treasury without the Appropriations Committee and yourselves having some voice in the amount that is paid out? That is what the formula will do.

Mr. Chairman, this city belongs to this Nation. This city is favored by this Nation. This city received grants during the past fiscal year equivalent to more than $500 million.

No one is neglected in this town—that is, as far as this Congress is concerned, nor insofar as this Government is concerned.

Now, listen, we have just heard a very beautiful appeal for more free money for the District. Some of those making this appeal never heard one word of the testimony; and with all deference to some of those offering such, they never attended the hearings but for 1 or 2 days.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no reward coming to those who serve on this committee. It is not what you call a rewarding type of service. It is not one that makes you any votes at home. If anything, it costs you votes. But some one has to do this job.

We spent some days over there working on the bill working in the committee. We have tried to be fair. I know my chairman has tried to be fair. And with all deference to my good friend from Louisiana, I ask the Members to stand by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. MCMILLAN), the chairman of the committee, and by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), the ranking minority member, and vote down the substitute, and pass the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi be permitted to continue for another 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I did not ask for any more time.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending substitute to the committee amendment. Even though I oppose this

substitute, however, I should like to commend and congratulate the sponsor of the substitute, and also the cosponsors and those who have spoken in its favor, for their sincerity and their concern for the welfare of our Nation's Capital, because it is our constitutional responsibility to see that this Federal City is properly supervised and properly financed.

And if you will forgive me for a personal note, I should like to state that I shall not yield to anyone in regard to my personal concern for the Nation's Capital and the people living in it. I represent a large portion of the Washington metropolitan area. I know many thousands of people living within the jurisdiction of the District of Columbia. I know them as friends and as business associates, and I am concerned for their hopes and aspirations. Further, I want to do everything possible to make this the best city in which to live.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter of personalities, or of civil rights, as mentioned by one of the previous speakers; this is a financial matter. The main objective and the main purpose of the pending substitute is to increase the Federal payment by approximately another $15 million. Now we are providing for one $15 million increase in the bill itself, but the sponsors of the substitute feel that we should offer more. Well, I submit, Mr. Chairman, the Congress has always—always—met its fiscal responsibilities to the Nation's Capital by providing adequate financing. In fact, over a period of years, whenever we have found that an increase in the Federal payment was necessary, we have promptly come forth and provided that increase.

In the fiscal year 1955, the Federal payment amounted to $20 million per year. In H.R. 12982, we provide for a Federal payment of $105 million for fiscal year 1970. That is an increase of more than 500 percent, is it not, in approximately 15 years? And within the last 6 years, we have on four occasions come forth in response to the request on the part of the District of Columbia government, by providing increased Federal payments from an amount of $32 million up to $90 million in the current year, and additional borrowing authority from $75 million up to $392 million. Taxes amounting to a single amount of $40 million. This was virtually everything that the District of Columbia government asked for, and even more, sometimes even more than the Committee on Appropriations thought was necessary.

Now we have a substitute pending, and it provides that the Congress or the House Committee on the District of Columbia will no longer have authority over setting the authorized amount for the Federal payment. We are asked to discharge this responsibility, mind you, by providing a simple formula by which Congress will automatically authorize appropriation of a Federal payment in amounts up to 30 percent of the revenues raised from other sources of revenue.

I submit that that is an oversimplification and that we cannot conscientiously discharge our responsibility that easily.

As was pointed out by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY) a few moments ago, when the District Government first came forth asking for a formula, they asked for 25 percent. Then when they found out that that would not provide as much money as we would provide for by a fixed dollar authorization, then they changed the formula to 30 percent. You see, this formula is somewhat of a two-way approach to the problem—if it provides enough revenue, or more than enough—then OK, we will reduce the formula. But if it does not provide enough, then the District government will come back to the committee and say, "Let us take this magic figure of 30 percent and change it up to 35 percent."

So I feel that this is a matter that should be dealt with from time to time, as it needs improvement or liberalization by the duly constituted Committee on the District of Columbia of the House itself.

Now the cost of operating this government, as I pointed out a few moments ago, is high. There is no one in this House who would like to be as benevolent and as liberal with the District of Columbia as the gentleman now occupying the well.

But it does concern me that in the last 2 or 3 years, we find that the cost of operating this government has gone up by 60 percent, and that in the last couple of years the number of city employees has increased by 50 percent. Furthermore, the number of high executive officials in the Mayor's office has increased by over 500 percent.

So the committee felt that it is necessary to require the District government to exercise some restraint. So a ceiling was placed on the number of employees that could be hired in the District government. The pending substitute seeks to have that necessary language knocked out of the bill.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERD BY MR. BOGGS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOGGS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS) is recognized in support of his motion.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say something to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY) and he is very right—we are the best of friends. As a matter of fact, I have been feeding him vegetables all summer long and it is a pleasure. We have been friends for years. I love him and I love his wife. She is a lovely lady—take my word for it.

The gentleman is right. I was born and reared in Mississippi and I am just as proud of it as I can be. Most of my family lives on the Mississippi gulf coast and they vote for the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER). One time, some years ago, he had some opposition, some bad opposition, and they asked me whom they should vote for and I said "BILL COLMER."

My family has had a home on the gulf coast for about 100 years and right now my wife and I are building a lovely home there. I grew up there and in Gretna and in Metairie in Jefferson Parish, La. I have been a permanent citizen of New Orleans since 1931.

Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY) that since he mentioned that I had not read the report, I have read the report. I have taken a rapid reading course and I can read pretty fast. But, in addition to that, I have also read the official report from the city government of Washington, which sets forth what it would have to do if a personnel freeze were imposed on the District of Columbia. I will make that a part of the RECORD at the end of these remarks.

As for the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) let me say that I learned long ago to be able to disagree without being disagreeable. And I think everyone knows that that is what I try to practice.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) and I serve on the Ways and Means Committee together, and let me tell you something. There is no more valuable member of that committee than the gentleman from Virginia. Having said that, I respectfully disagree with all that he said a moment ago.

But, let me address myself now to all of you who come from urban centers, whether it be Washington or New Orleans, where I come from, and where we have the worst kind of slums—you talk about slums. You know I had a good Irish friend of mine who lives in what we call the Irish Channel, which I represent, invited to the White House to meet the President of Ireland who was here. My friend, whose name is Dick Burke, the beloved assessor of my own district, rented a tuxedo and went to the White House for dinner with President Johnson and the President of Ireland. At that dinner he and President Johnson met the President of Ireland and he also met Sargent Shriver, then head of the poverty program. When he met him, he said, "Sarge, you want poverty? I got it."

Well, that is true. We have poverty in my community—plenty of it.

And every man who represents a city here, be he Republican or Democrat, knows that the problems of the District of Columbia are not unique to the District of Columbia. You will find them in Chicago. You will find them in New York. You will find them in Baltimore. You will find them in Houston, Tex. You will find them in Los Angeles. Why? Because our population has moved. The American historians write about the migrations from Ireland and Southern Europe during the second half of the 19th century. Those migrations fade into insignificance when compared to what has happened right here in America since World War II.

Do you know why there are fewer Congressmen from Mississippi and Arkansas than there were when I first came here 30 years ago? Because so many Negroes have left those two States, as well as all

rural areas. And where did they go? They went to New Orleans, and they went to Chicago—right straight up the Illinois Central Railroad to Chicago. But the migrants were not limited to our Negro Americans. Millions of other white Americans left the farms and moved to the cities, and they, too, lacked the skills needed in modern, urban America.

This has been the most significant migration in the history of our country. Now what we are trying to do is to build cities, tear down ghettos, clean the rivers, clean the air we breathe, and make our land serve the people—a prosperous, happy, contented people—who will not want to riot, to burn, to kill—a society where the polarization between the blacks and the whites, the old and the young, the inner city and the suburbs, no longer plague our land. And that is what the gentleman from Washington State, Mr. ADAMS is trying to do with his motion.

Mr. Chairman, here following is the government of Washington, D.C., report on the effects of the proposed personnel freeze, not including the personnel rollback:

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Due to the newness of this Office and its just-beginning effort to make governmental services more accessible and relevant to the residents of the city, the freeze would preclude or curtail many proposals to meet this objective and to strengthen the executive management of the District Government. No staffing could be provided for a planning operation, implementation of the administrative procedures act, the neighborhood service centers, a City Hall Complaint Center, Commission on the Arts, or Highway Safety Coordinator. Staff could not be developed for needed strengthening of the Office of Budget and Executive Management.

FINANCE AND REVENUE

No staff could be hired for the increased fiscal and tax workload or for the expansion of audit programs which bring in more revenue and equalize the tax burden.

PUBLIC LIBRARY

The Library's proposed new efforts to provide special services in deprived areas and kindergarten services (seven positions in the 1970 budget) would be precluded. The general staff of 563 would be reduced by about 85 due to high turnover, resulting in drastic curtailment of existing services.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Although the Bill exempts Police and Fire from the personnel restrictions, these provisions would severely impair other equally important components of the criminal justice and public safety system. This is particularly crucial in light of President Nixon's crime package and court reorganization bills.

COURTS

All supportive personnel to the new Judges of the proposed Superior Court (an immediate increase of ten judges) and its operations would be disallowed as would 25 percent of the turnover rate. The Juvenile Court, especially, experiences a higher turnover. Juvenile Court's effort to reduce the very high caseload of their probation officers and establish decentralized units for closer supervision to reduce recidivism would be impaired at a time when juvenile delinquency rates are rising. For all the Courts, the bill would defeat administrative and city efforts to reduce the case backlog with all the negative consequences for criminal justice this entails.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

At a time when institutional population is increasing from a total 2,659 in 1968 to an estimated 3,000 in 1969 and 3,600 in 1970 and there are increasing disturbances and tensions within the institutions, there could be no additional staff for security, let alone vitally important rehabilitation programs.

Many voted for mandatory minimums.

Some have wanted to hold dangerous suspects.

LEGAL AID AGENCY

This relatively new agency is making a significant contribution to speeding and making more equitable criminal justice proceedings and personnel restrictions would present its further development as well as the achievement of the Public Defender role envisioned by the President's recent crime bill. The Offender Rehabilitation Program, a former Office of Economic Opportunity-funded project with great success in reducing recidivism, would be abolished with the loss of 11 positions in 1970.

CORPORATION COUNSEL

As of June 30, 1969, the restrictions would mean two permanent vacancies for an already understaffed legal office responsible for the city's criminal and civil proceedings. The required two attorneys per judge for the ten new judges of the proposed Superior Court would not be allowed. There could be no staff to replace those lawyers involved in the interstate highway problem and previously funded by reimbursements.

OTHER AGENCIES—PUBLIC WELFARE

There could be no staff for the Pre-Delinquency Unit and Diagnostic and Evaluation Unit recommended by the D.C. Crime Commission to work with young people just beginning to get into trouble.

RECREATION

No expansion of the Roving Leader Program could occur which would achieve closer supervision in presently unserviced areas to combat juvenile delinquency.

EDUCATION

Although Public Schools are exempted from the personnel freeze of the Bill, the education program would nonetheless be drastically hurt at Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute, especially as these institutions are in their development stage.

FEDERAL CITY COLLEGE

Two thousand applicants for the college's second year would be denied admission. Because faculty for the coming year program (274 positions) had to be recruited in Spring, 1969, contracts for positions in September would have to be broken for 80 percent of the positions and notice given 12 percent awaiting final contract approval. Due to the decision to focus on instructive versus supportive personnel in the first year, this severe imbalance of personnel could not be corrected. Quality of education would be hurt by the need to make major shifts in course offerings and a lower faculty-student ratio.

WASHINGTON TECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Similar problems would face Washington Technical Institute. Full-time equivalent enrollment would be restricted to 960 as opposed to the planned 1,400. Enrollment would be denied to 540 students who have substantially been advised of acceptance.

HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Many programs of the newly organized Department of Economic Development would be drastically cut back or disallowed entirely.

RAT CONTROL

There could be no expansion of staff from 13 to 33 in 1970 to participate in the city's "War on Rats" Program.

HOUSING INSPECTIONS

No expansion as planned could occur and the division's high turnover experience would hamper the improvement of housing conditions in the District.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

No staff could be hired for this new Office.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

This effort to attract and maintain business in the District, and thereby create a more healthy tax base, would be precluded.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH

Termination of Federal grants would mean the end of many programs because the personnel could not be recruited even if the program were authorized to continue including: Maternal Health and Crippled Children Program, Alcoholic and Drug Addiction Division and Residential Treatment Center of the Area C Health Program, health services in the Garfield Terrace Public Housing Unit. The Detoxification Center could not expand nor could a second one open. This program relieves the courts and police of this problem according to new policy defining alcoholism as a public health problem.

Additionally, continuing Federal grants could be endangered by our lack of commitment or personnel; an example is the Children's Bureau's Pediatric and Mental Retardation Grant. The Drug Addiction programs would be highly inadequate without personnel (131 positions in 1970) and funding for the Drug Addiction Treatment and Rehabilitation Center. Due to high turnover, the 75 percent hiring provisions would hit hardest for nurses, and second, medical officers.

PUBLIC WELFARE

The expansion of Day Care to meet continuing needs and requirements of the 1967 Social Security Amendments, could not occur. The decision to expand the Youth Group Homes, an effective rehabilitation program of five residential halfway houses for juvenile offenders and probationers, would not be sustained.

Considerable loss of Federal funds would result due to about one half of welfare's positions being in a Federal match program. Immediate loss would be $311,934; in Continuing Services for Public Assistance Recipients, probable immediate loss would be $840,009.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The freeze would have serious funding repercussions due to its 80 percent Federal financing. For each District dollar, four Federal dollars are lost. The average cost per case is $422 and per rehabilitated person, $1,687. Program consequences are that for every 20 to 28 employees lost, 2,200 to 2,400 fewer disabled persons are served and 550 to 600 fewer are rehabilitated.

DEPARTMENT OF RECREATION

No staff could be provided for six new recreational centers and four new swimming pools which therefore could not open. A general overall reduction in services would take place and new services such as camping programs, could not begin.

SANITARY ENGINEERING

The program most severely hindered would be sanitation. The staff needed for alley cleaning more frequently than the present four or five week schedule could not be hired. Nor could there be staffing needed to lend essential assistance to an increasing number of citizen volunteer drives to clean up city

neighborhoods. Eighteen new positions were requested in 1970 for alley cleaning; nine for services to citizen clean-up drives.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must ask unanimous consent to withdraw his motion.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my preferential motion.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I, for one, am griped at listening to how this Congress has constantly abused the Nation's Capital. It has been just exactly the opposite. No people on earth and no city in the United States of America has received over the years I have been here—and that is 27—such preferential treatment as has the Nation's Capital and the people of the District of Columbia.

This is the only city in the United States of America that even subsidizes its professional athletes. We talk about cost overruns. We built a stadium that was originally supposed to cost $4 million, and when McCloskey got through constructing the building, it cost $20 million. It was supposed to pay for itself, and it is now costing the taxpayers—in your district and in mine—almost $1 million a year to keep it up.

Even the subsidization of the professional athletes does not seem to help, does not seem to do any good, because the people of Wisconsin even sent the District of Columbia "St. Vincent" and last Saturday, the team went to Buffalo, and a team that won only one game last year beat the Washington team.

I want to tell Members how the city is receiving preferential treatment. Let us talk about the percentage of the population that works for the government. If these figures do not stagger Members, nothing will. In Atlanta, Ga., 1 percent of the population works for the city government; in Cleveland, Ohio, 1 percent; in Milwaukee, Wis., where "St. Vincent" comes from, 1 percent; in St. Louis, Mo., 1 percent; in San Antonio, Tex., 1 percent; in Seattle, Wash.—the district of Congressman ADAMS—1 percent. But in Washington, D.C., it is 5.29 percent.

If we put that on a Federal level and prorate it accordingly, we will have 13 million Federal employees working for the Federal Government, applying the same ratio as is applied in the District of Columbia for the city government.

If that is not preferential treatment, I would like to know what is.

I want to say something else—they do not do their job. The Federal buildings that we have in Washington, D.C., that we are paying this grant for—they are not protected by Washington, D.C., police. The Nation's Capitol, our Capitol, has its own police force, and that does not cost the District of Columbia anything. Our national parks have their own police force. The White House has its own Secret Service. So they do not even police any of those things we are paying them the money for—and yet they have a ratio of 5.29 percent.

I am puzzled, because I have been here 27 years, and there has not been a city or people anywhere that have received the favored treatment the District of Columbia has received. I have a county in my district where the Federal Government owns 80 percent of the land, and we received not one thin dime from the Federal Government. We have to pay for the police, and we have to pay for the roads, and we get no Federal aid to impacted areas, such as they receive here in the District of Columbia, where the wage rate is the highest per capita anywhere in the world—and again that is preferential treatment.

I, for one, am griped at hearing the constant stories about how we are neglecting the Nation's Capital and how this should be the model city for the world. It is—for the money we are spending. The figures here are only about one-third of the actual money we are spending. If we added up all the grants and everything else that goes with them, the Members would find we are giving three times more money to the District of Columbia than is contained in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 0, noes 70.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief, and I hope that soon the previous question will be ordered to a vote.

I want to point out that the committee report, on page 2, shows the City Council's tax recommendations, to yield an additional amount of money. The total there is $39.7 million. Then if we turn to page 60 we find the additional revenue produced by virtue of permitted taxes contained in H.R. 12982, and this will yield in 9 months $28.9 million. For the annual amount, that would be $39.7 million. The shortage of revenue if the committee bill is enacted is thus overstated on page 60. So this is not to be overlooked when we talk about the total dollars involved so far as the Federal payment in the committee bill is concerned.

I also want to make the observation that the formula provision in this package is on a 5-year basis. The original borrowing authority was a formula. It was my amendment, and it expired in 3 years automatically unless reinstated. Here there is a 5-year period on the Federal payment provision as proposed by the minority. Five years is quite a long time.

Frankly, the committee has exceeded every formula we have ever had proposed, in lump sum appropriations, anyway. I believe the argument of the minority for a 5-year Federal payment formula is not the best.

I also want to make reference to the former Speaker, Sam Rayburn. He once admonished the new Members to always have in mind that he knew of no one who was ever defeated by things he did not say. I will say no more.

Thank you very much.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I hope I will be pardoned for making a personal reference in speaking in opposition to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

I have sat in on many budget hearings where the administrative branch of a portion of the Government has come to the legislative branch with a budget proposal for the coming year. I have never seen one where the legislative branch gave a blank check without even intelligent hearings for the request of the administration.

We heard testimony that utterly failed to justify the amount of money requested by the local city government.

I think we have an obligation to our taxpayers as well as those of the District of Columbia who are being also hit by this bill to watchdog it for them. I would submit to you, gentlemen, that if we agreed to these unusual requests, these unsubstantiated requests, if we do not retain the power of setting tax rates in the District of Columbia, if we give a specified formula, then it would be the biggest boondoggle that has ever been perpetrated on the taxpayers of the United States. Whenever a group not charged with having to raise all of their own tax moneys or even governing their own city can spend $1 million and get $300,000 discount on it on the day they spend that money, then I say that you have a shaky condition and one that will inevitably lead to waste, and ultimately corruption.

I would also like to say that there has been much said about our taking away from the District government the right to levy taxes. Gentlemen, actually the Congress is only retrieving what in my opinion had been an illegal privilege granted to them, because the Constitution calls for the Federal Government to levy the taxes in the District. The Constitution also requires that the Congress exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever in the District of Columbia. The Constitution likewise prescribes that all tax legislation originate in the House of Representatives. The Congress can neither exercise exclusive legislation nor can the House perform its constitutional obligation when the power to set taxes in this Federal jurisdiction rests with another body. So we have no recourse but to retain in the Congress the power to levy taxes in the District of Columbia.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. CABELL. In order to shut off further debate. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas declines to yield.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. JACOBS

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 60 seconds—in 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted 5 minutes for myself, but the hour is growing late.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman restate his motion?

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 5 consecutive minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. By "this amendment" does the gentleman mean the Adams substitute?

Mr. JACOBS. The amendment in the nature of a substitute. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. That is only applicable to the substitute and all amendments thereto? It does not relate to any subsequent amendments that might be offered if the substitute is defeated?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands it applies to the Adams substitute and any amendments thereto.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the substitute, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOWDY).

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the substitute.

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

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little bit embarrassed since I am not from Mississippi, and I do not know Mr. Rayburn, and I may not know a lot about this bill. But it does have $15 million in additional Federal payment and $24 million in additional tax revenue and I believe all in all taking into consideration the days of hearings which the Committee on the District of Columbia held, I think the committee on balance has done a fine job. I urge the defeat of the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to refer briefly to the statistical sleight of hand of the gentleman from Wisconsin when he said 1 percent of the people of Milwaukee are working for the city and 5 percent of the people of the District of Columbia are working for the District government. I would like to point out that in the District of Columbia these employees perform the functions of county and State governments, such functions as workmen's compensation administration and unemployment compensation. I cannot list everything in these 30 seconds which have been allotted to me. However, there is no comparison. So cleanse your mind of that statistical mirage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to again point out the fact that the President in his message to Congress said that "we cannot achieve a strong and efficient government in the District of Columbia unless they have an ample source of financing." In supporting the formula the President stated the "formula would equitably reflect the Federal interest in the District of Columbia."

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

Mr. GUDE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I forgot to mention this in my earlier statement but I made reference to the power to set tax rates by the District government. I find on our side considerable concern because of the restriction and as a result of a few conferences, I intend to offer an amendment at the proper time that would remove the restriction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I did not realize that I had been allotted any time, but I would like to concur with those who have taken the position here today that the District of Columbia has received through the years preferential treatment, and if you do not think it is so, I have checked with the Appropriations Committee since this discussion began today and have found that the total budget for the District of Columbia for fiscal 1970 is $866,014,000, of which $133,226,000 is in the form of Federal grants.

Now, if this is not preferential treatment, I do not know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at some of the gentlemen who indicated they would yield time to me but did not do so and there is only one reason in my mind that they did not, and that is the fact that they are trying to "jimmy" the statistics.

Mr. Chairman, when one considers the functions of this government of the District of Columbia, one has to take into consideration the fact that it acts not only as a city, but as a county, and in many respects as a State. In my own city, the courts, for example, are supported by the counties while the welfare system comes under the jurisdiction of State support.

The unemployment compensation system is with State support, plus the fact that the Federal Government brings into this city every day 340,000 people, and provides services.

Mr. Chairman, I support the substitute, and I hope the Members will do likewise.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired under the time limitation, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) as a substitute for the committee amendment, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 73, noes 85.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ADAMS and Mr. MCMILLAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 92, noes 106.

So the substitute amendment for the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NELSEN TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NELSEN to the committee amendment: Strike out title VI beginning with line 14 on page 36 and all that follows down through and including line 23 on page 37, and redesignate the succeeding titles and sections accordingly.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I indicated in my comments earlier in the debate that I was concerned about the provision that took from the city government the right to set a tax rate, or the power to tax real and personal propery. I indicated I had been hopeful that this provision, if it were to be adopted, would be contained in the committee report rather than the restrictive language contained in the bill as it is presently drawn.

I now find on my side of the aisle considerable concern about this provision. I find that the White House has indicated reservations relative to its restrictive language. I believe that this provision should be taken out of the bill, thus making it more acceptable to some of those who have indicated considerable concern about the bill generally and particularly these restrictive provisions in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. What is wrong with that? What is the reason for the amendment?

Mr. NELSEN. The power to set a tax rate has been in the law since 1922. If you are going to have any semblance of responsible government, in the city government, certainly you are going to have to give them some authority to levy taxes.

Mr. GROSS. Is it true that the government of the District of Columbia has refused at times in the past to increase taxes? Is this the reason this provision is in the bill?

Mr. NELSEN. No, that is not true. The District of Columbia has increased their tax rate levy and the language of this bill accommodates the increases adopted by the District government. But the bill restricts the District government from establishing the real estate and personalty rate in the future, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. I see. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The reason the committee considered the amendment was the fact that the majority of the members felt that under the Constitution the House District Committee and the Congress should set the taxes here in the Nation's Capital. However, in committee we had some opposition to the amendment. The time is getting late, and I will accept the amendment on the part of the committee and try to adopt this matter in a separate bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I think this is a wise move to restore to the District government a function that they have performed, as I understand it, since 1922. I am convinced that they will act responsibly and equitably, and with the opportunities of more revenue, as this bill reported by the committee will provide, I am hopeful that they will be able to do some of the things that are needed and necessary and which must be done if we are to make the District of Columbia the kind of city that we all want it to be and that we can be proud of.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished minority leader in his word of tribute to the distinguished chairman of the committee. This, it seems to me, is a wise move, and I think the power which it carries with it will be wisely used in the interest of this great city that we all love.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUDE TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUDE to the committee amendment: On page 44, after line 23, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 906. Section 401(2) of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1968 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1118) is amended (1) by striking out "and (B)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", (B)", and (2) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and (C) any individual who, as part of a program approved by an educational agency having jurisdiction over an elementary or secondary school located outside the District of Columbia, is voluntarily enrolled in such school." "

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, the matter of the education of a small number of inner-city children at the Bannockburn School has already been discussed to some degree on the floor. I would like to point out that the cost to the District of this project per child last year was approximately equal to the average of cost educating the average child in the city.

Also I must emphasize that this is a voluntary program. I cannot express too emphatically the volunteerism which lies at the base of it. Those who would dub it a busing program misunderstand its terms and my philosophy in backing it.

Those who suggest that it represented a beginning of what may become mandatory for them later in other districts also fail to understand this program. This is merely an effort of two schools and the parents and students involved to cope with an urban problem in terms they understand and in ways they can best act.

We have in this program a meager handful of 25 children out of the entire school system of the District, going into my own county school system, of about 130,000 students. I certainly implore Members of the House to think of this in terms of how they would like their own school districts to be run; whether they would like to have their school districts run from Washington or run by their own local citizens through their local school boards.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, does this involve the expenditure of any money? If so, where does the money come from? Also, on whom will the money be spent?

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, it involves funds which the District of Columbia school system would ordinarily use to educate these children in the city. The funds would merely be used instead to educate them in the county. There is also some foundation money and some county money. The cost for the District is about the same as the cost to educate the same group of children in the District.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I rise in opposition to this amendment, but I do so solely because of monetary reasons. We have been pleading here today and much comment has been made about the need for additional revenue for the District of Columbia. The gentleman from Iowa made a very pertinent point: Where is the money coming from to provide for the transportation and tuition cost of these students?

I was very concerned about this problem, because I wanted to support it. I think probably it is a good project. I have no objection. I do not think this House would have any objection to students from the District of Columbia going to Montgomery County schools so long as the country wants to pay the bill, but that is a different question.

This about doubles the total expenditure per pupil for education of these students. The per pupil cost in the District of Columbia is $797, and the per student cost in Montgomery County is $850. The superintendent of the Montgomery schools reported on June 24 of this year that the total cost would be about $33,536 for the 21 children. The tuition would be $17,850; the transportation cost would be $7,876; the teacher aid cost would be $6,000; and the school lunch cost would be $2,000. This amounts to approximately $1,597 per pupil expenditure, which is approximately twice the cost of the school tuition in the District of Columbia.

We have in the District of Columbia the schools, the space, the teachers hired, and the transportation available, as well as all the other things necessary to educate these children.

Montgomery County's generosity—and I am sure this is a fine project—to me just doubles the cost per pupil for this experimental program.

I hope, as it did last year, the House will reject this amendment, so if the county desires to continue with it, they can do it, but with other funds. But we will not be using the tax money to pay twice the amount of money per student than it is costing in the District to transport these children to Montgomery County. I certainly hope the House will join me in defeating the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

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

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says we would have to spend money to give these children lunches. Does the gentleman think they would not eat lunch in the District?

Mr. FUQUA. This is an additional cost of approximately $1,500, nearly $1,600.

Mr. GUDE. Without the money that may come from the foundations, the costs may be higher. As far as the District taxpayer is concerned, there is no more cost than they pay for the other children in the District. But I do not know if a child eats twice as much when he gets out into the fresh air of Montgomery County. I do not see how the cost of the lunch per child is doubled.

Mr. FUQUA. We are paying for their share in the District and also in Montgomery County.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FUQUA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland pointed out that this proposal was entirely voluntary and would involve only 25 pupils and that it was a very simple proposal causing no harm or injury to anyone.

I can assure the Members of the House the people in northern Virginia are concerned with the various plans and proposals and efforts that could result in busing of school children from the inner city to the suburbs and vice versa. With the various court decisions going on all the time, I do not think any of us in northern Virginia want to support any proposal that would have the effect of the camel getting his nose under the tent. The next thing we know it will be 25 more, and then 100.

Instead of being voluntary, it is going to become mandatory.

I have no objection to the people of Maryland being involved in any social administration they wish, but if they want to become involved let the taxpayers of Maryland pay for it rather than the taxpayers of Virginia and of other parts of the country.

We have denied Federal funds in the past to be used for busing students to overcome racial imbalance. Why should we approve this proposal, to do exactly the opposite?

Mr. FUQUA. The gentleman from Virginia is eminently correct. I believe that if Montgomery County or the State of Maryland wants to do this, they should do it with their own funds.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I support the gentleman from Maryland. I am pleased he has offered this amendment.

I am surprised, and I am pleased also, that the gentleman from Florida opposes this only for monetary reasons, because I believe the human values involved in this are far more important, far deeper.

This is the sort of thing I will leave to the judgment of my colleagues in the House, as to whether they want to let families, children, and local school boards get together on voluntary programs to try to improve human values we all live with.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GUDE), there were—ayes 74, noes 83.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORTON TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORTON to the committee amendment: On page 41, and all that follows down through and including line 2 on page 42 and insert the following:

"SEC. 801. Article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–2501a and 47–2501b) is amended to read as follows:

"'ARTICLE VI—FEDERAL PAYMENT

"'SEC. 1. A regular annual payment (hereafter in this article referred to as the "Federal payment") is authorized to be appropriated from revenues of the United States to cover the proper Federal share of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia. The Federal payment, when appropriated, shall be paid into the general fund. Subject to any adjustments required under section 3 for overpayments or underpayments, the Federal payment authorized by this article for each of the five fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, shall be an amount equal to 30 per centum of the amount of District of Columbia fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues which the Commissioner estimates will be credited to the general fund during such fiscal year and which is approved under section 2. Subject to any adjustments required under section 3 for overpayments or underpayments, the Federal payment authorized by this article for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and each fiscal year thereafter shall be an amount equal to 30 per centum of the amount of District of Columbia fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues credited to the general fund during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

"'SEC. 2. For each of the five fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, and June 30, 1974, the Commissioner shall estimate the amount of District of Columbia fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues that will be credited to the General Fund during such fiscal year. He shall submit such amount to the Bureau of the Budget with the regular budget of the District of Columbia for such fiscal years. The amount of such revenues and fees which is approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be submitted to the Congress.

"'SEC. 3. If the amount of the Federal payment appropriated in any of the five fiscal years ending June 30, 1970, June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, June 30, 1973, or June 30, 1974, does not equal 30 per centum of the amount of District of Columbia fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues credited to the General Fund during such fiscal year, increased or decreased as may be necessary to reflect the amount of the adjustment made under this section to the Federal payment authorization for such fiscal year, the amount of the Federal payment authorization for the second fiscal year beginning after such fiscal year shall—

"'(1) if such Federal payment appropriation exceeded 30 per centum of such fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues (so increased or decreased), be reduced by the amount of such excess; or

"'(2) if such Federal payment appropriation was less than 30 per centum of such fees, miscellaneous receipts, and tax revenues (so increased or decreased), be increased by the amount by which such appropriation was lower.

"'SEC 4. For purposes of this article—

"'(1) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

"'(2) The term "General Fund" means the General Fund of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States.

"'(3) The term "miscellaneous receipts" does not include any amounts derived from grants or loans from the Federal Government to the District of Columbia.'

"SEC. 802. This title may be cited as the 'District of Columbia Federal Payment Authorization Act of 1969.'"

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment which would provide the Federal payment formula at 30 percent. I bring it up at this time because I feel it is important for us to provide adequate revenues for the District to meet its commitments. You have heard a number of members of the committee talk about meetings of the committee in sessions before we reported out this bill. I wish, if you would get a chance, that you take a look at page 60 of the report in which we set out in our minority views an appendix showing the District government's revenue proposals and also the committee's proposals. If you will look down the list of the District of Columbia government proposals, you will find that the District of Columbia government proposed $62.41 million as their means of raising revenue. On the other side, in the other column, you will find the results of the committee meeting. As was said earlier, in the committee we did adjust and compromise the proposals with respect to sales taxes and revenues on such things as beer, whiskey, other spirits, and cigarettes. If you will take a look at it, though, you will find that the District government proposed a 4 percent sales tax in many of these areas. The point I am making is that the District government was willing to provide the wherewithal, but we in the committee did not provide the necessary funds for the District to meet its commitments.

Mr. Chairman, I have read many times here on the floor this afternoon, and I know there are some here who were not here earlier, President Nixon's statement to the Congress with respect to the Federal formula as a means of providing for the District government adequate revenues to meet their commitments. Again I would like just to ask the indulgence of the Members as I read this portion of what the President said to us in making a recommendation for this type of formula.

The formula that I am presenting here today is exactly what President Nixon proposed to this Congress on April 28 of this year when the President said:

> The District of Columbia cannot achieve strong and efficient government unless it has ample and dependable sources of financing. Sound financing can be achieved only if the Federal Government pays its appropriate share.

Then he says:

> I therefore recommend that the Congress authorize a Federal payment formula fixing the Federal contribution at 30 percent of local tax and other general fund revenues.

Then he supports this recommendation with the reasons why and the areas in which there are no Federal payments. Then he said that acceptance of the formula approach would be a significant step toward helping local government in the District. It would tie the level of Federal aid to the burden imposed by local taxes on the District citizens and also provide the District with a predictable estimate for action in the annual budget process. He also pointed out, as is true of this amendment, that the proposed Federal payment formula would not involve an automatic expenditure of Federal funds. This Federal payment would still have to be appropriated by the Congress. This is an authorization bill. We are not providing appropriations. This would be done by the Committee on Appropriations.

Then the President continued, saying that by authorizing the Federal payment of 30 percent of all District general fund revenues the Congress would allow the payment of $120 million in fiscal year 1970. We have in the committee bill before us provided $105 million. We are short by some $15 million to $20 million of what the District government says is absolutely necessary to run its affairs.

In other words, the authorization bill being presented here today is out of balance. It seems to me that it is appropriate for us to have a formula to which the District can look for the next 5 years.

It seems to me that it is important for us to follow President Nixon's recommendation.

Therefore, I hope the members of the committee will support this amendment which will provide a formula under which an additional $15 million will be raised in order to meet the expenditure needs of the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I shall not take the full 5 minutes.

I would like to say this: In the testimony before the District of Columbia Committee the District of Columbia government testimony indicated that in 1971 its budget would be increased by over $100 million from what they asked for for this fiscal year. The same testimony indicated to us that they might be back asking for a 35-percent formula next year.

Mr. Chairman, the formula which has been proposed by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON) has already been acted upon as a result of the action of the committee on the substitute awhile ago on which the able gentleman from Louisiana spoke in favor of it for about 30 minutes.

The District Committee comes here supporting an increase of $15 million in the lump-sum payment to the District by the Federal Government toward the expenses of the District, in lieu of the proposed Federal payment formula. This but reaffirms the method of payment by the Congress to the District which has been in effect over 90 years.

For at least 6 years the District government has urged that Federal payment be based on a formula, and each year the formula has been rejected by the District Committee and by the Congress.

The proposed formula is but a gimmick, pure and simple, designed solely as a lever to pry from the Congress higher Federal payments to the District.

The formula has been offered and found as the panacea for the financial plight of the District, which when adopted would solve the needs of the District.

That it is at best a misguided proposal is shown by its history. First it was offered over 6 years ago as a 25-percent formula; for example, the Federal Government to pay an amount equal to 25 percent of tax revenues collected by the District (from income and franchise taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, and inheritance and estate taxes), to be paid directly to the District. When that proved unpalatable to the Congress, the proposal was modified to require the District to come to the Appropriations Committees, as they do now, and justify the disbursement of such funds, but the Congress repeatedly rejected it.

In the last Congress, after the District again proposed the 25-percent formula, the April 1968 riots produced such a dropoff in taxes collected by the city that it became quite apparent the formula method would not produce the desired necessary revenues for expenditures the city had projected. So the city quickly and gladly settled for the Federal lump-sum payment, $90 million, as it provided more funds than the $82.9 million the District would have received under the formula.

In this Congress, in the light of that experience, the District increased the formula to a 30-percent formula, and also expanded the base so that the 30 percent would apply not merely to taxes collected but also would apply to all District of Columbia fees and miscellaneous receipts. By such proposal, the District would receive if the entire tax package had been adopted, a Federal lump-sum payment of $120.5 million, as contrasted with presently authorized $90 million increased to $105 million in the reported bill.

And for next year, the District of Columbia government testimony was that its 1971 budget would be increased by over $100 million. Informally it has been reported that the District will ask for a 35-percent formula next year.

So the formula approved does not pretend to place the District on any sound, durable basis, but still necessitates that the District, under its expanding-spending programs, return to the Congress each year with an increased Federal payment requested. Whether lump-sum or formula, the bite is on the Congress—meaning the taxpayers of the whole country—to pick up the tab for a large part of the District's spending.

It is the judgment of a majority of our committee that a closer surveillance and review of the District's financial needs are best met through use of the lump-sum Federal payment to make up any District deficit or requirement when same has been established and justified.

The history of the Federal payment to the District over the past 15 years is shown in the following chart. It will be noted that the authorized amount for this payment, based on the proposed increase in H.R. 12982, has more than doubled in the past 5 years.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AUTHORIZED AND APPROPRIATED, FISCAL YEARS 1955–1970

Fiscal year	Authorized Federal payment (in millions)	Actual Federal payment (in millions)
1955	$20	$20
1956	20	18
1957	23	20
1958	23	20
1959	32	25
1960	32	25
1961	32	25
1962	32	30
1963	32	30
1964	50	37.5
1965	50	37.5
1966	50	44.25
1967	60	58
1968	70	70
1969	90	89.4
1970	[1] 105	

[1] Proposed in H.R. 12982.

Mr. Chairman, I think the members of the Committee have heard about enough on this particular subject. Therefore, I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from Texas in opposing the amendment. As the gentleman knows this matter was disposed of once before here this afternoon when it was embraced in the Adams substitute amendment to the committee amendment. This was the main thrust of the Adams substitute amendment in that it would increase the Federal payment by about $15 million. But in addition to increasing the Federal payment by about $15 million we would not be discharging our responsibilities if we adopted this overly simplified formula. We know that the formula is not going to meet every expenditure contingency. However, if it does not provide sufficient funds they can come back here and ask that the formula be raised. I feel that if we want to make a larger Federal payment, why do we not say so? We have always provided the money. If it is determined that as a result of this formula they have been shortchanged, they should come back and ask for more, and I will support it. However, Mr. Chairman, I support the provisions as contained in this particular bill as recommended by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment now be closed.

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

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because I think debate can close on this bill. However, I want to indicate that those of us on this side are going to support the position that President Nixon has taken on the 30-percent formula and we hope that the leadership and that the Republicans will do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HORTON) there were—ayes 74, noes 90.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT TO COMMITTEE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HORTON

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORTON to the committee amendment:

On page 42, line 2, strike out "$105,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$120,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple amendment. All it does is increase the Federal payment by $15 million, which I think the committee will agree is the amount necessary to balance the authorization. I think it is only appropriate that we do this in this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, (Mr. HORTON), to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HORTON) there were—ayes 63, noes 91.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HORTON and Mr. MCMILLAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 109.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRASER TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRASER to the committee amendment:

Page 42, strike out lines 4 through 14.

Redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, in this bill is a provision which bars the District from having a Public Safety Commissioner. The District has had a Public Safety Commissioner for several years. That Commissioner, according to the Mayor, is helping to coordinate the anticrime programs passed by this Congress, and is coordinating corrections, Police Department, Fire Department, civil defense, juvenile programs, and so on. My amendment would take out this prohibition which the bill places against the continuation of the Public Safety Director of the District of Columbia. I cannot imagine a more clear-cut case of congressional intervention into the affairs of a local government than for this Congress, with all of its majesty, to dictate to that poor little District government that they shall not have a Public Safety Commissioner.

We, as the great Congress, know that a public commissioner is wrong. It is bad, even though he is asked for by the Mayor, who is in turn appointed and asked to continue to serve by the President of the United States. This is such a clear-cut case of intrusion into local responsibility that I thought perhaps we might get agreement in the House to take this provision out. This is not a sound provision. It has no place in this bill.

I would strongly urge the Members not to put handcuffs on the District of Columbia in its efforts to mount an effective anticrime program.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Would this legislation require the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a Public Safety Commissioner?

Mr. FRASER. The bill before the House prohibits the District from having such a commissioner. If my amendment passes, it will leave the discretion with the Mayor to have one or not to have one, as he feels is wisest.

Mr. GUDE. It would be discretionary?

Mr. FRASER. It would be discretionary if my amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BELL of California. Previously it was stated by another Member that the problem would be that the safety department man would be looking over the shoulder of the Chief of Police. It is my understanding that the mayor of the District of Columbia favors this Public Safety Department; is that correct?

Mr. FRASER. That is correct. The mayor wants a Public Safety Commissioner.

Mr. BELL of California. It was said at an earlier time that the Public Safety Department might be a difficult department organizationally because it would interfere with the operations of the Chief of Police. Obviously that is not the case, if that is what the mayor of the city wants.

Mr. FRASER. I agree with the gentleman. The mayor finds the Public Safety Commissioner of assistance to him in trying to coordinate all the safety and anticrime programs.

Mr. BELL of California. In no way is it duplicatory?

Mr. FRASER. It is not duplicatory at all.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will use a little commonsense and give the District government some discretion in this matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the matters we went over earlier this afternoon. The House voted it down. The facts are that the most troublesome period that this city has ever experienced was at a time when this position was an active position in the District of Columbia. You all remember that. I am not pointing fingers at anyone, nor am I criticizing anyone. When you take away from the chief law-enforcement officer of a city, and particularly this beautiful and lovely city, you tie the hands of his whole department and take away from him the authority to do the things that ought to be done to protect the people and the property of this city. We have been up this hill and we have been down.

I think they are getting along very well now without a permanent safety director. There is no plan on the part of anybody in this Government to fill this position. It has not been filled in a year. If there was any such plan, it would have been filled this year before the tax bill and the appropriation bill was sent to Capitol Hill. I think the amendment ought to be voted down.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, they had this authority. The so-called Mayor of Washington had this authority. He appointed an incompetent who sought to be a dictator. And I am sure that is the reason why the committee is removing this authority now, and properly so. I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is not anticipated the same man will be restored to this position. I do not think that is possible. But I do feel very strongly that the chief of police ought to be the chief of police, or else he ought to be just a policeman. The chief of police ought to have full authority to handle and direct the Metropolitan Police and protect the people of this community. Let us not water that authority down. After all, he has been doing a pretty good job for many years, and I hope we will leave this in his hands.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we do not have just an Army Chief of Staff. We do not have just a Navy Chief of Staff. Probably we should have a Marine Corps Chief of Staff. But nonetheless, we do not have just a Secretary of the Army, or just a Secretary of Navy. We need a Secretary of the Marine Corps. We have also the Secretary of Defense. Why? We have him to coordinate the various branches and the various efforts to achieve the defense of this country.

The same thing is true about the public safety of any given city. In my own city we have a safety board. In some cities there are public safety commissioners. It all comes down to the same thing: whether we are going to have organization and coordination toward the overall effort to protect the citizens of the community, or whether we are going to have everybody pulling in his own direction and have fire trucks running into police trucks. That is the purpose of the effort, to coordinate the public safety. That is the purpose of the job.

Some people may think one man is incompetent, and some people may think another man is incompetent. As my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, says, that does not have anything to do with who fills the job. A lot of people think some Members of Congress are incompetent, but they do not want to abolish the Government of the United States.

I think we need the position badly. We ought to have coordination in our city. We have had enough chaos in the cities. Let us not add to it.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments to the bill be closed.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GIAIMO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12982) to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. O'KONSKI

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'KONSKI moves to recommit H.R. 12982 to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the motion to recommit.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ADAMS) there were—ayes 104, noes 65.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 12982 and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE BARRATT O'HARA

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I have a painful duty to inform the House that my illustrious predecessor, Barratt O'Hara, passed away this morning at 11:30 o'clock.

There will be visitation tomorrow evening at Lee's funeral parlor, Fourth Street and Massachusetts Avenue NE., in Washington. Funeral arrangements are being made in Chicago at his home later in the week. The members of the Illinois delegation plan to take a special order in this regard, and at this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on September 3, immediately following the congressional recess. I invite other Members of the House to participate in that special order.

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

There was no objection.

WELFARE REFORM—A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91–146)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

A measure of the greatness of a powerful nation is the character of the life it creates for those who are powerless to make ends meet.

If we do not find the way to become a working nation that properly cares for the dependent, we shall become a Welfare State that undermines the incentive of the working man.

The present welfare system has failed us—it has fostered family breakup, has provided very little help in many States and has even deepened dependency by all-too-often making it more attractive to go on welfare than to go to work.

I propose a new approach that will make it more attractive to go to work than to go on welfare, and will establish a nation-wide minimum payment to dependent families with children.

I propose that the Federal government pay a basic income to those American families who cannot care for themselves in whichever State they live.

I propose that dependent families receiving such income be given good reason to go to work *by making the first sixty dollars a month they earn completely their own, with no deductions from their benefits.*

I propose that we *make available an addition to the incomes of the "working poor,"* to encourage them to go on working and to eliminate the possibility of making more from welfare than from wages.

I propose that these payments be made upon certification of income, with demeaning and costly investigations replaced by simplified reviews and spot checks and with *no eligibility requirement that the household be without a father.* That present requirement in many States has the effect of breaking up families and contributes to delinquency and violence.

I propose that all employable persons who choose to accept these payments be required to register for work or job training and *be required to accept that work or training,* provided suitable jobs are available either locally or if transportation is provided. Adequate and convenient day care would be provided children wherever necessary to enable a parent to train or work. The only exception to this work requirement would be mothers of pre-school children.

I propose *a major expansion of job training and day care facilities,* so that current welfare recipients able to work can be set on the road to self-reliance.

I propose that we also *provide uniform Federal payment minimums for the present three categories of welfare aid to adults*—the aged, the blind and the disabled.

This would be total welfare reform—the transformation of a system frozen in failure and frustration into a system that would work and would encourage people to work.

Accordingly, we have stopped considering human welfare in isolation. The new plan is part of an overall approach which includes a comprehensive new Manpower Training Act, and a plan for a system of revenue sharing with the States to help provide all of them with necessary budget relief. Messages on manpower training and revenue sharing will follow this message tomorrow and the next day, and the three should be considered as parts of a whole approach to what is clearly a national problem.

NEED FOR NEW DEPARTURES

A welfare system is a success when it takes care of people who cannot take care of themselves and when it helps employable people climb toward independence.

A welfare system is a failure when it takes care of those who *can* take care of themselves, when it drastically varies payments in different areas, when it breaks up families, when it perpetuates a vicious cycle of dependency, when it strips human beings of their dignity.

America's welfare system is a failure that grows worse every day.

First, it fails the recipient: In many areas, benefits are so low that we have hardly begun to take care of the dependent. And there has been no light at the end of poverty's tunnel. After 4 years of inflation, the poor have generally become poorer.

Second, it fails the taxpayer: Since 1960, welfare costs have doubled and the number on the rolls has risen from 5.8 million to over 9 million, all in a time when unemployment was low. The taxpayer is entitled to expect govern-

ment to devise a system that will help people lift themselves out of poverty.

Finally, it fails American society: By breaking up homes, the present welfare system has added to social unrest and robbed millions of children of the joy of childhood; by widely varying payments among regions, it has helped to draw millions into the slums of our cities.

The situation has become intolerable. Let us examine the alternatives available:

—We could permit the welfare momentum to continue to gather speed by our inertia; by 1975 this would result in 4 million more Americans on welfare rolls at a cost of close to 11 billion dollars a year, with both recipients and taxpayers shortchanged.

—We could tinker with the system as it is, adding to the patchwork of modifications and exceptions. That has been the approach of the past, and it has failed.

—We could adopt a "guaranteed minimum income for everyone," which would appear to wipe out poverty overnight. It would also wipe out the basic economic motivation for work, and place an enormous strain on the industrious to pay for the leisure of the lazy.

—Or, we could adopt a totally new approach to welfare, designed to assist those left far behind the national norm, and provide all with the motivation to work and a fair share of the opportunity to train.

This Administration, after a careful analysis of all the alternatives, is committed to a new departure that will find a solution for the welfare problem. The time for denouncing the old is over; the time for devising the new is now.

RECOGNIZING THE PRACTICALITIES

People usually follow their self-interest.

This stark fact is distressing to many social planners who like to look at problems from the top down. Let us abandon the ivory tower and consider the real world in all we do.

In most States, welfare is provided only when there is no father at home to provide support. If a man's children would be better off on welfare than with the low wage he is able to bring home, wouldn't he be tempted to leave home?

If a person spent a great deal of time and effort to get on the welfare rolls, wouldn't he think twice about risking his eligibility by taking a job that might not last long?

In each case, welfare policy was intended to limit the spread of dependency; in practice, however, the effect has been to increase dependency and remove the incentive to work.

We fully expect people to follow their self-interest in their business dealings; why should we be surprised when people follow their self-interest in their welfare dealings? That is why we propose a plan in which it is in the interest of every employable person to do his fair share of work.

THE OPERATION OF THE NEW APPROACH

1. *We would assure an income foundation throughout every section of America for all parents who cannot adequately support themselves and their children.* For a family of four with less than $1,000 income, this payment would be $1,600 a year; for a family of four with $2,000 income, this payment would supplement that income by $960 a year.

Under the present welfare system, each State provides "Aid to Families with Dependent Children," a program we propose to replace. The Federal government shares the cost, but each State establishes key eligibility rules and determines how much income support will be provided to poor families. The result has been an uneven and unequal system. The 1969 benefits average for a family of four is $171 a month across the Nation, but individual State averages range from $263 down to $39 a month.

A new Federal minimum of $1,600 a year cannot claim to provide comfort to a family of four, but the present low of $468 a year cannot claim to provide even the basic necessities.

The new system would do away with the inequity of very low benefit levels in some States, and of State-by-State variations in eligibility tests, by establishing a Federally-financed income floor with a national definition of basic eligibility.

States will continue to carry an important responsibility. In 30 States the Federal basic payment will be less than the present levels of combined Federal and State payments. These States will be required to maintain the current level of benefits, but in no case will a State be required to spend more than 90% of its present welfare cost. The Federal government will not only provide the "floor," but it will assume 10% of the benefits now being paid by the States as their part of welfare costs.

In 20 States, the new payment would exceed the present average benefit payments, in some cases by a wide margin. In these States, where benefits are lowest and poverty often the most severe, the payments will raise benefit levels subtantially. For 5 years, every State will be required to continue to spend at least half of what they are now spending on welfare, to supplement the Federal base.

For the *typical "welfare family"*—a mother with dependent children and no outside income—the new system would provide a basic national minimum payment. A mother with three small children would be assured an annual income of at least $1,600.

For the *family headed by an employed father or working mother,* the same basic benefits would be received, but $60 per month of earnings would be "disregarded" in order to make up the costs of working and provide a strong advantage in holding a job. The wage earner could also keep 50% of his benefits as his earnings rise above that $60 per month. A family of four, in which the father earns $2,000 in a year, would receive payments of $960, for a total income of $2,960.

For the *aged, the blind and the disabled,* the present system varies benefit levels from $40 per month for an aged person in one State to $145 per month for the blind in another. The new system would establish a minimum payment of $65 per month for all three of these adult categories, with the Federal government contributing the first $50 and sharing in payments above that amount. This will raise the share of the financial burden borne by the Federal government for payments to these adults who cannot support themselves, and should pave the way for benefit increases in many States.

For the *single adult* who is not handicapped or aged, or for the *married couple without children,* the new system would not apply. Food stamps would continue to be available up to $300 per year per person, according to the plan I outlined last May in my message to the Congress on the food and nutrition needs of the population in poverty. For dependent families there will be an orderly substitution of food stamps by the new direct monetary payments.

2. *The new approach would end the blatant unfairness of the welfare system.* In over half the States, families headed by unemployed men do not qualify for public assistance. In no State does a family headed by a father working full-time receive help in the current welfare system, no matter how little he earns. As we have seen, this approach to dependency has itself been a cause of dependency. It results in a policy that tends to force the father out of the house.

The new plan rejects a policy that undermines family life. It would end the substantial financial incentives to desertion. It would extend eligibility to *all* dependent families with children, without regard to whether the family is headed by a man or a woman. The effects of these changes upon human behavior would be an increased will to work, the survival of more marriages, the greater stability of families. We are determined to stop passing the cycle of dependency from generation to generation.

The most glaring inequity in the old welfare system is the exclusion of families who are working to pull themselves out of poverty. Families headed by a non-worker often receive more from welfare than families headed by a husband working full-time at very low wages. This has been rightly resented by the working poor, for the rewards are just the opposite of what they should be.

3. *The new plan would create a much stronger incentive to work.*

For people now on the welfare rolls, the present system discourages the move from welfare to work by cutting benefits too fast and too much as earnings begin. *The new system would encourage work by allowing the new worker to retain the first of $720 of his yearly earnings without any benefit reduction.*

For people already working, but at poverty wages, the present system often encourages nothing but resentment and an incentive to quit and go on relief where that would pay more than work. The new plan, on the contrary, would provide a supplement that will help a low-wage worker—struggling to make ends meet—achieve a higher standard of living.

For an employable person who just

chooses not to work, neither the present system nor the one we propose would support him, though both would continue to support other dependent members in his family.

However, a welfare mother with preschool children should not face benefit reductions if she decides to stay home. It is not our intent that mothers of preschool children must accept work. Those who can work and desire to do so, however, should have the opportunity for jobs and job training and access to day care centers for their children; this will enable them to support themselves after their children are grown.

A family with a member who gets a job would be permitted to retain all of the *first $60 monthly income,* amounting to $720 per year for a regular worker, *with no reduction of Federal payments.* The incentive to work in this provision is obvious. But there is another practical reason: Going to work costs money. Expenses such as clothes, transportation, personal care, Social Security taxes and loss of income from odd jobs amount to substantial costs for the average family. Since a family does not begin to *add* to its net income until it surpasses the cost of working, in fairness this amount should not be subtracted from the new payment.

After the first $720 of income, the *rest* of the earnings will result in a systematic reduction in payments.

I believe the vast majority of poor people in the United States prefer to work rather than have the government support their families. In 1968, 600,000 families left the welfare rolls out of an average caseload of 1,400,000 during the year, showing a considerable turnover, much of it voluntary.

However, there may be some who fail to seek or accept work, even with the strong incentives and training opportunities that will be provided. It would not be fair to those who willingly work, or to all taxpayers, to allow others to choose idleness when opportunity is available. Thus, they must accept training opportunities and jobs when offered, or give up their right to the new payments for themselves. No able-bodied person will have a "free ride" in a nation that provides opportunity for training and work.

4. *The bridge from welfare to work should be buttressed by training and child care programs.* For many, the incentives to work in this plan would be all that is necessary. However, there are other situations where these incentives need to be supported by measures that will overcome other barriers to employment.

I propose that funds be provided for expanded training and job development programs so that an additional 150,000 welfare recipients can become jobworthy during the first year.

Manpower training is a basic bridge to work for poor people, especially people with limited education, low skills and limited job experience. Manpower training programs can provide this bridge for many of our poor. In the new Manpower Training proposal to be sent to the Congress this week, the interrelationship with this new approach to welfare will be apparent.

I am also requesting authority, as a part of the new system, to provide child care for the 450,000 children of the 150,000 current welfare recipients to be trained.

The child care I propose is more than custodial. This Administration is committed to a new emphasis on child development in the first five years of life. The day care that would be part of this plan would be of a quality that will help in the development of the child and provide for its health and safety, and would break the poverty cycle for this new generation.

The expanded child care program would bring new opportunities along several lines: opportunities for the further involvement of private enterprise in providing high quality child care service; opportunities for volunteers; and opportunities for *training and employment in child care centers of many of the welfare mothers themselves.*

I am requesting a total of $600 million additional to fund these expanded training programs and child care centers.

5. *The new system will lessen welfare red tape and provide administrative cost savings.* To cut out the costly investigations so bitterly resented as "welfare snooping," the Federal payment will be based upon a certification of income, with spot checks sufficient to prevent abuses. The program will be administered on an automated basis, using the information and technical experience of the Social Security Administration, but, of course, will be entirely separate from the administration of the Social Security trust fund.

The States would be given the option of having the Federal government handle the payment of the State supplemental benefits on a reimbursable basis, so that they would be spared their present administrative burdens and so a single check could be sent to the recipient. These simplifications will save money and eliminate indignities; at the same time, welfare fraud will be detected and lawbreakers prosecuted.

6. *This new departure would require a substantial initial investment, but will yield future returns to the Nation.* This transformation of the welfare system will set in motion forces that will lessen dependency rather than perpetuate and enlarge it. A more productive population adds to real economic growth without inflation. The initial investment is needed now to stop the momentum of work-to-welfare, and to start a new momentum in the opposite direction.

The costs of welfare benefits for families with dependent children have been rising alarmingly the past several years, increasing from $1 billion in 1960 to an estimated $3.3 billion in 1969, of which $1.8 billion is paid by the Federal government, and $1.5 billion is paid by the States. Based on current population and income data, the proposals I am making today will increase Federal costs during the first year by an estimated $4 billion, which includes $600 million for job training and child care centers.

The "start-up costs" of lifting many people out of dependency will ultimately cost the taxpayer far less than the chronic costs—in dollars and in national values—of creating a permanent underclass in America.

FROM WELFARE TO WORK

Since this administration took office, members of the Urban Affairs Council, including officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Bureau of the Budget, and other key advisers, have been working to develop a coherent, fresh approach to welfare, manpower training and revenue sharing.

I have outlined our conclusions about an important component of this approach in this message; the Secretary of HEW will transmit to the Congress the proposed legislation after the summer recess.

I urge the Congress to begin its study of these proposals promptly so that laws can be enacted and funds authorized to begin the new system as soon as possible. Sound budgetary policy must be maintained in order to put this plan into effect—especially the portion supplementing the wages of the working poor.

With the establishment of the new approach, the Office of Economic Opportunity will concentrate on the important task of finding new ways of opening economic opportunity for those who are able to work. Rather than focusing on income support activities, it must find means of providing opportunities for individuals to contribute to the full extent of their capabilities, and of developing and improving those capabilities.

This would be the effect of the transformation of welfare into "workfare," a new work-rewarding system:

For the first time, all dependent families with children in America, regardless of where they live, would be assured of minimum standard payments based upon uniform and single eligibility standards.

For the first time, the more than two million families who make up the "working poor" would be helped toward self-sufficiency and away from future welfare dependency.

For the first time, training and work opportunity with effective incentives would be given millions of families who would otherwise be locked into a welfare system for generations.

For the first time, the Federal Government would make a strong contribution toward relieving the financial burden of welfare payments from State governments.

For the first time, every dependent family in America would be encouraged to stay together, free from economic pressure to split apart.

These are far-reaching effects. They cannot be purchased cheaply, or by piecemeal efforts. This total reform looks in a new direction; it requires new thinking, a new spirit and a fresh dedication to reverse the downhill course of welfare. In its first year, more than half the families participating in the program will have one member working or training.

We have it in our power to raise the standard of living and the realizable hopes of millions of our fellow citizens. By providing an equal chance at the starting line, we can reinforce the traditional American spirit of self-reliance and self-respect.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 11, 1969.*

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE ON WELFARE REFORM

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my own remarks at this point in the RECORD following the President's message and to include a statement made by me last Friday evening subsequent to the President's address.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I strongly agree with President Nixon that the present welfare system is a complete failure and should be abolished. I further agree with him that it is far better to develop an entirely new system of family assistance than to try to patch up and improve the existing system.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's message on family assistance, sent to the Congress today, is a historic document in more than the usual sense. It is a historic declaration because it breaks new ground in the history of American government and our attempts to perfect the American system.

There are several features in the President's new family assistance plan which I believe especially commend it to the American people and to the Congress.

One of these features is the enlargement of opportunities which the President's family assistance plan offers to those now on welfare but able to work and to the working poor who need an assist to enter the economic mainstream of this country.

Another is the emphasis that the President's plan places on keeping families together. The family is the basic building block of our society. The President's family assistance plan furnishes the foundation for economically deprived American families to stay together and thus serves to undergird our society as a whole.

Finally, although the family assistance plan initially would cost more than the present welfare system, the President's new assistance program means greater equity for the taxpayer.

We are telling the taxpayer that those who are able to work must work or take training if they are to receive Government assistance, except in the case of mothers with children under 6.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's program is a bridge to full opportunity for the able-bodied welfare recipient and for the working poor and a stride toward equity for the taxpayer.

Looked at in the aggregate, the Family assistance program is designed to break the vicious cycle of welfarism and at the same time provide those who cannot work with a basic economic floor.

Mr. Speaker, I think all Members of Congress recognize that the present welfare system is a colossal failure. I urge that members of both bodies look at the President's family assistance plan as the handle which will enable America to lift itself out of the rut of welfarism and to move ahead to a brighter day.

Following these remarks I am include the text of a statement released following the President's speech last Friday:

STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R–MICH., RELEASED FOLLOWING PRESIDENT NIXON'S SPEECH FRIDAY, AUGUST 8, 1969

I believe all Americans will welcome the bold new initiatives outlined by President Nixon last Friday night as a move to relax the muscle-bound Federal Government's stranglehold on people, programs and money.

What I see in the President's proposals in the areas of welfare, manpower training and sharing of federal revenue with the states and cities is an attempt to make government at all levels work better for all the people of America.

The course the President has charted is a far better way of solving problems in America than the path we have been pursuing.

I would describe the President's welfare plans as Family Assistance Reform, or FAR, because I see his proposals for welfare reform lifting economically handicapped Americans out of the slough of despair and placing them on a road to a better life.

FAR is an effort to give every American able to work the incentive to work, the desire to stand on his own two feet. For the first time, if the President's proposals are enacted, it would always pay an American to work instead of going on welfare. This is the true spirit of America.

The old welfare system born in the depression days of the Thirties perpetuates welfarism and kills decency in man. In addition, it taxes working Americans so that others may live in idleness. Like the tax reform bill just passed by the House, President Nixon's welfare reform program will be a great leap forward for the taxpayer.

I also applaud the President's plans to reorganize Federal manpower training programs to make them perform better and to give the States and localities the opportunity to operate them in a manner geared to local needs.

Establishing innovation as the primary role of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the war against poverty also will serve to promote our national objectives.

I was particularly impressed with the overall theme of the President's message to the people—that of a New Federalism, the placing of more power and responsibility in the hands of the States and the cities.

If the States and cities are to assume more responsibility, they must have more funds. Sharing of Federal revenue with them is the best way to solve the many domestic problems which confront us.

Overall, the proposals outlined by President Nixon tonight represent human investment—an investment *in* people and *for* people—which will redound to the great good of the country.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my enthusiasm and support for the President's new welfare system, which in many respects constitutes the farthest-reaching piece of domestic legislation in 35 years. As my colleagues well know, the existing welfare system does more harm than it does good, promotes gross inequities, disrupts families and defeats the very purposes that gave rise to it.

I believe it is accurate to say that the existing welfare system is liked by no one, Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative, rich or poor. The President has responded to that widespread discontent with a humane new program that promotes family stability and removes many inequities while at the same time reaffirming the importance of work.

This is not a welfare plan designed to subsidize the lazy and the inept. It is intended to make it possible for ablebodied persons to work, while simultaneously providing the elements of a decent life for those who cannot, especially the young and the disabled.

Americans have long agreed that they dislike the existing welfare system. It is my profound hope that they can agree on the merits of the President's proposal. In my own judgment, it is an historic move, one to which its supporters will look back in the coming decades with pride and satisfaction.

It is true that the new program will cost a good deal. But, as the President so prophetically observed:

If we fail to make this investment in work incentives now, if we merely try to patch up the system here and there, we will only be pouring good money after bad in ever-increasing amounts.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, many families which receive public assistance do not include any member who is able to work. Many more do include members who either can work or who could, if training, child care and similar services were available to them. Work and training programs were authorized under the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, the Economic Opportunity Act and the Public Welfare Amendments of 1967. While these have had some success they have been available on a limited scale and primarily in the form of separate projects for welfare recipients.

The new approach to welfare—family assistance—strongly emphasizes training and work. Instead of setting up separate programs and projects for welfare recipients it would mandate the Secretary of Labor to use all the manpower training programs at his disposal to provide the needed training and placement. Sufficient funding would be authorized to permit the participation of a vastly increased number of welfare recipients in manpower programs which would themselves be strengthened by the proposed Manpower Training Act. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be given the responsibility and the appropriation authorizations for the needed supporting services such as day care to make these programs effective. The plan is designed to assure maximum training, placement, employment and upgrading all skills.

As the President indicated, the only way we can end poverty in America is to work our way out. This new plan—"workfare, not welfare"—is designed to start a new movement toward self-support in America, and deserves working support by the American people.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the

proposals President Nixon has made on domestic policy represent an historic breakthrough on at least two fronts: in reforming the way in which Government helps the poor, and in reforming Government itself.

In the short run, his proposal to abolish the present welfare system and substitute the new family assistance plan is more dramatic; in the long run, the beginning he proposed on a "new federalism" may prove even more significant.

The present welfare system is a disaster, and the disaster grows worse all the time; as the President noted, if present trends continue another 4 million people will be added to the welfare rolls by 1975. The worst part, however, is not its size but its futility. The new family assistance plan at last offers a way out of the welfare morass. With its work requirement, its work incentives, its expanded job training and day care centers, it represents a comprehensive effort to start moving people away from dependency and toward self-sufficiency.

With his manpower and revenue sharing proposals, the President gave concrete evidence that he really means to reverse the massive trend toward centralization that marked the middle third of the century; that after about 36 years of chipping away at State and local governments, eroding their power and undercutting their authority, he means to start strengthening them again. This can be the key to saving America from the prospect, which has loomed larger year by year, of governmental paralysis. If America's Government structure is to survive through the 1970's as an effective instrument, President Nixon's "new federalism" will be what gives it life.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, finally, we have an approach to welfare that sets right four great wrongs.

Wrong No. 1 is that a dependent family in one State gets much more in benefits than a family in a poorer State. That wide difference would now be narrowed, which should help slow down the migration into the slums of big cities.

Wrong No. 2 is the requirement that a man be out of the house in order for families to receive payments—this has had the effect of providing an economic incentive to desertion. This would be ended by the new approach to welfare.

Wrong No. 3 is the fact that a family could often get more from welfare than from working; this has been rightly resented by the "working poor," who labor while they see some others loaf when they could be working. Family assistance—"workfare"—ends this unfairness with wage supplements to low-income workers.

Wrong No. 4 is the wrong to the taxpayer, who has had to support ever-growing welfare costs in a period of high employment. Under the new plan, there is a work-or-training requirement for every able-bodied person whose children are beyond the preschool age, when transportation and day care is provided.

This is indeed a new direction for a welfare system that has failed the Nation and failed the poor. The start-up costs are high—but they are necessary to set new standards and new incentives for Americans to get the training they need for jobs that will let them live lives of productivity and dignity.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it was just 20 years ago that Senator Robert Taft made the following comment about opportunity in America. He said:

> I believe that the American people feel that with the high production of which we are now capable, there is enough left over to prevent extreme hardship, to give to all a minimum standard of decent living and to all children a fair opportunity to get a start in life.

"A minimum standard," and a "fair opportunity to get a start in life"; these are cardinal principles in President Nixon's new strategy to help those in need. The package which the President announced does not help people who can help themselves; it helps people to help themselves. It does not provide a bed of roses for anyone, but it does provide a minimum standard for everyone. It does not lead people by the hand through their lives, but it does give every child the chance to get a start in life. And if we can do this much, then the human spark which now, as the President put it, is so often stifled by the heavy burdens of poverty, will be fanned into flame. Then our whole society will be the beneficiary.

The alternative to the President's system is to continue the present system, one which is highly expensive both in financial and in human terms. And while the present system grows bigger and bigger every year, with no promise of a reversal in that trend, the President's program will grow smaller and smaller as the early investment in people begins to pay off.

Under President Nixon's program, it pays for poor people to work. Under the President's program, it will be far easier for poor people to train for new jobs. Under the President's proposal, an entire office of the Federal Government will experiment with new ways to put people back on their feet. And under the President's proposal, the energies of State and local governments will be released to deal with problems in the most effective way, at the grass roots level.

Together, this package of reforms represents a conceptual breakthrough of the sort we have not seen in government in several decades. I believe the President's new policy will be viewed many years from now as a watershed moment in the history of this country, a moment when the prestige and authority of the President was put on the line in support of a bold new approach to government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's introduction of his "responsible federalism" represents an historic turning point. He addressed himself directly to the central crisis confronting America today: the crisis of government, and of confidence in government.

The disastrous failure of the present welfare system is only a symptom of this larger crisis. Appropriately, it was in the context of an approach to the larger crisis that he proposed a replacement of the old welfare system.

For a third of a century, as the President noted, power has been flowing from the States and the people to Washington. The result has been a drastic imbalance. The Federal Government has acquired more functions than it can handle. States and localities, with their power restricted, their authority undermined, their funds drained, have been left without the capacity to govern effectively.

As the demands increase on government at all levels, it becomes vitally important that the functions of government be sorted out, and distributed in such a way that each function gets the attention it requires—which means making more, not less, use of State and local governments to run those activities they can run effectively. At the same time, they have to be given the authority and the funds to do the job.

The President's precedent-shattering proposal to shift administration of the Nation's manpower programs to States and localities shows that decentralization is possible. His proposal for a start on revenue-sharing shows that he is in earnest about giving States and localities the means to govern effectively. The new federalism—breaking up massive problems into manageable pieces, and freeing the Federal Government to concentrate on those activities which only it can manage—is the pattern needed for this final third of the century. The time to begin it is now, and the President should be commended for having the vision to see this and the courage to propose it.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon, in his Friday night message to the Nation, outlined a broad new approach to dealing with some of our urgent domestic problems. There are many thought provoking and exciting facets to this message and today we have heard some thoughtful comments on some of these proposals.

I am particularly pleased at the President's plan to share a greater measure of responsibility and revenues with State and local governments. I have long been concerned that our States are sending too much tax money to Washington and receiving too little service in return.

The President pointed to the frustrations felt by many when he said:

> A third of a century of centralizing power and responsibility in Washington has produced a bureaucratic monstrosity, cumbersome, unresponsive and ineffective.

Revenue sharing is a sound means of restoring confidence of people in the ability of government to cope with growing social ills. Returning a portion of the Federal tax revenues to our States and cities will help make it possible for them to bring government closer to the people. I am greatly encouraged by the President's desire to attach few strings to these revenues. This will permit local governments, which are best able to identify the needs of their citizens, to use funds to solve their most pressing problems.

As a strong supporter of decentralized government, I commend the President for his bold proposal to share responsibility and revenue with the States and municipalities.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's approach to solving the problems of our Nations disadvantaged and underprivileged deserves the enthusiastic interest and support of all Americans. I hope that our citizens can see inside the necessarily complex structure of this program the foundation of human dignity and constructive work that it rests on. It is a thoughtful, far-reaching and sensitive response to the inequities and failures of the existing welfare program of the United States.

The President has called for a basic payment to those American families who are unable to care for themselves. This i- not another Federal giveaway program that taxes the hard-working American citizen and gives it to those who, although able to earn a living, refuse to do so. Rather, it requires those able-bodied citizens seeking aid to register for work or job training and to accept suitable jobs when available.

Also, the President's plan will provide significant fiscal relief for sorely burdened State governments. And, most importantly, the President's plan will finally make it possible for families to remain together and for work to be attractive and feasible.

The old system was intended to aid "dependent children." Yet it harmed them more than it helped, for it encouraged fathers to abandon their families, for low income families to move into often hostile new places because of financial inequities in their old abodes, and for the children themselves to suffer a series of indignities and cruelties.

The President's plan will enable families to remain together, and will enable them in large numbers to get off the relief rolls, as the President said, and onto payrolls. At the same time, it will assist that long-neglected but eminently deserving group of citizens known as the "working poor."

I believe the President should be congratulated for proposing a plan that encourages individual initiative and work as a substitute for the endless outright Federal giveaway programs proposed by past administrations.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks concerning the President's address on welfare reform.

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

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S NEW DOMESTIC POLICY PROPOSALS—A REFLECTION OF THE AMERICAN CHARACTER

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

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, Richard Nixon's new federalism reverses the flow of power in America—away from the center in Washington and back to the people where it belongs.

It sets national standards of fairness and national goals of compassion and dignity, but it places the responsibility and the capability for carrying these out in the hands of State and local authorities, most directly answerable to the people.

The new federalism encourages local participation in training programs and day care centers; it stimulates the ability of local government to be responsive to local needs through the much-talked about but never before accomplished technique of revenue sharing.

It relys on people to be self-reliant—and makes it possible for them to be that way. Under family assistance, the emphasis is on work and training, rather than on generations of handouts. And the working poor for the first time have the chance to pull themselves out of poverty.

The new federalism is a reflection of the true character of the American people: generous and compassionate toward the helpless and the dependent; impatient with the indolent; and concerned that every man has the opportunity to make the most of himself and his family.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL ON THE WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in his dramatic new approach to domestic problems, President Nixon has offered the most innovative package of proposals that this country has seen in 35 years. We have all known for a long time that the welfare system had to be revised We have known that the disorganized maze of manpower programs needed to be consolidated. We have known that State and local governments were headed toward fiscal disaster. Finally, we have known that the Office of Economic Opportunity was in need of change. Many people thought that accomplishing these tasks alone would take the administration a full 4 years and these same people have been quick to say that nothing has been done. We now see that they were wrong on both counts.

The President has proposed a domestic program that is both coordinated and sensible. The welfare reform is directly tied to a work requirement and job training program. Both the revenue sharing proposal and the welfare reform will provide fiscal relief to States and local communities. Added to this is the new concept of the Office of Economic Opportunity as an incubator for new and daring programs that will risk failure with the hope of gaining even greater success. For the first time we will be able to see how each program relates to the other. For the first time we will have a domestic program in which one part does not counteract another. This alone is a great accomplishment of social policy.

We have before us the opportunity to institute a "job and income strategy" that will break the line of dependency that has been fostered for so long and begin to bring millions of Americans into the economic mainstream of this country. I sincerely hope that we will take this opportunity.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS ON THE WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on August 8 the President addressed the Nation to outline the most dramatic proposals in more than 30 years pertaining to the welfare system of this Nation. He also announced far-reaching major changes in Federal programs of job training, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and Federal tax revenue sharing with State and local governments.

The most significant part of the President's welfare proposals is that millions of Americans will no longer have to rely solely on welfare checks. Our outdated welfare system has discriminated against the working poor and encouraged able men not to work and to desert their families. The system of doles we have called welfare has perpetuated generations of American citizens in a cycle of dependency on government which ruins families and thwarts efforts to either find work or take advantage of job training.

In presenting a program that offers incentives to work rather than remain tied to the welfare umbilical cord, President Nixon has touched a responsive note in all Americans. His proposal gives hope to the recipients, and will eventually reduce the cost to the taxpayers who must pay the bills. How much longer could we have gone on telling Americans willing to work and support their governments that they had an obligation to provide for those unwilling to work?

The President's proposal for revamping the job training programs of the Federal Government is also one of far greater consequences than simply a new approach to an old problem. In it he proposes to reduce some 30 Federal programs spread throughout government in a tangle of bureaucracy to one program, thus ending in this area the trend of ever-bigger and more concentrated government in Washington.

He proposes to turn these programs over to the States and local governments, where the problems are adjacent to the people who understand them, and who know what is needed to solve them. I quote the President's words that "we should trust the American capacity for self-government enough to try." It has been this capacity that has been the strength of our democratic system. Washington has usurped this capacity in too many areas, and has not produced a record of better solutions. Now it is time to reverse the trend.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, perhaps ultimately the most profound proposal is Mr. Nixon's request for Federal revenue sharing with the State and local govern-

ments. America has too many complex problems to solve to continue the unworkable system of a single Washington-dictated solution to many unique local problems. Surely the record of the last 10 years demonstrates the need for a plan to send Federal money and power back to local governments rather than the unsuccessful recent history of ever-growing Federal promises and programs and ever-shrinking Federal performance.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to give these proposals of the President its highest consideration in an effort to bring "practical" solutions to these problems confronting America.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10107. An act to continue for a temporary period the existing suspension of duty on certain istle.

REPORT OF THE DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP TASK FORCE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has failed to keep pace with the imaginative consumer programs of our past two Presidents. Each day we see new evidence of this administration's indifference to consumer needs. Seven senior FDA scientists recently reported:

The Federal Government is doing a grossly inadequate job of protecting consumers from dangerous drugs, contaminated food, and other hazardous products.

Recognizing the legal and moral responsibilities of our Government in protecting the consumer, the task force on consumer affairs of the Democratic Study Group offers the Congress and the American public this consumer message.

The text of the DSG consumer report follows:

REPORT OF THE DEMOCRATIC STUDY GROUP TASK FORCE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Chairman; Representative Joseph Karth, Vice Chairman; Rep. Shirley Chisholm, Rep. Bob Eckhardt, Rep. Joshua Eilberg, Rep. Michael A. Feighan, Rep. James M. Hanley, Rep. James J. Howard, Rep. Torbert Macdonald, Rep. Abner J. Mikva, Rep. Joseph G. Minish, Rep. Patsy T. Mink, Rep. John E. Moss, Rep. Richard L. Ottinger, Rep. Neal Smith, Rep. Robert O. Tiernan, Rep. Lester Wolff.

I—INTRODUCTION

Since the days of Theodore Roosevelt, the President has assumed the responsibility for presenting Congress with broad and innovative legislative programs. He thus fulfills his constitutional mandate to "recommend to their (congressional) consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." This function has been most significantly exemplified in the Presidencies of Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Lyndon B. Johnson.

One of the newest and most important national commitments so proclaimed by Presidential message pertains to consumer justice. Our last two Presidents have reaffirmed the national commitment to the public welfare by explicit messages devoted exclusively to the protection of the consumer interest.

President Kennedy delivered the first message to Congress devoted exclusively to protecting the consumer interest during his second month in office.

On February 5, 1964, March 21, 1966, February 16, 1967, and February 6, 1968, President Johnson delivered similar messages to the Congress.

More than six months have passed since President Nixon took office. This Congress cannot wait any longer for President Nixon to deliver a consumer message.

In contrast to president Kennedy's recognition of the consumer's dependency on government protection in a complex market economy, President Nixon has stressed self-reliance as a primary solution to consumer injustices. In contrast to President Johnson's activism on behalf of the consumer, President Nixon's indifference has encouraged lethargic enforcement of existing consumer laws.

Apart from a promising beginning by the President's second appointee as his Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, the signposts from this Administration point to a dead end for the consumer.

The historical imperative for consumer legislative direction now becomes a congressional duty. Accordingly, the Task Force on Consumer Affairs of the Democratic Study Group offers this statement.

II—THE NIXON RECORD IN CONSUMER AFFAIRS: PROGRAM CUTBACKS

This Administration's Fiscal 1970 budget contains significant cutbacks in consumer programs from the Johnson requests for Fiscal 1970. A review of the Nixon budget for 20 of the more than 250 consumer programs reveals not one increase over the Johnson requests, and cuts from the Johnson requests in several programs. The cuts exceed $13 million, plus an additional $25 million in grants to states and communities for highway safety. A few examples of these cuts are:

An 18 percent cut in funds for the President's Committee on Consumer Interests—the very Committee charged with planning and developing legislation to implement the President's consumer policies and objectives;

A 5 percent cut in Meat and Poultry Inspection programs at a time when the Department of Agriculture is not meeting its responsibilities under the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967;

An 18 percent cut in traffic and highway safety funds including grants to states and communities, when there are over 53,000 auto fatalities and 4 million injuries each year;

A 5 percent cut in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department's radiation control program although serious questions are being raised about possible hazards from color television sets and microwave ovens;

A 100 percent cut in the Food and Drug Administration's funds for enforcement of the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, amounting to $65,000.

III—THE NIXON RECORD IN CONSUMER AFFAIRS: APPOINTMENT AND PROGRAMS

We find a conspicuous failure of the President and his Cabinet to act decisively on behalf of the consumer:

The Office of Consumer Counsel in the Department of Justice remains vacant.

The Director of the National Highway Safety Bureau still has not been appointed.

Although Title 4 of the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968 directed the President to establish a National Commission on Consumer Finance and appoint one-third of its members, the President has failed to comply with this provision.

President Nixon appointed as Under Secretary of Agriculture the man who led the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture in a bitter fight against meat inspection legislation.

The President has not sent any consumer legislation to Congress.

Despite the Radiation Control Act's January 1, 1970 deadline, for promulgating safety standards for all electronic products which may produce a radiation hazard, it has taken the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare six months to appoint an advisory committee required under the Act.

The Secretary of Transportation has not added to the obviously inadequate staff of two employees of the National Bureau of Highway Safety who are charged with assuring that the million foreign autos sold in the United States each year comply with his Department's safety standards.

The Secretaries of HEW and Commerce have not moved with dispatch to carry out their responsibilities under the 1967 amendments to the Flammable Fabrics Act. The Secretary of HEW has not reported to the President and Congress on the need for new flammability standards, contrary to the requirements of law.

The Secretary of Commerce has failed to halt the numerous industry violations of package size agreements under the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act.

The Department of Transportation has failed to meet its responsibilities under the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968. The interim safety standards which the Department has established are in effect the same standards which industry itself had adopted years ago, and which the Act found to be inadequate.

By not requiring continuous inspections of fish at processing plants in his fish inspection proposal which will be submitted to Congress shortly, President Nixon has retreated form the fish inspection measure supported by the previous Administration and has seriously weakened the impact of such legislation.

IV. THE TASK FORCE CONSUMER PROGRAM

A. We endorse the establishment of a separate Federal Agency devoted exclusively to the consumer.

This agency, whether a full Cabinet-level department or a statutory office, should perform the following vital functions.

1. Establish better coordination and direction over the federal consumer apparatus;

2. Vigorously represent the consumer viewpoint before other federal agencies, federal courts, and regulatory agencies in matters or proceedings affecting substantially the interest of consumers;

3. Serve as a central clearing house for consumer complaints;

4. Develop and disseminate consumer information from governmental and private sources; and

5. Administer those programs that are transferred by Congress to the agency or department.

In the Executive Branch, proliferation of laws, inadequate funding, and a general lack of commitment, dictate the absolute need for a statutory consumer agency.

Despite the existence of the Office of Special Consumer Assistant to the President, the consumer viewpoint cannot begin to compete for attention and acceptance in the nation's capital (or in the state capitals), with those of other special interest groups. The reason: Other groups finance effective lobbyists and are represented by Cabinet-level departments or separate government agencies.

B. We endorse legislation that would:

Product Safety

1. Establish a permanent National Commission on Product Safety.

2. Require safety closures for all drugs and potentially dangerous products.

3. Eliminate dangerous toys from the marketplace.

4. Require tire manufacturers to comply with federal tire safety standards and recall defective products with adequate notice to the purchaser.

Food Safety

5. Require continuous inspection of fish processing and storage facilities.

6. Require continuous inspection of eggs at processing plants.

Medical Safety

7. Require generic labeling of all prescription drugs.

8. Establish a Federal Drug Compendium as a basic source of information on drugs sold in the marketplace.

9. Establish a national center to test the safety and efficacy of drugs, within the Department of HEW.

10. Require pre-market testing of diagnostic medical devices and the setting of standards to insure their safety and efficacy.

Consumer Information Availability

11. Require the listing of the unit price on certain packaged products.

12. Require package labeling on food products to have a content analysis of their nutritional value.

13. Require the release of test data on products from government agencies.

14. Establish a National Consumer Information Foundation to administer an infotag program.

15. Establish a Consumer Federal Register to provide the public with information on government activity in the consumer field.

Protection against deception and fraud

16. Authorize the issuance by the Federal Trade Commission of temporary injunctions and restraining orders to stop deception in the marketplace.

17. Permit class actions based on violations of state or federal consumer protection laws.

18. Provide for an investigation of unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts in the home improvement industry.

19. Give consumers the right to cancel any purchase from a door-to-door salesman within five business days after entering the transaction.

20. Require all retail outlets that deal in trading stamps to offer an honest cash redemption for stamps to customers.

21. Insure effective warranty protection by requiring manufacturers to repair or replace faulty merchandise at no cost to the buyer.

Credit

22. Enable consumers to protect themselves against erroneous credit information and establish safeguards to prevent the release of credit information to unauthorized persons.

23. Prohibit the sending of unsolicited credit cards through the mails and require all credit cards that have been solicited to be sent by registered mail.

24. Enact a Federal Consumer Credit Code to deal with the problems of consumer credit.

Consumer representation

25. Establish an Independent Office of Utility Consumers' Counsel to represent utility consumers before federal and state agencies and courts and make grants to state and local governments to create and operate their own Utility Consumers' Counsels.

Miscellaneous

26. Provide grants for the establishment and strengthening of state and local consumer protection offices.

27. Establish safety standards for the protection of persons engaged in potentially hazardous occupations.

28. Establish and enforce minimum electric power reliability standards and require interconnections among neighboring utilities.

29. Provide additional protection for the investing public through improved federal and industry regulation of securities transactions and mutual fund sales commissions and management fees.

30. Enable all segments of the populace to have reasonable access to insurance against all types of risk normally covered by insurance underwriters.

V—CONCLUSION

This program is too important and too urgent for further delay. We are in the midst of a consumer revolution which confronts the very integrity of the free enterprise system.

The answer of this Administration has been: let the buyer beware. But self-reliance is no substitute for governmental action. For example, can a housewife protect herself and her family from foul meat and poorly inspected fish—the condition of which can easily be hidden by additives and adulterants? Can the patient pre-test medical devices before he must rely on them? Can even the most careful shopper protect his family against flammable fabrics or choose the best food values when essential information is not readily available?

We reaffirm these basic goals of the consumer revolution—in essence, the same consumer rights enunciated by President Kennedy in 1962.

The consumer's right to honest and relevant information on products he buys; he is unlikely to get it without government encouragement and direction to industry.

The consumer's right to a full and complete choice in the marketplace; vigorous competition, overseen by truly independent regulatory agencies, will make that choice available.

The consumer's right to representation in government—his only recourse to redress the balance against the excesses of an economy heavily influenced by producers.

Finally, the consumer's right to the assurance—before purchase—of safe and effective products, and after purchase of the reliability of product guarantees.

If our system is to prosper, government must provide the counterweight to an uncontrolled profit motive. If the consumer lacks justice in the marketplace, the free enterprise system has failed—no matter which company prospers nor how large our Gross National Product is.

We urge the Congress to take those steps necessary to assure a system of justice for the consumer and equity in the marketplace.

SDS: USE THE LAW TO DESTROY THE SYSTEM

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, the attitude of Students for a Democratic Society toward the law is well illustrated by a handbook currently being distributed by New York regional SDS—133 Prince Street, New York City—in conjunction with the High School Student Union and the Movement for a Democratic Society—MDS, characterized by the Radical Education Project as "the off-campus branch of SDS." Titled "The Bust Book," this document provides movement activists with comprehensive advice on how to protect themselves during demonstrations and subsequent arrests. "Bust" is New Left jargon for arrest.

The basic attitude of the handbook's authors toward respect for and observance of the law is reflected in the following passages taken from the introduction:

The "rights" of the Constitution have little meaning to the cop on the beat, who is engaged in the first step of the legal process, and they also have little meaning in the courts, where the final stages of coercion are legitimized. To rely on "legal rights" is to ignore entirely the fundamental reality of a class society, that when those "rights" have been granted by a ruling elite, those same "rights" can and will be ignored when their use threatens the power of those who granted them. Such has been the history of "fundamental rights" in our country in times of crisis from the Alien and Sedition Acts . . . [to] . . . the McCarthy represson which killed the Rosenbergs and led to the imprisonment of Morton Sobell and many others in the fifties, down to the frame-up murder of members of the Black Panther Party today.

* * * * *

Sometimes we can fight back using the legal rights and procedures which movements before us have won from the system. But we must not be diverted from political organizing by courtroom battles. Our real defense lies in the growing strength of our Movement.

An examination of the table of contents reveals the scope of "The Bust Book." Included under such headings as "Before the Bust," "In captivity," and ""Trial Strategy" is information often in detail, on such subjects as how to avoid arrest for possession of narcotics, self-defense, resistance and escape, and how to turn a trial into a propaganda forum against the so-called establishment. There is even a section with information for those under 21 years of age. The section on so-called self-defense includes the following advice:

Self-Defense: The New York Times, although not useful for any other purpose, makes a very hard object when rolling (sic) up lengthwise and folded in half, and unlike other weapons is inconspicuous and not incriminating.

When the police throw tear gas canisters into the crowd the gas continues to come out after it hits—throw the canisters off somewhere into the blue.

The handbook is illustrated with pictures of Black Panthers and such revolutionaries as Eldridge Cleaver and Che Guevara, and it ends with a quotation from North Vietnamese Communist leader Ho Chi Minh. The usefulness of this book in the revolution is emphasized by a review which appeared in the May 24, 1969, issue of the Communist newsweekly, Guardian. This review, written by Columbia University SDS member Jomo Raskin, states that the "Bust Book" is indispensible to the revolutionary movement because "the law is a tool." Raskin further states:

The book is as revolutionary as the little red book.

Quotations from Mao Tse-tung is commonly referred to as the "little red book."

The concept of the law as a tool is reflected in the following passages taken from the section entitled "Before the Bust":

More and more of us are getting busted more and more. But getting arrested should be, as far as possible, a political decision.

There are good political reasons to get busted—to mobilize a community or a campus (like in the Columbia revolt), to take risks to be in the front lines of a demonstration (like at the Chicago Democratic Convention) or to do violence to the system, really or symbolically (destroying draft files).

* * * * *

The cop is an enemy, but the enemy has to be attacked tactically. If you are alone with a cop there is nothing to gain from talking back to him. All the power is in his hands.

This concept is also applied to the courtroom, as shown by the following extracts from the section on "Trial Strategy":

Legal technicalities have also been used to delay final judgment on a case until the political situation changed to the defendant's benefit. After the Columbia University busts, the defense lawyers stalled until the new University administration was appointed, which dropped the complaints against five hundred of the students.

* * * * *

One purpose of a political-legal defense is to use the courtroom as a classroom and teach about the role of law and courts in the United States. The defense can be conducted so as to reveal what, in fact, is on trial.

* * * * *

A political-legal defense can also stimulate political activity. The trial of four leaders of the Buffalo movement led to mass rallies on the University of Buffalo campus and raised fists in the courtroom protesting the sentencing of the one defendant found guilty.

The revolutionary intent of the book's anonymous authors is underlined forcefully in the introduction, which states:

The cop and the judge wear different uniforms, but they both serve the same system we seek to destroy.

This section of the book is replete with expressions of contempt for legal authority as merely another "apparatus for the preservation of the status quo—a society based on race and class exploitation." In the section on "Trial Strategy" this theme is reechoed:

It's important to bear in mind . . . that courts maintain the existing social order. They are not neutral arbiters of conflict, but part of the coercive apparatus of the people with power. They remove people from action, imprison them or tie them up in defense.

This emphasis is, interestingly quite similar to that in a pamphlet published many years ago by the International Labor Defense, a prominent Communist Party legal defense organization. The pamphlet, "Under Arrest," contained the following passage:

The worker must also understand that courts are not impartial, any more than any other agency of capitalist government is impartial. Those who drag the worker into court do so because they know that the court will serve the bosses and not the worker.

To summarize the point: the workers must see through the sham and ceremony, and recognize the capitalist court as a class enemy—as a weapon in the bosses' hands, with which to suppress workers' militancy. The worker must train himself to bring the class struggle into the court room into which he was dragged by the bosses' servants.

Another parallel between the two books is to be found in their respective statements of one of the aims to be pursued in a trial situation. The "Bust Book" states:

It is very important to break down the god-like aura that surrounds the judge and the entire legal system.

Compare that with the following passage taken from the ILD pamphlet:

Once and for all, it is necessary to destroy the illusions that workers have concerning courts and court procedure generally.

The "dignity" and "sanctity" of the courts are a means of paralyzing the struggle of the workers against capitalist institutions.

In a section devoted to detailed instructions on how to prepare for a demonstration, including preparation for possible violence, there appear recommendations of groups to be contacted in the event medical or legal assistance is needed. The medical group recommended is the Medical Committee for Human Right—MCHR—one of whose leading figures, Dr. Quentin Young, of Chicago, refused to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party last October during hearings conducted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on the disruption of the August 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. The legal organizations listed include two officially cited as Communist controlled: the National Lawyers Guild—NLG—and the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee — ECLC — now known as the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee—NECLC.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly evident that the objectives of Students for a Democratic Society are not reforms brought about by legal, constitutional means. This publication reveals the intent to destroy the concept of respect for the law.

QUALITY OF MAIL SERVICE

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Thursday, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) is displeased over the quality of his mail service.

It seems that the distinguished gentleman has experienced difficulty in communicating with and obtaining information from the Postmaster General of the United States, Mr. Winton Blount, as to the identity of the individuals chosen to serve on Mr. Blount's widely trumpeted Regional Selection Board—one of 15 boards designed to end all boards in the Post Office Department. I, too, am interested in the St. Louis Regional Board because it purportedly serves Iowa as well as Missouri, and the Ozarks.

The gentleman from Missouri was properly upset over his inability to obtain the list from the Postmaster General after having tried repeatedly, beginning back on May 26. He even uttered a disparaging remark or two at Mr. Blount's inability to negotiate the distance from 12th and Pennsylvania to the southwest corner of Capital Hill by mail, telephone, messenger, telegraph, semaphore, or smoke signal.

My friend even longed for a return of that noble institution, the Pony Express, which, he said, delivered the mail from St. Joseph, Mo., to Sacramento, Calif., in 8 or 9 days through Indian country—bristling with repeating rifles and tomahawks.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to embarrass the gentleman from Missouri, but I believe he has underestimated the Postmaster General. While he has been striving mightily to get that list of five names since May 26, I had been trying to get it since May 21. Beginning almost a full week earlier than the gentleman from Missouri, by numerous means and at numerous times I also attempted to break through the curtain of silence that surrounds the Postmaster General. I employed the facilities of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. I turned to Western Union. I even used the U.S. mail.

It did not occur to me that the Reverend Abernathy's mules might still be in the vicinity and that I might have revived the Pony Express.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it should be sufficient to say that from the House floor Thursday the gentleman from Missouri accomplished in minutes what he had been unable to accomplish in more than 2 months—a list of the names he sought. And the gentleman from Iowa was left in the lurch—he got his list 3 minutes later.

OBSCENITY HEARINGS SCHEDULED

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

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary announces that public hearings on legislation to curb the dissemination of obscene matter have been scheduled to begin on Thursday, September 25, at 10 a.m., in room 2141 Rayburn House Office Building. The initial days of the subcommittee's hearings will be devoted to receiving the testimony of congressional authors and cosponsors of legislation.

The Members know the wide public interest that has been engendered by the problem of obscenity and its apparent mushroom growth of late. The committee's files reflect an upsurge of anger at what appears to be a growing volume of obscene material moving in commerce and through the mail.

This has reflected itself also in the introduction of legislation and requests for hearings by Members of the House. More than 140 separate bills introduced or cosponsored by more than 175 Members have been referred to this subcommittee. A substantial number of related measures, dealing primarily with the use of the postal service for the dissemination of obscenity, are simultaneously pending in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which has also scheduled hearings on the measures before it. By message to Congress, dated May 5, 1969, the President requested three items of anti-obscenity legislation. These have been introduced. Two are pending in our subcommittee and will be part of our study, and the third is pending in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Substantial and important questions of public policy and of constitutional law are involved in the issues raised by the pending legislation. The subcommittee is determined to cope constructively with these questions and to make use of all available relevant data. It is expected that the imminent publication of an interim report by the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography will provide valuable material for the subcommittee's study. The Commission has the duty:

First, with the aid of leading constitutional law authorities, to analyze the laws pertaining to the control of obscenity and pornography; and to evaluate and recommend definitions of obscenity and pornography;

Second, to ascertain the methods employed in the distribution of obscene and pornographic materials and to explore the nature and volume of traffic in such materials;

Third, to study the effect of obscenity and pornography upon the public, and particularly minors, and its relationship to crime and other antisocial behavior; and

Fourth, to recommend such legislative, administrative, or other advisable and appropriate action as the Commission deems necessary to regulate effectively the flow of such traffic, without in any way interfering with constitutional rights.

The Members may be assured of the conscientious attention of the subcommittee to this challenging legislative problem.

UNDERPRIVILEGED HARDEST HIT IN PUBLIC TRANSIT DECLINE

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

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, a steady decline in public transit has increased difficulties for the poor, the aged, the very young, the handicapped and the socially isolated who cannot afford or readily use private automobile transportation. The hardest hit are actually the underprivileged elements of our society.

The inner city represents the city's greatest and most volatile variable, which affects every segment of our society. One of the most glaring inadequacies of our cities—which plays an important role in aggravating other problems—is in the area of public transportation. Public transportation has declined since the end of World War II for a variety of reasons; this decline has had a number of results, perhaps the most important being the steady increase of the private vehicle for urban transportation.

Although the automobile will continue to play an important role in our everyday lives, more are beginning to recognize that additional miles of freeways between cities is not the answer to solving the urban crisis. This is not to mention the price we must pay in automobile congestion and delay, air pollution, and haphazard land use practices.

The answer is in taking a whole new look at public transportation and finding a new approach to solving this crisis. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to step in and help private industry, local and State government, do the things that have been left undone for the past 25 years.

This means a Federal program must be designed on a long-term, permanent basis to offer a degree of security for planning and construction purposes.

I believe there is no greater problem facing this Nation than that of public transportation in our cities, both large and small.

Therefore, I am convinced a public transportation bill such as the President has proposed can be an impressive stride toward convenient, comfortable and reasonably priced public transportation service for our ever increasing urbanized population. I am glad he has recognized the need, taken the initiative and pledged the strong support of the administration for finding a balanced, sensible, and thoroughly planned solution.

PROHIBITION OF DEMONSTRATIONS AT THE PENTAGON

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, when the military construction authorization bill was before the House on Tuesday, it contained a section designed to protect Pentagon officials from harassment by pickets and demonstrators.

Recently, in an editorial, the Washington Post spoke out against this provision calling it constitutionally indefensible. In keeping with its usual indifference to the essential facts, the Washington Post editorial completely overlooks the fact that the original language of this prohibition was not only drafted by the Supreme Court, but was later held by the Supreme Court itself to be constitutional.

After quoting only a part of the section approved by the House, the Washington Post repeats the rather naive charge that a Congressman would be in technical violation of the section if he came to the Pentagon to discuss keeping a military installation in his district. With its usual ability to report only half the truth, the Washington Post fails to say that the section also requires that any attempt to "influence" Pentagon officials must be accompanied by picketing or parading in order to be in violation of the prohibition.

The language of this section, as overwhelmingly endorsed by the House, reads as follows:

Whoever, with the intent of interfering with, obstructing, or impeding the administration of justice or the conduct of military and defense affairs, or with the intent of influencing any judge, juror, witness, or court officer, or military or civilian employees of the Defense Department, in the discharge of his duty, pickets or parades in or near a building or residence occupied or used by such judge, juror, witness, or court officer, or in the Pentagon building or on Federally owned property appurtenant thereto, or with such intent uses any sound-truck or similar device or resorts to any other demonstration in or near any such building or residence, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Nothing in this section shall interfere with or prevent the exercise by any court of the United States of its power to punish for contempt. Nothing in this section shall interfere with or prevent the exercise of all other, available, civil and criminal remedies.

A simple reading of this section makes clear that the intent "to obstruct, interfere or influence" must be accompanied by the act of "picketing, parading, or using a sound truck" in order to constitute a violation of the proposed statute.

Thus, the only thing the House action does is to extend to Pentagon officials the same protection from harassment now provided judges, jurors, witnesses, and other court officials. Surely, the heart of our national security system deserves the same level of protection afforded our judicial officials.

If this is treason, 323 Members of the House are guilty.

The Washington Post forgets that the House speaks for all of the people of America—I have often wondered whose "cause" the Washington Post is attempting to espouse, or whose country.

The editorial referred to follows:

LEGISLATIVE HITCHHIKING

The days just before Congress takes off for a vacation are the golden days for legislative hijacking. Like an airplane bound for Pensacola but diverted at gunpoint to Havana, a bill intended to authorize or finance some vital program may, more pacifically, be subverted by an innocent-looking rider toward an entirely different destination. This is precisely what befell the otherwise admirable federal aid to education appropriation when the destructive Whitten amendment was tacked onto it last week. And on Tuesday it happened to the Military Construction Authorization bill through the attachment of an amendment aimed at kicking Quakers off the steps of the Pentagon for speaking their minds about the war.

The amendment, or rider, provides a year in jail or a $5,000 fine for anyone who, "with the intent of influencing any judge, juror, witness, or court officer, or military or civilian employee of the Defense Department, in the discharge of his duty, pickets or parades in or near a building or residence occupied or used by such judge, juror, witness, or court officer, or in the Pentagon building or on federally owned property appurtenant thereto, or with such intent uses any sound truck or similar device or resorts to any other demonstration in or near such building or residence."

The people who supported this rider—and the vote against Rep. Robert L. Leggett's proposal to strike it was beaten 145 to 43—must have been devoid either of all imagination or of all scruples about the United States Constitution. The sweep of this prohibition is breathtaking. One wonders, as Rep. Otis Pike pointed out, how any Congressman could now dare to try to influence anybody in the Pentagon to keep a military installation in his district. In the Capital of a democracy the essential business of which is influencing government officials, this rider amounts to a barefaced effort to forbid the democratic process.

Picketing, parading, other forms of demonstration are, of course, aspects of the free expression guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution. When they are peaceful and do not interfere with the rights of others or with the orderly operation of the government, they are part of the free-

dom to petition the government which the First Amendment also safeguards. But as the American Civil Liberties Union emphasized, this "ban on any and all picketing, parading, use of sound trucks, or resort to any other demonstration applies without regard to the time, place or manner of the person or persons involved."

The rider is constitutionally indefensible, in addition, of course, on grounds of vagueness. It forbids at the Pentagon what the courts just recently have ruled cannot be forbidden at the White House or at the Capitol. What we have here, patently, is another instance of gross irresponsibility in the House—passage of a preposterous measure as a form of flag-waving on the assumption that the Senate can be counted on to kill it or that the courts will declare it invalid. The House dishonors itself by such irresponsibility.

RATE TREATMENT OF NATURAL GAS PIPELINES

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

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 30, 1969, in reintroducing my bill—H.R. 5492—to help rectify the rate treatment of the natural gas pipeline industry by the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act, I set forth some data indicating the mounting difficulties confronting the industry during recent years. In January, it was feasible to carry this data only through calendar 1967, but it is now feasible and desirable to carry most of this data forward through 1968.

As we all know, the process of general price inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, has increased greatly from 1965 forward. This price advance averaged 2.9 percent from 1965 to 1967, and was 4.2 percent from 1967 to 1968. From December 1968 to June 1969, the Consumer Price Index advanced at an annual rate of about 6.3 percent.

As I indicated in January, this trend poses an unfair and inequitable squeeze upon the natural gas pipeline industry, in that the Federal Power Commission, in its treatment of rates charged by the gas pipeline companies, still refuses to make any allowance for inflation and the declining value of the dollar. In fact, these pipeline rates declined 1.5 percent from 1965 to 1966, 0.6 percent from 1966 to 1967, and 0.3 percent from 1967 to 1968. The average annual decline in these rates during 1960–68 was 0.6 percent, while the average annual increase in the Consumer Price Index was 2.0 percent.

It is true that the foregoing declines in prices received by the gas pipeline industry reflected in some measure FPC-ordered reductions in prices received by the gas producers. But putting aside the fact that such price declines at the producer level contributed to the increasing shortage in gas supply, the declines in prices received by gas pipeline companies in consequence of FPC regulation—even after allowance for the reductions in producer prices—were grossly undesirable, particularly in view of the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar during the same years. This regulatory policy explains the adverse trends in growth of gas pipeline sales, investments, and income as I depict these today, bearing so unfavorably upon the capabilities of the gas pipeline companies to render optimum service to the consumer.

This is because the FPC gives no recognition to the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar when fixing rates for pipeline companies. This puts the pipeline industry in the same position of a man who bought a house for $10,000 in 1945. The house is much like the industry's investment in the plant facilities required to supply natural gas to the consumer. The man's house today would probably be valued at $20,000. Suppose he wanted to rent the house. He would charge rent on the basis that the house was worth $20,000, and would figure his rate of return from the rental accordingly. But, what if a Government agency told him he could not because his original investment was only $10,000 and he must base his rent on that figure—less depreciation. He would probably sell the house, invest his money in 7-percent short-term Government bills or 8½-percent pipeline bonds, and so forth, and be ahead financially.

As difficult as that is to imagine, it is nonetheless the actual situation being faced daily by the pipeline industry.

During 1960–68, the net physical volume of gas sales by the industry grew at an average annual rate of only 5.5 percent, compared with an average annual growth rate of 8 percent during 1953–60. This extremely adverse trend set in, despite the fact that the real growth rate of the U.S. economy averaged annually twice as high during the later period as during the earlier period.

These adverse trends within the industry have occurred despite the fact that gas is offered to the consumer at much lower prices than those for competitive fuels. For examples, in 1967—comprehensive 1968 data still not being available—based on the average home being heated with gas in Brooklyn, N.Y., the average fuel cost per season would have been 26 percent higher if heated with fuel oil, 34 percent higher if heated by coal, and 166 percent higher if heated by electricity. On a similar basis, in Detroit, fuel oil would have cost 64 percent more, coal 52 percent more, and electricity 265 percent more. In Washington, D.C., the costs of the same competitive fuels were 23 percent, 44 percent, and 124 percent higher, respectively. In Memphis, they were 135 percent, 49 percent, and 128 percent higher, respectively. In Atlanta, they were 61 percent higher for fuel oil and 250 percent for electricity, with coal not being used. In Seattle, they were 28 percent higher for fuel oil and 43 percent higher for electricity, with coal 9 percent lower than gas.

It is thus clear that the reason why gas sales have experienced such adverse growth trends during the more recent years is not that the price has been too high, but rather that prices and rates of return have been forced too low by the regulatory processes to promote the growth in investment in plant and technology and research which, as we all know, is necessary to optimize sales. The average annual rate of advance in investment in plant and equipment, on the part of the natural gas pipelines, was only 2.7 percent during 1960–68, compared with 9.3 percent during 1953–60. During the later period, the average annual rate of advance was 7.1 percent in total manufacturing, and 7.7 percent in all U.S. industries.

As a causal factor in these adverse trends in gas pipeline investment, the average annual rate of growth in net income after taxes within the gas pipeline industry declined from 11.4 during 1953–60 to 7.9 percent during 1960–68. In the later period, the average annual rate of advance in net income after taxes was 8.2 percent in all U.S. industries—including depressed and retarded industries—and 9.8 percent in total manufacturing.

As the natural gas pipeline industry has an almost uniquely high ratio of debt to total capital, the industry has been hurt more severely than possibly any other industry, by the tremendous upward spiral in interest rates, with only minor interruptions, since 1952. It is estimated that, from 1953 through 1967—1968 not yet available—the cost of rising interest rates has imposed an additional burden of some $610 million upon the industry.

In 1968, the actual operating income of the industry was $722.2 million. Actual operating income is total operating revenue less operating expenses and all taxes. It has been professionally estimated that the industry in that year needed more than $909 million of operating income to optimize investment and service to the consumer. It is further estimated that, by 1977, if current regulatory practices continue without alleviation, the industry will receive only about $1,223 million of operating income, contrasted with the almost $1,700 million that would be needed in that year to optimize investment and service to the consumer, even assuming from 1968 forward that the general price level rises only at an average annual rate of 2 percent a year, which is much less than anticipated by most competent analysts.

For all of these reasons, during 1960–68, the prudent and informed investor has downgraded the relative worth of investment in gas pipeline securities compared with many other securities, resulting in relatively less price appreciation, lower ratings, and increasing difficulty in obtaining adequate debt or equity capital at reasonably competitive costs.

As I earlier pointed out, my bill to adjust the rate base after 1968 to take account of changes in the purchasing power of the dollar would have an almost inconsequential effect upon prices paid by the individual consumer. On the assumption of an average annual increase of 2.0 percent in the Consumer Price Index from the base year 1968 to 1977, the average annual weekly cost to the consumer, spread over a period of 52 weeks, would rise from year to year by only six-tenths of a cent to 1¾ cents, depending upon the city. Thus, in 1977, the average weekly cost would be only 5⅗ cents to 15⅘ cents higher than in

1968. Taking into account the application of the formula—but not rate changes occasioned for other reasons—it would take about 8 years for the prices received by the gas pipeline companies to return to the 1960 level, and, by that time, consumer prices in general would be about 37 percent higher than they were in 1960—with a corresponding decline in the purchasing power of the dollar.

The absence of affirmative FPC action to make allowances for inflation and for the declining value of the dollar in determining prices received by the gas pipeline companies, as such prices bear upon the coverage of rapidly rising imbedded debt costs, and particularly upon return to equity, is illustrated by the following:

In Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Co., opinion No. 543 issued July 19, 1968, particularly mimeo page 14 thereof, the Commission stated:

> The Commission is well aware that the financial market has been undergoing severe strain in the recent months and that this had had an impact on the pipeline industry. This is reflected most obviously, of course, in the rising interest rates, which have already had a substantial impact on Panhandle's imbedded debt costs. Nevertheless, we do not believe it would be appropriate to base any part of an allowance on an assumption that an inflationary spiral will continue *since this would be pure speculation.*

In Panhandle opinion No. 543–A, particularly mimeo page 2, the Commission stated:

> Panhandle contends that we have given no tangible recognition to the loss in purchasing power of the return dollars due to inflation. This contention is another facet of the "fair value" argument disposed of in the *Hope* case. We see no reason to dwell on it further.

In Northern Natural Gas Co., examiner's decision issued April 16, 1969—RP69–1—particularly mimeo page 21, the examiner stated:

> In the Examiner's judgment it is unnecessary to consider further Northern's contentions in regard to the alleged loss of purchasing power of return dollars due to inflation because, as stated in the Opinion and Order denying a rehearing in the *Panhandle case*, "This contention is another facet of the 'fair value' argument disposed of in the *Hope* case. We see no reason to dwell on it further."

In my opinion the Commission is committing a serious error in refusing to recognize inflation in rate cases coming before it, in reliance on the old Hope case, which was decided in 1944, in an era of relative economic stability and, more particularly, since in that case the Court stated—page 203:

> Nor is it important to this case to determine the various permissible ways in which any rate base on which the return is computed might be arrived at.

More than that, the gas pipeline industry is now being burdened with the responsibility to live under an unduly repressive price policy because the rate of general price inflation and the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar have been accelerating so greatly from 1966 to date. Following this proposition to its logical conclusion, the more the general price level goes up and the more the purchasing power of the dollar declines, the further the pipeline companies will be removed from any fair allowance based upon these trends. Never to my knowledge, in rational efforts to combat inflation, which I applaud, has such an unjust proposition been advanced and put into effect. This trend within the FPC is evidenced in the presiding examiner's initial decision of June 17, 1969, in the Algonquin Gas Transmission Co. case, docket No. RP69–14, where, in a cavalier fashion, the examiner dismissed Algonquin's contention that the impact of inflation must be faced or substantial cost or damage would be done to enterprises adversely affected thereby, predicating his action in this regard on the ground that these contentions are infelicitously timed, since the Nixon administration is taking steps to control inflation, increased prices will stimulate inflation, holding prices in line relates to the problem of controlling inflation, and stating as a conclusion:

> There is no reason why utilities like Algonquin should not assume part of the responsibility for curbing inflation.

The most recent FPC rate decision was issued on July 16, 1969, in Florida Gas Transmission Co., and others, opinion No. 561, docket Nos. RP69–2, and others. While the Commission did allow an overall return of 7.25 percent, this allowance is substantially below the current prime rate of 8.5 percent and below the experienced cost of current debt money to some pipeline companies which is in excess of 8.5 percent. Obviously, the Commission's action in Florida does not give appropriate recognition to the fact of inflation. Thus, every dollar invested today at costs higher than the return allowed by the Commission necessarily reduces the amount of dollars remaining for investors to assume the risks of the enterprise.

The failure of the Federal Power Commission, in the foregoing recent rate cases, to allow an adequate return on natural gas pipeline companies' investments demonstrates forcefully that the natural gas pipeline industry cannot expect any assistance from the Federal Power Commission in treating with the realities of our present economic life and makes clear the need for resort to and legislative action by the Congress if this major American industry is not to be seriously hampered in serving the public interest.

As trends through 1968, and on into 1969, have increasingly confronted the natural gas pipeline industry with a situation which is so highly inimical to its capabilities to provide optimum service to the consuming public, and to bring to that public the tremendous costs advantages which gas offers, I urge that H.R. 5492 be scheduled for committee hearings as soon as possible, and that it be acted upon favorably by the committee and by the Congress at the earliest feasible date.

THE AGONY OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA—1 YEAR LATER

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year ago on August 21, 1968, the combined forces of the Soviet Union and several of the Warsaw Pact nations invaded Czechoslovakia to extinguish the forces groping toward freedom there. In a partial reenactment of Munich, Communist German troops crossed the borders of Czechoslovakia in company with units of the Red army, the Polish army, and the Hungarian army. In spite of the fact that the Czechs offered no armed resistance, at least 23 persons were killed and scores injured in the first day of the invasion by nervous Soviet soldiers. Today a Soviet army of occupation still sits in Czech army barracks in order to insure that the Czechs hew to the Moscow line.

What are the lessons to be learned from this tragic event? There are several myths that need to be laid to rest, in my view. First, the myth that the Soviet Union invaded Czechoslovakia in order to prevent the development of a "humane" or more liberal form of socialism in Czechoslovakia. A better case can be made that the Soviets invaded because of the emergence of anticommunism, particularly among the young people of the nation.

As a result of the Soviet invasion, a serious "generation gap" has arisen in Czechoslovakia. The older people are not inclined to challenge the autocratic government; whereas the young cannot envisage a whole life ahead of them under communism.

Second, the rape of Czechoslovakia should also lay to rest the theory that Communist nations become more liberal as their economies improve. Communist Czechoslovakia became restless as their economy dipped to its lowest ebb since World War II. In other words the unbalanced trade they were and are forced to carry on with the Soviet Union and Comecon so impoverished them as to cause discontent which led many Czechs to conclude that Marxian economics are bankrupt.

Third, the theory that the Soviet Union has mellowed and can be now expected to live up to international agreements. This myth should certainly now be seriously questioned. As we prepare again to sit down with the Soviets and seek to negotiate arms limitation agreements possibly involving the ABM, we should look well at the evidence and not be deceived by wishful thinking, or their *pious statements.*

Last of all, we as a nation should continuously express our outrage over this diminution of freedom in the world. Communism does not change in any basic sense. It will not tolerate dissent of any kind, whether it be irreverent writings by Daniel and Sinyavsky or the longing of the Czech people for freedom and the right to enjoy the fruits of their labors. Having been in Prague last year shortly after the invasion, I can only say that my heart goes out to the Czech people.

APPROVAL OF THREE SISTERS BRIDGE REMOVES DULLES ACCESS BOTTLENECK

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the approval of the Three Sisters Bridge and the mass transit project by the City Council. This bridge was the brunt of much criticism which was often undeserved. Much of the controversy centered around the resulting freeway system and the displacement of parks and existing homes.

However, approval of the Three Sisters has removed a rather large bottleneck in the access route to Dulles International Airport. This is a prime objective. I am hopeful that we can now proceed in an orderly fashion to complete Interstate 66 from the beltway through to Three Sisters and Roosevelt Bridges. This project must be on the planning books before the link with the Dulles access road can be completed to Interstate 66 at Falls Church.

This program is vital. Not only will we shave 10 to 15 minutes off the travel time to Dulles, but, by making the trip out more attractive, we can curb the air traffic at National Airport and shift it to Dulles. This will vastly eliminate the air pollution, the traffic congestion and the air safety problems now plaguing the overcrowded facilities at National.

I would ask that all governmental agencies involved—State and Federal—work closely to get this access to Dulles underway as fast as possible.

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

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Texas for his remarks and I congrateulate him. He realizes, along with many Members of this House, that the location of Dulles Airport was predicated on the construction of a river crossing approximately at the position of the proposed Three Sisters Bridge. Because we do not have the Three Sisters Bridge, the additional access to Dulles Airport which would be provided through this highway, the airport has not been utilized to the fullest extent possible. As a result, a facility paid for with the taxpayers' money is not being fully used. To the extent air traffic is not diverted to Dulles from National we shall have jet noise and air pollution from jets along the Potomac Valley.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, may I say in addition to the gentleman, we already have the rights of way available for the link with the Falls Church connection with Interstate 66.

What we need to do now is to get that built, so that it can tie in with the rest of Route 66, that should go into the Three Sisters Bridge. This will mean a great deal to relieve traffic on the ground and in the air throughout this whole area, and we must get started on it immediately.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman.

SUSIE BAKER FOUNTAIN

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great and gracious lady, a dedicated private citizen and a loyal and devoted American; the late Mrs. Susie Baker Fountain of Blue Lake, Calif., and more recently, of Berkeley.

Mrs. Fountain is known on the north coast of California as "Humboldt County's own historian laureate" and, as such, was a lady who was deeply involved with the history of a community and studied and worked many hours to help us learn of the pioneers and the blood, sweat and tears they shed in building this State of California.

Susie Baker arrived in Blue Lake in 1912 from Nebraska and returned there briefly to finish her senior year at the University of Nebraska. She graduated with a bachelor's degree in mathematics and was installed into the honorary scholastic society, Phi Beta Kappa, as the only woman in the class of 1913. In 1914, she entered the newly opened Humboldt Normal School—now Humboldt State College in Arcata, Calif.—and was that institution's first graduate the following year.

She was married in 1915 to the late Eugene Fountain and, except for a short period in San Francisco, they lived in Arcata until moving to Blue Lake in 1931.

Mrs. Fountain began studying Humboldt County history as a hobby in 1947 and became a very dedicated and knowledgeable student. When she and her husband moved to Berkeley in 1966, she donated to HSC Library, books that covered more than 75 feet of shelf space, containing over 400 full, annotated three-ring notebooks, 100 large envelopes of clippings from early county newspapers and eight cartons of old maps and photographs.

Mrs. Fountain did intensive in-depth research into local history. She was president of the Humboldt County Historical Society, vice president of the Clarke Museum Board of Directors, recognized by the Huntington Library and a privileged member of the California Historical Society.

Humboldt County's historian laureate was the foremost authority on that county's heritage and history. In fact, her research was so complete and scholarly that it was never doubted to the extent, that, what she wrote was readily accepted by all.

Mrs. Fountain has lived her life fully and in so doing, has enriched the lives of those who personally knew her and those who will profit and benefit from her wealth of knowledge and research.

While all of us who knew and admired Susie Baker Fountain will miss her greatly, her memory and the contribution she made to her community will live on forever.

THE VOYAGE OF APOLLO 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we are now 22 days into the new era that began when man first set foot upon the Moon.

With the voyage of Apollo 11, we have clearly demonstrated that man need not and will not be confined forever to his home planet, Earth. And that demonstration has been strengthened by the wonderful pictures of Mars returned from Mariner 6 and Mariner 7.

Mankind's great leap forward has been taken with brilliant success. Unbelievable as it still seems, two of our fellow men, two of our fellow countrymen, have walked upon the surface of the Moon.

That splendid photograph of their footprints, beneath the Stars and Stripes, is one of the most eloquent and moving documents of all time. I know that many Members of this House shared with me the joy of great achievement as we watched our astronauts walking—and working—on the Moon.

Much well-deserved praise has already been spoken for the three astronauts who made this journey, and for all who conceived, sponsored, and led this great Apollo program.

Due recognition has been given to the great men of the past, in many lands, who have helped prepare the way. And we have noted with satisfaction that this has been a great team effort on the part of Government, industry, and the universities, made possible by the American system of free enterprise and carried out openly in full view of all the world.

Today, I want to make special reference to the leadership displayed by the House in 1958 in helping to create the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This was the result of work of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration chaired by Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who, as majority leader, played a principal role in enacting the Space Act into law.

I wish especially to recall the leading role played by this House in urging the Nation and its leaders to undertake the Apollo program and in supporting it faithfully in time of trouble as well as triumph, over so many years.

I wish to refer particularly to the pioneering work done by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics in getting the Nation to set its sights on the Moon in this decade.

The committee labored for months in the first half of 1960 to help sharpen this Nation's definition of our goals in space. On July 5, 1960, it submitted to the house a report entitled "Space, Missiles, and the Nation."

In this report some very important and foreseeing recommendations were made, including two I wish to emphasize today:

First, it recommended that development of the giant F–1 rocket engine be expedited; it was this engine, in a cluster of five, that lifted Apollo 11 off the pad at Cape Kennedy on July 16. Without the kind of power generated by the F–1 engine there would have been no Apollo program and no American leadership in space today.

Second, on July 6, 1960, more than 10 months before President Kennedy's historic message to Congress on space goals, the committee recommended, and I quote:

A high priority program should be undertaken to place a manned expedititon on the moon *this decade.*

I wish here to make this important point: great national achievements in space, as elsewhere, require both strong Presidential leadership and strong congressional support. There is no substitute for either.

President Kennedy could not have acted so boldly in 1961 without confidence that he would have the support of Congress.

The committee's recommendations on the lunar landing goal in 1960 were but one of many acts of leadership in the House in the long years of legislative scrutiny and legislative action that went into making Apollo a success.

I should mention particularly the searching examination given to the Apollo program by House and Senate committees after the tragic fire in 1967. Not only were they able to help NASA to improve safety procedures; they were also able to help restore national confidence in the program and get it rolling again, so that the landing could be made on time, in this decade, and ahead of our able and ambititous competitors.

But I do not want to dwell too long on accomplishments of the past, or even on the brilliant successes of the present. Nevertheless, the space program constitutes the leading edge of technological progress in this country.

In addition, countless scientific achievements have been made during this first decade in space. Advancing scientific knowledge and pressing forward the state of the art in technology has more than justified our expenditures to date.

Despite the many contributions of the space effort thus far, I am convinced that the greatest harvest will occur in the future. Therefore, it seems to me essential that the Nation continue to invest in space research, and I predict the space effort will produce many dramatic gains in the quality of life here on Earth.

Today, I want to stress the new leadership responsibilities this House has to help chart our Nation's future course in space.

We have now come to another great divide in our national history, another decision point on our road into space, such as we faced in 1960 and 1961. We face the challenge of setting new goals, of maintaining our hard-won space strength, of using wisely our great new space capabilities acquired in the Apollo program.

In 1960, the Committee on Science and Astronautics acted boldly and wisely when it called for a manned lunar landing in this decade.

I understand very well the enthusiasm of those who draw on the experience of 1961 and propose a manned landing on Mars as our next great national goal. I also understand very well how important the goal and commitment called for by President Kennedy were to the final success of the Apollo program.

But I do not at this time wish to commit ourselves to a specific time period for setting sail for Mars. I believe that there are many tasks that can be accomplished that will ultimately provide that capability, but will be less costly and will be necessary in meeting short-term objectives.

I urge instead that we concentrate first on a well-chosen set of intermediate steps and give the Mars goal a great deal more study before we decide if, how, and when we should take this next great leap forward for mankind.

Do not misunderstand. I am not against going to Mars or elsewhere in the solar system when the time to begin such a great undertaking has come. I think we have the technical ability to undertake such missions without undue strain before the end of the century, and possibly much sooner.

And I am sure that when the time comes we will make the first decisions and firm commitments necessary to carry out such great programs efficiently and successfully. But I urge no such decisions or commitments now.

Today, I urge a course that may be more difficult—because it is less glamorous and less exciting but in many ways no less demanding. I urge that we concentrate on the intermediate steps that must be taken to meet our most pressing national needs in space.

Now that the manned lunar landing mission has been accomplished, our goal for the next decade should be to achieve a balanced program, one that fully exploits the great potential of unmanned spacecraft, while at the same time maintaining a vigorous manned flight program.

There are at least five very important things that must be worked on now, so that we can decide wisely about other long-range goals later on:

First. We must continue exploration of the Moon, and gain the vital experience of operating a base for science and exploration on another heavenly body.

Second, We must carry out the Apollo applications program as now planned, with flights beginning in 1972; and we must move on to the establishment of our first long-range, long-term space station in Earth orbit, supported by a new kind of low-cost space shuttle rocket for bringing up fresh crews and supplies.

Third. I believe greater emphasis must be placed upon the development of applications satellite systems, those which have the greatest potential for economic return in the near term. In addition, a larger portion of the space budget should be designated for unmanned planetary exploration, an area in which the United States may soon be overshadowed by the Soviet Union which has made, and continues to make, a vastly greater effort.

Fourth. We must continue with the development of the Nerva nuclear-powered rocket engine, because this will greatly increase our capabilities for space propulsion, and improved propulsion is a key to space leadership and further advances in space.

Fifth. We must continue to take full advantage of the practical benefits to be had from Earth-orbiting spacecraft, with special emphasis on Earth resources survey satellites which promise to yield so much in benefits to agriculture and industry.

Continued activity in all of these fields will enable us to hold together our great space team with challenging and rewarding assignments. We will also be adding significantly to our space capabilities, and, depending on the pace at which we move, we should be able to maintain our space leadership.

The recent spectacular successes in the space program can be traced back to investments made several years ago.

Unfortunately, the space budget has declined each year since 1965 due to other urgent demands on the Nation's resources unrelated to the merits of our space program.

Employment in the space program reached its peak of 450,000 in 1965; today fewer than 200,000 people are working in the space effort.

I would hope that this trend could be reversed and that it will be possible to increase the space budget incrementally during the next few years. In my judgment, the present level of effort is not sufficient to support a viable space program during the 1970's, and our investment in space research and development should be increased.

As Members of the House well know, the President has a task force at work preparing recommendations for the national space program in the post-Apollo period; that is, the years immediately ahead.

This task group is chaired by the Vice President. The Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of NASA, and the President's science adviser are the principal participants. Their recommendations are to be submitted to the President in September.

These recommendations, and the decisions the President makes on them, will, of course, be reflected in the budget submitted to Congress next January. In congressional action on the fiscal year 1971 budget, very important decisions concerning this Nation's future in space will have to be made.

I do not want to anticipate today what the task group will recommend or what the President's decisions on their recommendations will be. I do want to point out that the main outlines of a strong future program, at least for the next several years, have already been given the NASA budget request for fiscal year 1970, which is still before the Congress.

A great deal has been said and written lately about the impending completion of space programs for the sixties and the lack of new goals for the future. But some of these reports have been more pessimistic than conditions warrant.

Important decisions still have to be made about long-range programs for the future; but at the same time NASA does have plans, and authorizations, and funds, for a variety of space activities that will keep many people busy over the next several years. This depends, of course, on favorable final action of the NASA appropriation for fiscal year 1970, which is expected.

Let us look for a moment at the currently approved NASA programs:

We have more Apollo flights to the

Moon planned. The last one will probably be flown in 1972. These flights will give us a chance to visit different areas of the Moon, stay longer, and carry out more experiments.

In the Apollo applications program, NASA now plans to outfit the top stage of the Saturn V rocket as a workshop, equip it with telescopes, and place it in Earth orbit in 1972. A crew of three will go into orbit in a separate launch, then occupy the workshop for up to 28 days, or twice as long as man has ever been in space before.

Later, other crews will revisit the workshop and stay in orbit up to 58 days. Activation of this Saturn V workshop is an important intermediate step before establishing a large space station in Earth orbit; and experience with a large space station is an essential preparation for longer ranged missions.

Studies have been and are presently underway to define a large Earth orbiting space station and a reusable, low-cost Earth orbital shuttle transportation system. Early development and operation of prototypes of a shuttle and a space station should be initiated so that the necessary technology will be in hand.

In 1971 two Mariner spacecraft, Mariner 8 and Mariner 9, will go into orbit around Mars and give us a complete map of its surface. In 1973, NASA plans to send two larger and more complex spacecraft to orbit Mars and to send probes down to the surface in search for life and to give us a much better idea of what the surface conditions are. These new spacecraft are called Viking.

Thus, over the next 4 years, we plan to explore Mars with unmanned spacecraft just as some years ago we explored the Moon with unmanned Ranger, Surveyor, and Lunar Orbiter spacecraft before sending men to land there. By the end of 1973 we should have a much better idea about how feasible it will be and how important it will be to land men on Mars in this century.

In the nuclear rockets program, full-scale development of the NERVA reactor and engine will be started in the current fiscal year. The House has voted to proceed at a pace that will provide a flight-ready engine in late 1976.

The NERVA engine is very important, because for many difficult space missions it will about double the payload capacity of the Saturn V rocket, already the most powerful rocket yet demonstrated anywhere in the world. Also, NERVA will provide a deep space capability not now possible with our existing boosters.

NASA has a strong space applications program underway. This program is to improve the technology available for weather, communications, navigation, and geodetic satellites, and to begin development of a new series of satellites called Earth resources technology satellites.

The House authorized a total of $128.4 million for the space applications program for fiscal year 1970. The House has shown especial interest in the Earth resources technology satellite because of the potential benefits it could yield to agriculture and industry.

If this satellite provides only a small increase in our ability to manage world food production better, utilize available water supplies better, find new minerals, protect our forests, develop the food sources of the ocean, and curb pollution, it would pay for itself many times, and possibly even for the entire space program.

These are some of the highlights of currently approved, ongoing programs. I will not go into further detail, but I can say that this is still a well-balanced, ambitious, and exciting mix of space exploration, space science, and space use for the good of man.

I hope I have said enough to indicate that the pessimism of those who think the space program is grinding to a halt is completely unjustified. Granted, the space program will soon need a new lease on life, but for the next few years it will be going strong.

Actually, it may help Members of this House and the public to think of space planning and space activity as going forward in three different phases.

One phase is currently approved programs, which are now underway. These I have just described. These are the programs the public knows best. These are the programs which have reached the flight stage, or soon will.

Another phase is those programs which are under current study, but which have not yet been given the go-ahead. These are programs we would want to carry out in the immediate future, the next 5 or 10 years.

Here we have a number of possibilities to choose from, and because of unavoidable leadtimes we have to choose wisely, and very soon, or our space program will indeed be grinding to a halt.

It is these new programs for the intermediate future which are now under consideration by the President's post-Apollo task force. I hope we will get firm recommendations for new programs for the intermediate future in the President's budget next January.

Here are some decisions about intermediate programs which will have to be made soon:

Do we want to begin work on a large-scale space station in Earth orbit, more or less permanent in nature, with room for 10 or more men, supplied by a new, cheaper shuttle rocket that can be used over and over and land at designated space ports? I suspect the Soviets already have rather advanced plans along these lines.

Do we want to continue exploration of the Moon after the Apollo flights currently planned? Do we want to set up scientific bases on the Moon in the seventies like those we have in the Antarctic?

Do we want to plan for the so-called grand tour to send unmanned spacecraft out past Jupiter, Saturn, and Uranus, taking advantage of a favorable lineup of these outer planets that will not come again for many decades?

Do we want to continue unmanned exploration of Mars and Venus after currently approved missions end in 1973?

Do we want to proceed in the Nerva program to build the actual rocket stage in addition to the reactor and engine which are the only parts currently authorized?

These are all questions of great interest and significance. They will, no doubt, be widely debated. All of our democratic institutions, including Congress, the public information media, and the various scientific organizations, will be put to severe tests in guiding rational public discussion and decision.

The third phase of our space planning has to do with long-range plans, such as: Building our space station in Earth orbit into a space base; setting up semi-permanent bases on the Moon, and undertaking the exploration of our sister planets.

As I have stated earlier, it is too early to make final decisions on such long-range programs now. But it will help, in considering present and intermediate programs, to make sure that they lead us in the general direction of what we may want to be doing, and may need to be doing, in the more distant future.

We must avoid the two extremes. We must avoid the sacrifice of flexibility that would come from premature commitment to distant goals; we must also avoid the indecision and aimless wandering that might result if we had no agreed concept of what, in general, our long-range goals should be.

I think it highly probable that 5, perhaps 10, years from now we may decide that it would be in the national interest to begin a carefully planned program extending over several years to send men to Mars.

In the meanwhile, we have important intermediate steps to take which are justified in their own right and which will give us the necessary base of technology and experience needed to plan the journey.

In planning for our future in space, let us draw wisely on the experience of Apollo. Let us see why the timing was right for a commitment to the Apollo program in 1961.

The timing was right for a national commitment to the Apollo program in 1961 for these principal reasons:

First. The basic technical philosophies for propulsion, reentry, life support, and guidance was generally well in hand, although not yet fully developed.

Second. The primary mission of Apollo in addition to getting to the Moon is also to serve as a focus for the rapid development of American capabilities for manned space flight in Earth orbit and beyond.

Third. The lunar landing in this decade was made a key part of the program because it would probably gain for the United States clear leadership in the Soviet Union, which, of course, it has done.

Fourth. Congress was clearly in the mood to accept the Apollo commitment when President Kennedy proposed it.

Fifth. For a combination of the above reasons, it made sense to begin the Apollo program while certain intermediate steps were still to be carried out. I have in mind such steps as putting our first

astronaut in orbit, which came in the Mercury program in 1962; demonstration of the feasibility of rendezvous in space and long-duration flights, which came in the Gemini program in 1965 and 1966; and the soft landing of Surveyor on the Moon in 1966.

The successful achievement of all our goals in the Apollo program, and its great contribution to the national interest, clearly indicate that it was sound to make the commitment to Apollo when we did, and not after all these intermediate steps had been successfully completed.

Now, drawing on this experience in Apollo, let us see why a commitment to a manned Mars mission would be premature at this time:

First. The basic technology for a Mars mission may be fairly well in hand today, but we clearly need more experience in long-duration flights in Earth orbit, and in operating on the Moon before committing ourselves to sending men on such a long and expensive journey.

For example, it made sense to keep the Apollo 11 astronauts on the Moon for only a few hours, but we should not send men all the way to Mars unless we are prepared for them to spend some weeks or months in exploring the surface.

Second. Unlike Apollo, the primary purpose of a manned Mars mission would not be to develop rapidly new capabilities, but to get to Mars and explore there.

Third. It is not clear at this time that we must commit ourselves to a Mars landing to compete effectively with the Soviet Union for space leadership. The next major advance of the Soviets will probably be in operating large space stations in Earth orbit.

Fourth. Because of the above combination of circumstances, it seems prudent to proceed with such intermediate steps as Earth orbital space stations, low-cost shuttle vehicles, and development of a nuclear-powered rocket stage before making a commitment to such a long-range and expensive program as manned exploration of Mars.

Fifth. There is also the hope that manned exploration of Mars may be made a great international undertaking. It is worth waiting a few years to see if this will be possible. If we concentrate now on the intermediate steps, we are much more likely to induce the Soviet Union to cooperate than if we slack off entirely or launch a Mars mission of our own.

In short, there are vast differences between the shining example of Apollo and the Mars mission to come; the time is not yet ripe for a commitment to a manned Mars landing or any such venture far out in the solar system beyond the Moon; but the time when Mars should be our goal will surely come.

As for now, we should give priority attention to the intermediate steps that must first be taken in Earth orbit, at the Moon, and in developing nuclear-powered rockets.

CHARLES REBOZO—YOU HAVE A FRIEND AT SBA

The SPEAKER pro tempore Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that there is a single Member of this House who, in recent months, has not received correspondence or telephone calls from small businessmen in his district wanting to know why the Small Business Administration is doing so little to help small business.

While our Nation's small businessmen are fighting for their economic lives, the SBA, our Government's direct contact with small businessmen, has been engaged in some of the most questionable activities imaginable. The actions of this agency have so shaken the confidence of small businessmen in the SBA that it is a serious question as to whether or not the damage can ever be repaired.

My office and the Banking and Currency Committee has received hundreds of letters from small businessmen complaining about the Small Business Administration. A typical comment contained in many of the letters is the question—"Why was I denied an SBA loan when the agency is loaning money to the Mafia?"

AN ASTONISHING RECORD

Quite frankly, these letters are difficult, if not impossible, to answer for the recent record of the Small Business Administration is astonishing. Here is a brief sampling of some of the recent actions of the agency:

First. Made loans either directly or indirectly of $560,000 to a New York City automobile and truck leasing company with ties to organized crime and controlled by individuals with long criminal records. When the background of the individuals was discovered, SBA turned its back on the situation and SBA only took action to recall the loans when public pressure was brought to bear.

Second. The agency loaned $100,000 to a Miami, Fla., apartment developer to repair damage to the project caused by hurricanes. The loan was defaulted and there is little chance of recovery. It is reported that the apartment house was used as a command post for a portion of organized crime in Miami and the developer of the project was indicted in connection with a bank fraud. SBA also paid an attorney in connection with disbursing the loan who was a former officer and incorporator of the apartment house project.

Third. The agency made a loan of $135,000 to a professional baseball player whose annual salary exceeds $80,000. The loan carried a low rate of interest since it was disbursed under a program of loans to "disadvantaged persons." To compound the situation, SBA Administrator Hilary Sandoval first questioned the granting of the loan under the "disadvantaged persons" category and chided the field office for making the loan. Later, Mr. Sandoval relented, however, and stated there was nothing irregular with the loan.

This loan was made after Mr. Sandoval assured the Banking and Currency Committee that he was going to "clean-up" the agency and run a tight ship.

Fourth. Albert Fuentes, appointed as a Special Assistant to the Administrator by Mr. Sandoval, was indicted by a Texas grand jury for allegedly shaking down a Small Business Administration loan applicant. Mr. Fuentes was fired by Mr. Sandoval, not for his actions in the alleged shakedown, but rather for disobeying an order of the Administrator while the indictment was pending.

Mr. Sandoval had promised to make certain information concerning Fuentes available to the Banking and Currency Committee but instead had the information impounded by the Justice Department so that he would not have to comply with his promise to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, these actions on the part of SBA set the stage for another Small Business Administration venture that has caused small businessmen throughout the country to question the soundness of SBA. I refer to the Small Business Administration's activities involving Mr. Charles Rebozo of Miami, Fla. In February, it was reported that the Small Business Administration had provided a guarantee of $2.4 million on rent payments for a shopping center Mr. Rebozo was building in Florida. It was further reported that one of the Small Business Administration officials approving the guarantee was the regional director of the Miami office of the Small Business Administration, Mr. Thomas Butler. The Associated Press, on February 6, stated:

> Butler, also a close friend of Rebozo, is the owner of land on an island Rebozo would like to develop as residential or a resort site, and is a charter stockholder in a bank founded and headed by Rebozo.

REBOZO, A PREFERRED CUSTOMER

When these disclosures were made, I stated that I planned an investigation of the matter to see why an individual with such large financial resources as those possessed by Mr. Rebozo was receiving rent guarantees from the Small Business Administration which, at the same time, was turning down hundreds of small business loan applicants throughout the country.

The shopping center deal was not the first time that SBA had done business with Mr. Rebozo. In fact, from 1962 through the present, Mr. Rebozo has been a "preferred customer" of the Small Business Administration. Time and time again, the Miami millionaire has received special favors from the agency even though SBA staff members strongly questioned the concessions being made to Rebozo.

The following memo, prepared by the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee, clearly outlines the special treatment bestowed upon Rebozo by SBA in connection with an $80,000 loan to the Monroe Abstract and Title Co., which he heads:

STAFF MEMO

On January 5, 1962, Mr. Rebozo, in the name of Monroe Abstract and Title Company, 245 Southeast First Street, Miami, Florida, applied for a 75% SBA participation in a $100,000 loan. SBA would be cooperating in the loan with the Merchants Bank of Miami, 950 Southwest 57th Avenue, Miami, Florida. At the time of the application for the loan, Rebozo filed a personal financial statement with SBA listing a net worth in excess of $600,000. He also listed his occupation as "investor". In addition to Mr. Rebozo, who personally guaranteed the loan, there was a second guarantor on the loan, a Mr. Arthur H. Olson, who, at the time of the loan, listed a net worth of more than $131,000. Olson was also an officer as was Rebozo, in Monroe Abstract and Title Company. The purpose

of the loan was to acquire the Monroe County assets of Land Title Company, a competitor of the Monroe Abstract and Title Company. On February 9, 1962, SBA declined the loan and prepared a letter to the participating bank which stated that the loan had been declined for the following reasons:

1. Lack of reasonable assurance of ability to repay loan and other obligations from earnings.

2. Disproportion of loan requested and of debts to tangible net worth before and after loan.

3. Lack of satisfactory evidence that the funds required are not obtainable without undue hardship through utilization of personal credit or resource of the shareholders.

Although the letter declining the loan was written on February 9 to Merchants Bank of Miami, it was never sent, nor was Mr. Rebozo officially notified that his loan application had been denied.

Although the files do not indicate how Mr. Rebozo was notified, he did learn that the loan had been declined and on February 13, 1962, Rebozo visited the SBA offices in Washington to discuss the loan. On February 19, 1962, six days after Mr. Rebozo's trip to Washington, SBA approved an $80,000 loan with a six-year maturity for Rebozo. Since the original loan was made for a six-year term, the maturity has been extended twice. On June 16, 1965, the maturity was extended for two years from 1968 to May of 1970. On July 3, 1968, the maturity was again extended, this time to May 1, 1972. This final extension provides the loan with the maximum maturity allowed under the Small Business Act (10 years).

It should be noted at this point that the final extension came during a period when SBA was refusing loan applications from small businessmen all over the country because they were faced with a critical shortage of lendable funds. It should also be pointed out that the average maturity on SBA loans is slightly over six years. This means that the ten year maturity granted Mr. Rebozo is well above the average maturity.

The circumstances surrounding the Rebozo loan can best be described as strange. Nothing in the SBA files justifies the preferential treatment given Mr. Rebozo. On the contrary, the files are filled with a vast majority of reasons why Mr. Rebozo should not have been given the loan in the first place, nor should the maturity or other favors granted by SBA have been extended to Mr. Rebozo after the loan had been made.

On January 29, 1962, a loan processors' report signed by J. W. Gilbert, Loan Examiner, carries the following information concerning the Rebozo loan:

"Primary stockholder, Charles Rebozo, indicates over $500,000 net worth with over $200,000 in real estate unencumbered. It is felt he could liquidate part of these assets for the loan's purpose. It is also not desirable that SBA furnish $100,000 against applicant's $15,000 to purchase this plant. All factors considered, it is concluded by the loan examiner that a rejection is in order."

On February 7, 1962, William B. Dean, an SBA loan officer, in commenting on the Rebozo loan, stated:

"Expansion of business by purchase of assets of competitor who is pulling out of Monroe County. Why is the profitable business selling to the non-profitable one? It would appear that a lot of duplication would exist in abstract records of both. Purchase would evidently be to prevent competition should someone else buy these records. Abstracting assets listed on books of seller at $32,000.

Projection by applicant on basis of actual sales, etc., for the first seven months of 1961, is reasonable and even without proposed increase of 50 cents per item would apparently generate sufficient cash flow for debt payment.

The main problem seems to be debt plus loan to net worth ratio which could be offset by sale of other holdings in injection of cash into company. *I see no reason why we should be asked to put up public money to protect applicant's investments. It is a case of selling investment properties below applicant's valuation to protect his abstract business from possible competition or holding properties for higher return and taking chance on no one buying these abstract records of present competitor."*

Following these statements, loan officer Dean recommended that the loan not be made.

On February 8, 1962, William R. Ward, Acting Chief, Area II, in agreeing with loan officer Dean's recommendation of declining the loan, the following statements were made:

"It is to be noted that C. G. Rebozo, President of applicant, listed his occupation on his personal F/S as "investor". His personal B/S shows various interests in real estate. The claim is that none of these are salable at this time. All appear to be held for future speculative increase in value. The request is for entire purchase price of concern to be purchased. Applicant does not propose to invest a single dollar in his expansion. $15,000 is proposed to be covered by a carry-back mortgage. Considering all the investment and real estate owned by the principal, it is felt that a reasonable investment by them should be made in this expansion."

On the same date, Pierrot R. Leef, Deputy Director of the agency's office of loan procurement, also concurred in the recommendation that the loan be declined. Mr. Leef listed the following facts for his decision:

"The business being acquired returned a profit of only $1,270 in 1960 on $92,306 income. In addition to the $10,000 owing bank, SBA first year, there will remain $15,000 owing seller shown as a current liability on the proformer."

The following day, Logan Hendricks, Director of the agency's office of loan procurement, also agreed to the recommendation that the loan be declined. Mr. Hendricks states:

"All aspects considered, *I would have to construe this credit as being on the weak or marginal side.* It is difficult to justify an investment by SBA of $100,000 versus $15,000 by owner with even that amount secured on a borrowed basis. Granting that some of the investment assets are already mortgaged and markets nil, plus a willingness to pledge the Key Biscayne property and when (and if) sold apply proceeds I.O.M., the government loan to a considerable extent is still gross substitute for equity funds. This is a first time bank and in addition, the community apparently needs an abstract company. Notwithstanding, I think an adjusted proposal is in order here. I would favorably consider a $60,000 loan for 5 years providing for an additional injection by principals on stock subscription or stand-by basis of $40,000."

Also on February 9, C. L. Lanman, Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration, agreed with the recommendations to decline the loan.

It should be noted at this point that in the years immediately preceding the loan to Monroe, the company had consistently lost money and, in fact, did not have a profitable year prior to its application for a loan.

On February 13, Logan Hendricks wrote a memo to the files of SBA concerning the meeting that he had in Washington with Mr. Rebozo discussing the decline of the loan. It is still not clear how Mr. Rebozo was informed that the loan was to be declined since a letter to that effect was never sent out. In part, the Hendricks memo reads:

"I pointed out to Mr. Rebozo that I felt the demand of $100,000 with $15,000 being advanced by him on a note placed the government in a disproportionate position—in other words too much of the purchase price was being sought through a government loan."

Mr. Rebozo emphasized the fact that very little of his property attracts any market whatsoever at this time, nor has he been able to raise any funds thereon by mortgages, though this has been attempted through banks and other sources. One bad development occurred during the conversation in that the Key Biscayne property, which was set up in the draft authorization for a first mortgage pledge back of Mr. Rebozo's guarantee, cannot be pledged since it involved in some agreement he has with individuals who are to start a new bank. They are to acquire sufficient of this property for banking and parking facilities. By inquiry, I learned that he might be able to mortgage half of it and he has stated that if he could mortgage the entire tract, subject to a portion of it being released at time bank stock is issued, he is to accept bank stock in payment, he would be willing to pledge the bank stock back of his guarantee. While I appreciate the need for making loan payments as low as possible, to better assure repayment from earnings, it is difficult for me to justify a 50% balloon payment at the end of 5 years on this type of security. This is another reason I felt a lesser loan was occasioned. *Mr. Rebozo continues to be very optimistic as to the earning potential, believing that a $100,000 loan can be paid in full in 5 years.* He may be right but we must admit that discretion dictates a more conservative attitude. I am reluctant to rule out any balloon on a situation of this kind—neither am I anxious to see a longer maturity than 5 years, but perhaps, some middleground might be in order if an $80,000 potential (mentioned later) comes into being.

I approached the problem in the beginning on the basis of his raising $40,000 cash, making a $60,000 loan feasible. He stated this was wholly impossible, whereas I inquired whether perhaps $20,000 cash could be raised. He said this likewise was out of the question. I then approached the matter of whether Land Title, who owned the Abstract Company he is trying to buy for $90,000 would take say $50,000 in cash and carry back $40,000 on a stand-by basis permitting that amount to be secured by a second mortgage on the pledged assets. Mr. Rebozo stated that he has been negotiating a long time with Land Title and was positive he could not work out any other deal with them say even a $75,000 cash offer with their willingness to carry back $15,000. This appeared to place us in a stalemate position. He then inquired whether an $80,000 loan might be possible provided he was able to work some satisfactory arrangement on smaller amounts of debt (which were to be paid with loan proceeds as originally contemplated) and possibly raise $10,000 or $15,000 W/C through private sources.

I told Mr. Rebozo that I could make him no promises, but that we would certainly take a close look at such amended proposition, if he is able to work it out. He stated that he would immediately pursue the matter and be in touch with the Miami branch.

In his meeting with Mr. Hendricks, Mr. Rebozo stated that $100,000 could be paid in full in 5 years. However, when SBA did grant him a loan for $80,000, he was unable to repay it in a six year period provided in the original agreement and the maturity had to be extended to a full ten years.

Despite all of the adverse comments about the loan, SBA did grant Rebozo an $80,000 loan.

Although the grounds for making the loan to Rebozo are highly suspect, it should also be pointed out that following the granting of the loan, in addition to extending the maturity of the loan on two occasions, the following concessions or favors have been

granted to Mr. Rebozo in connection with the loan changing conditions of the loan agreement: (1) release of stock, (2) consent to modification of note reducing payments, (3) release of Key Biscayne collateral securing guarantee, (4) waiver of violation of stand-by agreement, and (5) release of Key West property.

On December 23, 1963, Mr. Howard McGoogan, Chief of the Loan Administration unit, wrote to Merchants Bank of Miami with regard to a request by Rebozo to have property in Key Biscayne pledged by him to secure his guarantee of the SBA loan, released. The letter stated that SBA could not release the property. Despite the letter, SBA did at a later date comply with Rebozo's request. In addition to the concessions granted above, it should be remembered that Mr. Arthur H. Olson, an officer of the Title company was also a guarantor on the loan. Mr. Olson, following the completion of the loan transaction, left the Title company and Rebozo did not notify SBA that one of its guarantors was no longer involved in the transaction.

On January 10, 1964, McGoogan wrote to the bank stating that the decision not to comply with the request to release the property had been reversed and that SBA would no longer object to the release of the property. Two documents in the SBA file perhaps best sum up the preferential treatment that has been given to Mr. Rebozo. The first is a memo dated May 28, 1968, from Glen A. Pareira, loan officer to Thomas A. Butler, Regional Director of the Miami office. Butler is a stockholder in the bank owned by Rebozo and has also participated in other Rebozo ventures. In the memo, Pareira writes:

"Attached is a letter of participating bank on subject loan. It is my opinion after consultation with both Mr. Liedmann and Mr. Barnett that the request is unreasonable and should not be approved. It should be noticed that approval of requests as submitted would extend loan beyond legal maximum maturity date with a balloon at the end of the extension requested of approximately $30,000. We have no power to grant such an action."

On June 8, 1968, Mr. Pareira wrote to Mr. Joseph W. Armaly of the Merchants Bank of Miami as follows:

"With regards to your letter of May 23, 1968, wherein you state Mr. Rebozo has requested a further modification of subject loan to reduce payments for 36 months from $1,855.00 per month plus interest to $500 per month plus interest. While your letter does not indicate the bank's position on this request, which is necessary prior to any determination by this Agency, as to the concurrence or rejection, our reactions are as follows:

1. The request for reduction of payments for 36 months would exceed maturity date of loan. If reduction of payments could be granted to maturity, this would leave a $32,500 balloon balance due and payable on May 1, 1970.

2. The statutory limits of this loan are ten years and no extension of the maturity date can be granted beyond that point without Congressional action. If the loan were extended to the legal maximum (May 1, 1972) there would still be a balloon balance due and payable at that date of $26,500.

3. The records indicate that the tangible collateral has been reduced to nil and for all intent and purposes the loan is an unsecured note guaranteed by Mr. Rebozo. Also, the maturity of the note has been extended once from May 1, 1968, to May 1, 1970.

Under these conditions it seems highly improbable that any recommendations on your part for further concessions on the loan could be concurred in by this Agency . . ."

On January 20, 1968, Mr. Armaly wrote to Mr. Butler, the Branch Manager of the SBA's Miami office, once again requesting that the bank schedule be extended and even though the loan officer for SBA had stated that such request could not be considered, the extended maturity was granted.

The role that Mr. Butler has played in the Rebozo loan appears on the surface to be more than that of a disinterested SBA employee. For instance, on January 2, 1964, Butler wrote a memo to F. E. McKinney, Acting Chief, Loan Services Division, Office of Loan Assistance, supporting the release of certain bank stock pledged by Rebozo for his loan. In discussing Rebozo's financial position, Butler wrote, "It is not a bit unusual in our area for a person to have a good personal financial statement yet be pressed for available cash to meet various commitments." The memo further points out that the bank which participated in the loan with SBA to Rebozo is headed by Mr. Hoke Maroon who Butler stated was an active member of the National Small Business Advisory Committee. Maroon is also a large stockholder in Fisher Island, Inc., a corporation which owned Fisher Island of Miami. The corporation is headed by Rebozo.

When SBA was recently asked about the Rebozo loan, it said that "the loan is adequately collateralized." This disagrees sharply with the June 6, 1968, letter from loan officer Pareira to Merchants Bank of Miami in which Mr. Pareira stated "the records indicate that the tangible collateral has been reduced to nil . . ."

Mr. Speaker, there can be no justification for SBA lending money to an individual under the guise of a small businessman who then turns around and opens a bank. Small businessmen write me complaining that they cannot even get in to see a banker, yet in the Rebozo case, SBA is financing a banker and an investor while shutting out thousands of legitimate small businessmen.

The loan to Mr. Rebozo, it is my understanding, is current. However, in order for SBA to show that it has not foresaken our Nation's small businessmen, the loan should be called immediately. Granted there is not a great deal of money involved but the loan should not have been made in the first place and the unwarranted extensions of the maturities on the loan quite clearly are grounds for collecting payment in full at this time. Mr. Speaker, it is not so much the questionable activities of SBA that have come to light that trouble me, but rather the mistakes that have been kept quiet. Perhaps like the iceberg, most of the agency's mistakes are below the surface.

The Banking and Currency Committee has been assured that things were going to get better at SBA but that promise has not been kept.

I shall continue to pursue my investigation of SBA until I am certain that we can mold SBA into an effective agency of Government dedicated to the sole proposition of helping small businessmen.

No further statements are contemplated by me on this matter until after public hearings are conducted by the Banking and Currency Committee on bills—one inserted herewith—to increase the authorization of money which may be lent either directly or indirectly by the Small Business Administration.

H.R. 4291

A bill to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (4) of section 4(c) of the Small Business Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$1,900,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,200,000,000";

(2) by striking out "$300,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$500,000,000"; and

(3) by striking out "$200,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$300,000,000".

REPEAL OF EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT GAINS SUPPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. MATSUNAGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 our distinguished colleague, the dean of the House delegation from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), and I cosponsored a bill (H.R. 11825) to repeal title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950. Title II, popularly known as the "Emergency Detention Act of 1950," has often been referred to as the "concentration camp authorization law."

Fortunately, it has never been formally invoked since its enactment, but for 19 years it has remained the subject of continuing concern to men of justice. Its repeal is long overdue.

Briefly, title II provides that upon the declaration of an "internal security emergency" by the President, the Attorney General may apprehend and detain any person as to "whom there is reasonable ground to believe that such person probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or sabotage." A person may thus be apprehended and detained on the basis of mere suspicion or unfounded speculation. Title II does not require the Government to produce any evidence of an overt act.

A detained person may file an appeal. However, the appeal would be heard not by a court, but by an administrative review board set up by the Attorney General. The board's decision on emergency detention would be final; there is no recourse to our judicial system.

As a lawyer, I find these procedures to be repugnant to our basic constitutional guarantees and accepted legal practices. As a citizen, I see them as an ominous threat to our American way of life. This concern is especially important today when so many legitimate inquiries are being made into the values of present-day society. If these procedures are ever enforced, they would lead inevitably to a repetition of the tragedy which occurred in World War II, when 110,000 persons of Japanese ancestry living on the west coast were forced out of their homes and imprisoned in the only concentration camps ever maintained in our Nation's history. Historians have described this episode as the blackest blot in the tapestry of American democracy. A law that is based on such a sad legacy ought to be deleted from our statute books.

To date CHET HOLIFIELD and I have gained the support of 126 concerned colleagues as cosponsors of our bill. This strong support, I believe, is indicative of the increasing national awareness of the

need to purge from our statute books those provisions which are repugnant to the American way of life.

Among many citizen groups the Japanese-American Citizens League, with chapters in 38 States and the District of Columbia, has spearheaded the move for repeal of the Emergency Detention Act.

On July 30, 1969, the delegate assembly of the National Urban League meeting here in Washington voted unanimously for a resolution supporting the repeal of title II. Finding the information contained in the resolution to be highly pertinent, I submit a copy of this resolution for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also submit for inclusion a copy of a letter from the Peace and Freedom Association of Tucson, Ariz., which supports the proposed repeal legislation:

RESOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE TO REPEAL THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT OF 1950

Whereas Title II of the Internal Security Act, 1950 (The Emergency Detention Act) violates the constitutional guarantees and judicial traditions that are basic to our American way of life.

Whereas the precedent for this statute was in the tragic experience of Americans of Japanese ancestry in World War II an experience which most Americans now recall, as unnecessary and unwarranted.

Whereas Title II authorizes detention not on the basis of an actual act committed in violation of law, but on the basis of mere suspicion, of a mere probability that, during proclaimed periods of internal security emergencies, the detainee would engage in, or conspire to engage in, espionage or sabotage.

Whereas Title II fails to provide for trial by jury or even before a judge, substituting instead a preliminary hearing before a departmental hearing officer. The suspect is assumed to be guilty, for there is no presumption of innocence.

Whereas the accused need not be confronted by the facts which led to his detention, for the Government is not required to produce any evidence.

Whereas there is no appeal to the Courts, only to another administrative appeal board composed of members appointed de facto, and paid by the Attorney General, the very official authorized to detain the suspect in the first instance.

Be it therefore resolved that the National Urban League meeting in Annual Conference in Washington, D.C. on July 30, 1969 go on record as endorsing and supporting the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (Title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950).

Proposed and presented by K. Patrick Okura, President Urban League of Nebraska.

Adopted unanimously by the Delegate Assembly July 30, 1969.

PEACE & FREEDOM ASSOCIATIONS,
Tucson, Ariz., July 31, 1969.

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to commend you for introducing legislation to repeal title II of the Mundt-Nixon Internal Security Act, 1950, which authorizes the Attorney General to arrest and to hold without the use of courts and due process on suspicion that they might be capable of espionage.

I enclose a copy of a petition on which we obtained over 100 signatures on the McCarran Internal Security Act. We hope you will be able to use it in support of your repeal attempt.

Yours truly,

ALBERTA DANNELLS,
Secretary.

WATER QUALITY FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of last week I was pleased to cosponsor, H.R. 13358, the "Water Quality Financial Assistance Act of 1969," which is designed to provide a supplementary method of financing waste treatment works, on at least a temporary basis.

This bill would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act by providing—in addition to direct Federal grants for waste treatment works as presently authorized—a new method whereby the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to enter into long term, not to exceed 30 years, contracts with a State or local governmental unit to pay, in installments, the Federal share of the costs of constructing such work. Similar legislation was passed by both Houses of Congress last year, but it was never enacted into law because of problems with other sections of the bill that could not be ironed out before congressional adjournment.

Earlier this year, when Secretary of the Interior Hickel came before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works—of which I am a member and which is charged with responsibility for recommending the level of funding for the waste treatment program—he declared that—

> Water pollution is a growing National menace and must be abated and controlled.

I certainly agree with that statement. and I am deeply concerned over the fact that this key program has had to be so badly underfunded during these years when the mounting costs of the war in Vietnam have prevented the Federal Government from doing all it ought to be doing at home.

The fiscal problem we face in this new fiscal year is as bad as the one we faced a year ago—if not worse. Budgetary restraint it still demanded of both the administration and the Congress. In recognition of that fact, the Johnson-Nixon budget proposes only $214 million in waste treatment grant moneys—the same amount as was appropriated last year.

In view of the obvious need and the solid congressional support this program enjoys, it is going to be difficult for our subcommittee to hold to the budget request. By finding offsetting cuts to make elsewhere in that portion of the budget now before us, we might possibly be able to add $20 million or so to this request without having our bill's total exceed the amount originally asked for all purposes covered under it. But under the circumstances prevailing, I feel it would be irresponsible for us to recommend this program's full funding at the currently authorized $1 billion level.

I say this despite the fact that—apparently encouraged by last week's successful House attempt to add over $1 billion to Mr. Nixon's budgetary requests for Federal educational programs—118 House Members have now formed a bipartisan committee to likewise demand full funding of the waste treatment program.

There has been an alternative to "busting the budget" again in the same way we did week before last. I believe this proposal that both Houses of Congress voted for last year provides that alternative. For it would give us at least a temporary bridge to get us over these lean budgetary years until that hoped for time when disengagement in Vietnam, and reduced defense spending generally, may enable us to get a good many necessary domestic programs back on the track.

As I envisioned procedures under my proposal—which has President Nixon's endorsement even as it had President Johnson's in the last Congress—the Secretary of the Interior would probably use whatever funds we can provide by way of direct appropriations to fund the Federal share of the cost of smaller waste treatment projects with cash grants, resorting to the installment method only for the larger urban projects. And it should make no difference to the local municipalities in such instance whether they get the Federal share of the cost of their projects in a lump sum or in annual installments over the life of the bond issue they will have to make to finance the remaining portion of the cost.

Water pollution has to be attacked now. We cannot wait until the twin roadblocks posed by the war in Vietnam and the war against inflation have been overcome lest our environmental problems overwhelm us. I sincerely believe my proposal provides us with a way to do what needs to be done in a responsible fashion—and, by retaining a prepayment option for the Federal installments where used, the Secretary of the Interior could ask Congress to increase the direct appropriations for the program in order to get it back on a direct grant basis when budgetary conditions permit.

Mr. Speaker, my bill also contains a section offering a 5-percent "bonus" on top of the normal Federal share of a waste treatment project's cost in States that pick up at least 25 percent thereof. Unfortunately, only a few States have followed New York's lead so far in supplementing the local cost of sewage treatment plants. The difficulties faced by local governments in picking up all but the Federal share of such a project's cost has also slowed the progress we should be making in this direction. If we can induce more States to enter the picture as New York has done, we will finally have the all-out, partnership attack on water pollution we ought to have if we are ever to get the job done.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY COMPARABILITY

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, for years Congress had to fight the annual battle

of Federal pay raises. An employee's compensation was dependent on the mood of Congress and he had no assurance of what was before him. When Congress felt the pressures to perform in a parsimonious manner, our employees did not receive any increased salary benefits, regardless of what might be happening with comparable positions in private industry.

Much to our credit, in 1967 we fully realized the undesirability of such an inadequate system and produced the Federal Salary Act which did away with the annual, and often unsuccessful, battles for pay raises, and substituted automatic yearly salary increases. These have been effected in each of the past 3 years and the Government's salaries are approaching parity with those of non-Government employers.

We are, Mr. Speaker, at this time beset by a significant problem, for the automatic salary increase provision of the 1967 Federal Salary Act expired with the pay adjustments of last July. Today, I have introduced a bill which offers a solution to this problem and allows the Government employee to have what is rightfully his—the same compensation and advantages enjoyed by those individuals who have not chosen to dedicate their careers in service to our Government. It is my belief that our goal should be a permanent comparability pay system that would assure automatic Government salary adjustments annually to keep pace with industry.

Federal salary adjustments will certainly be necessary in the coming years. This bill calls for the creation of a Federal Employee Salary Commission which will annually recommend such adjustments. This Commission wil be composed of representatives of the Government and of Government employee organizations.

In addition, to further assure the fairness to the employees, the bill establishes a Federal Employee Salary Board of Arbitration. If the employee unions are not satisfied with the recommendations of the Commission, they may require the entire issue to be submitted to the Board of Arbitration. In either case, the annual adjustments will be made on this consistent and automatic basis; and we will be able to stabilize our pay structure.

In a February 1969 report to the Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Joseph E. Winslow, the professional consultant who conducted the study of Federal job evaluation and ranking, was moved to comment:

> I cannot say that job evaluation and ranking practices in the Federal service have reached a crisis stage. But I do believe that within the next several years they will. Continued tampering with the various systems by the executive branch and the Congress, unless based on a consistent policy, will create more and more inequities within and among the several existing systems.

The bill which I am introducing endeavors to establish some consistent policies and end these inequities.

In the bill, both the general service and the postal field service classification systems have been reevaluated and redefined. The 18 grades of the classified service have been regrouped into six classes. There are established within these classes ranges of pay differentials which are designed to maintain comparability with private enterprise rates.

The postal field service grades are linked to these improvements in the classified general schedule. This will rectify the situation which has found many of our employees, especially those in the levels around GS–4, 5, and 6, and PSF–4, 5, and 6, falling far short of comparability with private enterprise.

Passage of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, will enable the millions of civil service and postal employees to at last be released from the grasp of an uncertain future which is annually determined by the mood of Congress. Our employees will have a guarantee of what is in store for their future; and they will have assurance that their efforts are being rewarded on at least an equal basis with the citizens who work in private industry.

VOTE FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation that I have been proposing since I came to Congress, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older.

I feel as strongly about the need for such legislation today as I ever have. And I am glad to say that the number of colleagues backing such resolutions is growing. At present, approximately 59 resolutions have been introduced by other Congressmen who also feel strongly that a change is needed for a better representative Government. The young adults have to be heard, too.

The proposal is not new; the old arguments still hold: if a young man is old enough to fight for his country, he should be considered old enough to make his views known through the democratic processes. The 18-, 19-, and 20-year-old who pays taxes on income earned should be able to have a hand in determining who shall legislate revenue bills. The young people who are expected to follow the laws of the land, should be allowed to select the Representative who votes on them. And, have not the youth of today made their presence be known, because they do not want to be ignored any longer? In their frank questions and protests they have taken a place in public life already. They are helping bear the burdens of our social and political life already. Why should they be deprived of the most cherished right Americans have—the right to vote?

The individual States have the implied authority to establish the voting age now, yet the age of 21 does not exist in all of the States. There are four States that allow voting under 21: Kentucky, Georgia, Alaska, and Hawaii. I say that it is time the Congress took the initiative to recognize what these States have—that modern times warrant our young citizens to be heard.

Just recently I met with representatives of the national LUV campaign. LUV, which means Let Us Vote, is an organization typical of the active youth who intend to be represented in our Government. Just this week I received a communication from the National YMCA's, Hi-Y, and Tri-Hi-Y Council representing 250,000 young people supporting this legislation. In part the letter stated—the President of the council: "I ask that you support such action, thus making it possible for our Nation to take a giant step in enabling young people to influence those forces in society which control their lives—and to do so through the democratic process." I could not have expressed it better.

I urge my colleagues to seriously consider this proposal in this Congress and carry through our commitment to your youth. Help support the LUV campaign.

INCOME MAINTENANCE AND PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, listening to the President last Friday evening, August 8, as he addressed the Nation about the crisis of poverty facing America, and reviewing his message to Congress today on the failure of the present welfare system, the thought occurred to me that Richard Nixon had discovered America. He has discovered the other America, the existence of which many of us have recognized and have been calling to public attention for years. When President Nixon spoke about the failure of Government to deliver that which it has so often promised; when he spoke about the failures of the welfare system; and when he spoke about that system's destructive effects on a man's home, his desire to work and his human dignity; I knew then that Richard Nixon has discovered the 30 million Americans who are forced to survive at a level of existence more likely associated with some of the countries the President alluded to in his speech than with the most affluent Nation this planet has even known.

The substance of the President's remarks made me also realize that, while the President may have discovered the vast continent of poverty, he has only stepped upon its shore. He has yet to explore the extent, the true depth, of this world that is new to him. The President has made a beachhead. He must now press on.

The President's prescription for overhauling the existing welfare system calls for the establishment of a program of income maintenance at a low level. President Nixon, in his speech, and through the sundry press leaks prior to his speech, refused to have the program labeled as guaranteed annual income. Methinks he doth protest too much. While the coercive features of the work training aspect of the program are inconsistent with the

rest of it, there can be no doubt that his plan is constructed around the concept of income maintenance.

Income maintenance is a concept which was first put before Congress in leigslative form in a bill, the Income Maintenance Act, which I introduced in May of 1968. I reintroduced it in the 91st Congress as H.R. 586.

As I said upon introducing my bill on May 16, 1968:

> Clearly, income maintenance is an idea whose time has come.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy of the Congress, Joint Economic Committee, on June 26, 1968, I said—

> There must be a shift entirely from conventional welfare programs to a Federal income maintenance or guaranteed income approach.

The concept in my bill is generally identical to the concept in the plan proposed by the administration. People are guaranteed a floor on their income. This floor is standard throughout the Nation, set, and paid for by the Federal Government. As people earn money, the income maintenance benefit is reduced. When the income level reaches a certain point, benefits cease. In order not to discourage outside earnings from work, the amount of assistance is not reduced 1 dollar for every dollar the person earns, but rather 50 cents for every dollar earned. The concept flows from a position which naturally shuns all coercive and paternalistic techniques. It is assumed, and supported by fact, that the American people will work, if they are able to do so and are given half a chance.

Income maintenance also involves the idea that people who need assistance should be given every opportunity to be a part of normal American society. They should not be made to suffer the indignities of constant governmental investigations. They should be able to be free agents in the marketplace, and not be made to account for any item they buy.

All these ideas together form the theoretical basis for scrapping the present welfare system and replacing it with income maintenance. The President's position of including a coercive work-training or employment program does not make his program anything other than income maintenance. It does, however, make his program inconsistent with the position from which income maintenance is derived and to which income maintenance leads.

While most of the poor are simply unable to work, those who are able to work either already do work or would work if they had the skills or opportunity or both.

Most of the poor cannot work. They are too old or too young, or they are blind, or they are permanently and totally disabled, or they must care for children under five years of age. For example, in March 1969, of the approximately 9,600,000 people participating in the four principal Federally aided public assistance programs, 80,000 were blind, 728,000 were permanently and totally disabled, 2,000,000 were in the old age category. Under the aid to families with dependent children program 4,815,000 were children and some 1,500,000 were mothers of pre-school children.

Of the remaining welfare recipients, 400,000 to 500,000 are women with school age children; and 80,700 are employable males who are eligible for aid to families with dependent children payments in 25 States.

Thus, of the total welfare population, only approximately 5 percent are potentially employable males and women with school age children.

Turning to the overall poor population, that is all those families with incomes below the nationally defined poverty standard of $3,335 at 1966 prices of consumer goods.

In 1966, 54 percent of this Nation's poor families, including those who received public assistance, were headed by persons in the labor force. The other 46 percent were not capable of work. As I have already said, only 5 percent of the welfare recipients can work. Of the 54 percent of the poor in the labor force, 96 percent were in fact employed. Only 4 percent of the total poor population was not working even though it was capable of doing so. Mollie Orshanky, "Counting the Poor; Another Look at the Poverty Profile." Social Security Bulletin, January 1965, pages 10–12. Of those unemployed persons, very few were what we call chronic unemployed. Fifteen percent of the unemployed in an average month in 1967 had been out of work for as long as 15 weeks. Only 6 percent had been out of work for as long as 27 weeks. James Tobin, "Raising the Incomes of the Poor," Agenda for the Nation, Brookings Institution, 1968, page 86. Thus, the vast overwhelming majority of the unemployed poor who could be employed were only temporarily out of a job. They were not shirkers. They were not perpetual loafers. They were just out of work for a short period of time.

These statistics show that the trouble with welfare is not that people are unwilling to work. Those who are able to work do work whenever and wherever they can. Therefore, it is public relations nonsense to talk about mandatory job training programs. If the job training program is there, if people are able to train for good jobs, or if they can find jobs, they will use the training or take the job.

The President implied that to institute income maintenance without a mandatory job program would cause people to sit around and take the maintenance payments rather than work. He implied that without the coercive features it might be more advantageous not to work than to work. Let's examine that notion for a moment.

I have already shown that even under the present welfare system, which discourages work, the poor will try to work. It is also ridiculous to believe that under the level of payments proposed by the President anyone who could work would not do so. But let us consider the deeper implications of what the President said.

Why did President Nixon include coercive measures in his plan which fly in the face of the rest of the plan? The reasons were clearly political. He felt that otherwise he could not sell the plan to a nation which has as one of its most fundamental values the value of work. Since the development of a national character, the people of America have held that to work is good. Work in and of itself is held to have social virtues above and beyond any compensation it provides. This concept is part of America.

Throughout the world, we are known as an industrious people. American efficiency and dedication to labor are admired and studied by other nations. This reputation is justified. We did not become the richest state the world has ever known by sitting on our hands.

It is thus sad to find Americans criticizing themselves, explicitly or implicitly, as being lazy, shunning work, and doing anything possible to avoid it. It is an inconsistent self-criticism. The criticism arises from an ingrained value of work, while at the same time being directed at any imaginary distaste for working.

The conclusion is unavoidable that those who launch this criticism at the poor of our Nation hold them to be of another people, another culture, another heritage. We should recall the wise quip of Ernest Hemingway who, when told that rich people are different than other people, commented, "Yes. They have more money." Indeed the poor are different. They have less money

Thus, to recapitulate, President Nixon's coercive feature does not make sense when we look at who the poor people are or at what they do. It also does not make sense when we look at the rest of his plan.

The level of assistance recommended as an appropriate floor on income is inadequate, casting serious doubts on the whole plan. $1,600 a year for a family of four. That means $400 a person to last a year. Think for a moment of what it would mean to live on $400 a year. Could one buy enough food? Enough clothes? Would it pay rent? I do not care where one lives, $400 per person is not enough to survive. It is not enough for an adult to survive, and it is even less adequate for a child.

Considering other aspects of the administration's plan, there are incentives for a person to find work. He gets to keep all of the first $60 a month he earns. Beyond that his assistance is reduced by only 50 percent of his earnings. If he participates in a work training program, he can get $30 a month additional.

With what we know about the poor, with what we know about ourselves as Americans, and with what we know about the plan's incentives to work, does it in any way make any sense to use coercive measures to "get people to work?"

The President says that we must never make it more beneficial not to work than to work. I agree. Without the coercive work plan, it is still better to work than not to. The financial incentives to seek training or employment are clear and attractive. Poor people want to work and do work when they have the chance and are not penalized for it. It is

thus inconsistent to include measures befitting old, out-of-date assumptions.

In the Income Maintenance Act which I introduced last May and again in January, there is no forced labor plan. There need not be one in the Nixon plan either. The outmoded thought that income maintenance is a program which "pays people not to work" is, as I told the Joint Economic Committee, "much more applicable to the existing welfare system, which in most cases taxes earnings at 100 percent." Income maintenance, with built-in incentives to seek work, is a system which pays people to work, and requires no compulsory work provision.

What is necessary is a rapid improvement in work training facilities. There are not enough such facilities, they are not located where they should be, and they frequently train people for obsolete jobs. Improved job training facilities and opportunities would do far more to improve the employment rate among the poor than would mandatory participation in inadequate programs.

In this respect, it should not be forgotten that the very same administration which would impose coercive work requirements on welfare recipients, only last April shut down 59 of the Nation's 113 Job Corps Centers and slashed the budget of the Job Corps by $100 million.

For many of those young men and women participating in the Job Corps programs, the training they were receiving spelled the difference between obtaining the kind of employment the President spoke of in his address and joining the welfare rolls.

Acceptance of the concept of income maintenance is not enough, for the basic concept and intent can be perverted by unwise provisions. The details of an income maintenance program and its implementation require intense scrutiny, lest inconsistent details and inadequate implementation discredit the concept.

For example, the amount of the basic benefit. While the administration proposes $1,600, my bill as revised, will provide for an initial basic benefit of $2,000 to increase annually over a 5 year period until it is $3,200, far more realistically meeting the human needs.

The rate at which earned income causes assistance to be reduced is also important. If it is too high, there may be an incentive not to work. In this respect, 50 percent reduction rate in the Nixon plan provides a strong incentive to seek employment.

Provisions regarding the level of benefits and the reduction rate are of prime importance in their effect on poverty and the American society. Of great concern is how an income maintenance plan will blend with existing public assistance payments and programs and whether or not State and local costs will be reduced. In relative terms any program will be of greatest benefit to the States which have always given least assistance. However, the burdens of the States which have done most should be minimized. This the administration's plan does not do. The plan provides that no State can reduce payment levels, that no State may spend less than half of what it now spends on public assistance, but that no State will be required to spend more than 90 percent of its present welfare costs.

Thus a State like New York, which makes payments under AFDC of approximately $67 per person per month, will in a sense be penalized for making decent payments. States which have had low welfare budgets will be able to cut them in half. New York State, in order to maintain its present payment level, will continue to pay 90 percent of its present costs. While it is true that 90 percent is better than 100 percent, a way must be found so that New York State will be reimbursed by the Federal Government in relation to its substantial contribution.

Under the administration's proposal New York State will only receive $43 million of which $20 million will be for New York City—New York City is now contributing $432 million. This is not a very significant part of a $3 billion national expenditure.

Under the administration's plan the Federal Government pays approximately $40 per person per month. If the Federal Government were to pay 50 percent of the next $40 per person per month, then it would be meaningful.

In view of the fact that the present AFDC payment in New York State is $3,300 per year for a family of four, of which the Federal Government pays 50 percent or $1,650, welfare recipients in New York State will not benefit immediately from the program.

Under my revised bill, over a 5-year period, the level of benefits will be increased until it is comparable to any existing payment level in any State. A regional cost-of-living differential will keep costs down.

By accepting the concept of income maintenance the administration has defined poverty and welfare as a national problem which requires a national solution. The Federal Government should move as rapidly as possible to assume the full costs of public assistance through an income maintenance program with an adequate level of benefits.

There are several other points which should be carefully evaluated.

How often will payments be made? Will recipients be given a check once a year, twice, quarterly? I propose monthly declaration of need and monthly payment of benefits. The President's message appears to do likewise.

How will application be made? How will investigations be conducted? One of the most repressive, degrading features of the present welfare system is the way recipients must account for every item of need, must make specific requests for most purchases, and must be subject to constant harassment and investigation. Any program which includes these procedures cannot be considered as an overhaul of the welfare system. It would be the worst perversion of income maintenance to perpetuate these archaic practices.

In my bill, application is made by simple declaration of need, much as is now done for social security. Recipients will receive monthly checks with no restrictions on how they are to be spent. Investigations are to be conducted in a manner similar to internal revenue investigations. Five percent of all recipients would be checked, so that inforcement is on a spot check system. I am pleased to find that the administration plan does the same.

The basic values of justice must not be cast aside in this program. My bill provides for hearings when benefits are denied. The decision of these hearings is subject to judicial review. We must be certain that any plan we adopt will not deprive those we assist of their elementary rights.

Will the different costs of living throughout the country be taken into account in the benefits?

As I said before the Joint Economic Committee:

> The average AFDC benefit ranges from about $8 per person per month in Mississippi to about $51 per person per month in New York, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Surely, this disparity is not reflective of the difference in relative cost of living in these States.

The cost of housing alone varies tremendously. It is argued that differences in present welfare payments from one State to another have contributed to the migration of the poor to States with higher benefits. If this is true, it is not because they can live well in higher payment States. It is because they cannot live in the States with low payments. The welfare benefits in Mississippi, for example, come nowhere near meeting the cost of living, or even of surviving, in that State. Welfare benefits in New York may attract people not because they are higher on an absolute scale, but because they go a great deal further toward meeting the cost of living in New York than the Mississippi payments do in Mississippi.

Benefits which take the cost of living into account in a realistic manner are relatively equal in all areas. No matter how high or low they are, they go an equal way toward meeting the cost of living in the particular area.

The plan, which I have proposed, will take into account regional differences in the cost of living, and will also take into account differences between rural and urban areas.

It will now be up to the Congress to have a careful evaluation of the several income maintenance programs. I have outlined but a few of the aspects of any plan which need to be studied. I have explained the provisions of my bill which deal with some aspects of my program. I urge my colleagues to begin this review immediately. President Nixon's support of income maintenance potentially represents a major victory for the poor of this Nation. This victory will be complete when the acceptance of the concept of income maintenance is backed up by an adequate and comprehensive implementation of that concept.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE PROBLEMS OF OUR TIME: WELFARE, URBAN LIVING, AND THE QUEST FOR QUALITY—PART IV

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past year, much emphasis has been put on the need to establish

some system of national priorities and goals. Too often the rhetoric has stressed more the process of setting and meeting objectives, rather than the specific goals themselves, and we have heard much debate on overall military policy and broad domestic policies—and on the relationships between these seemingly competing areas.

Part of the problem—of the lack of specifics—of course, follows the lag that comes naturally from any new government administration. Until recently, the Nixon administration has been rather silent on precise program goals. But, now, the situation appears to be changing.

During the past weeks, we have heard impressive statements from the President concerning health care, population control and now, last Friday, on the welfare system and the overall subject of economic security.

Today, I want to comment on the President's message, but, in addition, I would like to expand from the framework laid by Mr. Nixon in his television address, and to look also at a number of problems tightly keyed to the President's remarks.

THE WELFARE SYSTEM

The President's long-anticipated program of welfare reform deserves commendation. Even though forthcoming analysis and debate which Mr. Nixon invites may produce some changes in form, the substance and thrust of his proposals recognize and move toward rectifying many of the grossest inadequacies in our present welfare system.

While I will both suggest and work for some modifications I think are required, I shall not hesitate to support the major innovations the President recommends, and I will seek to create all necessary public support for them.

For those of us who for a generation or more have sought to bring into welfare programs such key ingredients as concern for the dignity of recipients, freedom from bureaucratic oppression, and a chance to live a normal and productive life with opportunity and incentive for social and economic achievement, the President's proposals may be the key to a major breakthrough toward these goals. That such proposals should come from a President commonly viewed as politically conservative points up the danger in attempting to predict programmatic directions by reference to slogans of a political past.

But the fact is that any political leader who believes that our Government was created to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity and promote the general welfare," will generally seek to eliminate or to modify programs which obviously fail to achieve these objectives and to develop in their place new and better programs which will reach the goals. Unfortunately, much of our existing welfare structure fails to meet those fundamental objectives as set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution which I have quoted above. To change the welfare structure so that it does meet these aims is conservative in the broadest sense of history and tradition.

A prime example of such a defective provision in the existing welfare pattern was pointed out by the President: In most States a family is denied welfare payments if a father is present, even if he is unable to support his family. A system that, in effect, encourages a man to desert his family is inherently contrary to the fundamental values and needs of society.

Another example of a faulty provision is the present requirement that welfare payments be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis when a recipient family has any earned income. Surely if we want to encourage those persons on welfare to work, we need to give them more incentive to do so, not less.

Mr. Nixon's proposal for an expanded program of community day-care centers—in which many welfare mothers could be employed and which could also provide health and educational programs for children—ranks as one of the most important of the President's recommendations. Obviously, such centers can be geared to existing preschool programs, such as Headstart, with great benefit to all. Ideally, these centers can become a focus for many programs of community interest, such as parent and adult education, consumer education, recreation, and training for subprofessional and professional community staff workers.

Establishing Federal minimum standards and Federal minimum payments for all categorical aid programs—for the aged, blind, and disabled, as well as for families with dependent children—will have several beneficial effects:

First, it will increase payment levels in nearly half the States now paying below those minimums, thus alleviating some of the worst hardships that now exist.

Second, national benchmarks will reduce pressures on the poor and needy to migrate to higher-paying States, and thus tend to reduce the rate at which local and State taxes in those States are rising to fund those higher benefits.

Third, it will lessen somewhat the pace of urbanization and could ease the causes for the problems which are mounting in all of our large cities as administrators and citizens alike seek to cope with the population influx.

I am less clear now on the desired impact of the President's recommendations in the three other areas he discussed—manpower training, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and Federal revenue sharing with States. To the extent that those proposals result in simplified administration, use of improved technological resources, and greater reliance on the State and local governments, I can and will fully support them. However, more detailed information must be available before a full analysis can be made.

Obviously, Mr. Nixon's package of proposals will stir critical comment and debate throughout the land. There will be those who contend that he did not go far enough, or that some aspects may be contrary to individual welfare and freedom. The idea that mothers will be forced to leave their children and to undertake training or work which they do not desire or for which they are unsuited is one such fear. I do not believe that should be the result of these changes, and I will seek to alter those results if they do develop.

A larger objection will come from those persons who contend that this trust takes the Federal Government far beyond its proper role in meeting the problems of those in need; that the enlargement in the number of assistance recipients and in the amount they will receive is beyond the capacity of the public tax structure. I cannot agree with these objections. The tax resources of this country—at existing rates—are more than adequate, if properly administered, to meet these broadened objectives. As the President said, this program holds the promise of halting otherwise spiralling welfare costs by creating a framework that builds family stability and rewards economic initiative. If the program fails to do this, then more effective solutions must be sought.

This debate on welfare concepts will be lengthy. If it is as productive as it should be, there will be a reexamination of Government's role in many areas. The debate will also bring into focus the overall goals and bearing of our society—topics already the subject of public and congressional debate in connection with our foreign and military policies. And, the debate provides a valuable balance to the work of the President's Commission on National Goals which is now at work.

Beyond question, the discontent of our time—reflected over the past decade in the civil rights struggle, the Vietnam war, the campus revolution—has moved us to one of the great watersheds for the direction of both our country and, possibly, the world. We must now hammer out in the fires of crisis new policy instruments; we must forge new fundamental concepts of purpose and value to carry us through the next period in our history.

It is the great glory of this country that we have inherited a tradition and a structure within which this process can take place with a minimum of violence and destruction. It is the great challenge to us as citizens that we, and our leaders, can all be part of this process. I can think of nothing more satisfying to me as an individual, and as a servant of the people, than to have the opportunity to contribute my very best to our Nation as we reshape the course of history. It is in this spirit that I wish to suggest other related critical areas that demand attention, and then possibly offer some guidelines for future change.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL CITIZENS

If adopted, the President's proposals will help move us toward a society in which there will be minimal economic insecurity for even the most deprived citizen. But there remains much yet to accomplish before that goal is met, and before the point is reached which will allow a productive life for all citizens.

Beyond the categories of the needy we have been discussing are two other large program areas: The elderly, now provided for by social security pensions, and the unemployed worker, who is now covered in part by unemployment insurance, or, when benefits are exhausted, not covered at all. Both of these systems have gradually improved and developed since their inception in the depression of the 1930's, but they must be brought to new standards of effectiveness, and they must be integrated into a complete national program of economic security. Coverage must be extended to persons not now included—of which migratory farmworkers are a prime example—and the minimum levels of unemployment compensation must be increased in amount and duration.

Since unused human effort is an irreplaceable resource, a major goal of our economic system must always be to provide productive employment for every able person who seeks it. Today's relatively low level of unemployment does not accurately index success in this regard. In addition to the official unemployed work force, there is at least an equal number of potentially valuable workers who have withdrawn from the labor market in frustration and despair at their inability to find productive work, or who are marginally attached to the labor force in work far below their capacity. And, within every organization, public and private, are those persons in dead-end, unsatisfying jobs who work only at a fraction of their capacity because they have lost that vital spark which is created by hope and opportunity.

To maintain a healthy and dynamic society this problem must be overcome. In every sector of the work force—and this includes public service, private production, and the increasingly large sector of private service—there must be opportunity at the entrance level for every person seeking employment. Both public and private sectors must share the responsibility to provide this opportunity. If the public sector must be an employer of last resort, then it must be done. In the final analysis society will be served far better if it provides this opportunity than if we maintain a large pool of needy and unemployed at public expense.

No longer can we argue that the economy cannot provide a place for every person seeking employment. To every eye the range of needs is too large and too obvious. Nor can it be argued that the mechanics of the private enterprise system require a pool of unemployed persons available to "flow" wherever laws of supply and demand dictate. The fact is that today it is the pool of the most skilled that flows to where there is need and opportunity. We need only to witness the mobility of engineers and scientists. And it is generally the unemployed and unskilled who are least mobile and least responsive to changing economic opportunity. An economy of full employment where even the lowest skilled are mobile and responsive to opportunity for advancement is the answer to the requirements of a flexible economy.

It must be repeatedly stressed that in the economy of today—and even more so tomorrow—a changing attitude is developing toward jobs and their rewards, as well as toward the concept of work itself. Just as we have evolved from an agricultural economy to one based on industrial production, we are now moving toward an economy based on service. And just as the family farm and the small producer and distributor, with their opportunities for individual freedom and decisionmaking, have largely passed away in favor of the giant corporation and the huge bureaucracy, we are now finding that we must meet the human obligations within a new framework.

The challenge to the leaders of both public and private service sectors is to achieve anew an environment in which people work toward commonly shared goals, objectives which they all have helped to formulate, and under conditions which exact from them their best efforts and highest achievements. To meet this summons should require all the talent of the next generation.

HIGHWAY SAFETY: COMMENTARY NO. 13

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most drivers have at one time or another come across a sign warning of an animal crossing. Whether it be a zebra crossing in the heart of Africa or a deer or cattle crossing in Vermont or New Hampshire makes little difference when we consider the danger that is presented to both the animal and the occupants of the car by the threat of a collision.

Hardly a week goes by without a report of an automobile mishap involving a car and an animal. On June 27, of this year, a father, 29 years old, and his 6-year-old daughter were killed and his wife and son injured in Westmoreland, N.H., when the car he was driving hit a deer.

Since this danger is present, especially in the less populated areas of the country, I think serious consideration should be given to protect motorists as well as the animals. Mrs. Isabelle King of Keene, N.H., recently sent me a newspaper clipping that endorsed a simple but probably effective means of deterring an animal from crossing a road at night while a car is approaching.

This fascinating idea is reported in his nationally syndicated column by the Reverend James Keller.

The potential value to both man and beast would appear to be great and I hope officials at both State and Federal levels will give it careful consideration:

BRIGHT LIGHTS PROTECT DEER

(By Rev. James Keller)

Tiny mirrors protect deer from being killed on highways in The Netherlands.

Two metal mirrors, about three inches square, are mounted on slender poles set across from each other on highway shoulders in heavily wooded areas.

As an automobile approaches at night, its headlights shining on the mirror, reflect light into the forest at a 90-degree angle. The closer the car gets, the more the reflected light expands.

As soon as the deer see the light they come to an abrupt stop. The slight pause prevents them from crossing the highway when a car is speeding by.

Those who show imagination and initiative in safeguarding all forms of life against man-made dangers perform an important service.

By showing a thoughtful consideration for the least of God's creatures, any person can thereby develop an even greater concern for the welfare of his fellow human beings.

"Do not be afraid: you are of more value than many sparrows."—Matthew 10:31.

Thanks to You, O generous Father, for the countless blessings of creation.

ROGERS INTRODUCES BILL TO EXTEND HEALTH SERVICE ACT

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to extend and expand the Migrant Health Service Act for 3 years. The present authorization expires June 30, 1970.

This law was first enacted in September 1962, and was extended in 1965 and again in 1968 without changes in the basic law other than in the dollar authorization for the fiscal years.

The bill that I am introducing would change the basic law to include nonmigrant seasonal agricultural workers and their families within the scope of the act. In the home-base areas, the migrant and the nonmigrant living next door are often indistinguishable from each other. They work side by side in the fields, and citrus groves, but the nonmigrant is excluded from health care services under the present law. Even where the nonmigrant meets the residency requirements in his home-base county, he seldom has access to a comprehensive and effective health care program. Too, the nonmigrant may have a history of past migration and may migrate again in the future.

I believe that expanding the target home-base population to include these nonmigrant seasonal farmworkers will result in an overall reduction of health problems of both population groups. Too often the migrant worker and his family receive treatment for health problems under this program only to return to the field or to the living area and become exposed again to a disease carried by a nonmigrant worker.

I am also including language in this bill to stimulate and foster more involvement of the allied health professions in public health work with migrant and nonmigrant workers and their families.

Likewise, I am stressing in this legislation the importance of continuity of health care which is such a critical factor in the proper and effective delivery of health care to migrant workers and their families as they traverse the migration routes.

Mr. Speaker, at the present time, 116 single- or multi-county projects now operate with migrant health grant assistance in 36 States and Puerto Rico. Yet, there are 900 of the Nation's 3,000 counties that are annually temporary "homes" to migrants ranging in number from 100 to 40,000. These 116 projects reach 300 counties, but in the other 600 counties health care is sporadic and often crisis oriented.

In my congressional district of Florida there are between 45,000 and 50,000 agricultural workers. Of these, 12,000 to 15,000 are resident local migrant workers who live in the district most of the year, but who travel to other areas during the off season; 15,000 are local workers who live in the district year around; 8,500 are foreign workers who cut sugar cane only; 8,500 are interstate migrants who come into the district for the peak farming season; and 4,000 are intrastate workers who migrate only in Florida from area to area as crops are ready.

Nationwide, the migrant population continues to total approximately 1 million persons including workers and their families.

There are two other points, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make as I introduce this legislation, and they concern the administration of the law.

First, when this law was enacted, and when subsequent amendments were made, I took the position that this program should have separate identity and operations within the Public Health Service. Today, I reiterate that position and wish to state that I am opposed to any reorganization within the Public Health Service which would destroy this separate identity and would obliterate the separate central and regional office staff of the migrant health unit.

Second, while I support the purpose and intent of Public Law 89–749, the partnership for health program which enables each State to designate a comprehensive health planning agency within the State to provide new statewide systems for health care, I believe that the migrant health program should continue on a categorical basis. To do otherwise would mean diluting migrant health moneys over a much broader population. Moreover, the problem of the migrant workers moving from State to State is more of a Federal problem than a single State problem and by delivering health care needs through categorical grants we will ease the burden upon the States and permit them to devote more energy to solving other health problems within the States.

The problem of effective health care for migrant and nonmigrant agricultural workers is one that is serious, and yet funding of the existing program has been disappointing. The Labor-HEW appropriation bill recently passed by this body contained only $8 million of the authorized $15 million for fiscal year 1970. This means that we will be spending approximately $8 for each migrant worker and his family this fiscal year while the average expenditure on medical care in the Nation will be more than $300 for every man, woman, and child. This is a disgrace.

I am hopeful that the Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare will be able to hold hearings on this legislation very soon.

THE GREAT DEBATE

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think the year 1969 will forever hold a special place in history: it will not only go down as the year in which man first set foot on the Moon, but as the year of the great debate over national priorities here on Earth.

A number of factors have spurred this debate, not the least of which are the mounting crises in our cities, the fouling of our environment, the housing shortage, and racial and social tensions.

A new and healthy look at our defense budget has grown in part out of a frustration over the Vietnam war and discoveries of waste and inefficiency in the Defense Department.

And the achievement of a manned moon landing 8 short years after that monumental goal was set has raised questions about our abilities to apply comparable amounts of manpower, resources, and technology to more pressing domestic concerns.

I think it is a gross oversimplification to suggest that we are faced with an either/or proposition: either we maintain a strong defensive posture or we use that same money to fight poverty; either we move into new frontiers in space or we allocate those resources to clean up the old frontiers in America that are now blotted with waste and pollution.

I do not think there are any responsible people who would favor dismantling our Defense Establishment in order to free funds for other needs. And I do not think there are many who would suggest that we completely abandon our space program to enable us to attack more mundane challenges. We must maintain a strong defensive posture and we must continue to press ahead with space exploration.

But the point remains that there is a need to face the coming decades with a realistic set of priorities and I would suggest that our first priority must be a commitment to making this country a better place in which to live for all Americans.

As Housing and Urban Development Secretary George Romney put it in a recent speech:

> The greater struggle to which we should now address ourselves (is) the rebuilding of our cities; the cleansing and improvement of our environment; the elimination of racial prejudice and social tensions; the realization of the equal justice, equal opportunity and equal human dignity which are the birthright of all Americans.

In that speech, delivered on the day of the Moon landing, Secretary Romney had the courage to suggest that we content ourselves with achieving these goals rather than with setting another priority goal in space. In his words:

> How much greater would be our contribution to the well-being of all Americans if we were to make massive new investments to improve the lot of man on earth—rather than to divert those resources to land an American on still another planet.

Twenty years ago Congress set the goal of "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family." Twenty years later we are faced with the severest housing and environmental crises in our history. Eight years ago we said we would put a man on the Moon and last month we did just that after a massive commitment of resources, manpower, and technology. I applaud that effort and am proud of that achievement. But I also think the time has come to apply that same type of effort to meeting our 20-year-old pledge here on Earth.

There is a lot of talk today in scientific and public circles about putting a man on the planet Mars in the next 10 or 12 years. I would not be one to deny us this eventual goal. But I do not think we should make this another crash program of the magnitude of our Apollo program. I think we may be well advised to listen to those who urge a shift in emphasis in the immediate future to more unmanned space probes which they claim would not only be cheaper, but scientifically more productive.

It is interesting to note in passing that despite all the excitement, glamor, and pride surrounding the Apollo Moon landing, a recent Gallup poll reveals that Americans are cool to a manned Mars landing. The poll, which was taken just after the Moon landing, shows 39 percent of the adult Americans polled favor a manned landing on Mars, while 53 percent oppose such a venture.

I would suggest that we set aside the immediate goal of putting a man on Mars and instead make life a bit more bearable for men on Earth. Or, as Secretary Romney so eloquently puts it:

> Let us turn our principal energies, our chief concern, to this great spaceship on which we ride together—to the speedy betterment and ennoblement of the quality of life on planet Earth.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced we would be far better off if we shifted our priorities from baking pie in the sky to giving a piece of the pie to everyone here on Earth.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include the text of Secretary Romney's speech as well as editorials from the Washington Post and New York Times and an article on the Gallup poll relating to a Mars program.

The articles follow:

EXCERPT OF REMARKS BY GEORGE ROMNEY, JULY 21, 1969

This weekend belongs to history. The first men have set foot upon the moon. With all Americans and men and women of all nations, we pray for the safety and full success of the mission and the men who discharge it.

America's manned space program has been good for America and good for mankind. It has lifted our hearts in a period of turmoil and distress. It has captured the imagination of the world. Its by-products of technology and management have far-flung applications. Its imminent success represents the

achievement of a magnificent national objective. It is an inspiring demonstration of what Americans can accomplish when we set our eyes on a high target and mobilize our resources to achieve it.

The question now before us is what lies beyond the moon. For as Walt Whitman said, "It is provided in the essence of things that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary."

President Nixon has rightly proclaimed this day as a National Day of Participation in the expected triumph of our mission to the moon. I hope that it can also be a National Day of Reflection—a time when all Americans may pause to consider our next national objective—to ask what is the greater struggle which should next engage our energies.

I do not propose that we now abandon our efforts to extend man's reach still further beyond our planet, any more than we abandoned our domestic goals while we were reaching for the moon.

But I do believe the time has come for a revision—in fact, a reversal—of our national priorities.

I believe that in the decade ahead, the public interest and indeed our national survival require us to assign our housing and urban goals a high priority—at least comparable to the priority we gave our space program in the decade just ending.

It took more than rhetoric to reach the moon—more than a declaration of intent—more than enabling legislation from the Congress. It took a massive national commitment—an investment of billions in research and technology—the assembling of a private-public organizational system every bit as intricate as the complex mechanical and electronic system that carries our astronauts through space.

And the systems required to achieve our housing and urban goals are even more complex than the systems which take us to the moon. As Dr. Thomas Paine, NASA's Administrator, said recently, "Mobilizing modern science, technology and management to accomplish bold ventures in space is clearly far simpler than better organizing the extraordinarily complex human interactions that comprise a modern metropolis."

This, in my judgment, is the greater struggle to which we should now address ourselves: the rebuilding of our cities; the cleansing and improvement of our environment; the elimination of racial prejudice and social tensions; the realization of the equal justice, equal opportunity and equal human dignity which are the birthright of all Americans.

How much more meaningful our accomplishment would be if we were to carry to completion in the seventies our 20-year-old goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for all Americans—rather than to content ourselves with setting another priority goal in space on the heels of our landing on the moon.

How much greater would be our contribution to the well-being of all Americans if we were to make massive new investments to improve the lot of man on earth—rather than to divert those resources to land an American on still another planet.

And how much greater would be our impact on the opinion of mankind if we were to make America a model of domestic progress, tranquility and opportunity—rather than to settle for the easier task of proving once again our merely technological superiority.

Our housing and urban goals already are in place. Congress has laid the statutory groundwork. We are developing innovative new approaches to muster the private and public resources we will need to reach these goals.

All we need now, in order to succeed, is the commitment—the setting of priorities—and the determination to devote sufficient resources to the task.

Americans have proved time and again that hardly any task is beyond our capacity once we commit ourselves to its achievement. We are proving it again this weekend.

The question we must now decide is what lies for us beyond the moon.

Let us press forward in space. Let us reach for Mars, the other planets, and the very stars.

But let us turn our principal energies, our chief concern, to this great spaceship on which we ride together—to the speedy betterment and ennoblement of the quality of life on planet Earth.

Let us set priorities. Let us set timetables. Let us commit resources. Let us build systems. Let us break barriers. Let us build homes and cities and a new America.

If we do, we can fulfill the promise of America for ourselves and for all mankind.

Then truly we will have reached beyond the moon and touched the stars.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1969]

BEFORE WE START TO MARS

It is quite understandable that NASA Administrator Paine and Associate Administrator Mueller should propose an expanded manned space program designed to send men to Mars perhaps as early as 1981. Flushed with the success of Apollo 11, the advocates of manned flight are eager to latch onto a new goal and the money needed to reach it. It may be that they have judged the mood of the country accurately and that a Mars landing will become the focus of future space activities. But before they or the President make a final judgment, some other considerations ought to be weighed.

The news from Houston, still exciting in some respects, has taken a disturbing turn in others. There seems to be a notion in Houston that the highest priority in the space program should be assigned projects designed to perfect the technology of space travel. The resignations of Dr. Wilmot Hess as director of science at the Manned Space Center and of the scientist-astronaut F. Curtis Michel, coupled with the low priority given research scientists who wanted to talk to the two men who walked on the moon, demonstrate the results of such thinking. The challenge of the space program for the group in Houston which has had the dominant voice in planning the Apollo missions has been simply to put men in space. So far the pursuit of basic scientific knowledge, which is the fundamental justification for the program, has been a handmaiden (often an unwanted one) on space flights.

Against this background, Dr. Hess was brought into NASA a few years ago in an effort to improve the quality of the basic research done on Apollo flights. His successes have been small but important for they seemed to pave the way for other scientists—those more interested in the knowledge that lunar and planetary exploration can bring than in the techniques of getting there—to take a larger hand in the future Apollo plans. His departure is likely to reverberate through the scientific community as a sign that the goal of Apollo is simply to repeat the tremendous feat of July 20–21 and improve on the techniques of space flight instead of setting the mission of each flight primarily to maximize the yield of basic scientific data.

The manned space program cannot be allowed to take such a course either in future Apollo flights or in the grandiose plans for a trip to Mars. If the landing of Apollo 11 is to be any more than a stunt, albeit the grandest stunt in history, it must be the beginning of a careful and systematic basic research program aimed at unlocking the secrets of the universe. It makes only a little sense to go back to the moon again and again simply to improve our method of getting there and of getting to Mars; it makes a great deal of sense to go back in order to learn all we can about the moon's origin and composition. It makes little sense to send only test pilots while bypassing the trained scientists among the corps of astronauts, although it is undoubtedly wise to use only test pilots until landing techniques are improved.

There was a certain logic in playing down the purely scientific aspects of the Apollo program in the past since the effort was to land men on the moon before the Russians did. But that day is past. The scientists of space, as contrasted with its engineers and technicians, have been forced into the back seat of the manned space program. It is time now to make them the navigators. The choice of missions—for future flights to the moon and for future operations that will lead some day to a trip to Mars and eventually other planets—should be largely in their hands. They, far better than the men who created the hardware and the knowledge necessary to make space travel possible, know the areas most appropriate for exploration in terms of gaining knowledge.

It is possible that the great sense of exhilaration that Apollo 11 provided can be sustained most easily by embarking at once on an all-out effort to reach Mars. But the costs of the space program (and Messrs. Paine and Mueller are now talking about $6 billion a year) can be rationalized only in terms of basic research. Before either NASA or the administration commits itself to long-range plans for man in space, it ought to be sure that the program it suggests is based on doing it right, not merely on doing it first. It is knowledge we seek, not spectaculars, and the task of gaining knowledge often is tedious. Our ability to move through the universe may grow more rapidly than our ability to absorb the information that awaits us there. In such a situation, the pace of the space program must be geared to our capacity for absorption, not our capacity for travel.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 7, 1969]

BLUEPRINT FOR EXPLORATION

The United States now has the capability of exploring the solar system at relatively low cost; wisdom suggests that intensive use be made of this capability during the 1970's. This is essentially the conclusion reached in a report by 23 leading space scientists—a conclusion that deserves adoption as a pillar of this nation's space program in the next decade.

Mariners 6 and 7 have been demonstrating for a week the fantastic capabilities of unmanned satellites, sending back to earth from 60-million miles away brilliant clear photographs of the Martian surface plus key information about Mar's atmosphere, temperature and physical constitution. In the process they have enormously increased man's knowledge of the red planet and forced revision of many previous ideas. And still this has been done at a cost which—when compared to the $24 billion spent on Apollo—is very small change indeed. Similar inexpensive probes could be sent to other planets—from Mercury near the sun to far distant Jupiter, Saturn and even Pluto. The scientific harvest from such a program would be enormous; the diversion of public funds from urgent needs on earth would be relatively slight.

With the encouragement already provided by President Nixon and Vice President Agnew, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has begun drumming up pressure for the huge sums required to send men to Mars in the early 1980's. But the latest Mariner information makes the prob-

ability of life on Mars much less than it seemed even a week ago, thus removing much of the original motivation for such a project. The shift of emphasis now proposed to unmanned satellites would be far cheaper, scientifically it would also be far more productive.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 7, 1969]

THE GALLUP POLL—PUBLIC COOL TO MANNED MARS LANDING

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—A nationwide Gallup survey finds the public generally lukewarm toward the idea of setting aside money to pursue an eventual manned landing on the planet Mars. Opinions on this issue, however, depend largely on a person's age, with a majority of young adults in their twenties in favor of the idea and majority of those over 30 years of age opposed.

Taking adults of all ages together, 39 per cent favor a U.S. space push to Mars, 53 per cent express opposition and another 8 per cent have no opinion on the question. Persons with college training are far more likely to favor a Mars landing program than are those with only a high school or grade school background.

Negroes are opposed to the government setting aside money for an eventual Mars landing by the ratio of 3-to-1. The Rev. Ralph Abernathy, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, has been sharply critical of federal funding for the exploration of space and has called for more federal aid for the nation's poor.

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew said recently that he was pressing for an effort to land men on Mars by the end of the century. He is on a panel named by the President last February to recommend, by September, the nation's long-term goals in space.

Last week the U.S. unmanned Mariner 6 and 7 spacecrafts traveled to within 2,100 miles of Mars to photograph linear features on the planet.

The core of the public's opposition to setting aside money for a Mars project stems from the belief that money earmarked for a Mars landing would be better spent on domestic problems here on earth.

A 59-year-old college instructor from Lansing, Michigan said: "With all the poverty, crime, urban decay that we have on this planet, I see no reason why we should use all of our resources to get to a planet where life probably does not exist."

Those in favor reason that the scientific exploration of space must be continued to "advance the knowledge of mankind" and to "stay ahead of Russia."

A 23-year-old Bronx, New York, printer was excited about the prospect of a Mars landing: "The moon shot was tremendous, almost unbelievable. We can't stop now. There are so many areas of the universe we should explore. Man can learn a great deal from these adventures."

A total of 1517 adults in more than 300 randomly selected areas across the nation were asked this question between July 26–28.

There has been much discussion about attempting to land a man on the planet Mars. How would you feel about such an attempt—would you favor or oppose the United States setting aside money for such a project?

Following are the national results and the findings by age and education:

	Favor (percent)	Oppose (percent)	No opinion (percent)
National	39	53	8
21 to 29 years	54	41	5
30 to 49 years	40	53	7
50 and over	28	60	12
College	52	45	3
High school	39	52	9
Grade school	25	63	12

The public was also lukewarm about proposals in the early 1960's to begin an extensive program designed to land a man on the moon.

In May, 1961, President John F. Kennedy called on Congress to increase expenditures for the space program with the ultimate goal of landing a man on the moon before Russia did. On the eve of that appeal, the Gallup Poll found only one person in three willing to see the U.S. spend the billions necessary to get a man on the moon.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 10, 1969]

MANY EXPERTS OPPOSE MARS LANDING

(By Thomas O'Toole)

HOUSTON, April 9.—When President Nixon sits down next month to ponder the proposals of a White House task group on space, he may well approve a manned landing on Mars as the next national space goal. And in doing so, he may also spark one of the biggest scientific controversies the Nation has ever seen.

While not that simple, the controversy is expected to match the muscle and money of the space agency and the aerospace industry against a pair of unlikely allies—most of the Nation's scientists and many of the members of Congress.

Indeed, the battle lines are already drawn. "At this stage," says Dr. Eugene Shoemaker of the California Institute of Technology "it is premature to go to Mars, and the day when we should go there is a long way off."

"Mars isn't going to go away," declares Cal Tech's Dr. Bruce Murray, one of the world's foremost experts on Mars. "We have no need to be in a rush to get there."

Key members of the Congress also seem to be against the Mars goal, if for other reasons than the scientists have.

"I think it's time to slow down a little," says Sen. Warren Magnuson (D-Wash.), a top-ranking member of the Senate's Space Sciences and Appropriations Committees. "I certainly don't think we can lay down an agenda for Mars like we did for Apollo."

While NASA is itself divided on the issue, most space agency officials see a manned landing on Mars as the next big hurdle in space, the challenge that must be met of the exploration of space is to be carried out the nation is to explore space to the best of its abilities.

"We've got to move ahead," is the way it's put by George M. Low, Apollo spacecraft manager at Houston's manned spacecraft center and one of the most able men in the whole space agency. "If we set a goal that is less than Mars, we are not pushing as hard as we can."

ULTIMATE GOAL

The way top planners in the space agency see it, Mars need not be an immediate goal but it most certainly must serve as an ultimate goal, both to rally around and to provide the push for developing beyond the moon into deep space.

Rocket pioneer Wernher von Braun believes it is possible to put men on Mars in 1981, but nobody believes the space agency will push for that early a landing date.

"We won't ask for a Mars goal by that date," says a space agency spokesman. "What we want to do is commit ourselves to exploring the solar system, with a goal within that commitment of landing on Mars."

TWELVE-MAN SHIP

The way to land men on Mars, the space agency says, is to begin immediately to develop a 12-man orbiting space station, a shuttle "bus" that can carry men back and forth to it, a space "tugboat" to push space stations together and a nuclear engine to supply the rocket thrust needed for long excursions into space.

Nobody is willing to estimate the cost for such a multiple undertaking, but as of now space officials believe the Mars landing goal can be met within a total space agency budget of $60 to $70 billion over the next decade.

This would mean that NASA's budget would rise by more than $1 billion in fiscal 1971 to $5 billion, then rise each year for the next three years to a peak of $7 billion, where it would stay for another year before starting a gradual decline again to an average of $5.5 billion for the balance of the Mars program.

The development of the four new pieces of "hardware" necessary to land men on Mars would be undertaken in stages, starting in fiscal 1971 with a 50-ton space station that could remain for as long as 10 years in earth, moon or planetary orbit, where it could keep 12 men alive as well for periods up to two years.

Next in line for development would be a reusable space shuttle to ferry crews from the orbiting space stations to the earth, moon or Mars—wherever the space station might be at the time.

When the space station and shuttle begin to operate in earth orbit, the deep-space "tugboat" and nuclear rocket engine projects would be accelerated. Both of these would be necessary to carry the space station and shuttle bus out to the moon and then to Mars.

The space agency justifies their expense by relating it all not to priorities but to percentages of the gross national product.

"We estimate," a space agency spokesman said, "that even in the peak years of 1974 and 1975 we would be getting no more than three-fifths of one per cent of the gross national product to undertake the Mars adventure. Then, it would start to decline until in 1990 we'd be down to about one-fifth of one percent."

The argument against priorities and for percentages of the nation's wealth may be a just one, but it won't get a warm reception in Congress.

NATIONAL PRIORITIES

Even now, budget restraints and cries about national priorities are enough to hold down space spending. Senate Democratic leader Mike Mansfield and majority whip Edward Kennedy have both challenged the man-on-Mars notion for these very reasons.

Beyond that, there is a definite sentiment in Congress against any new big push in space.

Sources close to Congress agree that Capitol Hill would like to see some new directions in space, that there is a feeling of support for space exploration—but nothing on the scale of a manned landing on Mars.

"This isn't 1961," says a staff member of the House space committee, "We haven't just come from the Bay of Pigs and we haven't just witnessed Yuri Gagarin becoming the first man in space. There's no pressure to climb Mount Everest again."

If there is sentiment against a manned Mars landing in Congress, there is strong and active opposition to it among scientists.

SEE NO NEED

Like many members of Congress, scientists feel little political need to set our sights on Mars.

"The need to land men on Mars just doesn't exist," says Cal Tech's Bruce Murray. "We're ahead of the Soviets in almost every aspect of space. There is no justification for it at all.

More than the lack of a race with the Russians, scientists believe a manned Mars landing would be a waste of the nation's space resources.

"It would be immature," Dr. Murray says. "What we ought to be doing is extracting the minimum benefits and scientific discovery we can out of space, out of the technology that already exists. I'm not saying we shouldn't go to Mars with men someday but there's so much else we ought to be

doing now that I would give Mars a very distant priority."

MOON COLONIZATION

If the nation sets a new national goal in space, most scientists think it should be exploration and eventual colonization of the moon.

"We should have a 10-year program to explore the moon beyond Apollo," declares Cal Tech's Dr. Shoemaker. "We ought to go to key places on the moon, develop long distance roving vehicles and set up scientific base on the moon."

Some scientists worry that if we set out to land on Mars, we will end up on just another moon anyway.

The findings of the two Mariner spacecraft that flew by the red planet recently did little to suggest there is any but the most simple form of life and atmosphere on Mars, while the closeup photographs taken by the Mariners of Mars revealed the same type of crater cluttered face the moon has.

"If you want to do space science," says Dr. Wilmot N. Hess, director of space science and applications at the Manned Spacecraft Center, "you might be better off doing it on the moon, where you can study the sun and examine all the effects of the solar wind you could on Mars."

While many scientists who opposed sending men into space now concede man's usefulness in space, they do not feel the goal of a manned Mars landing exploits that usefulness in a full and proper fashion.

MORE INTERESTING

"It's not at all clear," Murray says, "whether men might be better off in orbit around Mars or around some other planet like Jupiter that would probably prove far more interesting than Mars anyway."

Murray goes on to say that if we really want to set ourselves a national goal, it should be to explore the solar system in a step-by-step fashion, eventually landing men "someplace more exciting than Mars."

"In my own mind," Murray goes on, "The asteroids and the moons of Jupiter are the most mysterious objects in the solar system. If we want to be adventurous, let's set out to put men there.

The argument that keeps coming up against setting out to land men on Mars is not one supporting adventure, however. It is more the plea for reason, for caution and against haste.

"Men have just landed on the moon for the first time," says a scientist at the manned spacecraft center, "and already we're deciding our next trip will be to Mars. It makes no scientific sense."

Put another way, the argument runs something like this:

The nation must decide whether we want to be tourists or travelers in space. Do we want to see 15 cities in 14 days, or do we want to lay over in Paris for a month before deciding where to go next.

ON PROJECT PEACE

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, for over 4 years, I have been proud to support Project PEACE, an experimental job retraining program of the very hard core unemployable persons sponsored by the Catholic diocese of Cleveland. Bishop Clarence Issenmann, of the Cleveland diocese, deserves a great deal of credit for his continued concern and support of Project PEACE even though the going has sometimes been difficult. Since PEACE began in November of 1965 it has trained, under the direction of Father Edward Camille and Mr. Ellsworth Harpole, hundreds of educationally limited people and as the report of progress indicates, an astonishingly high percentage of those who completed PEACE training courses found gainful and long-lasting employment which is supposed to be the goal of our manpower policies.

However, too many times, as can be seen in the history of Project PEACE, an experimental project is funded in good faith; the work of the project is accounted for periodically in reports submitted to the relevant Federal agencies; and results produced are cataloged, with no beneficial effect on manpower policies or even other training programs which seek assistance.

The vast Federal investment in manpower programs is wasted when beneficial results produced from experimental programs are not utilized. Programs which produce positive results experience bureaucratic procrastination, frequently because interim project reports are not read and studied.

Notwithstanding these roadblocks, it has been my pleasure to support this fine program, Project PEACE. It has shown how to produce results. Too many have not. It is time to give our manpower policies and their Federal administrators a real restructuring. The full Project PEACE report to the Labor Department is as follows and should be read—it is a valuable report:

FOLLOWUP STUDY OF PROJECT PEACE SKILL CENTER FORMER TRAINEES, APRIL 1969

(Prepared by Elizabeth B. Minton; funded by Department of Labor and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Project PEACE Skill Center, 7115 Woodland Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio: Cosponsored by Board of Catholic Education, Family and Children Services, and Catholic Inter-Racial Council of The Diocese of Cleveland. Project Director, Edward J. Camille; program director, Ellsworth H. Harpole; orientation director, John J. Klecan, Jr.

FOLLOWUP STUDY OF PROJECT PEACE SKILL CENTER FORMER TRAINEES

In November, 1965 the Project PEACE Skill Center, operated by several agencies of the Cleveland Catholic Diocese, commenced operation of an experimental and demonstration manpower training program financed in part of the U.S. Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. The program was part of an Inner City Project designed to develop occupational potentials of socially, culturally and economically deprived families through foundation skills elevation, job readiness orientation and prevocational experiences. The trainees were to be 300 vocationally limited, unemployed heads of household, male or female, aged 22 years and over, who could benefit from a program aimed to rendering them intellectually and socially ready to enter vocational education classes or on-the-job training situations leading ultimately to gainful employment. The main thrust of the Project PEACE program was on remedial education and pre-vocational experiences in simulated and actual situations.

In Project PEACE's first training program cycle, which lasted from November 15, 1965 through April 14, 1967, 316 persons were served. The intent of this study is to determine the employment status and experiences of these 316 Project PEACE former trainees over the 20 months which have elapsed since the last group of trainees left the Center.

METHODOLOGY

The study design was to locate, interview and include in the survey the 316 former trainees who attended Project PEACE between November 15, 1965 and April 14, 1967, even though all 316 did not complete the prescribed program. An interview schedule was developed which covered a wide range of topics, including the respondents' opinions about the relatedness of Project PEACE and other job training programs to actual employment experiences, as well as information on employment records since termination at Project PEACE. After pre-testing, this lengthy schedule was greatly simplified because of the length of time required to administer it to the respondents. As it was anticipated that most of the 316 trainees would be interviewed personally, a short interview schedule was a necessity. (A copy of the final schedule used for interviewing is attached as Appendix A.)

Interviewers were hired who, using records at Project PEACE, attempted to locate and interview the former trainees. Call-back visits were made, with an average of three attempted visits to each respondent. In some instances, seven or eight attempts were made. All possible sources of information were investigated and utilized to locate former trainees. Many of the trainees had moved and efforts were made to trace them to their new residences. All of these intensive efforts resulted in uncovering the whereabouts of a majority of the trainees and interviews were held with 163 of the 316.

Because two respondents refused to answer questions and because seven schedules had to be discarded when the information contained on them appeared to be inaccurate, the study which follows deals with 154 former trainees, 49 percent of the total group. Although some information is available about the 162 former trainees not included in the study, no assumption can be made that their experiences or employment records since leaving Project PEACE are similar to that of the respondents.

FIGURE 1. *Percentage distribution of selected characteristics of the 154 respondents*

[In percent]

Sex:	
Female	52
Male	48
Age:	
Age 20 to 29	28
Age 30 to 39	25
Age 40 to 49	34
Age 50 and over	13
Marital status:	
Single	12
Married	42
Divorced	22
Separated	18
Widowed	6
Education:	
Under 6th	11
Grades 6 to 8	25
Grades 9 to 11	40
Grade 12	24
Length of unemployment prior to enrollment:	
Under 5 weeks	15
5 to 14 weeks	16
15 to 26 weeks	11
26 to 52 weeks	15
Over 52 weeks	43

CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

The 154 Project PEACE Skill Center former trainees interviewed in the followup study were similar to the total group of 316 trainees in age, marital status, education and length of unemployment immediately prior to entering Project PEACE. The respondent group differed from the total group in two respects: (1) males were underrepresented in the respondent group, 48 to 60 percent; and (2)

persons receiving public assistance at the time of enrollment in training were also underrepresented, 47 to 60 percent. (A comparison of characteristics of the total group with the respondent group is given in Appendix B.)

The typical respondent was a married female, aged 38 to 39, with 2 dependents, who had completed the tenth grade and who had not been receiving public assistance although unemployed about 40 weeks immediately prior to training. Figure 1 on the following page presents a graphic description of selected characteristics of respondents as of the time of enrollment in Project PEACE.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS AT FOLLOWUP

As of December 31, 1968, 19 of the 154 respondents had withdrawn from the labor market, and of those still in it 106 (79 percent) were employed and 29 (21 percent) unemployed. This rate of employment compares very favorably with reported rates from other manpower training programs. Slightly more than one-half of the employed respondents were females and, as can be seen from Figure 2, the female employment rate was somewhat higher than the rate for males.

FIGURE 2.—*Employment status of males and females*

[In percent]

Females:	
Employed	82
Unemployed	18
Males:	
Unemployed	26
Employed	74

Duration of current employment ranged from 1 week to 3 years, with a median of 21 months. A geat deal of this variation in length of employment can be attributed to the corresponding range of time individual respondents were actually in the labor market; that is, actively seeking employment. Trainees at Project PEACE left the Center at various intervals of the training cycle and many of the trainees went into additional job training or educational programs after leaving Project PEACE. Thus, the data given above on duration of employment does not reflect the fact that 54 of the 106 employed respondents (51 percent) became and have remained employed since completion of training.

Almost all of the employed repsondents (90 percent) were working full time, and three-fourths reported receiving wage increases, upgrading or promotions on their current jobs. Average weekly earnings were $97.00, with 37 former trainees (35 percent) earnings over $100 per week. Added to the impact of earnings to these former unemployed heads of household is the fact that 44 of the 106 were, but are no longer, recipients of public assistance.

Jobs were secured in many occupations, with the largest group of respondents (35 percent) moving into skilled and semi-skilled jobs in manufacturing industries. Many of the trainees were hired in the new semi-professional jobs with social agencies, schools and in health services. Even though 26 percent of the respondents reported employment in service jobs, many were not in the traditional custodial and unskilled jobs.

Figure 3, below, summarizes the data secured on respondents employed as of December 31, 1968.

Twenty-nine of the 154 former trainees were unemployed. Eight had not worked since leaving Project PEACE but the remaining 21 had held an average of 1.5 jobs. Some had been unemployed only a few weeks but the majority had been without employment for almost a year (median, 44 weeks). Comments made to interviewers by some of the unemployed respondents attributed inability to secure and retain employment to racial discrimination, age and to partially limiting physical conditions.

Nineteen respondents had withdrawn from the labor market; that is, they were unemployed and were no longer seeking employment. Twelve of the 19 were females. The major reason given for leaving the labor market was illness (10 of the 19). Other reasons included family problems (usually around care of young children), marriage, school or training programs, and age.

FIGURE 3.—*Percentage of employed respondents for selected characteristics*

[In percent]

Sex:	
Male	47
Female	53
Source of employment:	
Self, friend, relative	51
Project PEACE	25
Agencies	19
Other	5
Weekly earnings:	
Under $50	4
$50 to $75	16
$75 to $99	45
$100 to 150	27
Over $150	8
Weeks employed:	
1 to 26 weeks	11
27 to 52 weeks	8
1 to 2 years	42
Over 2 years	39
Occupation:	
Skilled	7
Semiskilled	29
Semiprofessional	17
Service	26
Sales, clerical	14
Other	7

EMPLOYMENT STATUS DURING THE PERIOD SINCE TERMINATION AT PROJECT PEACE

In the period since leaving Project PEACE, 89 percent of the respondents (136 of 154) were employed at least part of the time (106 are still employed, 21 unemployed and 9 out of the labor market). The majority of the respondents (58 percent) secured jobs through their own efforts after learning of job openings from a friend or relative. Project PEACE and other job training programs placed an additional 34 percent. Thus, only 8 percent (N-12) secured jobs through the normal community employment channels.

The amount of mobility between jobs was relatively small with only 49 respondents holding two or more jobs during this period. Some of the mobility between jobs can be attributed to career advancement but the majority of the multiple job holders (62 percent) changed occupations as well as jobs. The most frequently reported reason (64 percent) for leaving a job involved the amount of work available or working conditions. Several were laid off; others reported the work "ran out" or "there was too much work for the money". Some stated the work was too taxing physically. In addition, 11 percent were discharged for absenteeism, insubordination, intoxication or incompetence. The remaining job terminations were for job advancement, illness and family responsibilities.

Employment was secured over a range of industries and occupations. The medical, educational and welfare professions provided one-third of the jobs as aides, counselors and office workers. Manufacturing industries employed 28 percent in a wide variety of skilled and semi-skilled occupations. Retail trade and business and repair services employed an additional 19 percent. Employment was also secured on a very limited basis with utility companies, construction firms, financial institutions and governmental agencies.

The duration of unemployment among the 154 respondents varied greatly. Although the median weeks of unemployment for the group was 5.4 weeks, 34 of the respondents (22 percent) were unemployed more than 52 weeks. As the number of weeks of unemployment does not reflect the varying lengths of time individual respondents spent in the labor force, an analysis was made for individual respondents of the percentage of time employed based on the length of time each spent in the labor force. Table 1 shows that 60 of th respondents (39 percent) were employed the full length of time they were in the labor force, and that 85 (55 percent) were employed for at least 75 percent of the time. It appears from this analysis that the majority of the Project PEACE former trainees were successful in entering and remaining in the labor market.

TABLE 1

Percentage of time employed	Number	Percent
Total	154	100.0
1 to 24.9 percent	16	10.4
25 to 49.9 percent	6	3.9
50 to 74.9 percent	15	9.7
75 to 99.9 percent	25	16.3
100 percent	60	39.0
Never employed	11	7.1
Never in labor force	9	5.8
No data	12	7.8

FACTORS RELATED TO STABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT

An analysis of the data was made in an attempt to isolate any factors or characteristics of the respondents which appeared to have a relationship to securing and retaining employment. For this analysis, comparisons were made with groups of respondents classified by the percentage of time employed. The respondents who were employed 75 percent or more of the time spent in the labor market (N 78) were considered to be the stable group and were compared to the group employed 0 through 74 percent of the time (N 45). The 19 respondents not in the labor market on December 31, 1968 and the 12 for whom no data was available on percentage of time employed were excluded from the analysis. Comparisons were made on 18 variables, 9 of which appeared to have considerable relationship to stability of employment; 5 indicated some relationship, and 4 appeared to have little, if any, meaning. The nine factors which appeared to be significant are:

1. Completion of Program at Project PEACE: Project PEACE trainees were evaluated at enrollment and placed in remedial and pre-vocational programs on the basis of achievement level. The trainees were expected to remain at the Center long enough to achieve the level of preparation necessary for entry into the labor market. Of those trainees who remained at Project PEACE throughout the prescribed program, 67 percent were in the stable employment group as compared to 47 percent for those who left Project PEACE before completing the program.

2. Achievement Group Level at Project PEACE: As stated above, Project PEACE trainees at enrollment were evaluated and classified as to achievement level. Trainees were then placed into five groups according to test scores. Group I contained trainees with the highest scores and Group V those with the lowest scores, the majority of the latter group being unable to read and write. As shown in Table 2, former trainees from Groups I through IV were similarly represented in the stable employment group but Group V trainees had only 30 percent with stable employment.

TABLE 2.—*Percent in stable employment*

Achievement level group:	
Group I	65.4
Group II	54.1
Group III	60.0
Group IV	63.5
Group V	30.0

Less than one-half of the Group V trainees remained at Project PEACE until completion of training. Because the achievement level of Group V trainees was so low, the training program was intended to last for 50 weeks, a considerable time investment for persons who are seeking employment. However, those Group V trainees who did complete the training showed considerably more stability in employment than the group as a whole. This finding, of course, supports the relationship described above between completion of training at Project PEACE and stable employment.

3. Reason for Termination at Project PEACE: Those trainees who were placed in employment through the job development efforts of Project PEACE staff and those who secured employment through their own efforts were more likely to have employment stability than trainees who left for other reasons. The group of trainees dropped from the program for chronic absenteeism and inability to adjust to the program showed little stability of employment (14 percent); and none of the trainees returned to referring agencies because of lack of improvement was employed for more than 25 percent of the time spent in the labor force.

TABLE 3.—*Percent in Stable Employment*

Reason for Termination:	
Employment:	
Project PEACE	76.9
Self	67.6
Training program	52.4
Illness	50.0
Dropped by agency	14.3
Retirement to referring agency	0.0

The findings in these first three items strongly indicate that Project PEACE was extremely successful in evaluating and screening the potential of its trainees as well as assessing their readiness to move into the labor market.

4. Number of jobs held: As might be expected, respondents who held only one job after leaving Project PEACE were more likely to be employed 75 percent or more of the time spent in the labor force than those who held two or more jobs (72 and 45 percent).

5. Source of job placement: There was a marked difference in stability of employment for those respondents who secured jobs through Project PEACE than from other sources. Those placed by Project PEACE showed 76 percent with stable employment compared to 56 percent for self placements and 46 percent for other agencies such as OSES and MDTA, AIM Jobs and County Welfare Department's Title V program.

6. Type of occupation: Great variation was exhibited in stability or employment based on skill level of occupations, ranging from 100 percent stability for those in skilled occupations to 41 percent for private household workers and laborers. In spite of the wide variation, Table 4 shows a definite progression in stability of employment related to the type and skill level of occupations. The more skilled the job, the more stable the employment.

TABLE 4.—*Percent in Stable Employment*

Occupations:	
Skilled	100
Semiskilled	67
Semiprofessional	64
Service	59
Clerical and sales	48
Laborers	41
Private household	41

7. Age: Older respondents were more likely to be in stable employment than younger respondents. Here, too, a clear line of progression in stability developed related to age, as seen below.

TABLE 5.—*Percent in stable employment*

Age:	
20 to 29 years	48.5
30 to 39 years	55.5
40 to 49 years	62.5
50 to 59 years	66.7

Even though older workers evidenced greater employment stability, the majority (especially those aged 50 and over) were employed at unskilled jobs or had returned to the occupations held prior to enrollment in training.

8. Years of gainful employment: Not surprisingly, respondents with the most years of gainful employment prior to enrollment were more frequently in stable employment at follow-up than those with shorter employment histories. Respondents with 2 years or less of previous employment had only 40 percent in the stable employment group, those with 3 through 9 years of employment 60 percent and 10 or more years, 66 percent.

9. Criminal record: The final characteristic which showed a marked relationship to stability of employment was the absence of a criminal record. Arrests and convictions for intoxication, fighting and non-support were excluded from the criminal category. The percentage of respondents with criminal records who showed stability in employment was 36 percent compared to 60 percent for those without criminal records. The same relationship does not exist for those respondents with arrest records for non-criminal activities, such as those listed above. This indicates that the lack of employment stability of persons with criminal records may be a reflection of personality and behavioral patterns rather than of the fact of a prior arrest record being a deterrent to stable employment.

The above analysis strongly indicates that Project PEACE has been very successful in training and moving previously unemployed heads of household into the labor market. Further, the analysis suggests that the key to successful entry and retention in the labor market probably depends upon the methodology of the training agencies and not so much upon inherent characteristics of the individual trainees. The group of five factors which evidenced some, but not great tendencies to be related to stability of employment was largely focused on characteristics of the individuals. The significance of these factors to employment stability, however, appears to be small, and tends to support rather than contradict the importance of training methodology.

Married respondents showed a much greater tendency to unstable employment than any of the other marital status categories, with only 38 percent rated as stable. This compares with a high of 67 percent for widowed respondents. Persons with four or more dependents had slightly less stability of employment (50 percent) compared to those with fewer dependents. There was, however, no progression of stability; that is, as the number of dependents increased employment stability did not decrease as would be expected in a true relationship between the variables. The same type of situation occurs in analyzing data on education. High school graduates had a higher percentage (72) in stable employment and yet the group with the least percentage of stability was respondents who had completed grades 9 through 11. There was a tendency for persons not receiving public assistance at time of enrollment at Project PEACE to have more employment stability than those who were receiving assistance (62 to 53 percent) but the difference was not large. Also, there was an indication that persons unemployed less than 26 weeks immediately prior to enrollment were more likely to be stable in employment than those unemployed over 26 weeks. A percentage distribution of the five characteristics which evidence some relationship to stable employment is found in Appendix C.

The four factors which appeared to have significance in stability of employment were sex, length of time spent at Project PEACE, number of times moved since termination, and completion of a job training program subsequent to leaving Project PEACE. (Percentage distributions are provided in Appendix C.)

Males and females showed similar percentages of 55 and 60, respectively, in stability of employment. The number of weeks spent by trainees at Project PEACE accounted for little variation in percentage of stable employment. This might be a result of Project PEACE's policy of programming for trainees based on achievement level rather than length of program. Neither the fact that a respondent changed his place of residence nor the frequency of such changes had any effect on stability of employment, with both movers and non-movers showing an identical 58 percent in stability.

The final finding, and perhaps the most unexpected, was that completion of a job training program subsequent to leaving Project PEACE had no significant effect on stability of employment. Respondents who completed such training showed 61 percent in stable employment compared to 57 percent for those who either did not enter or complete a job training program. (About 60 percent of those who completed training programs secured employment in the occupation for which they were trained.)

Further analysis of the data might provide explanations for some of the variation in and lack of relationships as described above but such analysis is beyond the scope of this study.

FINANCIAL RETURN

One of the most frequently raised questions concerning special manpower training programs relates to the financial return on money expended for the program. The Project PEACE Skill Center operated on a budget of $800,000 to provide remedial education and pre-vocational services to 316 trainees. Data secured in this follow-up study showed that as of December 31, 1968, 106 former trainees had been employed for 90.2 weeks at an average weekly wage of $97.00. Based on the averages, the 106 respondents have already earned a total of $927,436 in wages, over $100,000 more than the total cost of the Project PEACE program. This computation does not include earnings from previous jobs held by the 106 employed former trainees and by the 29 unemployed respondents, nor does it take into consideration the possible earnings of the 162 former trainees not located by the study.

In addition to earnings there has been a corresponding reduction in the use of public funds for public assistance payments. At the time of enrollment in Project PEACE, 72 of the respondents were receiving public assistance. As of December 31, 1968, 51 respondents were no longer receiving assistance, 3 were receiving reduced benefits and 3 previously not receiving assistance had been added to the rolls. Using the average monthly payments to these recipients, there has been a monthly reduction in public assistance payments of $12,658, or a savings of $151,896 per year. Combining a year's reduction in public assistance with the earnings of the respondents, the cost of the Project PEACE program has already been exceeded by $279,332.

In light of the above, it appears that the answer to the question of financial return on program costs must be answered in the af-

firmative for the Project PEACE training program.

The follow-up study of former trainees of the Project PEACE Skill Center was designed to determine employment status and experiences of 316 trainees who attended the center between November 15, 1965 and April 14, 1967. Personal interviews were conducted with 154 of the 316 former trainees.

The study revealed that, as of December 31, 1968, 79 percent of interviewed trainees who were in the labor force were employed. This rate compares favorably with reported rates from other manpower training programs. The employed respondents had been employed on their current jobs for an average of one year and nine months and were earning an average of $97 a week.

In the period since termination at Project PEACE, the majority of the former trainees were successful in entering and remaining in the labor force. During this period, 136 of the 154 respondents (89 percent) were employed at least part of the time, with 106 still employed. Fifty-one of 72 former public assistance recipients had become self-sustaining. Jobs were secured in a wide range of industries and occupations. Only about one-third of the respondents held more than one job after entering the labor force. There was indication, however, that the respondents did not utilize normal channels for entry into the labor market or in moving from one job to another.

There was strong evidence that Project PEACE was extremely successful in evaluating and screening the potential of its trainees as well as assessing their readiness to move into the labor market. The analysis further suggests that successful entry and retention in the labor market probably depends upon the methodology of the training programs and not so much on inherent characteristics of the individual trainees.

APPENDIX A

FOLLOWUP STUDY OF 316 FORMER PROJECT PEACE SKILL CENTER TRAINEES (FROM NOV. 15, 1965, THROUGH APR. 14, 1967)

Interviewer_____ Date_____

Name_____

Current address_____ Phone_____ Age_____ Number dependents_____

Number of times moved since leaving center_____

EMPLOYMENT RECORD (SINCE TERMINATION FROM SKILL CENTER)

Presently employed: Yes_____ No_____ If yes, where employed_____

Starting date_____ Job category_____ Number of weeks on present job_____

How was job obtained_____ How employed: Full-time_____ Part-time_____ Casual_____

Earnings: Weekly $_____ Did you get wage increase_____ Upgraded rate_____ Change in title_____

PREVIOUS EMPLOYMENT (PRIOR TO PRESENT EMPLOYMENT AND/OR SINCE TERMINATION FROM CENTER)

1. Where employed_____
Job category_____
How was job obtained_____
Starting date_____ Date left_____
Number of weeks worked_____ Earnings $_____
Employed:
Fulltime_____ Parttime_____ Casual_____
Reason for leaving_____

2. Where employed_____
Job category_____
How was job obtained_____
Starting date_____ Date left_____
No. of weeks worked_____ Earnings $_____
Employed:
Fulltime_____ Parttime_____ Casual_____
Reason for leaving_____

(Use reverse side if more space is needed for previous record)

TRAINING RECORD

Type of training_____ Where: MDTA_____ Which school_____ Starting date_____
Placed by_____ Completed training_____ Date completed_____ Presently in training_____
Dropped out: Voluntary_____ Involuntary_____ Mutual_____ Reason_____
If training was completed, did you secure job in area trained: Yes_____ No_____ If not, what type of job did you obtain_____

Are you furthering your training_____ How_____

Are you registered with Ohio Bureau of Employment Service? Yes_____ No_____
Are you receiving unemployment compensation? Yes_____ No_____ If yes, Amount $_____
Welfare recipient: Previous: Yes_____ No_____ Present: Yes_____ No_____
Category_____ Amount $_____

APPENDIX B

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF TOTAL PROJECT PEACE TRAINEE GROUP AND RESPONDENT GROUP ON SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristics	Percent distribution: Total group (N=316)	Percent distribution: Respondent group (N=154)
Sex	100.0	100.0
Male	60.0	48.1
Female	40.0	51.9
Age (in years)	100.0	100.0
20 to 29	30.1	28.6
30 to 39	31.3	24.7
40 to 49	29.4	33.8
50 and over	9.2	12.9
Marital status	100.0	100.0
Single	14.6	12.3
Married	45.3	42.2
Separated	20.2	18.3
Divorced	15.8	21.4
Widowed	4.1	5.8

APPENDIX B—Continued

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF TOTAL PROJECT PEACE TRAINEE GROUP AND RESPONDENT GROUP ON SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS—Continued

Characteristics	Percent distribution: Total group (N=316)	Percent distribution: Respondent group (N=154)
Number of dependents	100.0	100.0
None	20.6	29.9
1	15.8	16.9
2	12.3	9.7
3	18.4	13.0
4	8.5	8.4
5 or more	24.4	22.1
Last grade completed	100.0	100.0
Less than 6	17.4	11.5
6 through 8	24.3	24.7
9 through 11	41.1	40.3
12	17.2	23.5
Weeks unemployed	100.0	100.0
Less than 5	10.4	14.9
5 to 14	9.5	16.2
15 to 26	8.9	11.0

APPENDIX B—Continued

PERCENTAGE COMPARISON OF TOTAL PROJECT PEACE TRAINEE GROUP AND RESPONDENT GROUP ON SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS—Continued

Characteristics	Percent distribution: Total group (N=316)	Percent distribution: Respondent group (N=154)
Weeks unemployed		
26 to 52	13.0	14.9
Over 52	58.2	43.0
Public assistance	100.0	100.0
Yes	59.5	46.8
No	40.5	53.2
Criminal record	100.0	100.0
Yes	12.6	11.0
No	87.4	89.0

APPENDIX C

Percentage of respondents in stable employment for selected characteristics

Marital status:	
Single	52.9
Married	38.6
Divorced	58.6
Widowed	66.7
Separated	46.7
Number of dependents:	
None	58.8
1	61.9
2	69.2
3	60.0
4 or more	50.0
Education:	
Less than 6	62.5
Grades 6 to 8	64.7
Grades 9 to 11	54.0
Grade 12	72.2
Public assistance recipient:	
Yes	53.2
No	61.6
Length of unemployment:	
Under 26 weeks	63.2
26 weeks and over	52.5
Sex:	
Male	55.2
Female	61.1
Weeks at Project PEACE:	
1 to 14	58.5
15 to 26	57.1
27 to 52	56.7
Over 52	60.0
Number of times moved:	
None	61.8
1	66.7
2 or more	70.0
Completed training program:	
Yes	61.1
No	57.3

URBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

(Mrs. DWYER asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to join in introducing the administration's proposed Urban Public Transportation Act of 1969. This legislation, in my view, is the most far-reaching and potentially effective proposal ever offered by any administration to help arrest the serious decline in public transportation facilities in the United States, and not only to arrest the decline but to begin in a massive way the rebuilding and expansion of a balanced system on which millions of our people must depend.

In his message to the Congress last Thursday, President Nixon spelled out the conditions which make a program of this size mandatory: The cycle of increasing costs and fares, decreasing passengers, inadequate maintenance and capital investment, and declining service.

He also held out the hope of what this program could achieve: Better service for bus riders, train commuters, and subway users; less congested streets and roads for car drivers; greater opportunities for the poor to reach jobs and training programs; greater access for suburbanities to the economic and social resources of the cities; and a loosening of the noose around the necks of city centers.

Improved public transportation is a vital key to ultimate success in dealing with the innumerable problems of urban areas and the administration bill, I believe, will contribute greatly to this objective for several reasons:

First. It represents a strong national commitment to goals which have too long been postponed.

Second. It authorizes Federal funds in an amount substantial enough to make a visible impact on the problem and, hopefully, to attract heavier investment at the State and local levels and from private operators.

Third. It places the urban transportation program on a long-term basis for the first time which, coupled with assured contract authority for a minimum of 3 years, will enable the necessary planning and programing to be done on an orderly basis.

Fourth. In addition to providing capital investment funds, it also strengthens the existing research and development program in order to assure that public transportation will be built for a lengthy future on the basis of the most advanced technological knowledge.

Fifth. It relaxes the stringent existing limitation on the share of available funds to which larger States and cities are entitled—the very areas where the public transportation problem is most critical—and it provides for direct participation in the program by private transit companies which are performing a public service.

Mr. Speaker, this program will be expensive, but not nearly as expensive as it would be to do nothing. We have paid heavily for our failure to do more sooner. We have paid by relying almost exclusively on the far more costly system of private transportation on public highways. We have paid in terms of cost escalation of public transit facilities. As the Department of Transportation recently pointed out, a 1966 study of the cost of fixed rail system capital improvements over a 10-year period has been revised upward 3 years later from $8.6 billion to $10.4 billion. And, finally, we have paid for our delay in the missed opportunities and frustrated hopes of millions of Americans who are poor or young or elderly or handicapped.

The administration bill, Mr. Speaker, presents a major challenge to this Congress, a challenge to cooperate in an endeavor which holds great promise for the future of our country. As an original sponsor of the first mass transportation demonstration program enacted by Congress and as a sponsor of every mass transit act since that time, I am deeply proud to put my name—together with those of other colleagues—to this legislation. Our need is great, our time is short.

As a part of my remarks, I include a section-by-section summary of the bill I have introduced:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO PROVIDE LONG-TERM FINANCING FOR EXPANDED URBAN PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Sec. 1—This section declares it to be the finding of the Congress that, in order to realize urgent national goals, the Federal commitment to assist urban public transportation must be raised to at least $10 billion over a twelve-year period. This is necessary to achieve efficient, safe and convenient transportation compatible with soundly planned urban areas. The purpose of the bill is to create a partnership in which local communities may exercise the initiatives to satisfy their urban transportation needs, with Federal financial assistance.

Sec. 2—Amends section 3 of the Act which is the basic authority for the program of grants and loans for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction and improvement of public transportation facilities and equipment.

3(a)—This subsection presently specifies the purposes for which the grants and loans under the program may be used, defines eligible sponsors, and prescribes certain capabilities that the proposed sponsor must display. The amendment provisions spell out the authority of the Secretary to provide assistance on terms and conditions which he may prescribe, which might include, for example, the establishment of a uniform system of accounts.

Another change permits the Secretary to make loans for real property acquisition under new subsection 3(b) upon a finding that the land is reasonably required in connection with an urban public transportation system and will be used for the purpose within a reasonable time. He need not make the more detailed findings required by this section for grants and loans for other purposes.

There is a provision, also, which requires that the appropriate State Governor be furnished with a copy of the application for assistance so that he may have 30 days in which to comment. The Secretary must consider any such comments before taking final action on the application.

Finally, the subsection is amended to permit loan assistance to be extended directly to private transit companies; grant assistance may be provided directly only when the Secretary determines that there is no appropriate public body or agency through which to transmit funds and that the public interest does not require the establishment of one. Any application for a private operator must first be approved by the appropriate State or local public body or agency thereof.

3(b)—This subsection is new and provides the authority and mechanics for loans to enable public transportation systems to acquire rights-of-way in advance of construction. Loans for this purpose may include the net costs to the locality of relocation payments and property management and will require a Secretarial finding that the proposed acquisition is reasonably expected to be required for a public transportation system and that it will in fact be used for public transportation facilities within a reasonable period. Repayment of the loans must take place within ten years; however, if a grant is made for construction on that right-of-way, repayment of the loan must be made at the time of the grant. Repayment will be credited to the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

The loan agreement would provide for construction not later than ten years after acquisition, but it is possible that acquired real property interests might ultimately not be used for that purpose. If and when such a determination is made, the Secretary would direct that an appraisal be made to determine how much, if any, the property has increased in value since acquisition. The Federal Government and local agency would share any profit on a two-to-one ratio respectively, which is the ratio for sharing project costs. The Federal Government would not share in losses in value of the property, however.

3(c)—This subsection (based on section 3(b) of the present Act), imposes restrictions on the making of loans and prescribes certain conditions on loans which are made. It prevents making both loans and grants for the same project, except where (1) the grant is made for relocation payments, and (2) the real property involved was acquired for rights-of-way, station sites, or related purposes pursuant to the authority added by the new subsection 3(b).

The effect of this subsection is to establish, by deleting certain provisions of the present Act, that loans are to be made only from the authorizations contained in this bill. Under the Act as originally passed, it was intended that Treasury borrowing, pursuant to section 203 of the Housing Amendments of 1955, would be employed for this purpose; however, to date under this scheme, no Treasury borrowing has occurred, and loans have been made only from specifically appropriated funds.

Finally, the subsection prescribes the manner of computing the interest rate, and establishes a maximum maturity period of forty years, for loans made under section 3; however, loans under subsection 3(b) are repayable within 10 years.

3(d)—This subsection, relating to safeguards for operators of private transportation companies, restates subsection 3(c) of the present Act, except to change the concept of "mass transportation" to "public transportation".

3(e)—This new subsection will require the local agency making or approving an assistance application to show that it has held (or afforded the opportunity for) public hearings and has considered the economic and social aspects of the project, its urban impact and consistency with planning goals. It is similar to 23 U.S.C. 128, which applies to Federal-aid highways.

Sec. 3—The section would: (1) amend section 4(a) of the Act which now requires certain Secretarial findings before section 3 assistance can be provided, to reflect the less stringent criteria of new section 3(b) in the case of land acquisition loans; (2) further amend section 4(a), consistent with permitting private transit companies to receive assistance directly in certain cases, to allow those operators to supply all of the non-Federal share of net project costs. (Present law permits this only in the case of "demonstrated fiscal inability" of the public agency.) But the share contribution of the private company could not be paid out of current revenues, only out of surplus, replacement funds or reserves, or new capital; further, any private transit company receiving a grant will be required to establish a funded depreciation account for the purpose of replacing fully depreciated equipment, regardless of when acquired; and (3) add a new subsection (c) to section 4 providing authorizations for loans and administrative costs, as well as grants and other projects under the Act for fiscal years 1971–1975 and establishing contract authority.

The amounts authorized for appropriation, $300, $400, $600, and $800 million and $1 billion, respectively, for the first 5 years of the new program will increase the level of funding in graduated increments which will help to assure an effective and efficient build-up in the extent of Federal support. The authorized levels of funding, $300, $400, $600, and $800 million and $1 billion, would be available for obligation in their full amounts during the fiscal year for which first authorized, and would remain available until expended. The Secretary would be authorized to obligate these amounts through grants or other contractual agreements. These obligations would be liquidated by subsequent appropriations.

Sec. 4—Makes the same change to section 5 as is made to section 4(a) respecting the share of net project costs paid by a private transit company and the requirement for a fully funded depreciation account.

Sec. 5—Amends section 15 of the Act, which restricts the aggregate of grant projects (other than relocation grants) in any one State to 12½ percent of the total amount authorized for this purpose. The existing legislation anticipated that some States would experience serious inhibitions with this limit and, so, a discretionary pool of $12.5 million was established to be available for use in States which had previously received more than two-thirds of the maximum grants. Notwithstanding this fund, California is now, and a number of other populous States will soon be, at a point where they can receive no further assistance. In the period after 1970, the 12½ percent ceilings would continue to apply but the Secretary would have discretion to use up to 15 percent of the authorizations without reference to the ceilings. Thus, each year 15 percent of monies authorized could be used by the Secretary as a discretionary fund. A percentage figure for this fund, rather than a static dollar figure, is more appropriate for a long-range program with progressive increases up to a substantial figure.

Sec. 6—Section 1 of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968 transferred to the Secretary the program authority under the Act. But that section reserved to the Secretary of HUD authority to make grants for or undertake such projects or activities under sections 6(a), 9, and 11 of the Act (relating to research, development, and demonstrations; technical studies grants; and grants for research and training in urban transportation problems) as "primarily concern the relationship of urban transportation systems to the comprehensively planned development of urban areas, or the role of transportation planning in overall urban planning." It was contemplated that such grants would be made out of appropriations to HUD. Section 105 preserves that understanding and insures that the appropriations authorized under this Act would be available only for grants in furtherance of the functions of the Secretary of Transportation under the Act.

Sec. 7—This section makes several changes in titles and descriptive words to better reflect the nature of the programs. The Urban Mass Transportation Administration would become the Public Transportation Administration and the term "mass transportation" would be replaced by "public transportation."

Sec. 8—Gives the short title of the Act, the "Public Transportation Assistance Act of 1969."

ONE SMALL STEP FOR MAN: ONE GIANT LEAP FOR MANKIND

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

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, countless volumes have been written about our U.S. moon triumph. Every newspaper in America has proudly described the historic moon-conquering flight of the Apollo 11 astronauts.

Certainly one of the foremost journalistic efforts in our country to preserve for history the chronology of events from the liftoff to the safe return to earth of our moon heroes is that of the Kansas City Star and its morning edition, the Kansas City Times.

The extra edition of the Kansas City Times for July 21, 1969, followed by the commemorative edition of the Kansas City Star for July 26, provides a wrap-up of all the events commencing with the launch of July 16, the moon walk of Sunday, July 20, and the splashdown of July 24.

The news articles are an example of distinguished reporting and the editorials are outstanding for their exceptional excellence.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to have the opportunity that excerpts from this extra edition of the Times and the commemorative edition of the Star be preserved in the permanent edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The editorials follow:

[From the Kansas City Star, July 21, 1969]

MAN REACHES OUT AND TOUCHES THE STARS—AND THE MOON

With the touch of his booted foot on an arid lunar plain, man has turned the planet of his creation from a space-locked island to a universal port of call and proclaimed dominion over the stars.

Surrounded and sated by our lesser miracles—the steel birds in the July night overhead, the cataclysm ticking patiently in buried silos, the electronic picture coming live across a quarter-million miles—we received the news. And in those tentative steps of the first moon men, rediscovered our capacity to wonder.

There is pride of nation in this moment, and that is forgivable. But there is also a larger pride of species. The creature with the apposed thumb and the boundless dream—scarcely equipped even to rule his own environment—has dared call himself "the eagle" and go where wit alone would let him live. And we—the collective we—are that creature.

One thing is certain: Man's view of himself, or of the potential of his reach, can never again be the same. Children too young today to mark an era's passing will, tomorrow, let go their toes and grasp a universe.

To the biologist, Apollo's journey may be the crowning triumph of an ordered accident in nature. To the anthropologist, it is tool-making of a consummate order. To the geologist, it may be the key to the cosmic mystery. To the theist, it is a profession of faith by men who, though not divine, are touched by divinity. The plaque left behind in the searing noons and frozen nights on the Sea of Tranquility is a blend of the rational and the ethical.

"Here men from the planet earth first set foot upon the moon," it reads. "We came in peace for all mankind." It is written in stainless steel and meant for the ages.

Yet the great pyramids and the Aztec ruins and the flint arrow points in the secret sands of a thousand rivers are there to remind us that the dream is so terribly vulnerable. Only when a divided mankind has met the larger test—which is the test of spirit—can it be known whether that steel marker will be a monument to vision or, perhaps, a wistful artifact of a species that failed.

[From the Kansas City Times, July 22, 1969]

TRIUMPH IN SPACE CAN NOW BE SAVORED

Exhilarating as it has been, the successful landing of men on the moon could not be fully savored until the two astronauts had left the lunar surface and been safely reunited with their comrade in the orbiting mother ship. Now that critical maneuver has been accomplished and the three—Armstrong, Aldrin and Collins—have begun their two and one-half day trip back to earth. Their achievements are history and their names are on the lips of hundreds of millions of their fellow men.

From a scientific standpoint, the Apollo 11 adventure has only begun. Weeks, months, perhaps years will be devoted to analyzing the lunar samples collected by the moon-walkers for the return journey. Earthbound scientists are awaiting those few precious pounds of material with a curiosity born of generations of speculation.

But the leap of spirit, for which science was but the means, has already become a part of the human experience. What generation has shared such a profound adventure? When have men of all nations been privileged—or obliged—to view their dealings with one another from the perspective of another celestial body? Or had such incentive to proceed rationally?

For the crew of Apollo 11, there remains the final re-entry and recovery phase. Then, finally, the held breath of a nation and the world can be let out in celebration. We wish them Godspeed. They have opened to us possibilities and responsibilities unparalleled in the memory of our kind.

We were there. We put our footprints in the unstirred dust. What we make of that is up to us.

[From the Kansas City Star, July 22, 1969]

FOOTPRINTS—ON THE SANDS OF TIME

Write large this day in the consciousness and history of mankind:

July 20, 1969, when human footprints first were etched on the surface of the moon.

And other days:

Yesterday, when the homeward voyage began.

Thursday, when, according to plan, it is scheduled to end.

And think on the meaning of all this for the generations to come.

For here, perhaps, is the ultimate mystery of it all, the incomprehensible at this point in time.

What now of the year 2000?

What name to give the age that dawned on a Sunday afternoon in the last year of the 1960s?

What judgment to place on the skill and the initiative of man who has left his planet for the first time?

It seems a trifle audacious on this day even to contemplate the answers. Audacious and perhaps beyond the bounds of the humility which confident man should—and must—feel at this moment. Brashly—with a strange and almost inexplicable certainty of his success—man has gone to the moon and is on the way home. When he returns, the sun will rise on schedule, and history's pulse will return momentarily to normal.

But there will be a difference, a difference as yet unmeasured, and one which this generation may not in its lifetime ever measure.

The flight of Apollo 11 becomes now a creature of time, modeling clay of the future to be molded and remolded as other men may choose.

It is, in a sense, an ending, but an ending to what? The era of the earthbound? Perhaps.

It is also a beginning. But of what?

The question is asked, and its answer must be vague and uncertain. For we have yet to hear from the philosophers, theologians and poets of the ages, from the historians and technologists and diplomats of tomorrow.

We have yet to hear—except for the quick judgments of those whose business is commentary on men and their times—from mankind itself in ultimate judgment.

Look forward, then beyond the flights of other spacemen, to the moon and beyond. The flight of Apollo 11 will ultimately recede into the ages, as large as the words may appear on the tablets.

Man, in 1969, stood tall in a great moment of glory. And moved on into a future even more uncertain than it was in the pre-lunar era that suddenly ended. For if the moon itself, its privacy invaded by the confident outreach of mankind, will never be the same again, neither will the planet earth nor man himself.

DOMESTIC FOOTWEAR CRISIS CONTINUES

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have frequently warned of the crisis faced by America's shoe industry. A massive wave of imported footwear has swamped the market. Our domestic shoe manufacturers cannot compete with subsidies, low costs, and sometimes virtual slave labor. Shoe factories are closing down, putting men and women out of work. In New England particularly, imports are damaging the economy. The shoe industry in this country does not want "protection" as such. It merely seeks a chance to compete fairly with foreign labor rates and conditions that would be illegal in the United States.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOOTWEAR MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

The latest report of the National Footwear Manufacturers Association, which I recommend to my colleagues and include at the end of these remarks, shows that 108.3 million pairs of leather and vinyl footwear were imported in the first 6 months of 1969. Despite the effects of the dock strike from January to April, this amounts to a rise of 12 percent over the same period last year. If this rate continues, many more American shoe workers may lose their jobs. I urge Congress and the administration to take action now in order to keep this crisis from getting worse.

NEW ENGLAND SHOE FOREMEN & SUPERINTENDENTS' ASSOCIATION CALLS FOR QUOTAS

I am gratified to see that independent action has been taken by the New England Shoe Foremen & Superintendents' Association, Inc., of Boston, Mass. The board of directors of this organization has adopted a resolution calling upon President Nixon to seek voluntary import controls on shoes. I also include their resolution at the conclusion of my remarks. I have joined many of my colleagues in endorsing this proposal, under the leadership of Congressman JAMES BURKE. It is my hope that communities that depend upon the shoe industry will begin circulating petitions for quotas, particularly signed by those with the most at stake: the workers themselves. We must give this important industry a chance to compete with foreign products on a fair basis.

U.S. FOOTWEAR IMPORTS

(January–June 1969)

June has busted out all over, unloading 16 million more pairs of leather and vinyl footwear or 37% more than the same time last year. Gains were scored by all major groups. Leather and vinyl imports were 37.2% of an estimated domestic production of 43 million pairs.

The effect of the dock strike clearly shows the distortion of trend which took place in the first four months totals. May and June increases follow the same pattern established before the strike took place.

LEATHER AND VINYL IMPORTS

[Millions of pairs]

	1967	1968	1969	Percent change 1968–67	Percent change 1969–68
January	10.3	17.9	[1] 8.8*	+74	[1] −51
February	10.9	17.0	[1] 15.9*	+56	[1] −6
March	13.7	17.2	[1] 19.8*	+26	[1] +15
April	11.9	17.0	[1] 27.1*	+43	[1] +59
May	12.0	16.2	20.7	+35	+28
June	11.4	11.7	16.0	+3	+37
6 months average	11.7	16.1	18.1	+38	[1] +12
July	9.2	13.2		+43	
August	9.2	12.0		+30	
September	8.2	10.7		+30	
October	9.2	12.5		+36	
November	11.4	13.7		+20	
December	11.7	16.4		+40	
12 months average	10.8	14.6		+35	
Total year	129.1	175.4		+36	

[1] 1st 4 months 1969 totals affected by dock strike.

Thus far, first half 1969 imports of leather and vinyl footwear amounting to 108.3 million pairs were nearly 12% ahead of the same period last year. Average value (fob) per pair increased by 15.7%. Shipments from foreign ports were 37% of domestic output estimated at 292 million pairs, and 27% of the new supply (domestic production plus imports).

Men's, children's and wood footwear continue their strong hold in the market place. The volume of imported women's and misses' footwear lines have now advanced to the plus side.

JANUARY–JUNE

Shoes and slippers (Leather and vinyl)	1969 pairs (thousands)	1968 pairs (thousands)	Percent change pairs 1969–68	Percent share of total 1969	Percent share of total 1968
From:					
Japan	32,033.5	34,421.8	−6.9	29.6	35.5
Italy	37,018.7	36,748.7	+0.7	34.2	37.9
Spain	10,948.1	6,335.7	+72.8	10.1	6.5
France	1,899.1	1,859.1	+2.2	1.8	1.9
China T. (Tiawan)	14,901.1	8,103.4	+83.9	13.7	8.4
Other countries	11,509.2	9,517.8	+20.9	10.6	9.8
Total pairs	108,309.7	96,986.4	+11.7	100.0	100.0

AUGUST 1, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: We, the New England Shoe Foremen and Superintendents' Association, Inc., respectfully present and petition the President of the United States, as follows:

The New England Footwear Manufacturing Industries face intensive and ever-increasing foreign competition from footwear imports from low-wage countries. Ours is a labor-intensive industry and, therefore, is an important employer of shoe workers in New England.

In our region, over 300 shoe factories employ approximately 75,000 workers. The majority of these factories are located in small communities where they supply the major source of income and employment.

The dramatic increase in imports from 7.8 million pairs in 1955 to 175 million pairs in 1968 has seriously affected our industry by taking most of its growth and eliminating many job opportunities. The import totals continued to increase in 1969, and by the end of May reached 92,300,000 pairs, amounting to the equivalent of 36.3% of domestic output.

While the rate of imports is increasing, domestic production has been decreasing, with production declining 10% this year.

In addition, due to the loss of industry growth to imports, we estimate that an additional 2,000 job opportunities were foreclosed.

Therefore, this problem is so serious that our Association, on behalf of its 1300 members, and on behalf of the shoe manufacturing industry, respectfully request that you take steps under the general negotiating powers delegated to you by Congress to enter into agreements with the principal foreign-supplying nations aimed at arranging voluntary agreements limiting quantities of footwear imports so that during this year and the years ahead the shoe manufacturing industry of the United States may continue as a viable and healthy segment of our economy. These arrangements could be limited to the principal foreign-supplying nations and

directly relate to those categories of footwear where the greatest impact has occurred and where the major threat exists.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. NORTON, *President.*

THE PRESIDENT'S MASS TRANSIT BILL

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the President's mass transit bill, calling for a 12-year, $10 billion program. The House is already familiar with the details of this program, as a result of the President's message on the subject but I would like to make a few additional remarks.

As many of the senior Members of the House are aware, I have long had an interest in this subject, and the Banking and Currency Committee has worked on it ever since the first such proposal came along as part of the housing bill back in 1961. The whole program began as a simple study. It soon became clear, however, that transportation within our cities is vital if the cities are to live, and that many of our urban problems will not be met unless the transportation problem is solved.

Of what value is it for us to build new health centers, with Federal funds, if those who need these centers cannot reach them because of inadequate transportation? What value can we gain from urban renewal funds if the projects thus built are so far removed from those who would most benefit that they fail to serve the needs of our citizens?

Transportation facilities are geared too much today to those in our society who own and operate their own cars. Too often we ignore the transportation needs of the young, the poor, and the elderly who cannot make use of the freeways we have built for the convenience of the rest of us; and in our larger metropolitan areas, use of the automobile is virtually impossible because of traffic congestion. Unless we relieve this pressure, everyone regardless of his economic status will be affected more and more by "transportation paralysis." The traffic jam, with all its attendant waste of time and energy, has become an unpleasant fact of modern life which we can no longer tolerate.

Ever since Congress recognized this need in the early sixties, the progress has been slow and sporadic. We have never had more than a 2-year program. Now, at last, we have a long-range plan big enough to let us make real headway.

Mr. Speaker, hearings on this subject were scheduled on other bills now before the Banking and Currency Committee, but they were postponed, partly because the administration's position was not yet available to us and partly because the bills submitted called for a trust fund, which would require the concurrence of the Ways and Means Committee. Now we have the administration bill before us. Since it calls for the use of contract authority from the general fund, we can proceed without adding another item to the already overcrowded calendar of the Ways and Means Committee. I am hopeful that we can have hearings soon in September, so that our cities will not have to wait longer than necessary for relief of this most pressing need—the need for adequate public transit.

In short, Mr. Speaker, in introducing this measure, I congratulate the administration on sending us the most massive, long-range, comprehensive transit program ever submitted to Congress, and urge its speedy approval. I shall have more to say on the subject at a later time.

"BROWN LUNG" IN THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, what are the effects of cotton dust on the lungs of workers in the cotton textile industry?

Some preliminary studies have been made in this country, and even though these studies are not as advanced as the research in Great Britain and other European nations, we do have enough data to know that the problem is a serious and growing one. Dr. Arend Bouhuys, professor of epidemiology at the Yale University School of Medicine, describes the disease of "byssinosis" as "an occupational respiratory disease of cotton, flax, and hemp workers." This disease, like pneumoconiosis or "black lung" among coal miners, has the same symptoms of breathlessness, progressive disability and eventual death. Likewise, corporate political power and allied medical experts have effectively suppressed research, knowledge, regulations to curb cotton dust and compensation for byssinosis.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be very timely for Congress to initiate hearings on the prevalence of this dread disease, and measures which should be taken to control and prevent byssinosis. In a letter dated August 9, Ralph Nader has lifted the lid on numerous aspects of this problem in a communication to Hon. Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the text of this letter follows:

AUGUST 9, 1969.

Hon. ROBERT FINCH,
Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY FINCH: For many years a serious occupational respiratory disease has raged silently through the factories of the cotton textile industry. For the same years, the cotton textile industry has been powerful and callous enough to deny the undeniable—that this disease—byssinosis—exists among its workers. For the same length of time, the states, the federal government, the medical and legal professions have been, at best inactive toward this silent violence, and at worst have served the corporate dictates of an industry whose concentrated might has turned jurisdictions into company states and company towns. The result has been private government and public anarchy and human anguish.

The Board of Health of a Southern state has written the following words: "Pure air is a necessity for health, but an individual may have little control over the air which surrounds him and which he must draw into his lungs—he may be powerless to prevent other persons from contaminating his air and thereby striking at the very foundation of his health and happiness. Here as in so many other cases which demand regulation of the conduct of individuals toward each other—the State steps in for the protection of its citizens and enacts rules which shall be binding upon all . ."

Those words were written in 1898. Their message of felt concern and declared action have never been applied to the thousands of cotton textile workers who have experienced the suffocation of their lungs as they were afflicted with byssinosis. Now in 1969, there are no laws applied toward the control of cotton dust in the mills and there is no workmen's compensation awarded for disability from byssinosis or "brown lung."

The dimensions of byssinosis in this country have not been as clearly discerned as has been the case in European countries. In fact, until this year, the official position of the U.S. cotton textile industry has been that there is no such disease in this country. Byssinosis has been recognized in the medical literature of European countries for decades. In Great Britain "brown lung" disability has been compensable since 1940 and several hundred awards are rendered annually. But in this land, research on byssinosis has been plagued by unparalleled obstruction by textile plants ranging from denial of entry to medical scientists to political pressure on state departments of public health. This intransigence is focused in the states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Alabama where 180,000 of the 230,000 cotton textile workers in the U.S. are employed.

The conventional attitude of the cotton textile industry can be seen in the aftermath of a U.S. Public Health Service grant to a then Emory University Professor Arend Bouhuys in 1964 to study the incidence of byssinosis in the mills. On June 4, 1964, a confidential memorandum went out to members of the Georgia Textile Manufacturers Association by the Association's Executive Vice President. The memo urged that members should contact the Trustees of Emory University about how healthful and comfortable working conditions were in the plants and indicated that the study is a waste of taxpayers' funds and is damaging to the public image of the industry. Needless to say, access to the plants by Dr. Bouhuys was not forthcoming. No state law requires the plants to provide access to state public health officials—the air that workers are compelled to breath as a condition of their employment is considered inaccessible private property.

Dr. Bouhuys, now a Professor of Epidemiology at the Yale University School of Medicine, describes byssinosis as follows:

"Byssinosis is an occupational respiratory disease of cotton, flax and hemp workers. Its initial symptoms of tightness in the chest, dyspnea and cough shortly after return to work on Mondays, after an absence from work during the weekend, are characteristic and stereotyped. The symptoms are accompanied by a decrease of ventilatory capacity during the working day. Later, symptoms may extend to other workdays, and finally there is severe and continuous dyspnea, chronic cough and permanent ventilatory insufficiency. Total disability and death may follow. In the cotton industry, byssinosis occurs primarily among cardroom workers."

Dr. Bouhuys and his associates have documented a number of case histories, for example:

A 61 year old man started work in the cardroom at the age of 18 years. By the time he retired he was constantly short of breath; there was little relief when he ceased to work. He mentioned that dust conditions were very bad in the mill in which he worked. There was no air conditioning—only a fan, "which kept the dust stirred up."

A 46 year old man started work in the cardroom as a "slubber tender" at the age

of 25. . . . In January, 1965, he moved to the same job in another mill, where conditions were bad. This mill was pinning low-quality cottons. The cardroom was provided with a dust exhaust ventilation system, but according to the patient, the ducts were insufficiently cleaned and therefore usually clogged. "At times you could not see 10 feet in front of you because of the dust." Symptoms of tightness in the chest and breathlessness soon developed and were worse on Mondays and Tuesdays than on other days, becoming still worse and eventually occurring on all days. In April, 1966, he had to stay away from work because of severe symptoms. He consulted one of us who diagnosed byssinosis and wrote to the mill suggesting that the patient be transferred to a nondusty job. However, the personnel manager told the patient, "I have never heard of such a disease," and discharged him from his job. The patient said that many other cardroom workers were similarly affected.

Dr. Bouhuys and associates have also reported in the *New England Journal of Medicine* (July 27, 1967) that a large proportion of cotton workers exposed for many years to dust in cardrooms were respiratory cripples due to byssinosis. However, physicians in the localities were not reporting this byssinosis, the authors added, due to the untenable diagnosis of these workers as having asthma, chronic bronchitis or emphysema from other causes. Other observations by the authors rebut recurrent myths: (1) "There is no evidence that disabling byssinosis is confined to a small group specifically predisposed to allergic diseases." (2) "We suspect that byssinosis may be on the increase rather than on the decline. The higher productivity obtained with modern cards has caused increased dustiness and more respiratory symptoms in textile workers in England, France and the Netherlands. In the present study, a former cardroom foreman said that the increased speed of carding more than outdid the improvement in dust conditions brought about by air conditioning. In addition, mechanical cotton picking has led to increased amounts of trash in raw cotton and most workers state that dirtier cotton leads to more symptoms. Indeed, one element of this trash, the bracts, contains agents that release histamine in human lung tissue and constrict human bronchi." (3) Wherever a few patients with byssinosis have been identified by physicians, in other parts of the world, and this observation was followed up by epidemiologic studies, many more workers similarly affected have been identified." (4) "None of our patients, while employed, had regular medical examinations that included any test of respiratory function."

Notwithstanding this nation's pretensions on occupational health, and the overseas studies showing byssinosis to be a serious hazard for textile workers in Europe (many plants use American cotton) there has never been a regional or national prevalence study undertaken in this country. Two recent studies, however, provides a glimpse of the widespread incidence of this lung disease. A yet unpublished study by Dr. Arend Bouhuys and Dr. Ronald Wolfson (and associates) at the cotton mill at the U.S. Federal Penitentiary, Atlanta, Ga. (241 control subjects (reported: "Among men in carding and spinning, 28% had symptoms of cough and/or chest tightness on Mondays or worse. 15% had chest tightness on all Mondays, and 5% complained of chest tightness on other days of the week as well." Extrapolating to the industry generally, Dr. Wolfson speculates that nearly 20,000 workers could be suffering from byssinosis. This is a highly conservative estimate for the following reason. Of the 110,000 workers in the cotton textile industry working as carders or spinners, very few of them have been exposed so little in time as the workers in the prison cotton mill in Atlanta. Half of the workers diagnosed were exposed for less than a year in this mill. Moreover, this six year old mill is, according to Dr. Wolfson, "relatively clean, modern, and up-to-date on air filtering and dust removal."

The results of the second study, presented before the American Thoracic Society in May 1965, came from tests of 500 cotton textile workers in a large North Carolina mill. The researchers, Dr. Peter Schrag and Dr. A. Dale Gullett, reported that 12% of the workers had byssinosis as an overall prevalence; 29% of cardroom workers, 10% of weavers and 9% of spinners had the disease.

Dr. Schrag* points out that the "problem of byssinosis is also complicated by technical considerations and is related to the more general problem of health and safety standards in industry. The cotton mills treat cloth with phenol and formaldehyde to make it crease-resistant, stain-proof, permapress, drip-dry, etc. Before cotton comes to the mill, it is sprayed with numerous pesticides and defoliating agents including DDT, benzenehexachloride, toxaphene, chlordane, parathion, and calcium cyanamide. The humidifying systems of many cotton mills blow steam containing fungicidal agents into the workrooms. This is necessary to prevent mold and slime from growing within the ducts and the use of chemicals is cheaper than cleaning the ducts regularly." He urges what few in government heed—that "more money be spent to study the effect of new chemicals and new technology not only on cloth but also on people."

The struggle for breath on the part of the tens of thousands of retired cotton textile workers must also receive attention. These people, most of them poor Whites, are living lives of quiet desperation that are wracked with coughing and breathlessness. They are uncompensated for their work-related disabilities from byssinosis. Depleted human beings, they produced for their corporate leaders and now are cast aside, like bits of used machinery.

Taking active and retired cotton textile workers together, it is highly probable that over 100,000 persons are suffering from byssinosis in this country. Yet the textile industry has denied repeatedly the existence of such a disease.

The problem of controlling and preventing byssinosis is not technical but one of corporate political power. The technical remedies are known: better dust suppression techniques employing hoods, exhausts and air filtration systems; redesign of machinery to control dust eruptions; greater attention to the cleaning of cotton; the use of vacuums and suction rather than air pressure hoses to "blow off" looms—these are some of the changes suggested by specialists. In addition, careful medical testing of workers' respiratory state and relocation of disabled workers have long been urged by the very few physicians and public health officers working in this area. The political power of the textile industry stands in the way. This power has no countervailing offsets in the states. Unions have little acceptance in these states' textile plants; state laws either do not exist or are endemically unenforced; the public health profession has long been intimidated by the animosity of the textile manufacturers to studies of byssinosis. There remains the federal government to assume the leadership in developing a national policy of care for these unfortunate workers.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare's programs in occupational health have been underfunded and under led for many years. This deficiency was shown clearly in the "black lung" controversy involving coal mine operators and workers. I urge you to avoid a repetition of this weakness in the forthcoming challenges to the cotton textile industry over "brown lung" disease.

There are a number of policies which can be initiated promptly. First your Department could announce a major study of byssinosis incidence in the nation; in the meantime alerting the workers and the public of this disease and suggesting temporary remedies and precautions (such as medical examinations for possible respiratory diseases). Second, your Department could urge the White House and the Congress to give this rampant disease a high priority. The White House last week proposed a program for occupational health and safety that was so weak and so industry-indentured as to constitute a paramount disgrace. Your good offices may be able to temper this situation. More probably, Congress would respond to your call for hearings on byssinosis. Third, under the Walsh-Healey Act, the Department of Labor is empowered to establish health and safety standards for plants with whom the federal government does business. The federal government does a great deal of business with the textile manufacturers but the Act has had not an iota of effect on cotton dust suppression. Not having any research base, the Department of Labor can add that incapacity to its traditional non-enforcement of Walsh-Healey. Your Department does have a fund of knowledge on byssinosis which can make a most compelling case for the Department of Labor to *act*.

The breathless byssinotic workers of the cotton textile industry are voiceless. The many other occupational health and safety hazards of the industry also deserve immediate attention (from tremendous noise to hazardous machinery to toxic chemicals). It is hoped that your leadership will initiate what must be done to curb this violence on the cotton textile worker.

Thank you,

Sincerely yours,

RALPH NADER.

* Chief Resident, Internal Medicine, Harlem Hospital, New York City.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. NIX), for the week of August 11, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORSE, for 60 minutes, on August 13.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TUNNEY, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 25 minutes, today

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MCMILLAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin immediately following the President's message.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio immediately following the President's message.

Mr. BROCK, immediately following the President's message.

Mr. ADAIR in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks made today on H.R. 10420.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. STOKES), to revise and extend his remarks during his special order today, and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SEBELIUS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHADEBERG.
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.
Mr. SNYDER in three instances.
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. POLLOCK in three instances.
Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
Mr. ROTH.
Mr. BROTZMAN.
Mr. TAFT.
Mr. ASHBROOK in three instances.
Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.
Mr. SPRINGER.
Mr. GUBSER.
Mr. SAYLOR in two instances.
Mr. DELLENBACK.
Mr. CLEVELAND.
Mr. WYLIE.
Mr. ROBISON.
Mr. O'KONSKI.
Mr. MICHEL.
Mr. ESCH.
Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.
Mr. MCDADE.
Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.
Mr. BUSH.
Mr. LANDGREBE.
Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.
Mr. RUPPE.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.
Mr. DENNEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.
Mr. FRASER in two instances.
Mr. GIAIMO.
Mr. CLAY in six instances.
Mr. PEPPER in three instances.
Mr. BROOKS.
Mr. ANDERSON of California.
Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.
Mr. COHELAN in five instances.
Mr. UDALL in eight instances.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. TUNNEY.
Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.
Mr. BINGHAM.
Mr. SIKES in five instances.
Mr. PICKLE.
Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in five instances.
Mrs. CHISHOLM.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas.
Mr. CONYERS in 10 instances.
Mr. BOGGS in 10 instances.
Mr. DULSKI in four instances.
Mr. WALDIE in four instances.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.
Mr. REUSS in eight instances.
Mr. BOLAND in two instances.
Mr. FEIGHAN in four instances.
Mr. ROYBAL in eight instances.
Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1108. An act to waive the acreage limitations of section 1(b) of the act of June 14, 1926, as amended, with respect to conveyance of lands to the State of Nevada for inclusion in the Valley of Fire State Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1836. An act to amend the Federal Seed Act (53 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1934. An act for the relief of Michel M. Goutmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2564. An act to amend the act fixing the boundary of Everglades National Park, Fla., and authorizing the acquisition of land therein, in order to authorize an additional amount for the acquisition of certain lands for such park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 864. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 912. An act to provide for the establishment of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Colorado; and

S. 1611. An act to amend Public Law 85–905 to provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On August 7, 1969:

H.R. 1632. An act for the relief of Romeo de la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sanano; and

H.R. 2336. An act for the relief of Adela Kaczmarski.

On August 11, 1969:

H.J. Res. 864. Joint resolution to provide for a temporary extension of the authority conferred by the Export Control Act of 1949.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, August 12, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1040. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a report on exports of significant defense articles for the period July through December 1968, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90–629; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1041. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and detailed to the Army General Staff, on June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 3031(c) of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1042. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide a long-term financing for expanded urban public transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1043. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a revolving fund for the development of housing for low- and moderate-income persons and families in the District of Columbia, to provide for the disposition of unclaimed property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1044. A letter from the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act providing for the zoning of the District of Columbia and the regulation of the location, height, bulk, and uses of buildings and other structures and of the uses of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved June 20, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1045. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, transmitting an interim progress report on the work of the Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1046. A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report on the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in June 1969, in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia, pursuant to the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, and the applicable Presidential determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1047. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 91, *The Havasupai Tribe of the Havasupai Reservation, Arizona, plaintiff,* v. *The United States of America, defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Indian Claims Commission Act, as amended (60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1048. A letter from the President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting a report on claims paid by the Company during fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claim Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII pursuant to the order of the House of August 7,

1969, the following bill was reported on August 8, 1969:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12982. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted Aug. 11, 1969*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 13300. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax to provide for the extension of supplemental annuities and the mandatory retirement of employees, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALDIE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1782. A bill for the relief of Irving M. Sobin Co., Inc., and/or Irvin M. Sobin Chemical Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 91–465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 13420. A bill to provide for settlement of claims resulting from floods which occurred along Four Mile Run and its tributaries in Arlington County and the city of Alexandria, Va., during the period beginning July 21, 1969, and ending August 2, 1969; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 13421. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the League of Women Voters, on February 12, 1970; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 13422. A bill to provide long-term financing for expanded urban public transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. O'HARA, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. HICKS, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 13423. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 13424. A bill to encourage the development of novel varieties of sexually reproduced plants and making them available to the public, by making protection available to those who breed, develop, or discover them, thereby promoting progress in the useful art of agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 13425. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, by providing for temporary injunctions or restraining orders for certain violations of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 13426. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 13427. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct inequities with respect to the overtime, night, holiday, and Sunday pay of certain employees of executive agencies performing inspection, quarantine, immigration, and other control and regulatory services at points of entry into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 13428. A bill to create a Federal Insurance Guaranty Corporation to protect the American public against certain insurance company insolvencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 13429. A bill to establish a national policy and program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 13430. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Old Kodiak National Historic Site in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 13431. A bill to permit all compensation paid at regular rates to certain employees of the Alaska Railroad to be included in the computation of their civil service retirement annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 13432. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the program of assistance for health services for migrant agricultural workers, to provide assistance for health services for other seasonal agriculture workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 13433. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 13434. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Ariz., in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 90 and 122, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 13435. A bill to provide for the award of a Congressional Space Medal to astronauts and others for significant contributions or outstanding achievements in the national space program; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 13436. A bill to amend section 902 of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate certain duplications in Federal benefits now payable for the same, or similar, purpose; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13437. A bill to repeal the savings provision of Public Law 90–493 protecting veterans entitled to disability compensation for arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13438. A bill to include railroad retirement benefits as income of veterans for Veterans' Administration pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 13439. A bill to regulate interstate commerce by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the inspection of facilities used in the harvesting and processing of fish and fishery products for commercial purposes, for the inspection of fish and fishery products, and for cooperation with the States in the regulation of intrastate commerce with respect to State fish inspection programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 13440. A bill to provide more efficient and convenient passport services to citizens of the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 13441. A bill to permit expenditures in connection with certain facilities in Kansas City, Kans., to be counted as local grants-in-aid to federally assisted urban renewal projects and neighborhood development programs in Kansas City, Kans.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 13442. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal mortgage adjustment payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary, in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CAREY, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROBISON, and Mr. SMITH of New York):

H.R. 13443. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Connecticut-New York railroad passenger transportation compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 13444. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13445. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide for the payment of an additional amount of up to $100 for the acquisition of a burial plot for the burial of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 13446. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deduction from the monthly insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13447. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide cost-of-living increases in the insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HÉBERT (for himself and Mr. BOGGS):

H.R. 13448. A bill to authorize the exchange, upon terms fully protecting the public interest, of the lands and buildings now constituting the U.S. Public Health Service hospital at New Orleans, La., for lands upon which a new U.S. Public Health Service hospital at New Orleans, La., may be located; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 13449. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of

equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 13450. A bill, Water Bank Act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 13451. A bill to authorize the sale of silver dollars remaining in the U.S. Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ESCH, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. FRASER, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. ZABLOCKI):

H.R. 13452. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BUTTON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FISH, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. DENT, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. NIX, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. KYROS):

H.R. 13453. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TAFT, Mr. STEED, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KEE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. SLACK, and Mr. STAGGERS):

H.R. 13454. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA (for himself, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. GRAY, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. RONAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. MINISH, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. RODINO, and Mr. HANLEY):

H.R. 13455. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1959); to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 13456. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 13457. A bill to establish a national policy program with respect to wild predatory mammals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 13458. A bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to provide for programs of job training and education of inmates of correctional institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13459. A bill to protect the privacy of the American home from the invasion by mail of sexually provocative material, to prohibit the use of the U.S. mails to disseminate material harmful to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 13460. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to authorize a program of assistance for treatment centers for young drug abusers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13461. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (for himself, Mr. ALBERT, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 13462. A bill to amend the act of August 25, 1959, with respect to the final disposition of the affairs of the Choctaw Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL (for himself, Mr. WYDLER, and Mr. ADAIR):

H.R. 13463. A bill to provide long-term financing for expanded urban public transportation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 872. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

H.J. Res. 873. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND (for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H. Con. Res. 316. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the "Eulogies on Dwight David Eisenhower"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. GAYDOS, and Mr. BURTON of California):

H. Con. Res. 317. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 318. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the elimination of the Castro-Communist regime of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELLENBACK (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H. Res. 519. Resolution providing for the transmissions of proceedings of the House by means of closed-circuit television to offices of Members of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 520. Resolution expressing the sense of the House with respect to the establishment of youth advisory councils to inform the departments and agencies of the Federal Government of the opinions and viewpoints of the Nation's youth; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H. Res. 521. Resolution, United Nations Conventions on Human Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

250. By the SPEAKER:

Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the New Melones Dam and Reservoir project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

251. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to community development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

252. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to establishment of a mass transit fund; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

253. Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to oil drilling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAPPELL:

H.R. 13464. A bill to authorize the conveyance of the mineral rights and interests of the United States in certain real property to Jesse W. Yawn; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr ECKHARDT:

H.R. 13465. A bill for the relief of George V. Vincin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 13466. A bill for the relief of Giulio de Nicolais; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 13467. A bill for the relief of Puducode Subramaniam Balasubramania Sarma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 13468. A bill for the relief of Paul Koller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 13469. A bill for the relief of John R. Gosnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 13470. A bill for the relief of Mr. Loo Kay Choo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

209. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Allan Feinblum, New York, N.Y., relative to Armed Forces chaplains; to the Committee on Armed Services.

210. Also, petition of Julie Price, and others, Bartlesville, Okla., relative to permitting girls to serve as pages in Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

211. Also, petition of Clarence Martion, Sr., Washington, D.C., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

212. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to establishment of a Committee on Petitions; to the Committee on Rules.