cultural areas culminating in the Old Erie Canal Trail Parkway following the historic canal route. However, recreational activities for all age groups must be developed and conducted as physical facilities are completed.

The development and implementation of new programs and facilities would be carried out the first year with the immediate erection of the Cohoes Community Center providing social, cultural and recreational services and programs to MNA families. In addition, innovative plans have been submitted for a joint historic preservation, educational, recreational and cultural venture which would restore the Old Opera House and connect it into two greatly needed facilities; namely, a theatre and a library.

Crime and Delinquency: To combat adult crime, a comprehensive survey will be made the first year for the purpose of improving systems for maximizing the security of residents regarding their persons and property and developing new programs to meet these ends during the second and succeeding program years. Juvenile delinquency will immediately be attacked by supporting community youth programs and facilities while developing improved and innovative systems and programs. The Juvenile Aid Bureau will be established and the Youth Bureau expanded through supplemental funds during the first year. A police and community relations will be developed in the first year, including the conducting of police training programs.

Relocation: First program approach would be to initiate a Comprehensive Housing and Relocation Study to determine specific relocation needs by characteristics of households. This approach would also include the monitoring of the Economic Base Study to determine specific relocation needs of industry and business.

While this study is under way, the city should then create, through new legislation, a Central Relocation Agency; recruitment of a staff to administer an effective city-wide program and provide supplemental funds to organize the agency.

Relocation standards and policies should be adopted by the City government and the administrative machinery would go into full operation.

Housing: First program to be initiated would be the Comprehensive Housing and Relocation Study, cited in the Relocation Goal. Next, the development of open sites by installing needed utilities and the establishment of a Housing Development Corporation. This would be followed by development of programs for construction of new housing on open developed sites or redevelopment sites.

Vacant dilapidated units would be demolished early in the program.

Rehabilitation of sub-standard housing could take place that would not cause major dislocation. Upon completion of new housing units, families and individuals from dilapidated housing, major rehabilitation projects and those dislocated from major improvement projects could be relocated. Simultaneously the program for assistance toward homeownership could be in effect.

Economic Development: The immediate need under this component is to provide redevelopment land (land that is currently occupied by vacant, obsolete, and deteriorated structures) for existing industries whose facilities have become obsolete for the construction of new facilities. Therefore, the program approach to develop blighted land and install facilities would be of first priority.

While this action is being initiated under an NDP program, a Comprehensive Economic Base Study would begin which would include an employment study, an update of the 1965 economic base study, and long range industrial and commercial development plans.

A Comprehensive Employment Program would be organized and implemented. This would be followed shortly by the program to identify characteristics of MNA households below the CPIC, and the development programs, according to household needs, to boost incomes above the CPIC.

The demolition of dilapidated non-residential buildings would begin under the NDP program along with demolition under the Physical Environment Component.

Restoring of industrial and commercial buildings would begin with the reorganization of the Cohoes Indsturial Development and Redevelopment Corporation as a Community Development Corporation.

A long range CBD plan and industrial development plan would begin to be implemented through a Community Development Corporation.

Physical Environment: The program approach to which the greatest attention should first be given is the adoption and enforcement of the necessary regulatory controls. This approach also serves as an alternate approach, in the event that sufficient financial resources are unavailable, or other problems arise, which might prevent the implementation of other program approaches under this component. The strategy behind this is that if an effective system of regulatory controls is established, individual, corporate or other organized initiative could be marshaled to correct deficiencies in the physical environment.

The execution of various planning studies under the above approach would begin early in the program. These studies are described throughout the plan and include historic preservation, thoroughfare plan, Erie Canal trail development, housing, and relocation, commercial and industrial development, etc.

During the first year of the program, engineering studies, drawings, specifications, etc., would be completed for the development of 60 acres of recreation and open public spaces.

The construction of sewer intercepts would begin in the first year to eliminate the open polluted canals, and would continue through and be completed by the end of the five year period, including sewer treatment facilities.

The selection of alternate sites for solid waste disposal would be completed by the end of the first year with sites available by the second year for the removal and disposal of various solid wastes.

Comprehensive Studies: Several comprehensive studies will be conducted during the first year action program.

The following studies will be conducted under the "701" Program:

Housing and Relocation.
Open Spaces.
Historic Preservation.
Economic Base Study.
Thoroughfare Plan.

These studies are necessary for the following reasons:

1. To obtain detail and sufficient data, presently not available, for program planning and implementation.

2. To obtain data in order to establish proper measures for program evaluation.

3. To determine projects and activities, their priorities, feasibility, cost estimates, cost benefits, analyses required to properly achieve the long-range goals and five-year objectives of this plan submission.

However, projects and activities will be undertaken during the first year which are related to the comprehensive studies.

These projects have been selected because sufficient information is presently available to require completion of these programs, financial resources are available and the need is apparent.

Examples of such programs are the Neighborhood Development Program as part of the Economic Development Component, Restoration of the early American Theater, as part of Culture and Recreation of the Human Resources Component. As these studies are being conducted, other projects and activities will be formulated.

Other studies coinciding with the strategy herein described will be:

Social Services and Activities.
Health.
Police Services.

These studies will result in a sound program development for the entire community.

In conclusion, the overall strategy and goal of the Cohoes Model Cities Program, as visualized by the CDA, is the elimination of social and economic problems so common to our many cities, the elimination of physical blight and the sound development of the entire city. When we realize that the City of Cohoes is a small city of 20,000 people, and its problems can be defined and are controllable, this goal is not impractical or unrealistic. The attainment of this goal depends on the commitment of the community. The CDA believes that the people of the City of Cohoes will fully dedicate themselves to this goal and show the nation that the problems of the cities can be solved through total community effort.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, October 23, 1969*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Baan Vitez, O.F.M., Holy Trinity Roman Catholic Church, Barberton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, grant us the courage, we pray, to love our heritage. This is the day when Your children lit the flame of freedom on the streets of Budapest, Hungary, in 1956.

The fire they lighted, if kept alive, will spell the doom of any oppressors' enforced darkness. The fire within them, and thanks to Your graciousness, within us, is a fire that brightens and warms all men of good will.

May the flames of love of God and national consciousness leap forever in our hearts till we leap with joy into lasting freedom and peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On October 17, 1969:

H.R. 3165. An act for the relief of Martin H. Loeffler;

H.R. 3560. An act for the relief of Arie Rudolf Busch (also known as Harry Bush);

H.R. 11249. An act to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such Center; and

H.J. Res. 851. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to issue a

proclamation calling for a "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival."

On October 20, 1969:

H.R. 9825. An act to amend subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to civil service retirement, and for other purposes.

On October 22, 1969:

H.R. 13194. An act to authorize special allowances for lenders with respect to insured student loans under title IV–B of the Higher Education Act of 1965 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, and to increase the authorizations for certain other student assistance programs.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, 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. 4293. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports.

A CEASE-FIRE NOW

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on May 15 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 256 which proposed that the President call for an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam. Fifteen of my colleagues ultimately joined in cosponsoring this resolution. On July 23 the White House responded by informing me that—

A cease-fire is a sensitive and complex question that hopefully will be addressed to (at) an appropriate time in the Paris talks.

Since that time, many of us have despaired that President Nixon will not be moved to call for a cease-fire. Consequently, I have advocated an immediate and total withdrawal of American troops in order to avoid the continuing loss of American lives in Vietnam.

Now there appears to be a decline in enemy-initiated action. Now we are told that American troops no longer pursue offensive military tactics. Now perhaps the Nixon administration will finally consider the "appropriate time" has come for a cease-fire.

Since May when I introduced the cease-fire resolution, approximately 4,000 American men have been killed in Vietnam. If the President will not be committed to the total and immediate withdrawal of American troops, let him call for a cease-fire. First, and foremost let our policy be committed to saving American lives.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on a joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO EXECUTE SUBORDINATION AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN LANDS IN LEE COUNTY, S.C.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9946) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in certain tracts of land to the board of education of Lee County, S.C., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after "assigns," down to and including "to" in line 9 and insert "an agreement subordinating all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to the land hereinafter described to a lien or liens to be executed by the said Board of Education of Lee County, South Carolina, its successors or assigns for the financing of consolidated public school improvements on the said land, which consists of".

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a subordination agreement with respect to certain lands in Lee County, South Carolina."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO FILE REPORT UNTIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Friday to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

CALLING FOR A CEASE-FIRE IN VIETNAM HOSTILITIES

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, while the debate continues on the schedule for American withdrawal from Vietnam, why not stop the killing now?

The most horrible and unexplainable deaths of war are those which so needlessly occur while governments and their leaders make up their minds on the format of peace. It is imperative to stop the hostilities so that no more of our young men are lost as the talks proceed. I therefore call upon the administration to implement an immediate cease-fire to prevent further loss of life.

The timetable for cease-fire is critical, Our Government should announce a unilateral plan for cease-fire by region or by military unit directed toward a total cease-fire.

If we take this action on an announced schedule, the entire world can bear witness to the validity of the offer and the sincerity of the response—and lives can be spared.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is the gentleman advocating that the President should order a unit, a group, or all of our forces in Vietnam to stop firing and stand with their guns behind their backs while the enemy can shoot at them?

Mr. VANIK. I did not suggest that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman said "unilateral cease-fire."

Mr. VANIK. If the gentleman will permit, I suggested that what we do is announce a cease-fire by unit or by region so that we can see what the response is to such action by our Government. I believe I have made that very clear in the basic part of the statement.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me ask again a simple question. Does the gentleman want the President to tell one unit to stand with their guns behind their backs while the enemy has the right to shoot? Is that what he is advocating?

Mr. VANIK. I did not suggest that at all.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman said a unilateral cease-fire, and that is what it means.

Mr. VANIK. I suggested that by region and by unit we give an expression of our intention. Certainly I do not expect our people to go out and be shot. I expect that they are going to protect themselves and stay behind protective enclaves and not expose themselves to fire.

I believe if we announce a unit-by-unit cease-fire that we can see what the reaction will be on the other side to that kind of action.

It is precisely in line with what Senator SCOTT suggested in the other body. I do not believe our suggestions are very different. I believe there is a great deal of merit to what he has suggested.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Senator SCOTT did not say that we should implement ourselves a unilateral cease-fire. He urged that the enemy join with us in a cease-fire and I believe a mutual cease-fire is sound and desirable. The gentleman went one step further however and said a "unilateral cease-fire," which would expose American GI's to the enemy, if the enemy has not agreed to a cease-fire.

Mr. VANIK. Senator SCOTT is quoted in this morning's Washington Post as saying that:

One side has to take the initiative, and to that extent it would be a unilateral action.

Of course, I do not believe in exposing any of our people to a needless exposure

to death. I suggested that we cease fire by a region or by a unit so that we can have an expression of how this kind of action will be treated by our adversary.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If we expose one unit to a unilateral cease-fire, then we are exposing x number of defenseless Americans to be shot by the enemy.

Mr. VANIK. My suggestion does not expose a single person needlessly. It is an effort to save lives.

DECLARING NOVEMBER 11 A DAY OF NATIONAL CONCERN

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, I arranged a special order on the floor of the House of Representatives, and over 150 Members of the House joined in speaking out on the problem of our servicemen who are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia. I introduced a concurrent resolution, cosponsored by approximately 200 of my colleagues, which calls upon the President, the Departments of State and Defense, the United Nations, and the people of the world to appeal to North Vietnam and the Vietcong to abide by the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war. Several hundred wives and family members came to Washington to be present for this occasion and they sincerely appreciated the efforts by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my taking this time today is to request help again by further emphasizing the problem—in hopes of securing the release of our POW's. I have called upon the President and today I call upon my colleagues to assist me in urging the President to, by Presidential proclamation, declare November 11 a "Day of National Concern" for American prisoners of war, concurrent with our Veterans Day observance. I respectfully urge each of you to seriously consider my request. Such a proclamation would pay tribute to our servicemen, their wives and their families, many of whom have been waiting for over 5 years for information regarding their loved ones.

Once again, your serious consideration for a "Day of National Concern" will be appreciated.

A DAY OF NATIONAL CONCERN, NOVEMBER 9

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

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the President has been requested to make a proclamation for a day of concern on November 11, may I tell the Members of the House that the Chief of Chaplains of the Navy has been requested by the National League of Families of American Prisoners of War to commend to our Navy chaplains the 9th day of November as a day of prayer for the brave men being held prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese. I would suggest to Members of the House that they might use that day, also, the 9th day of November, to offer their prayers in behalf of prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a prayer:

Almighty Father, who suffers in the affliction of your children we call upon you now from the depths of our anxiety and great concern for our countrymen and loved ones who have fallen into the hands of the Nation's foes. In the face of the evils that these brave men endure and before the grim burdens they are forced to bear, give them courage and hope, and a never failing confidence in you.

But most of all, O God, we ask that the day will soon come when we can all celebrate their release and safe return to their homes and kindred.

Give to all of us who wait and hope in the face of every disappointment the will to persevere in the cause of peace and the wisdom to conquer hate with love and every doubt with a renewed faith in you. Amen.

VIETNAM WAR MORATORIUM

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Washington Daily News of October 22, 1969, reveals what the leaders of the Vietnam war moratorium group are really up to. They indicated that a cease-fire in Vietnam is unsatisfactory. Yet, the whole pretext of their movement has been to "stop the killing." A cease-fire is to all practical purposes an end to active warfare. This group does not want an end to killing so much as they want total U.S. troop withdrawals and this I submit would unleash a wave of Communist bloodshed and killing across the whole of South Vietnam. Their hand has been tipped. They are working for the defeat of the United States and victory for the Communists. These out and out Leftists have ill-used millions of sincere Americans who want an end to the shooting war. If the measure of my mail is any indication of public opinion, the great majority of Americans want an end to the war, yes, but they do not support a policy of complete and immediate withdrawal with no regard for the consequences.

The Communist training of the New Left is showing up, and those who support their cause from now on must do so with the knowledge that they are working with sworn enemies of the United States. They must realize that they could possibly be used as dupes in a Communist-inspired plot to notch up a major victory in Asia. Rejection of the idea of a cease-fire has uncovered the peace march leaders' real purpose—military defeat for the United States and handing over South Vietnam to their Communist brothers.

AMENDMENT OF THE SECOND LIBERTY BOND ACT TO INCREASE THE MAXIMUM INTEREST RATE PERMITTED ON U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 14020) to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on U.S. savings bonds, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object but do so in order to ask the gentleman from Arkansas for a brief explanation of the bill, and I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I thank my friend from Wisconsin for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill before the House, H.R. 14020, is to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on U.S. savings bonds.

The bill raises the maximum allowable interest rate ceiling on savings bonds to 5 percent from its present level of 4¼ percent. The Department of the Treasury has indicated that just as soon as this legislation is adopted it will raise the interest rate paid on series E and H bonds to the new 5-percent ceiling rate, and under the provisions of the bill, the new ceiling may apply to all savings bonds issued on or after June 1, 1969, and also to outstanding savings bonds for interest periods beginning on or after June 1, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, the increase in the ceiling rate that would be authorized under H.R. 14020 is needed for two reasons. First, it is needed because the rates of interest on other forms of savings substantially exceed 4¼ percent. As we all know, interest rates generally have risen rapidly in recent years, and as a result, the yields on Government savings bonds are now significantly lower than those on alternative forms of savings. This situation has reduced the incentive for individuals to buy savings bonds, and redemptions of these bonds have substantially exceeded sales in recent months. The excess of redemptions over sales has amounted to $1,516 million in the first 8 months of 1969 compared to $1,219 million in the whole of calendar 1968.

A second reason why prompt enactment of this bill is necessary is for purposes of sound management of the national debt. There are about $52 billion of series E and H bonds outstanding, and this dollar amount is almost one-third the size of the total outstanding privately held marketable debt. The average maturity of the outstanding privately held marketable Treasury debt is only 3 years and 11 months. In contrast, the $52 billion of outstanding savings bonds will remain outstanding for 7 years, if past experience continues into the future. An effective savings bond program thus helps to reduce the problem of refunding the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means was firmly convinced that the increase in the ceiling rate on savings bonds to 5 percent, provided in H.R. 14020, will help make savings bonds more attractive to savers and will thereby both increase bond sales and reduce redemptions. I, therefore, urge approval of the bill by the House.

Mr. Speaker, to clarify a point respect-

ing the new interest ceiling, let me say that the Treasury Department has asked me to note that the mechanics of the issue and redemption of the series E bonds may make it impossible to achieve an exact yield of 5 percent. This is due to small discrepancies, before rounding, which result from the administrative necessity of using maturities stated at monthly intervals and maintaining established issue and redemption prices.

In these circumstances, I believe it should be clear that this body, in establishing a new ceiling rate for savings bonds, contemplates that the Treasury, in setting the precise terms of new issues in accord with established procedures, should remain within the new ceiling when rates are stated with the degree of precision that accords with common practice in the securities markets. Accordingly, this ceiling is not intended to prohibit sales of bonds at a rate of 5.00 percent rounded to two decimal places.

With this understanding, Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of H.R. 14020.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this question of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. This bill does not include the 4½ percent interest on long-term Government bonds; does it?

Mr. MILLS. It only applies to the series E and H bonds which are not the type of bonds the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. PATMAN. I would have no objection to that, but I certainly would of course object to the repeal of the 4¼-percent interest rate on long-term Government bonds.

Mr. MILLS. It does not involve any other bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. It does not involve any other bonds?

Mr. MILLS. No, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has considered the possibility rather than increasing rates which obviously the Government is going to have to raise someplace, and pay it—has the committee ever considered making the interest on these series E and H bonds tax exempt to make them more attractive, the way we did with the municipal bonds?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, we have considered it over the years. We have done that. We did not consider it in this recent discussion on this bill but it has been considered.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Why not? Why would it not be considered as an alternative to raising the rates?

Mr. MILLS. Very frankly, one of the main considerations we had in mind in connection with tax reform was to prevent further shrinkage of the base of income subject to taxes. The tax reform bill, as we passed it in the House some weeks ago, had for one of its principal purposes to make more income subject to tax in order to avoid the possibility of people having $200,000 or $1 million of some type of income and paying no taxes on it. This instant bill is a much better approach to the problem of interest rates on these bonds.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The series E bonds and H bonds in a decedents estate have not been treated fairly in comparison with other property of the decedent. In other words, upon death, the entire value of the bonds including accumulated interest is included, yet there is no advantage in arriving at a new basis later on. Has anything been done about that?

Mr. MILLS. This bill does not deal with that.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Do you intend to do something about that?

Mr. MILLS. I know of the problem that the gentleman is referring to, but it is only one aspect of an overall problem, the problem of how Government bonds are treated in connection with one's estate for tax purposes. For example, there is a certain series of Government bonds which cannot be used to pay the inheritance tax, which I think is also wrong. But these are matters which I think can be more appropriately reviewed when we get to the question of estate taxes and gift taxes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 14020, a bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to increase the maximum interest rate permitted on U.S. savings bonds.

This bill, endorsed by the Treasury Department, will permit the interest rate paid on series E and H bonds to be raised from the present 4.25-percent interest ceiling to a new 5 percent for savings bonds.

Inflationary pressures have pushed interest rates of other forms of comparable savings to levels that are significantly higher. Redemptions of savings bonds have substantially exceeded sales in recent months, thus impairing the role that savings bonds have played in the sound management of the Nation's debt. The $52 billion of series E and H savings bonds outstanding represent a dollar amount that is almost one-third the size of the total outstanding privately held marketable debt and provide a payroll savings plan for about 11 million people.

The excess of redemptions over sales has grown to $1.5 billion in the first 8 months of 1969. In calendar year 1968 the same cash drain was $1.2 billion. Thus the 5 percent rate is in the national interest. It will make the savings bonds more attractive by making them more competitive, and thus help reduce the growing trend in redemptions. At the same time the 5 percent rate will not hamper the vital flow of savings into private institutions that are sources of channeling funds into housing and other markets. It is noted that the bill applies the 5 percent interest rate only to those savings bonds that are held to maturity. Bonds redeemed prior to maturity yield a lower rate.

The enactment of this legislation is also essential if we are to be fair with the purchasers of these bonds. We owe a responsibility to these buyers to make sure that they receive a reasonable return on their investment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I cannot say how happy I am that the House has finally taken action to raise the interest rates on Government bonds from 4.5 percent to 5 percent. I introduced legislation last February to accomplish this objective and have taken the floor on at least a half dozen occasions, urging that this be done. This interest increase is long overdue and I hope the American public will respond by increasing their purchases of bonds, which help fight inflation and also will provide financing for the Government's debt. This increase should also help to reverse the present high rate of bonds being cashed over bonds being sold.

These bonds are good investments for the small investor because of the deferment of taxes on interest until the bonds are cashed in. Their safety and the tax deferment feature should make them attractive to many savers, especially now that we are providing more realistic interest rates.

Now that we have gotten this legislation over the first hurdle, I hope it will move along in the other body, so that it can become effective as soon as possible.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to urge the adoption of H.R. 14020 to raise the maximum allowable interest rate on series E bonds to 5 percent from the present level of 4.25 percent.

In my community and in every community in the United States, millions of prudent citizens have been buying the series E bonds on payroll savings plans. This citizen participation in investment in the public debt during recent years has constituted an act of extraordinary patriotism, particularly since their investment could more profitably be made in other areas.

It would be regrettable if the payroll savings plans were to be dropped because of the incredible and unfair 4.25 percent yield.

It is my hope that every citizen and every corporation will assume its fair share of the Federal debt which has been imposed on our country primarily because of the overwhelming cost of war, past, present, and future. While we endeavor to reduce Federal expenditures and bring the Federal debt into more manageable levels, a broad base of citizen participation is imperative.

Although $52 billion is presently invested by our citizens in outstanding savings bonds, the total amount of public investment in savings bonds has not kept pace with the gross national product.

The series E savings bonds are generally held for a long period of time, an average of 7 years, or until retirement. It is my hope that we can reverse the skyrocketing rate of interest and make the continued investment in series E bonds as wise and profitable for the citizen as it has been for the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 14020

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the proviso in the second sentence of section 22(b)(1) of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 757c(b)(1)), is amended by striking out "3.26 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 25 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C., sec. 757c-1) is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 22(b)(2) of such Act (31 U.S.C., 757c(b)(2)) is amended by striking out "(subject to section 25)" each place it appears therein.

SEC. 3. The authority granted by the amendment made by the first section of this Act may be exercised with respect to United States savings bonds bearing issue dates of June 1, 1969, or thereafter. Such authority may also be exercised with respect to United States savings bonds issued before June 1, 1969, but in no case shall the interest rate or investment yield on any bond be changed pursuant to such authority for any period which begins before June 1, 1969. For purposes of section 22(b)(2)(A) of the Second Liberty Bond Act and for purposes of section 454(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the United States savings notes known as freedom shares issued not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act in connection with the issuance of United States series E bonds shall be treated in the same manner as such bonds.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF CONFEREES ON S. 1857

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), one of the members on the part of the House on the conference on the bill S. 1857, be excused. The gentleman was called to California this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. WINN) as a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the bill S. 1857, to fill the vacancy resulting from the resignation of the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL).

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

NATIONAL BUSINESS WOMEN'S WEEK

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

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, this week is being observed by the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs of America as "National Business Women's Week"—a salute to the achievements of all business and professional women in their communities.

I would like to take this opportunity to join in that salute, for a very special reason. With one exception my present staff is composed entirely of women, and this has been largely the case throughout my entire 19 years in Congress. My administrative assistant is a woman. My campaign manager is a woman. My Tulsa office is managed almost singlehandedly by a woman.

I will not say men could not have done as good a job as these fine ladies have done. But I am convinced no man could have done any better job. Over the years I have discovered that, given the opportunity and the training necessary, a woman can handle almost any job there is in the political arena, and, in a lot of cases, do it better.

For years now I have had a campaign unit known as "Page Belcher's Pages" and I have often said, "You may beat me, but you can't beat my pages." This group has certainly been one of my most valuable assets in every campaign.

Thus, from firsthand experience, I can say that I am indeed pleased and grateful for the tremendous progress of American working women over the last 50 years. And I commend the Business and Professional Women's Clubs for the great contribution they have made toward encouraging the ladies in this progress and equiping them for competence in the business and professional world.

THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-183)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The United States Merchant Marine—the fleet of commercial ships on which we rely for our economic strength in time of peace and our defense mobility in time of war—is in trouble.

While only one-fourth of the world's merchant ships are more than twenty years old, approximately three-fourths of American trading vessels are at least that antiquated. In the next four years, much of our merchant fleet will be scrapped. Yet we are now producing only a few new ships a year for use in our foreign trade. Building costs for American vessels are about twice those in foreign shipyards and production delays are excessive. Operating expenses also are high by world standards, and labor-management conflicts have been costly and disruptive.

Both government and industry share responsibility for the recent decline in American shipping and shipbuilding. Both government and industry must now make a substantial effort to reverse that record. We must begin immediately to rebuild our merchant fleet and make it more competitive. Accordingly, I am announcing today a new maritime program for this nation, one which will replace the drift and neglect of recent years and restore this country to a proud position in the shipping lanes of the world.

Our program is one of challenge and opportunity. We will challenge the American shipbuilding industry to show that it can rebuild our Merchant Marine at reasonable expense. We will challenge American ship operators and seamen to move toward less dependence on government subsidy. And, through a substantially revised and better administered government program, we will create the opportunity to meet that challenge.

The need for this new program is great since the old ways have not worked. However, as I have frequently pointed out, our budget constraints at this time are also significant. Our program, therefore, will be phased in such a way that it will not increase subsidy expenditures during the rest of fiscal year 1970 and will require only a modest increase for fiscal year 1971. We can thus begin to rebuild our fleet and at the same time meet our fiscal responsibilities.

THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Our shipbuilding program is designed to meet both of the problems which lie behind the recent decline in this field: low production rates and high production costs. Our proposals would make it possible for shipbuilders to build more ships and would encourage them to hold down the cost of each vessel. We believe that these two aspirations are closely related. For only as we plan a major long-range building program can we encourage builders to standardize ship design and introduce mass production techniques which have kept other American products competitive in world markets. On the other hand, only if our builders are able to improve their efficiency and cut their costs can we afford to replace our obsolescent merchant fleet with American-built vessels. These cost reductions are essential if our ship operators are to make capital investments of several billion dollars over the next ten years to build new, high-technology ships.

Our new program will provide a substantially improved system of construction differential subsidies, payments which reimburse American shipbuilders for that part of their total cost which exceeds the cost of building in foreign shipyards. Such subsidies allow our shipbuilders—despite their higher costs—to sell their ships at world market prices for use in our foreign trade. The important features of our new subsidy system are as follows:

1. We should make it possible for industry to build more ships over the next 10 years, moving from the present subsidy level of about 10 ships a year to a new level of 30 ships a year.

2. We should reduce the percentage of total costs which are subsidized. The Government presently subsidizes up to 55 percent of a builder's total expenses for a given vessel. Leaders of the ship-

building industry have frequently said that subsidy requirements can be reduced considerably if they are assured a long-term market. I am therefore asking that construction differential subsidies be limited to 45 percent of total costs in fiscal year 1971. That percentage should be reduced by 2 percent in each subsequent year until the maximum subsidy payment is down to 35 percent of total building expenses.

We are confident that the shipbuilding industry can meet this challenge. If the challenge is not met, however, then the Administration's commitment to this part of our program will not be continued.

3. Construction differential subsidies should be paid directly to shipbuilders rather than being channeled through shipowners as is the case under the present system. A direct payment system is necessary if our program is to encourage builders to improve designs, reduce delays, and minimize costs. It will also help us to streamline subsidy administration.

4. The multi-year procurement system which is now used for other government programs should be extended to shipbuilding. Under this system, the government makes a firm commitment to build a given number of ships over a specified and longer period of time, a practice which allows the industry to realize important economies of scale and to receive lower subsidies.

5. The increased level of ship construction will require a corresponding increase in the level of federally insured mortgages. Accordingly, we should increase the ceiling on our present mortgage insurance programs from $1 billion to $3 billion.

6. We should extend construction differential subsidies to bulk carriers, ships which usually carry ore, grain, or oil and which are not covered by our present subsidy program.

7. A Commission should be established to review the status of the American shipbuilding industry, its problems, and its progress toward meeting the challenge we have set forth. The Commission should report on its findings within three years and recommend any changes in government policy which it believes are desirable.

THE SHIP OPERATING INDUSTRY

My comments to this point have related to the building of merchant vessels. The other arm of our maritime policy is that which deals with the operation of these ships. Here, too, our new program offers several substantial improvements over the present system.

1. Operating differential subsidies should be continued only for the higher wage and insurance costs which American shipping lines experience. Subsidies for maintenance and repair and for subsistence should be eliminated. Instead of paying the difference between the wages of foreign seamen and actual wages on American ships, however, the government should compare foreign wages with prevailing wage levels in several comparable sectors of the American economy. A policy which ties subsidies to this wage index will reduce subsidy costs and provide an incentive for further efficiencies. Under this system, the operator would no longer lose in subsidies what he saves in costs. Nor would he continue to be reimbursed through subsidies when his wage costs rise to higher levels.

2. At the same time that we are reducing operating subsidies, it is appropriate that we eliminate the "recapture" provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. These provisions require subsidized lines to pay back to the government a portion of profits. If the recapture provisions are removed, the purpose for which they were designed will be largely accomplished by corporate taxes, which were at much lower rates when these provisions were instituted. We will also save the cost of administering recapture provisions.

3. Many bulk carriers presently receive indirect operating subsidies from the government because of the statutory requirement that certain government cargos must be shipped in United States vessels at premium rates. When the Department of Agriculture ships grain abroad, for example, it pays higher rates out of its budget than if it were allowed to ship at world market rates. We will propose a new, direct subsidy system for such carriers, thus allowing us to phase out these premium freight rates and reduce the costs of several nonmaritime government programs.

4. Ship operators now receiving operating differential subsidies are permitted to defer Federal tax payments on reserve funds set aside for construction purposes. This provision should be extended to include all qualified ship operators in the foreign trade, but only for well-defined ship replacement programs.

5. Past government policies and industry attitudes have not been conducive to cooperation between labor and management. Our program will help to improve this situation by ending the uncertainty that has characterized our past maritime policy. Labor and management must now use this opportunity to find ways of resolving their differences without halting operations. If the desired expansion of merchant shipping is to be achieved, the disruptive work stoppages of the past must not be repeated.

6. The larger capital investment necessary to construct a modern and efficient merchant fleet requires corresponding port development. I am therefore directing the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Transportation to work with related industries and local governments in improving our port operations. We must take full advantage of technological advances in this area and we should do all we can to encourage greater use of intermodal transportation systems, of which these high-technology ships are only a part.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The expansion of American merchant shipbuilding which this program makes possible will provide many new employment opportunities. All of our citizens must have equal access to these new jobs. I am therefore directing the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor to work with industry and labor organizations to develop programs that will insure all minority groups their rightful place in this expansion.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

We will also enlarge and redirect the maritime research and development activities of the Federal Government. Greater emphasis will be placed on practical applications of technological advances and on the coordination of Federal programs with those of industry.

The history of American commercial shipping is closely intertwined with the history of our country. From the time of the Colonial fishing sloops, down through the great days of the majestic clipper ships, and into the new era when steam replaced the sail, the venturesome spirit of maritime enterprise has contributed significantly to the strength of the Nation.

Our shipping industry has come a long way over the last three centuries. Yet, as one of the great historians of American seafaring, Samuel Eliot Morrison, has written: "all her modern docks and terminals and dredged channels will avail nothing, if the spirit perish that led her founders to 'trye all ports'." It is that spirit to which our program of challenge and opportunity appeals.

It is my hope and expectation that this program will introduce a new era in the maritime history of America, an era in which our shipbuilding and ship operating industries take their place once again among the vigorous, competitive industries of this Nation.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 23, 1969.*

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON MERCHANT SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, for the first time since the Eisenhower years, America has a positive program to again bring this Nation into the front rank of seafaring countries.

That is the significance of the merchant shipbuilding program which President Nixon has outlined in the message he sent to the Congress today.

This is a program which gives American shipyards the incentive to modernize and expand. Unlike the previous administration President Nixon is not throwing our shipbuilding business into foreign shipyards. Instead he is offering American shipbuilders—industry and labor—a challenge and an opportunity.

Under the Nixon maritime program, American shipbuilders have the opportunity to invest $4 billion in modernizing their yards over the next 10 years so they can become fully competitive with other shipyards throughout the world—in techniques, facilities, and production.

If American shipbuilders accept the challenge and avail themselves of the opportunity, the program outlined by President Nixon will succeed. But it must be remembered that the Nixon program is predicated on a responsible repsonse from industry and labor. The Federal Government cannot carry this program forward

alone, because it is not just another subsidy program. It is a program under which the Federal Government is providing the leadership and incentive for a great surge forward in America's maritime fortunes.

This is a program of deeds and not words—a multiyear shipbuilding program to make long-range planning possible, a trebling of Federal mortgage insurance from $1 billion to $3 billion, payment of construction differential subsidies directly to shipbuilders instead of through shipowners, extension of subsidy payments to bulk carriers.

I think the Nixon maritime program will revitalize the American merchant marine and revive our shipbuilding industry. If industry and labor respond, we can once more make our merchant fleet a source of pride for every American.

PRESIDENT'S MARITIME PROGRAM

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

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon today officially announced the administration's long-range maritime program. As a result of that announcement, I believe this day, October 23, 1969, will be recorded as a momentous day in the history of the American merchant marine.

This is a day that I and many other Members of Congress have long fought for. Although at times our fight seemed futile, our energy and dedication and persistence has, I hope, at last paid dividends.

I have already been briefed on the President's 10-year program, which calls for construction of 30 ships a year and would include a mix of general cargo ships, dry-bulk carriers, and tankers. I am most happy to report that this program does not include build-abroad proposals. These ships will be built in American yards, by American craftsmen, and they will fly the American flag.

I want to congratulate President Nixon, not only for refusing to accept the counsel of those who wanted to build abroad—since such a proposal would have endangered acceptance—but also for incorporating so many of the basic elements for which we in Congress have been fighting so long.

The principal features of the program include:

First, procurement of groups of ships to reduce construction costs. This is expected to permit reduction of payment of construction differential subsidy from a present ceiling of 55 percent to 35 percent over a 6-year period.

Second, adjustments in the payment of operating differential subsidy to reduce costs and administrative burdens.

Third, emphasis on the building of dry-bulk carriers to carry bulk cargoes, which have been completely forfeited to foreign carriers.

Fourth, extension to all shipping companies of the privilege to establish tax deferred capital reserve funds for ship construction.

Fifth, other proposals to improve and strengthen our mortgage insurance, research and development and nuclear ship programs.

One proposal, on improving labor-management relations in the shipping industry, will be controversial. But again, the administration should be complimented for seeking new ways to meet this serious problem.

As chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I have sat through many hearings on the vexing problems of the maritime industry. I especially want to emphasize that all the efforts of my committee have been bipartisan in nature. Republicans and Democrats alike have put political interest aside and joined together to achieve the mutual goal of revitalizing the American merchant marine.

Hopefully, the House and Senate will react with the same bipartisan spirit in accepting the administration's proposals. I think the President has produced a sound, workable, good program, and I intend to support it. I also urge every Member of Congress to give it the support it deserves.

The administration's actions did not come any too soon. The hour is already late, and there is much to be done. Since more than two-thirds of our privately owned merchant ships are, or almost are, 25 years old, we must begin a solid shipbuilding program now—immediately—in order to protect our economic and military needs of the near future.

In view of this crisis situation—which, I am happy to say, this administration has recognized—there is a need for immediate and concerted action on many fronts. First of all, the House and Senate must initiate legislative action on the administration's program. My committee is ready to move on this program. And, I know that the Senate Commerce Committee will take prompt action as well.

I mentioned earlier that there is a need for concerted action on many fronts It is obvious that no program will work unless it has the support of all segments of the highly diversified maritime industry; this includes labor and management—as well as Government.

The administrative segment of Government acted today; Congress—as I have already indicated—is primed to act; ultimate success will, in the final analysis, depend upon concerted industry action.

The shipbuilding industry has promised that it can deliver the goods. It must now prepare itself to face the challenge and prove that it can produce the ships we need at prices and in time to meet our needs. The program presented to us today calls for construction subsidy to be paid directly to the shipyards, instead of to the steamship owner; it also proposes a multiyear procurement system which should enable shipyards to obtain long-term financing.

All of these provisions, including the administration's call for a multiyear, series-type construction, some of standardized ship design, should provide the long-awaited incentive which the shipyards have constantly said they needed.

Although the administration program contains no build abroad proposals, I think the American shipbuilding industry is aware that it must now stress increased modernization of construction facilities and employ all its technological know-how to try to build more ships in the most economical way possible. I think the industry is aware that it must face up to this challenge, and I think it can meet the new demands that will be placed upon it.

The extension of tax deferments to the unsubsidized segment of the American merchant marine will help that seriously declined segment to put aside capital funds for ship replacements. This, too, is a vital element in any long-range program, and should constitute a giant step in our merchant fleet's battle to regain ocean superiority.

In the past, the American maritime industry has been criticized unjustly, damned unmercifully and neglected disgracefully. It was almost allowed to die. Now it has been granted a reprieve—a new lease on life—in the form of this long-range program.

But in the days ahead, the industry will be watched with even more critical eyes. It will be up to the industry to prove it has the ability to once again become competitive.

The ability to compete on the world market will only be achieved if the total American maritime industry cooperates to make this program work. I hope that all elements will join forces in a new spirit of unity, forget petty differences, and work together for the good of the industry and the Nation.

If this is done, we shall surely succeed in again making the American flag a dominant power on the sealanes of the world.

Unless this is done, our merchant marine will surely sink.

Mr. Speaker, I want to personally thank President Nixon for this challenging opportunity he has presented us today. I have faith the industry will show its thanks and appreciation by rising to meet the challenge.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON MARITIME PROGRAM

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

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I also congratulate President Nixon for his good judgment and foresightedness in making this announcement.

I assure Members the President is right in keeping with the needs of this country today.

I am delighted that the Nixon administration has seen fit to take this step in the right direction toward rebuilding our merchant fleet.

At long last an administration appears to recognize the critical condition of our merchant marine.

The legislation is expected to get to Capitol Hill within the next 4 weeks.

Of necessity, I must reserve full judgment until I have a chance to see just how far reaching this program is, and how the administration plans to implement it.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the President's message on the merchant shipbuilding program.

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

There was no objection.

SIX IN TENNESSEE RECEIVE 33d DEGREE, SCOTTISH RITE MASONRY

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, six middle Tennesseans—five of them from my home district of Nashville-Davidson County—are in Washington today to receive the highest degree that is offered in Scottish Rite Masonry—the 33d degree, inspector general honorary.

These outstanding leaders include James W. Allen, Jr., a certified public accountant and a Nashville attorney; Wallace Phelan Douglas, grand secretary of the Grand Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons of Tennessee; Robert L. Evans, a retired businessman from Murfreesboro; Ernest C. Matthews III, a Nashville attorney; James G. Stahlman, owner and publisher of the Nashville Banner; and Clyde R. Watson, past potentate of Al Menah Shrine Temple, and a certified public accountant.

Their election to receive the 33d degree, inspector general honorary, of the Scottish Rite, was announced by Mr. Andrew Benedict, sovereign grand inspector general in Tennessee.

Each of these individuals has made outstanding contributions to his community, his State and to the principals of free masonry. Election to this highest degree in Scottish Rite Masonry is given to those individuals who have demonstrated their belief in and practice of great American fundamentals, outstanding service to the Rite, the community, country and mankind.

Each of these individuals possess these qualities, and I am proud that such an outstanding group are part of my congressional constituency. The honors being paid them are justly deserved. I am confident my fellow Members of the House join me in this personal tribute to their dedication and commitment to the principles of free masonry.

DRAFT REFORM

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, in emphasizing the importance of the President's draft reform legislation, Secretary Laird recently stated:

> There are no greater sacrifices that we, as government, can ask of our young men than those entailed in the Military Selective Service Act. There are no more sacred responsibilities of government than to assure that this obligation is shared fairly and that, consistent with national security needs, we do whatever is possible to limit the burden of Selective Service on those who are subject to it.

Last May, President Nixon in his selective service message to the Congress outlined a number of overdue reforms in our draft system. One major objective is to reduce the period of prime draft vulnerability from as long as 7 years to only 12 months. To place this revised system into effect, the administration has proposed a simple one sentence revision in the present law. This revision will permit the President to initiate a random sequence of selection for men in each year group who upon classification and examination are found equally available for military service. The revised system has been described in the President's message. It is—by any reasonable standard—the fairest and most understandable procedure open to us under conditions when more men become available for service than are needed.

This legislation, gentlemen, is not only urgently needed at this time; it is also by far the simplest piece of legislation that is likely to be presented to the Congress in this or any other session. More than 5 months have already elapsed since this proposal was first submitted to the Congress by the President. I urge that it be promptly approved by this House.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 133, on the appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, I was in my district in Alabama on official business and missed the vote. Had I been present I would have voted for the appropriation bill.

On rollcall No. 214, on the Educational Television and Radio Amendments of 1969, I was in my district in Alabama on official business and missed the vote. Had I been present, I would have voted for H.R. 7737.

ELECTION FINANCING REFORM LEGISLATION

(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, today I am reintroducing the Election Financing Reform Act along with 16 of my colleagues. We hope there will be growing support for this needed change in regulating the financing of Federal elections. The present law is regulation in name only and by its operation it encourages proliferation of political committees and impedes the effectiveness of political parties. The most glaring fault of the existing law is that it denies the electorate information which is vitally important in making a choice on election day.

It is the intention of this bill to make public the machinery of campaign finances. It is also the intention of this bill to limit campaign spending and contributions without making that limit unrealistic and unenforceable.

There are too many doubts cast today on the decisions of elected officials, and in requiring less than full disclosure of campaign finances we encourage further doubt. Change is necessary in order to maintain the integrity of our election process and to allow our system of representative government to be truly responsive. Given the record of this Congress for taking necessary reform action, I am hopeful we can soon give serious consideration to this legislation being introduced today by our group.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1689, CHILD PROTECTION AND TOY SAFETY ACT OF 1969

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1689) to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 21, 1969.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call for immediate consideration of the conference report on S. 1689, the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969. The House passed this legislation on September 4 by a rollcall vote of 327 to 0.

The bill amends the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles which are dangerous because of the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards.

Substantially, the conference reported the House version. The conference substitute combines the respective short titles; the House version had "Child Protection Act" and the Senate version had "Toy Safety Act."

The conference also combined the procedural requirements for regulation by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Under the House version the Secretary would have engaged in formal rulemaking—either before or after removing a given item from the market. Under the Senate version the Secretary would have used informal rulemaking proceedings, but there was no provision comparable to the House provision which would allow him to summarily remove an article from the market upon a finding of "imminent hazard." The compromise allows the Secretary to remove from the market any article which he deems is an "imminent hazard" either before or after an in-

formal or a formal rulemaking proceeding. There were no other changes in the House version of the bill.

I am satisfied that the House managers successfully maintained the position of the House on this legislation and I urge that the conference report be adopted.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Child Protection Act passed by this House some time ago was a well considered and adequate measure for the protection of children from toys which endanger them by reason of mechanical, thermal, or electrical hazards. The difference between that bill and the one passed by the other House was slight and, as it turned out, really related to purely procedural matters.

The House bill had provided that toys presenting an imminent hazard could be immediately removed from the marketplace, after which proceedings under the Administrative Procedures Act would be followed to final determination of the issue. Since there are several alternatives under that act some difference appeared in the details for handling such cases. The conference quickly resolved the matter by providing more than one possible route to a decision, granting to both the Secretary and the party marketing the toy adequate remedy.

Other provisions of the House bill which refined the definitions of thermal, mechanical, and electrical hazards and which added a requirement that retail dealers repurchase toys proved to be hazardous were recognized as desirable additions and changes by the conferees and were therefore accepted.

The bill as it comes back to the House from the conference does no violence whatsoever to the aims of the bill as considered and passed by the House, and I recommend approval of the conference report.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 13763, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 13763) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—the main argument in respect to this bill is over what to do with the west front of the Capitol.

As our colleagues know, the House put in the bill $2 million to go ahead with planning for the necessary work to be done. The Senate called for study funds of $250,000, for the National Park Service to restudy this front extension. This is in essence what it boils down to. We have already had one study—do we need another?

I understand there may well be a motion to instruct the conferees, a strange motion, in that it would be not to sustain the position of the House but rather to sustain the position of the other body.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. I yield to the chairman of our subcommittee.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The gentleman has stated the parliamentary situation as I understand it to be. It is almost unprecedented to instruct conferees before they even have gone to conference about a matter which has not been before the conferees. If such a motion is made, I intend to offer a preferential motion to lay the motion on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, the gentleman from North Dakota has, of course, stated the issue correctly, that the major point involves the appropriation of some $2 million to proceed with a $45 million extension of the west front of the Capitol.

The Senate has stricken out that money which the House included and instead inserted $250,000 for an engineering study to be conducted by an independent agency, the U.S. Park Service, of just what would be involved in restoring the Capitol so that it does not fall down, in short, a cost and feasibility study of plain restoration, something which has never been fully studied or researched by the Architect or his people.

The American Institute of Architects has recently indicated that this restoration work would cost only $10 million, or at the very most $20 million. That would mean, if this estimate is borne out by the feasibility study, that we would save the taxpayers between $25 and $35 million. Under the Senate amendment we would be spending $250,000 for a feasibility and cost study, with the likelihood that we may thereby save the taxpayers of this country $25 to $35 million.

Mr. Speaker, may I pose a parliamentary question to the Chair? If the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Alabama is approved, will it not then be in order to move to instruct the conferees?

The SPEAKER. If the consent is granted and before the appointment of conferees, the motion to instruct would be in order.

Mr. STRATTON. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer a motion to instruct the conferees to accept the Senate amendment which deletes $1.75 million for extension and provides instead $250,000 for a feasibility study of restoration. We have never had a chance to vote on the record of this particular issue previously in this House. In view of the overwhelming 2-to-1 vote that took place in the Senate, the other day against the costly extension project, I think Members ought to be given the opportunity for that vote, and I shall try to give them that opportunity.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. And it is not unprecedented—not the usual procedure but certainly not unprecedented—to offer a motion to instruct conferees. Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman from Iowa is absolutely correct. Not only have I researched the precedents and rules of the House, which spell this authority out very carefully, but I am sure that the gentleman from Iowa and other Members of the House who were here will recall that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) offered an almost identical motion about a month ago to instruct the conferees on the Agriculture appropriation bill with respect to that $20,000 limitation on price-support payments to an individual farmer.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I make the statement that it is almost unprecedented. I have seen many motions made to instruct conferees to insist on the House position after there has been a conference report returned to the House. But now we are talking about instructing House conferees to do something before even going to conference and to take the Senate position, not the House position. I say that is almost unprecedented.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I think in my time in the House I have offered—and it has been some years ago—two motions to instruct before they went to conference. This would not be a procedural precedent. That is the time to instruct—before they go to conference.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. How many times did you win?

Mr. GROSS. I do not recall, but I do not win often around here, anyway.

Mr. STRATTON. I might also comment to the gentleman from Iowa that a motion to instruct the conferees also permits an hour of debate. However, if another motion should be made to lay that motion to instruct on the table, then we will not have any opportunity for debate at all. This is the reason I am taking some time now to clarify just what the issue is. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that on page 126 of Cannon's Precedents it says this:

> A motion to instruct conferees is not in order until a conference is agreed to and is not in order after the conferees have been appointed.

So, this motion requires split-second timing in order to make sure that we

get it in after the conference has been agreed to but before the Speaker has appointed the conferees.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. It is not always a question of how many times you win here or anywhere else. It is a question of whether you support a principle.

Mr. STRATTON. Absolutely.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. If we adopt a precedent here of instructing the conferees before we even go to conference, we might as well not have any conference.

Mr. STRATTON. I would say again to the gentleman that we had a motion to this effect just the other day in the Conte motion. If we can save the taxpayers of this country between $25 million and $35 million at a time when the President of the United States is trying to cut down expenses, I think we ought to make a real effort to do it.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I would ask the gentleman from Iowa, who has indicated that he has previously asked the House to instruct conferees, how many times he asked the House to instruct conferees to agree with the Senate's position?

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is not the issue. The issue is whether the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) is right or wrong in asking that the conferees be instructed to support a position of the House. If this procedure and rule of the House has no meaning then why is it provided for in the rule book?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York will yield further, he has that right, but how many times has the gentleman from Iowa asked the House to instruct conferees to agree with the position of the Senate before we went to conference? We should allow the conferees to give the position of the House on this matter.

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, let me point out to the gentleman from Illinois that we had 2 hours of debate in favor of his point of view and only 8 minutes of debate in favor of mine.

Mr. YATES. That is a fair proportion.

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

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

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGED MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Privileged motion offered by Mr. STRATTON: Mr. STRATTON moves that the managers on the part of the House on the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 13763 be instructed to accept the Senate amendment, numbered Senate amendment 251, entitled "West Front of the Capitol" which occurs on page 28, line 8 of the Senate version of the bill which strikes out lines 8 through 15 and inserts in lieu thereof the following:

"WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

"For the conduct of studies to determine the feasibility and cost of restoring the west central front of the Capitol, without regard to any other act, $250,000, which shall be transferred to the appropriation for 'Preservation of Historic Properties, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.'"

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS OF ALABAMA

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preferential motion offered by Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama: Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama moves to lay on the table the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) to lay on the table the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 165, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 241]

YEAS—199

Abernethy	Corbett	Hansen, Wash.
Addabbo	Cunningham	Hawkins
Albert	Daniels, N.J.	Hébert
Anderson, Calif.	Davis, Ga.	Henderson
Anderson, Ill.	Davis, Wis.	Hicks
Andrews, Ala.	Delaney	Holifield
Andrews, N. Dak.	Dellenback	Hosmer
Annunzio	Dent	Hull
Arends	Dickinson	Johnson, Pa.
Ayres	Donohue	Jonas
Barrett	Dorn	Jones, Ala.
Beall, Md.	Downing	Jones, N.C.
Bevill	Dulski	Jones, Tenn.
Blanton	Edmondson	Karth
Blatnik	Edwards, La.	Kazen
Boggs	Eilberg	Kee
Boland	Erlenborn	Keith
Bolling	Evans, Colo.	Kleppe
Bow	Evins, Tenn.	Kluczynski
Broyhill, Va.	Fallon	Kuykendall
Buchanan	Feighan	Landrum
Burke, Mass.	Findley	Langen
Burleson, Tex.	Fisher	Lloyd
Burlison, Mo.	Flood	Long, La.
Button	Flowers	Long, Md.
Byrne, Pa.	Flynt	Lukens
Byrnes, Wis.	Ford, Gerald R.	McClory
Cabell	Friedel	McCloskey
Caffery	Fulton, Pa.	McDade
Cederberg	Galifianakis	McFall
Chamberlain	Gallagher	Macdonald, Mass.
Clausen, Don H.	Garmatz	Mahon
Cohelan	Gettys	Mann
Collier	Giaimo	Mathias
Collins	Gibbons	Matsunaga
Colmer	Goldwater	Melcher
	Green, Oreg.	Miller, Calif.
	Griffin	Mills
	Gubser	Minish
	Hagan	Minshall
	Haley	Mizell
	Hall	Monagan
	Halpern	Montgomery
	Hamilton	Morgan
	Hammer-schmidt	Morton
	Hanley	Moss
	Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, Ill.
	Harrington	Murphy, N.Y.
	Harvey	Natcher
	Hathaway	Nelsen
	Hechler, W. Va.	Nichols
	Heckler, Mass.	O'Hara
	Helstoski	Olsen
	Hogan	O'Neal, Ga.
	Horton	Passman
	Howard	Patman
	Hungate	Patten
	Hunt	Perkins
	Hutchinson	Pettis
	Ichord	Philbin
	Jacobs	Pickle
	Jarman	Pirnie
	Kastenmeier	Preyer, N.C.
	King	Price, Ill.
	Koch	Price, Tex.
	Kyl	Pucinski
	Kyros	Quillen
	Landgrebe	Railsback
	Latta	Reid, Ill.
	Leggett	Reifel
	Lennon	Rhodes
	Lowenstein	Riegle
	Lujan	Rivers
	McCarthy	Roberts
	McCulloch	Robison
	McDonald, Mich.	Rodino
	McKneally	Rogers, Colo.
	McMillan	Rogers, Fla.
	MacGregor	Rooney, N.Y.
	Madden	Rooney, Pa.
	Marsh	Rostenkowski
	Mayne	Ruth
	Meeds	St. Onge
	Meskill	Saylor
	Michel	Schwengel
	Mikva	Shipley
	Miller, Ohio	Shriver
	Mink	Sikes
	Mize	Sisk
	Mollohan	Slack
	Moorhead	Smith, Iowa
	Mosher	Snyder
	Myers	Stafford
	Nedzi	Staggers
	Nix	Steed
	Obey	Steiger, Wis.
	Ottinger	Stephens
	Pike	Stokes
	Podell	Stubblefield
	Poff	Stuckey
	Pollock	Sullivan
	Pryor, Ark.	Taft
	Randall	Talcott
	Rarick	Taylor
	Rees	Thomson, Wis.
	Reid, N.Y.	Tiernan
	Rosenthal	Ullman
	Roth	Vander Jagt
	Roudebush	Waggonner
	Roybal	Wampler
	Ruppe	Watts
	Ryan	White
	St Germain	Whitten
	Satterfield	Williams
	Schadeberg	Wilson, Bob
	Scherle	Wilson, Charles H.
	Scheuer	Wright
	Schneebeli	Wyatt
	Scott	Wydler
	Sebelius	Wylie
	Skubitz	Wyman
	Smith, Calif.	Yates
	Smith, N.Y.	Young
	Stanton	Zablocki
	Steiger, Ariz.	
	Stratton	
	Teague, Tex.	
	Thompson, Ga.	
	Thompson, N.J.	
	Udall	
	Utt	
	Van Deerlin	
	Vanik	
	Vigorito	
	Watkins	
	Weicker	
	Whalen	
	Whalley	
	Widnall	
	Winn	
	Wold	
	Yatron	
	Zion	
	Zwach	

NAYS—165

NOT VOTING—67

Adams	Cramer	Gray
Aspinall	Culver	Grover
Baring	Dawson	Hanna
Bell, Calif.	de la Garza	Harsha
Brooks	Denney	Hastings
Brown, Ohio	Devine	Hays
Burton, Utah	Diggs	Johnson, Calif.
Bush	Dingell	Kirwan
Cahill	Dowdy	Lipscomb
Camp	Dwyer	McClure
Casey	Edwards, Ala.	McEwen
Celler	Fascell	Mailliard
Clark	Foley	Martin
Clawson, Del	Ford, William D.	May
Clay	Frelinghuysen	Morse
Conte	Fuqua	O'Konski
Corman		O'Neill, Mass.

Pelly	Reuss	Waldie
Pepper	Sandman	Watson
Poage	Springer	Whitehurst
Powell	Symington	Wiggins
Purcell	Teague, Calif.	Wolff
Quie	Tunney	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Celler with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Del Clauson.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Denney.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Baring with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Fascell with Mrs. May.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Hastings with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Quie with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. McClure with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Symington with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Whitehurst with Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. DOWNING changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. YATRON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CARTER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WYATT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ANDREWS of Alabama, STEED, KIRWAN, YATES, CASEY, MAHON, ANDREWS of North Dakota, LANGEN, REIFEL, WYMAN, and BOW.

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1969

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 13827) to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes.

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

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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 13827, with Mr. FLOOD in the chair.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee Amendment: Page 45, line 2, strike out "412" and insert "415."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRADEMAS

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADEMAS: Page 46, after line 8, insert a new section 416 to read as follows:

"FHA FINANCING FOR MOBILE HOMES

"SEC. 416. Section 2 of the National Housing Act is amended by—

"(1) inserting '(i)' after the words 'for the purpose of' in the first sentence of subsection (a);

"(2) inserting '; and for the purpose of (ii) financing the purchase of a mobile home to be used by the owner as his principal residence' before the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (a);

"(3) inserting '(other than mobile homes)' after 'new residential structures' in clause (1) of subparagraph (iii) of the second paragraph of subsection (a);

"(4) inserting the following new sentence at the end of subsection (a): 'The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed, with respect to mobile homes to be financed under this section, to (i) prescribe minimum property standards to assure the livability and durability of the mobile home and the suitability of the site on which the mobile home is to be located; and (ii) obtain assurances from the borrower that the mobile home will be placed on a site which complies with the standards prescribed by the Secretary and with local zoning and other applicable local requirements.';

"(5) inserting ', except that an obligation financing the purchase of a mobile home may be in an amount not exceeding $10,000' before the semicolon at the end of clause (1) in the first sentence of subsection (b);

"(6) inserting ': *Provided*, That an obligation financing the purchase of a mobile home may have a maturity not in excess of twelve years and thirty-two days' before the semicolon at the end of clause (2) in the first sentence of subsection (b); and

"(7) striking out 'real property' each place it appears in subsection (c) (2) and inserting in lieu thereof 'real or personal property'."

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words about a problem which I feel—indeed, I am sure most all of us here today feel—is rapidly approaching crisis proportions. This problem put simply is: The tremendous shortage of decent housing at reasonable cost.

With the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949, Mr. Chairman, Congress established the official national goal: "a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." Yet after decades of fragmented and grossly underfinanced Federal housing programs, over 6 million families still live in substandard housing—dilapidated, lacking in basic sanitary facilities, overcrowded. Millions more live in neighborhoods which are fast deteriorating. Further, at a time when most Americans are enjoying the highest standard of living that this Nation or any nation has ever known, we are also faced with a severe shortage of available housing.

It must therefore be obvious to all of us, Mr. Chairman, that we have not met our national goals in housing and that the results achieved under existing programs have fallen far short of meeting even the minimum needs of our people.

Because this country is facing such vast housing problems, has firmly set as its goal decent housing for all Americans, and has the basic wherewithall to attain this end, I have offered this amendment to the housing bill before our consideration today.

One of the most difficult problems facing our country today is that of providing decent housing for low- and moderate-income families at costs that are reasonable, particularly at a time of high land costs, high costs of construction, and of high interest rates.

My amendment is aimed not at solving the whole problem of housing, but at solving part of it.

The amendment that I propose, Mr. Chairman, would amend title I of the National Housing Act to allow the Federal Housing Administration to insure loans for the financing of mobile homes to be used by the purchaser as his principal place of residence.

Under my amendment, a mobile home buyer could obtain an FHA-insured loan in an amount up to $10,000 repayable over a maximum of 12 years.

The amendment, may I say, has already been adopted by the Senate as part of the housing and urban development bill. It is also supported by Secretary Romney of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as by the National Housing Conference, and the savings and loan industry.

The Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association and Trailer Coach Association, which represent nearly 90 percent of the Nation's mobile home producers, and the Mobile Housing Association of America, which principally represents mobile home dealers from across the country, and numerous other organizations concerned with mobile homes have also given approval to my amendment.

The amendment I offer has one significant modification from the Senate-passed amendment but that change, which I will come to in just a moment, is strongly supported by Senator HOLLINGS of South Carolina, the principal author of the Senate amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me say a word about mobile homes. Mobile homes represent a low-cost form of housing which offers a means of solving the housing problem of many low and moderate income families who cannot afford conventional housing and whose housing needs can be met by mobile-sized units.

As such, mobile homes supplement, not undercut, the home construction industry. For all practical purposes the low and moderate income consumer has been priced out of the more expensive home-buying market.

The rapid growth of the mobile home market alone is ample testimony to this, Mr. Chairman. A study of mobile home buyers conducted for the U.S. Department of Housing, and Urban Develop-

ment by the Bureau of the Census not long ago shows that mobile homes accounted for approximately 25 percent of the total production of new single family homes in 1968. In addition, during the same year the mobile home industry supplied more than 95 percent of all new single family housing units selling under $12,500.

Statistics gathered by the mobile home industry also show a rapid growth in mobile home sales: from about 100,000 units in 1960 to over 300,000 in 1968. By the end of 1969 this figure may well reach the 400,000 mark, a quadrupling in less than a decade. Indeed, it has been estimated that about 6 million people now live in mobile homes across the United States.

Considering its expanding growth and production, then, Mr. Chairman, the mobile home industry must indeed be looked upon with hope as capable of mass producing permanent, low-cost housing units which can be used to alleviate the current housing crisis in America by helping provide homes for low- and moderate-income families.

To illustrate, the HUD study of mobile-home buyers reached the following conclusion:

> Ninety-four percent of the mobile homes covered in the survey sold for less than $10,000. By contrast, only six percent of all new one-family homes (other than mobile) sold in 1966 for less than $12,500.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the people buying mobile homes today are those whose incomes have priced them out of the homebuilding market. They are the young married couples just starting out, the retired caught in the bind of rising costs and little income, those living in smaller communities where housing is scarce, as well as lower and middle income citizens trapped by inflation and high interest rates. These, in short, are Americans who cannot afford to build their own homes.

So it is not correct to say, Mr. Chairman—and I know some Members may have had apprehensions about this point—that extension of FHA title I loans to cover mobile homes would eat into the money available for financing conventional housing.

Indeed, the current average retail price for a mobile home is about $6,000 which is far below what the home construction industry could or would be able to produce conventional homes for and survive. The median selling price for the conventional home today is just under $27,000.

Mr. Chairman, as I have pointed out, over 6 million Americans now live in mobile homes. Recent production rates of mobile homes, I am informed, have approximated one-fourth to one-fifth of the new housing starts in 1968. Further, last year about 90 percent of the new homes sold in this country for less than $15,000 were mobile homes. There is no question then, Mr. Chairman, that mobile homes are here to stay.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to clear up another misconception about mobile homes and their use, and this concerns their "mobility." I should like to here point out that a common conception of mobile homes as always on the road, transient in nature and a credit risk to finance, is just not true. According to the HUD survey I have cited previously, more than 2 million American families use mobile homes as their sole residence. Moreover, 80 percent of all mobile home owners sampled had not moved within a 5-year period. Again, I would cite a conclusion of the HUD survey of mobile home dwellers:

> So far, the mobility of these households is no greater than that of the population as a whole.

One additional statistic ought to be mentioned in this regard and that has to do with the financial stability of mobile home buyers. It was perhaps cast most vividly by John M. Martin, managing director of the Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, in his testimony on September 12, 1969 before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs which held hearings on Senator Hollings' bill. Speaking in behalf of both the Mobile Home Manufacturers Association and the Trailer Coach Association, Martin said:

> Regarding mobile home financing, current FHA programs have a foreclosure rate of approximately 7 per 1,000. The mobile home industry financial institutions consider a rate of 5 per 1,000 high and one prominent company has a rate of 1 per 1,000, with others generally ranging between 1 and 3. This is achieved in spite of the fact that mobile home financing has generally been more expensive than conventional mortgage financing. The mobile home owner is parked to stay and he pays his bills. A good risk for either private enterprise or FHA.

To speak of "mobile" homes, then, Mr. Chairman, is not really accurate. And, as I have stated before, the amendment which I have offered today would only apply to purchases of a mobile home to be used by the buyer as a principal residence.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a general proposition, having given these several statistics, that in view of them it is really now appropriate for the Federal Government to recognize the need to help people who wish to do so finance the purchase of mobile homes.

Under my amendment a buyer could get a loan insured by the FHA, repayable over a maximum term of 12 years.

At this point I want to lean very hard on one particular point, about which I feel strongly, as I am sure most Members of the House do. This is about high interest rates. To those who show with me a deep concern about high interest rates, let me note that by tying the mobile home financing program into the FHA title I program, mobile home buyers would be able to borrow money at rates substantially below the rates applicable to non-FHA insured loans, as much as 50 percent below.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice that this would provide an effective rate of 11 percent on the mortgage up to $2,500; that is, on a discounted basis of 5½ percent. The next bracket would be 4½ percent on a discounted basis, which would be an effective rate of 9 percent, and would be an average of about 10 percent.

Now, under the regular FHA 203 section, would the effective rate be 7½ percent?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, let me respond by quoting from a comment which I asked HUD to give me on this amendment. They said that it does provide—that is to say, the amendment I am offering provides "for effective annual interest rates generally ranging from 8 percent to 8.83 percent, depending on the amount and term of loan."

HUD goes on to say:

> These rates would not even approach the 12 percent interest typical of conventional financing of mobile homes.

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

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, HUD goes on to say that—

> These rates—

That is to say, the rates for mobile home financing that would be made possible by the amendment I have here offered—

> would not even approach the 12 percent interest typical of conventional financing of mobile homes.

In further response to the question of the distinguished chairman, I might point to the statement made in the hearings on the Senate side by William B. Ross, then Acting Assistant Secretary for Mortgage Credit and FHA Commissioner, in which he inserted a table that makes the comparison between the interest rates that would be charged under my amendment and the interest rates that are presently being charged for mobile home loans which are not FHA-insured.

For example, I may say to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), that if the amount to finance were $5,000, repayable over a 7-year period, this would involve, under my amendment, an effective annual interest rate of 8.83. True, this is very high, but if a mobile home purchaser borrowed the money under the present non-FHA-insured conventional financing, it would cost him 11.5 percent.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to compare it with the conventional rate on mobile homes. I want to compare it with the FHA rate in the other chapter under title II. In other words, that would be 7½ percent, would it not? Therefore, this rate would actually be about a percent or two higher, under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I appreciate the chairman's question.

Let me make this comment: We want to be careful not to compare apples and oranges, if I may put it that way, because the kinds of loans which are made for mobile homes are not the same kinds of loans which are made on conventional

housing. There are certain important distinctions.

For example, a person buying a mobile home does not seek a loan for the same length of time as he would on a conventional home loan. Under a title II mortgage credit type loan the length of time would be normally up to 30 years, whereas for a conventional mobile home purchase loan he would get, let us say, 5 to 7 years—or, under the amendment before us, he would be allowed as much as a 12-year loan.

Another important distinction between the two kinds of loans, title I and title II, of course, is that the amount of money borrowed for a mobile home is far less under title I than is customarily the cost under title II.

Still another significant difference between the two types of loans is that the title I loans are commercial consumer-type loans as distinguished from title II mortgage-type loans which are secured by buildings on real estate.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman not take it out of that category of consumer type when he extends the term to 12 years?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think that the point the chairman raises is a fair-minded one. What we have tried to do is have a reasonable cutoff period. Twelve years seems to be a fair cutoff point. I do not pretend to have any divine expertise on whether 11 years is better than 12 years, but this seems to be, in the judgment of the experts with whom I consulted in drafting this amendment, a reasonable cutoff.

I think I understand what the chairman is saying in respect of his concern about interest rates, because, as the chairman knows from earlier conversations with the gentleman from Indiana, I share his hostility to high interest rates. That is one reason why I am a strong advocate of this amendment. If my amendment is adopted, it should make possible—on the basis of the evidence reported to me about interest rate structures—a reduction of as much as 50 percent in the effective interest rates paid by purchasers of mobile homes in this country.

Mr. PATMAN. There is just one thing. If it is a reduction in rates, I would be for it, but it occurs to me that it is actually charging more. If you put this over in the FHA title II where it logically belongs, in section 203, the interest rate would be 7½ percent, and you admit that this would be an average rate of 10 percent under this proposal of yours.

Mr. BRADEMAS. No. I did not say that.

Mr. PATMAN. I said it in evaluating it.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I did not say it.

Mr. PATMAN. It appears it is 5½ percent on a discount basis, which is an effective rate of 11 percent. After the first 25 it is 4½ percent on a discount basis, which means 9 percent, and between the two it will average out to about 10 percent. That means you are paying 10 percent, if I am correct, under this proposal of yours, whereas under the regular FHA it is only 7½ percent.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I appreciate the chairman's question. All I can say to him is that I think his information is not completely in accord with the facts as I have been given them.

Because I anticipated the question of the chairman, I went back to HUD not once, not twice, not three times, but four times, Mr. Chairman, to say that I wanted to be very sure about the question of interest rates. As I have just indicated to the chairman, in this document from HUD it was made very clear that my amendment provides for an effective annual interest rate generally ranging from 8 to 8.3 percent.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. PATMAN) Mr. BRADEMAS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Whereas, if we were to continue with the present pattern of financing mobile homes in this country, the result would be people having to pay 12 percent. I do not like that, and I am sure the chairman does not like it, either.

If you put the mobile home insurance program over into title II type loans, as the chairman is suggesting, to repeat my metaphor, you are mixing apples with oranges, because title II is for a conventional home purchase generally over a 30-year period. And the interest rate under title II loans is straight line in nature over a long period of time, unlike the discount procedure that is provided under title I type loans.

Therefore, to place the mobile home program into a program of insured loans for a completely different purpose is to do complete violence to the purpose of my amendment and would, in all candor, Mr. Chairman, make completely ineffective and inoperable my intent with reference to mobile home loans.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. These are substantial homes and will last a long time. The gentleman has 12 years in there. Mobile homes can be good, substantial homes. If you put them all into section 203, title 2, you would have an effective rate of 7.5 percent. I do not understand why the gentleman would insist upon mobile homes be FHA financed at a higher rate. However, if I could be convinced by the gentleman that it does represent a lower rate, I would be glad to support his amendment, but at this point I cannot do so.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think you can readily appreciate that if a lender were considering whether to make a loan on a mobile home or on a conventional home—that is an FHA, title II-type loan—he would certainly see himself at a disadvantage if he were to go for the mobile home at the same interest rate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADEMAS. If I may complete my statement, Mr. Chairman, because there is another important point which I want to make about my amendment, I should like to do so. This point is, namely, that my amendment would also answer some of the queries of those who might see mobile homes, or mobile home courts, as old, unsightly, substandard, and generally in conflict with sound planning and zoning practices.

This problem—the old "house trailer" or "trailer park" image—is a real one, and one with which the mobile home industry, numerous communities throughout our Nation, and concerned individuals and organizations have been dealing for many years.

This same general concern was brought out in the recent Senate hearings time and again, with the result that a provision was added in the Senate-passed version of the amendment that I am introducing today—a provision authorizing the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to prescribe minimum standards for construction and design of mobile homes financed through FHA-insured loans. The Senate provision further requires assurances from mobile home buyers using such FHA-insured loans that the mobile home will be placed on a site which complies with local zoning and other applicable local requirements.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that my amendment goes even a step further to authorize the Secretary of HUD to prescribe minimum standards for the site on which the mobile home is to be placed and to require that the borrower provide assurances that the site on which the mobile home is initially placed conforms with these standards.

The purpose of this modification, is to assure that the site is adaptable to the surrounding neighborhood. This control over the location of the mobile home unit should assist in preventing the development of unsightly and poorly planned mobile home courts.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the gentleman from Indiana in offering this amendment. Out in my part of the country the mobile home has become a real way of life for the young Americans and the old people, as well as a lot of people who cannot afford conventional homes. We have got to make a breakthrough in this area and, therefore, I enthusiastically support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the proposal of this program by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Before coming to Congress I was involved in the construction of moderate-income housing. I know how frustrating it is for builders across the country to produce houses in the $15,000 category. It has become almost an impossibility. The mobile home represents a real breakthrough. We are going to the heart of the matter when we deal with the environmental implications of the mobile home or the mobile homes that are

in place in mobile home parks that really have become eyesores in many instances, unfortunately, because of the lack of local zoning.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) Mr. BRADEMAS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, frequently the zoning or lack of zoning has permitted the conglomeration of trailer parks that have been eyesores and which have been blight upon the environment.

I commend my colleague upon his suggestion that we have zoning standards—that we provide Federal standards—which are higher than some of the standards which exist today.

I would like to ask the gentleman whether he has had any discussion with the officials of HUD as to the kind of environmental standards they will provide and the availability of community services, recreation, and entertainment in these parks as well as outdoor facilities, schools and the like. Does the gentleman know what their standards are likely to be?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

With reference to his question, I would say I have talked only informally with HUD officials and we have discussed some of the very points that the gentleman has just mentioned.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. In the discussion of these mobile homes, taking into consideration that we have allowed them to be built on water the same as on land, but the Federal Home Loan Bank has never issued regulations in accordance with the law.

I hope the gentleman will keep that in mind because it is just as important that some people have them on water as well as on land.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I hope that on water, land, and the sea we will have the support of the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to add my commendation of the gentleman from Indiana on his very worthwhile amendment.

Mobile homes have become almost a way of life in my State.

Also I would like to commend this administration for supporting the gentleman's amendment. I think it is excellent.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman from Oregon.

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

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks. I know that the mobile home industry is an important industry in your district and it is certainly an important one to the State of Indiana. I congratulate the gentleman for his amendment.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I too would like to indicate my endorsement of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Indiana. I think it represents a very reasonable, sound, and constructive approach.

Mr. Chairman, I too will shortly offer an amendment which I think is designed also to help eliminate the deficit of housing in this country.

These proposals have the support of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman's amendment is overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) for his amendment. I think it will be a fine addition to this year's housing bill. It can provide an opportunity for low income people to own homes that are modern, sanitary, and well constructed and at a price that ranges at the most, I would say, up to $12,000.

You can today get in the mobile home field a home that has three bedrooms and two baths and 20 feet by 60 feet in size for a maximum of $12,000, and running between $8,000 and $12,000. There is not anything comparable in regular construction of single-family homes that I know of anywhere in the United States. It would be an excellent addition to the programs we already have that are trying to help low income people.

I think this is instant housing. This can be done almost immediately. We have an urgent and crying need for this kind of housing and at the price it is possible to construct a home using the mobile home program.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. I appreciate the views of our distinguished minority leader. I know, from personal experience, of his deep concern for an adequate supply of attractive moderate-cost housing. Would it be a fair expression of the congressional intent, with reference to the environmental implications of this mobile home program, would it be the congressional intent that officials of HUD would apply high standards of community planning and environmental design to assure that a new mobile home community and such other places where these mobile homes are used, would make a positive contribution to the environment whether they are urban or suburban, and that there would be available a full complement of attractive, wholesome, and appropriate community facilities and services available for families living in these new facilities, and that we would not repeat the experiences of the past of the blighting, "eyesore" effects on communities of mobile home colonies, which have sprawled, unplanned, and unkempt, growing like Topsy, across the face of the country?

Mr. WIDNALL. From my interpretation of the administration's position, it is their intent to do what the gentleman has suggested. In many communities throughout the United States there has been a fear of creating trailer courts in unregulated areas. They have become eyesores and little cancers on the landscape. There is absolutely no intent to encourage anything like that in the administration of this program. I feel that the proposal is the only hope for meeting the very urgent needs in cities, suburbs, and some of the rural areas of the United States. This type of housing that I have seen—and I have made it my business to see it in various places in the country—is excellent housing. I would be very happy to have one of these homes myself.

Mr. SCHEUER. If the gentleman will yield further, would not the gentleman be much happier if it were the policy of HUD to require that your mobile home be placed in a pleasant environment, attractively planned and landscaped, with proper recreation and community facilities and services, and proper community planning? Is this not the congressional intent, and would you not appreciate your mobile home being placed in such an attractive community environment?

Mr. WIDNALL. I certainly would.

Mr. SCHEUER. Do you think it is the intention of HUD to follow your view and the congressional mandate in that connection?

Mr. WIDNALL. I believe so.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachsetts. Mr. Chairman, while all these bouquets are being thrown around here, I think we ought to recognize the facts of the situation. At an interest rate of 13 percent, a married couple buying one of these homes and having a $10,000 note on it will have to pay back within a period of 7 years the sum of $20,000. I imagine very soon we will have a motion made in the House, possibly under this bill or some other bill, providing for married couples to be able to go to war surplus outlets and buy some of the pyramidal tents they have around.

I believe we ought to be realistic. All we are doing is kiting-up the interest rates, encouraging people who lend money to kite-up interest rates, and a 13-percent interest charge is an exorbitant charge. To expect a married couple to be able to pay that amount back within 7 years, the sum of $20,000, is unconscionable in my mind.

Mr. WIDNALL. I believe the gentleman should remember that today in the

United States there are many places where people are paying 18 and 22 percent in order to get mortgages when they seek to buy single-family homes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. That is correct. That is why we need a strong usury law in this country, and why we should stop soft-soaping and spreading false hopes and get down to the real nitty-gritty issues here and put a ceiling on interest charges, because the people who sell mobile homes get a down payment and they hold title to the mobile home until final payment is made, and when a young married couple is required to pay back to those people the sum of $20,000 within 7 years, I say it is an unconscionable thing for the Congress to encourage.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to the fact that this measure does not provide for 20-year loans. The loan would have a top of 12 years, as I understand, and it also provides something that you and I want most: some instant housing for the low-income people of this country. We can stay here and debate this year, next year, and the following year, and talk about unrealistic interest rates and get nowhere, while conditions worsen throughout the entire country. I want to see some action now, and this is the beginning of that type of action.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I reiterate what I have said: Within 7 years, on a $10,000 note, the borrower will have to pay back $20,000 for that note.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, when one considers that the housing shortage at present, as documented by Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney, is the biggest in our Nation's history, then it is understandable why support of FHA financing for mobile homes is so overwhelming in all housing circles.

In a recent interview, Secretary Romney pointed out that the shortage of homes between now and 1978 will be about 26 million units. This is the number of new or rehabilitated homes that it is estimated we would need to take care of people between now and 1978 and to replace substandard units.

But, for a more startling fact, consider this observation which was made by Daniel M. Fitz-Gerald, Wickes Corp. board chairman, last June. Mr. Fitz-Gerald, a nationally known business executive, revealed in a speech that from the time the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth Rock until this year—142 million houses have been built in the United States. That is 349 years. Now, in the next 30 years—yes, just 30 years—it now is estimated that we must build 142 million more to fill our needs. We must double in 30 years what it took us to do in 349 years, according to Mr. Fitz-Gerald.

These are startling facts. At this critical time, however, our homebuilding industry is now beset by high interest rates. Loan money for the homebuilding industry is hard to come by. The housing industry is in perhaps its most critical period of the postwar era.

Therefore, this special amendment being offered by our colleague, the Honorable JOHN BRADEMAS, which has my fullest support, is particularly timely today.

It is for an industry which, despite loan problems, is breaking records month after month. Let me recall from the September 1, 1969, issue of U.S. News & World Report that this year's total of mobile homes is expected to be about 400,000, up from 300,000 of 1968.

Furthermore, industry experts predict that mobile homes will soon account for one-third of all the next single-family houses sold in this country. Already, nearly 6 million people are living in these units.

This has particular and special meaning to me. Within Michigan's Eighth Congressional District, at least four companies in and near the small community of Marlette, Mich., located in Sanilac County, are a dynamic part of this industry.

These industries include Marlette Homes, Inc., Guerdon Industries, Inc., Active Homes Corp., and Divco-Wayne Industries, Inc. The latter's Marlette plant specializes in classrooms, but its plants elsewhere in the Nation are in what we now call the prefabricated transportable home business.

This is the new offshoot of the mobile homes. The transportable homes, of two-unit construction, truly are permanent structures which, if necessary, can be moved from time to time. They are customarily set on a foundation and become very much a permanent place of residence.

Marlette Homes' President Earl Swett has, I believe, correctly predicted an "unlimited expansion" in the years ahead for this industry.

Again, let me emphasize these are not like the old trailers. These are homes. The two-unit home is 20 feet wide and 55 feet long. New models have been expanded to 24 feet wide and 60 feet long. Marlette Homes, as do other manufacturers, have research-experimental models. These range from 24 feet wide to 45 feet long. The bigger units include three bedrooms, 1½ baths, kitchen, dining room, living room and walk-in closets.

Last year I supported legislation which finally granted savings and loan associations the power to make loans to finance mobile homes. This has proved helpful. But it is apparent additional help is required to help low- to moderate-income families who comprise the bulk of the mobile home purchasers. In permitting FHA to insure loans for the purchase of mobile homes, not to exceed $10,000 and to be repaid in 12 years, I believe we would finally provide real help to individuals in quest of housing.

Until today, purchasers of mobile homes have had to overcome real obstacles in order to purchase their homes. Short-term loans and high interest rates have been among them. Let me quote one paragraph from the testimony of William B. Ross, Acting Assistant Secretary for Mortgage Credit and FHA Commissioner, Department of HUD, as he testified before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, in talking about present methods of financing these mobile homes:

> Interest is charged by the "add-on" method, meaning that it is calculated on the full loan amount for the whole term, rather than on a declining balance as in mortgage loans. This results in interest charges of roughly double the amount of simple interest.

I think eventually, Mr. Chairman, in the mobile home industry we are going to come to what the chairman of the full committee wants, which is to have this sort of provision included in title II, but I do not think that is at all practicable at this time. I do not think the mobile home industry feels it is practical in this period of tight money. I know the Department of Housing and Urban Development does not think it is wise, and as a reasonable person who observes the money market, I do not think it would work. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. I hope it will pass.

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, did the gentleman take into consideration the fact that in a regular residence regardless of the way it is financed, when it is paid for, the purchaser owns the land as well as the house? In the mobile home the purchaser mortgages just the home and not the land. They have to pay rent on the land.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Texas, of course there is no land to be bought. Approximately 20 percent of the purchase price of an ordinary house today according to HUD figures, is included in the land value. If the purchaser is not paying for that land, of course he does not receive it when he finishes paying for his home.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman a question. I have great respect for the gentleman and great confidence in him. He was a most useful member on our committee, and I am sorry he is not still on it. If we would put this proposed amendment in section 203 of title II, it would be financed at the rate of 7.5 percent. The rate here, if put as the gentleman from Indiana has suggested in his amendment, could be 10 percent. So there is a 2.5 percent difference, it occurs to me. Would the gentleman please explain to me how we could afford an amendment that would raise the interest rate 2.5 percent?

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee is talking about 7.5 percent plus points.

Mr. PATMAN. There are no points under FHA to the buyer.

Mr. HARVEY. There certainly are. There are in Michigan. I do not know about Texas, but there certainly are in Michigan. Let me say to the gentleman

from Texas that I fully concur in what the gentleman from Indiana the sponsor of this amendment says, that there is just so much money available, so much available credit. In such a period of tight money, if the lender who has funds to lend is forced to make the basic decision as to whether he is going to lend it on a home that is fixed on a permanent foundation or a mobile home, it is obvious which it will be.

It will be the much more substantial home on a permanent foundation rather than the mobile home which he will choose. It is that simple, for it is a wiser investment.

It seems to me because that is so, we will not accomplish the purpose we have in mind which is to get more people into homes.

I realize this is not the best solution. I think eventually we will come to title II on this, but I do not think we are ready for it right now.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I believe a great deal is being overlooked here and we are being very shortsighted.

Recently, when I asked the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development why a thorough review was being made of the leased housing program, section 23(d), his reply was that by going into leased housing we are discouraging the construction of new housing.

No. 1: I disagree with that.

But if he is going to use that answer as far as section 23 housing is concerned, which I support fully, how can he then turn around and support the financing of mobile homes and encourage people to move into mobile homes?

Just consider the 12-year mortgage on the mobile home itself. When the 12 years are over and the home is paid for, what will the person have left? He will not even own any land, let alone equity.

True, the house today is that much more expensive, but consider the result, as was mentioned a few moments ago, when a person buys that mobile home. That is all he gets, and he has to find a place to put it.

Gentlemen, let me say that this is the first step. We are talking about 12 years, but the Senate wanted to go from 15 to 40 years on the mortgages for the mobile home sites.

In this particular bill we are going from $1,800 to $2,500 on the maximum amount of a mortgage which may be insured per space in a mobile home court.

This discussion about environment, community planning and what have you—that was put into the act last year, when we allowed mobile homes to be financed through the Federal Savings and Loan Associations.

Gentlemen, if you want to go along with this amendment, fine and dandy, but consider the future. You are discouraging Operation Breakthrough.

According to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the point of Operation Breakthrough is to find a method to produce low-cost housing that will be within the reach of these younger families and the elderly families who do not have funds to buy a $25,000 house. Is that not where the thrust should be, rather than to take the easy way out?

As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) said earlier, the next thing we know we will be putting them up in tents. Admittedly, it is instant housing, but consider the quality of that housing and the durability of that housing. Consider what that mobile homeowner will have at the end of 12 years. What kind of equity will he have? That I believe is worthy of serious consideration.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. WIDNALL. As to the quality of production of the housing in the mobile home field, it is good housing. It will last. It is something anybody would be proud of. It is not junk housing at all. Some of it in the past has been, but not today.

I would take one of these mobile homes today, that can go on a 20- by 60-foot foundation, over most of the homes in Georgetown, where today people are paying $65,000, $75,000, or $85,000 just for prestige.

The ceilings are higher and the rooms are bigger and the sanitary facilities are better and everything else. We all know that many people buy homes just for prestige in Georgetown which would be condemned because they are inadequate today. They just do not measure up to the codes.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I agree with the gentleman, but I suggest, as far as the housing in Georgetown is concerned, that this is a personal thing. As I say, I do not feel, by its very nature, that you have a permanent investment in the mobile home, and I do not believe we should encourage it by easing terms, which we do with each succeeding bill that we pass in the Congress.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. FLYNT) Mr. ST GERMAIN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLYNT. I would like to commend the gentleman for the approach that he has taken to this amendment, and I would like to associate myself with his remarks. I had not planned to discuss this amendment at all, but in view of the very fine argument that the gentleman from Rhode Island has made, I wish to join him, and I would like to ask for the comments of the gentleman from Rhode Island on some aspects of this. Recognizing that something is necessary now, perhaps as a crash measure to try to get people into homes, I was initially inclined to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. However, when you look at this thing over the 12-year life of the mortgage, this could turn out to be one of the cruelest hoaxes that could possibly be perpetrated on the "homeowner" who would borrow money under the provisions of this particular amendment. At the end of the 12-year mortgage period he might find himself involved in litigation rather than living in a home to which he has title and one which he could sell to somebody else. As I understand it—and I think the gentleman from Rhode Island has pointed it out during the course of his remarks—under the provisions of this amendment it is not necessary that the borrower acquire any title to the land or the foundation upon which this mobile home is erected. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. That is correct.

Mr. FLYNT. Now I would like to ask the gentleman if at the end of that 12-year period, when the title would normally become clear, assuming that the mortgage is paid off, if this had been attached to the real estate and had become a part of the realty, when the mortgage is paid off, would the borrower then own his "personal property in the form of a mobile home," or would the owner of the land upon which the foundation rests own it? Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Very frankly, this is a legal question which has not been hit upon here. However, I would say eventually that the mobile home itself which was originally purchased would probably belong to the borrower who borrowed the funds and finally paid it off at the end of 12 years.

Also I want to point out that if they are going to pay off $10,000 in 12 years there is nothing that says that mobile home did not cost him $12,000 or $14,000 when he only financed $10,000. In addition to that, they are paying on the loan and they have to pay a pretty good charge for the utilities. When you consider what the monthly payments will be and what kind of a house they could afford for the same amount of money, I believe that that is important, too. Again at the end of the 12 or 15 years what do they have? No equity.

Mr. FLYNT. If the gentleman will yield further, when I asked that question I meant it as a question, because I do not know the answer to it. It is very clear that the answer would vary from State to State, depending upon the real property laws of the respective States.

In the absence of a written contract, or if a written contract had expired, the mobile home might well become a part of the realty and revert to the owner of the real estate. In this event the title of the borrower would lapse and the borrower would be divested of his property.

In some States the law is very clear in the absence of a contract that if there are direct affixations to the realty that the title to that which is affixed to the realty passes to the owner of the real estate rather than to the owner of what was previously personal property. Then does this become a deed of trust or does it become a chattel mortgage?

I think in States where legal differences exist between mortgages and deeds of trust that this would be a real question. It might be that the borrower who exercised his rights under the provisions of this amendment might be buying a lawsuit instead of buying a home.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I respect and congratulate the gentleman upon his concern with reference to Project Breakthrough. I, too, share those concerns. But I believe that this program is not only consistent with Project Breakthrough, but may provide a part of the very breakthrough that we are looking for in this particular project.

After all, what Project Breakthrough is all about is an attempt to apply industrialized housing techniques to produce shelter, industrial techniques which have been used in a technological society to produce automobiles, dishwashers, washing machines, and many other items successfully at ever-decreasing unit labor costs.

The labor unions are now showing very real and very encouraging signs of being sensitive to the nature of this problem and are now cooperating in several important new ventures with management.

They should be encouraged in every way and this program provides an additional laboratory for applying new manufacturing and technological developments and new forms of labor-management cooperation—to reducing housing costs and improving quality.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. SCHEUER) Mr. ST GERMAIN was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SCHEUER. And, it seems to me that producing industrialized housing and mass-produced housing via the mobile home route can provide new guidelines, new techniques and a new approach for the Operation Breakthrough program.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, there is one other point which I would like to make, and that is the big problem facing us today, tight money and lack of credit. If you cannot find money with which to buy homes now, you are going to encourage the financing of mobile homes to a greater degree. All one needs to do is to look at the percentage at which the use of mobile homes has increased over the past few years. Are you not going to worsen the situation insofar as tight money is concerned?

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

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. Opponents of the Brademas amendment seem to be saying that we will make money available with FHA backing to purchase high cost housing but we will not make money available with FHA backing to make possible the purchase of more modest housing? I think this could lead us into a very discriminatory situation. While I tend to be sympathetic to much of what the gentleman is saying, I think he should be very cautious about the position he is taking. We agree with respect to our concern for the environment, but the fact remains that although there is housing being built today, 90 percent of that housing is being bult for the upper-middle-income and rich people in the United States. For all practical purposes, we are building no housing whatsoever for our lower income families. I regard this program as really the first step in Project Breakthrough. We know we are faced with the need for shelter. This program represents a new delivery system. Certainly, it does not have all of the conventional and traditional aspects of custom built housing; no. But I am not as fearful as I have been and on balance, for the reasons that I suggest, I am going to support the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana because, begging the indulgence of the gentleman from Rhode Island, with whom I have discussed this at great length, I think we may be looking at a tight money situation for several years to come.

We have the competence to produce mobile, low-cost industrial housing. It makes sense, it seems to me, to facilitate the financing of this housing.

I think we cannot stand idly by and see the more fortunate segment of our society housed with Federal backing while this is denied to those who are less fortunate.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue the dialog with the gentleman from Rhode Island.

First, in regard to the conversation of the gentleman from Georgia. He expressed a general point of law regarding land and appurtenances. As a matter of fact, this is not an issue here because the placing of the mobile home on property is covered by specific contract, which does express in detail the exact terms.

The second thing is this. The gentleman from Rhode Island has made a point that we might be stifling Operation Breakthrough. At this point I am trying to decide whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is a good one or not. But pursuant to the argument of the gentleman from Rhode Island, is it not possible that since mobile homes are taking an increasing percentage of the housing market year after year, if we encourage mobile home purchasing, we may stimulate, by competition, the very kind of effort we need to get the breakthrough in permanent type housing?

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. Yes, I certainly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I think it is entirely a question of what one believes in—whether one believes that this country should go to mobile homes to house our people; or are we looking for a breakthrough, let us stick with the term "breakthrough"—are we looking for a breakthrough in the homebuilding industry where we provide houses for low- and moderate-income people at a price that they can afford?

Incidentally, I have seen housing being produced now and I feel certain we are going to be able to produce housing in the $12,000 to $15,000 price—two- and three-bedroom houses. But we have to keep working at it and pounding at it if, as I say, we are going to go the mobile home route, if that is what you want and if Congress decides that is what it wants and the country decides that is what it wants, fine. But if we want to continue searching for a way to house our people in the ordinary conventional housing, then I say we have to put more emphasis, and not be deterred, but we have to put more emphasis on that because it is very tempting to take the easy way out. I fear we are doing this by encouraging mobile home purchases.

Mr. KYL. There is a further point to consider here. Most of us now look at mobile homes, not as a mobile homes but permanent ones. But mobile homes as such do have an advantage for those workers who must move around the country, and for many of the older people today who prefer to live in one part of the country during one season of the year and live in another part of the country in another season of the year.

I am not arguing with the gentleman. I am trying to think out loud to see if I can make a decision on this matter. I still wonder perhaps if the very fact that we encourage the use of mobile homes might not stimulate competition in the building industry.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. All I can say in answer to that is that that theory may well work out. But so far as the point the gentleman made about workers and elderly people who like to be in one place at one time of the year and in another place at another time of the year, certainly that was the original concept of the mobile homes. I agree with that. But then they are out of the ordinary, they are not the ordinary individuals we are putting in mobile homes today by approving this type of amendment.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Has the gentleman any knowledge of the length of life of these mobile homes? In other words in 10 years—that is, after they are paid for—how long will they last after that?

Mr. KYL. In response to the gentlewoman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Indiana who is the author of this proposition, and ask him the question. What is the average useful life of these mobile homes?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, according to statistics I have been given by the Mobile Home Manufacturers Association—and I might add that there are relatively few documented statistics on the life expectancy of mobile homes—the median life expectancy for the life of a 12-foot-wide mobile home unit is around 16 years.

And I would like to make clear that here we are talking about those mobile homes which would be used as a place of permanent residence by the buyer. My amendment would only pertain to mobile home purchases such as these. I quote my offered amendment: "For the purpose of financing the purchase of a

mobile home to be used by the owner as his principal residence."

Incidentally, statistics for the mobile home industry show that some 86 percent of all mobile homes produced last year were 12 feet wide and varied from 54 to 65 feet in length. This year over 90 percent of the production is estimated for the 12-foot-wide mobile home, or more than 360,000 of the projected 400,000 units. As I have pointed out, the life expectancy of such trailers is 16 years.

I would also make the observation, in commonsense terms, that obviously the life of most mobile homes is not as long as that of a conventional home. That is merely one of the reasons it is easier to get title II type financing, mortgage financing, at lower interest rates on a conventional home than would be the case if mobile home loans had to be made under title II instead of title I. The effect of putting mobile home loans under title II would be to make such loans inoperable.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The reason I asked the question is that the buyers of mobile homes are going to have their $10,000 or $12,000 debt paid off within 10 years, but after they have it paid off, what do they have, really, in equity? What is the worth of that mobile home they have been living in that length of time?

Mr. KYL. I would suggest that the answer to the question depends on the kind of care that is given to the property. I know of many mobile homes which have existed for a period in excess of 10 years and which are still very usable facilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object to the gentleman's request, and I shall not object, but since the debate has been rather free and many Members have participated in it, I wonder if we are about ready to vote on the amendment. I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. RANDALL, have five minutes, and who else wants time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will decide that question.

Mr. PATMAN. I wish to find out how many Members wish to speak further on the amendment. I suggest that 10 minutes would be satisfactory.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Is not a unanimous-consent request pending?

Mr. PATMAN. I reserved the right to object. There is a reservation of objection only. I ask for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to limit all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto to 15 minutes. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana to provide financing for mobile homes. It is difficult to believe there should be any opposition to this amendment. I had thought the principal purpose of this housing bill was to provide decent housing at reasonable costs not only to those who are well to do, but also to those families with low and moderate incomes.

We were all encouraged that a similar amendment has already been adopted by the other body, sponsored by one of the Senators from South Carolina.

Someone has said that statistics without analysis are not only meaningless but possibly misleading. Well, some statistics which are meaningful so far as mobile homes are concerned is that 90 percent of all homes sold for less than $15,000 are mobile homes. These are figures from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Also, a HUD survey shows that millions of our citizens live in mobile homes and 80 percent of the occupants have not moved in 5 years which is no greater mobility than that of the general population.

It is my privilege to represent several counties in west central Missouri. I have studied carefully the provisions for rural housing in this bill. In our rural areas there is not only plenty of land room for sites for mobile homes. Quite frequently there is a real preference for this type of home. Take the case of a young couple who have bought some vacant acreage. They may not have the means at first to construct a conventional home.

Before we look at the arguments of opponents to this amendment who, for some reason seem to be against the inclusion of mobile homes in this bill, let us look at some of the real gains which are provided. First, no matter how we put it, or no matter how it is sliced, if mobile homes financing is made possible under this bill, it will be at a lower rate of interest than conventional financing. The present conventional financing rate may run as high as 11 or 12 percent, but would never run over 8 percent under the provisions of this housing bill. For example, a lower cost trailer which would not exceed the price of $5,000 could be financed for 7 years with a total interest cost of 8.8 percent under FHA. Under non-FHA or conventional financing the rate would be 11.5 percent.

A second great advantage in financing mobile homes under the housing bill is that we thereby achieve what is called instant housing. There is much talk about Operation Breakthrough. Sometimes it is only lipservice. In other words, it is nice to repeat such an attractive phrase, but here in this amendment is a proposal which will go a long way to realizing in fact and in truth a large number of housing units right now, not at some indefinite date in the future.

Yet another argument for this amendment is that there is a large number of persons who simply insist upon living in a mobile home. This is their first and last preference and they are going to select this type of housing even if this provision is not added to the housing bill. Without the amendment it means they are going to wait until they can find some conventional means to finance these mobile homes and that means higher interest and longer waiting.

In many parts of our country living in mobile homes is a way of life not only for young married couples but for retired couples.

As a testimonial to the popularity of this type of housing it is estimated that one out of every four newlywed couples will be moving into a mobile home.

There are bound to be those who will raise objections. What are the arguments that have been raised against this amendment? First, there are those who are worried about cluttering up the landscape as they put it. They have even gone so far as to say they are concerned about the bad environment which mobile homes create. Well, many years ago when I served as a member of the Jackson County court in Jackson County, Mo., I listened to perhaps as many as 3,000 zoning cases in the 12 years I sat on the county court. I have learned opponents to zoning have a way of making their objections heard. Even in the middle 1950's an applicant seeking to zone what was then called a trailer park, had to have some plans for streets, utilities, and a plan for landscaping surrounding the park.

Today these areas are no longer called trailer parks. They were called mobile home subdivisions. They are attractively laid out in a lot plan just like any other subdivisions.

For those who are really and honestly concerned about the damage to surroundings from these mobile homes should recall that in the other body the sponsor of a similar amendment provided these mobile homes could be financed by insured loans only if they were located in properly zoned areas. In an effort to improve over even that sort of provision, our good friend from Indiana, Mr. BRADEMAS, in his amendment left it up to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to approve or disapprove a mobile home insurance loan depending upon the suitability of the site upon which the home would be situated.

Strangely enough, another source of concern by those who oppose this amendment is that at the end of the payout period they own personal property and no real estate. This type of opponent argues that with the conventional home when a person pays for a house he also owns a lot. The answer to this argument is, of course, that the buyer has paid for the lot in the one case and has not paid for a lot in the other. Housing, by means of mobile homes is a fairly recent innovation. Just as the condominium was an innovation which came to be well accepted, we understand there are subdivisions

which accept mobile homes that also set off an area of these subdivisions for those mobile homes which were never intended to be transient. It is reserved for those who intend to "stay put," these persons are given an option to buy the parcel of land to which their mobile home is affixed.

In such cases after 10 years the mobile home occupants in these areas not only have their mobile home paid for, but also the parcel of land upon which it is situated.

Suppose the owner of a mobile home is not so lucky as to find one of these new subdivisions which sells a parcel of ground as an option under the rental agreement. Even so the occupant of a mobile home all of those years during which he is paying to find a suitable parcel of ground so that when he nears the end of his term of payment he can be the owner of the lot as well as the mobile home itself.

Yet another objection we hear is that this type of housing will do a disservice to our cities and counties and even our school districts because, for some unexplained reason, these units of housing will escape taxation. Of course, this kind of argument is a spurious one because conventional housing could also escape taxation if the assessor omitted to conduct a careful survey of new improvements within the area he is charged to assess. Certainly, there is no way to conceal or hide a mobile home any more than there is conventional housing. If in the past mobile homes have not borne their fair share of local taxes, then it is certainly not by design or intent on the part of the occupants of these mobile homes but an omission of some kind or other by those whose job it is to place a fair valuation upon these mobile homes just as they are required to place a fair valuation on conventional housing.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment merits the adoption of the Committee. If there is as great an interest in quickly providing a large number of units of housing as those who talk about Operation Breakthrough, then they will support this amendment. In the past the Congress has provided ample housing funds for the affluent and have provided not enough funds for the less affluent.

Let us make no mistake about it, we are not talking about the old-type house trailers. Today there are mobile homes which have three bedrooms and two baths on a lot as large as 20 by 60 feet. These run from $8,000 to $12,000. Nothing in the past has been comparable to the product that is available on today's market.

Today, they may be called mobile homes although they are not really mobile. Instead we are talking about good, prefabricated homes which have all of the conveniences and comforts of conventional homes. They are set upon foundations. Perhaps they are susceptible to being moved but only most infrequently.

Please remember we are not talking about old trailer parks but according to the words of the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, we are authorizing these prefabricated units to be placed on "suitable sites" and that means in an area designed and planned in advance for this type of housing with all the utilities and with streets and sidewalks like most other subdivisions.

I strongly favor this amendment because I am convinced this is the type of housing that can make some real progress in the housing problems not only in our suburban areas, but also in our rural areas which it is my privilege to represent. In rural areas, this type of housing can be handily heated by liquid petroleum. There are already enough distributors to provide quick delivery for this type of fuel for heating. Lights can easily be provided by power companies which are either investor owned and in other parts of our district by our rural electric cooperatives. The time has passed to argue whether this type of housing has merit. It is preferred by literally thousands and thousands of families. The time has passed to quibble. The time to move forward is now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, for what he had to say. I want to come back just to summarize for a moment what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) so eloquently said. I think, as the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN) pointed out, we are all deeply concerned about affording more opportunities for low-income families to buy housing.

The fact of the matter is, under the present law, most of the housing that is constructed of a conventional kind, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY) pointed out, is not for low-income families. One of the fundamental justifications for the amendment I have offered is that it will make it possible, in realistic, practical terms, for low-income families to purchase homes at much lower interest rates than they must presently pay if they cannot get an FHA-insured loan for a mobile home.

If we want such persons to have to keep paying 12-percent interest, then Members ought to be against my amendment. If we want them to have an opportunity, considering that they are people who are not able to afford conventional housing, to obtain a loan at perhaps 50 percent less interest, according to the testimony of the people from HUD, then Members should be for my amendment. So if a Member is a good William Jennings Bryan populist, he should be for my amendment, I may say to the gentleman from Texas.

I think the fundamental point, Mr. Chairman, is this: People are now buying mobile homes. Do we want to give them an opportunity to buy mobile homes at more reasonable rates of interest than is presently the case?

That is the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

There is no question that the mobile home industry is the fastest growing industry in this country. There is also no question there are many problems to be resolved. Some of the building trades unions are trying to work out jurisdictional problems which I am sure will be resolved in due time; for this industry cannot flourish without the expert knowledge and experience of the building trades unions. However, basically the industry does offer in those communities where there is no other recourse, some hope for low-cost housing to the people of those communities.

We have adequate safeguards such as local zoning laws and other regulations to protect communities from indiscriminate use of this kind of housing. It would be my hope that the chairman of the banking committee, in view of the extended debate today on this issue, would take time to hold hearings on this whole question of the growth of the mobile home industry with particular emphasis on what it does to communities; its financing and in particular, financial help in building parks.

In many parts of the country they are using so-called mobile homes for development of entire communities. The gentleman from New Jersey said these are really prefabricated homes. I would say many of them are equally as well built as conventional buildings. This is a big subject. I would hope the chairman would initiate hearings on this industry, on this entire subject, to see what the impact will be on housing in America.

Mr. Chairman, in the meantime, I support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN).

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment because I can see the benefits that can be derived therefrom.

Primarily as a Representative of an underprivileged area and of an area where the people need low- and middle-income housing, I am concerned about the possibility of any funds being withdrawn from housing of that type. I understand this amendment solely provides for FHA loans. I can readily see where, if insurance is provided for the purchase of these low-cost mobile homes, there is a possibility that those individuals who live in the central cities may be able to go to the suburbs and purchase these mobile homes, thereby releasing some of the pressure that presently exists in the central cities. Today all these people who need low- and middle-income housing can do is to remain in the central cities because of their inability in any way to obtain housing within their ability to pay.

It is a hope that these mobile homes will permit those who can afford them to move out of the central cities and thereby expand the number of housing units in existence. This will be a salutary situation as far as the people of my area are concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) asked a very thoughtful question just as he con-

cluded that part of the dialog on this amendment to give 12-year FHA credit to mobile-home buyers. It was, "What was the life of a mobile home? How long could one reasonably expect it would last?"

I wanted to inform the gentleman at that time that from the best statistics available from the mobile home industry, since World War II, 2,926,980 mobile homes have been produced, and approximately 70 percent of these homes produced going all the way back to 1946 are still in existence. And approximately 50 percent of these more than 2 million homes are in existence in mobile home communities.

Mr. Chairman, I can only speak for the State of Michigan, but I would say in the State of Michigan these homes hold their value and hold it very well. Mobile homes do not depreciate, in many cases, as much as a home built by conventional standards. They are a very worthwhile investment, as already recognized by commercial banks and savings and loan institutions.

Someone said this would hurt Operation Breakthrough. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, I do not know if this is what Governor Romney has in mind for Operation Breakthrough, but this is where the action is in housing today. This is the real breakthrough in housing today, producing homes such as this and not in the conventional housing field.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana will be a major step forward in our announced goal of giving every American a decent place in which to live. It should be supported overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, on the question to which the gentleman from Michigan just addressed himself, we nad no testimony before the House Subcommittee on Housing on mobile homes, but they did ask questions on this subject on the Senate side.

Mr. Gray, representing the mobile home industry, stated in an answer:

> I am just trying to visualize my own sales area. We have a 1956 unit that we will sell for close to $2,000 that sold originally for about $5,200. This is a nice unit.

He says—and listen to this—that originally in 1956 the cost was $5,200. Inflation has hit us; prices have gone up; and they will sell that for $2,000.

Quoting Mr. Gray further, there was a question asked about depreciation of mobile homes. He answered by saying:

> Therefore, the usual unit doesn't depreciate in comparison with something like an automobile or appliance or something like that. To give you an exact figure percentagewise of what it depreciates is very difficult. It depends a great deal on the individual that is residing in it, too.

I should like to conclude by saying that when Governor Romney came before us on Operation Breakthrough I did not get the impression that he was looking to mobile homes as being the answer to Operation Breakthrough. I hope to God, for the sake of this country, that this is not going to be the answer to Operation Breakthrough.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MCCLORY).

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the effect of adoption of this amendment, if it would do anything, would be to discourage this Operation Breakthrough on the construction of new low-cost housing which we so desperately need.

My experience with this subject, particularly at the State level, has been that the addition of great numbers of mobile homes cast an unconscionable burden on the homeowner, the small homeowner as well as the large homeowner. This is because these mobile homes do not pay taxes as people who own homes do. They are not subject to real estate taxes. And the mobile park owners resist the payment of any fair and equitable tax. So, if we adopt this amendment, we will hurt every county and municipality and State in the country which relies upon real estate taxes for the support of local government and local education wherever one of these parks is located.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, this is a promising program that would affect the housing market in three ways.

First of all, from the point of view of dollars, it gives the moderate-income or low-income person or family another option, another choice, another alternative, to conventionally built FHA financed housing, which we have learned in city after city after city across the country cannot build for less than $20,000 or $22,000. Housing costs produced by conventional construction method and costs poses an impenetrable barrier to the low-income person in achieving decent shelter. It gives him no option whatsoever.

Second, is the time saved by the use of industrial mass production methods in manufacturing housing. How many mayors have agonized over the problem of land cleared for redevelopment perhaps several years, and how many local redevelopment agency officials have agonized over the endless time that it takes to get an urban renewal project for moderate-income people off the ground? This program could well reduce the amount of time that it takes to get a large-scale moderate income housing development started.

Third, it could be the very "breakthrough" that we are looking for in Project Breakthrough and provide the catalytic agent, which could bring cost cutting, mass production techniques, into housing construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) to close debate.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would discriminate against the poor. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) seriously urges adoption of the amendment, because he sincerely believes it is in the public interest and in the interest of the poor. However, when you consider that it is actually increasing the rates, it is another thing. If he insists that he lowers the rates—and let us presume he is correct for the sake of argument—then he could lower the rates even more by putting this program under title II, section 203 of the National Housing Act. So why not do that? Why make these people pay 2½ percent more than the FHA rate under section 203?

Mr. Chairman, I seriously suggest this does substantially increase interest rates, and this is not the time to do that, particularly at the expense of the poor people of the country or the low-income groups. Therefore, I shall be compelled to vote against the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois: Page 30, after line 9, insert the following:
>
> "Section 1010(a) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, is amended—
>
> "(1) by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (2);
>
> "(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and'; and
>
> "(3) by adding after paragraph (3) a new paragraph as follows:
>
> "'(4) assure, to the extent feasible, in connection with housing construction, any major rehabilitation and maintenance under programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, that there is no restraint by contract or practice against the employment of new or improved technologies, techniques, materials and methods or of preassembled products which may reduce the cost or improve the quality of such construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and therefore stimulate expanded production of housing under such programs, except where such restraint is necessary to insure safe and healthful working conditions.'"

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and printed in the RECORD. We have copies of it on both sides of the aisle and we are well acquainted with it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there obection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, 2 days ago Members of the House received a letter from the Department of Housing and Urban Development in which they indicated the Department was supporting two amendments to the Housing Act of 1969. One of them has just been adopted. The second amendment is the one which has just been read and which I offer to the Committee for your consideration, an amendment that

would direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to "assure, to the extent feasible, in connection with housing construction, any major rehabilitation and maintenance under programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, that there is no restraint by contract or practice against the employment of new or improved technologies, techniques, materials, and methods or of preassembled products which may reduce the cost or improve the quality of such construction."

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion it has been useful and beneficial that we have had 3 days of debate on this bill during which time we have surveyed and analyzed the critical housing needs of our country. I further think it has been useful that immediately prior to the discussion of this amendment, we had the discussion on the mobile home amendment wherein several Members asked the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN), will it appreciably help Operation Breakthrough to the degree that it should.

There cannot be any question that the purpose and purport of this amendment is to lend our support to Operation Breakthrough.

Mr. Chairman, it was just a few weeks ago that we were successful in landing three intrepid young men on the moon. At that time many people were asking why did we attach so much significance to that magnificent feat while we have all of these problems in our land that remain unsolved. Of course, there are many reasons in addition to the accomplishments which were achieved and the commitments and the national purpose. But I think one important reason was that we were willing to embrace new technology and new materials and to set out and to use every innovative method that was possible in connection with achieving that goal.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of talk about the housing conditions which exist in our country. If we proceeded at the rate of 1.9 million new units that the chairman indicated was the goal at the beginning of this year, but which we have fallen far short of accomplishing, at the rate proposed in January we would still be almost three-quarters of a million units under what we need to fill the housing requirements of our country.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as I am concerned there is only one solution, there is only one answer, and that is we are going to have to adopt new technology, new methods, and industrialized mass-produced housing.

We are going to have to industrialize and mass-produce housing. We are going to have to use the systems approach as we used it in the space program and as we have used it successfully in so many other areas if we really want to make a breakthrough in this particular and very important and critical area of our country's needs.

So this amendment is designed to write into law the direction that the Secretary has the support of the Congress. That he has our support in trying so far as feasible to see that there are no restraints imposed against the introduction of new technology and new methods.

There has been some criticism following the adoption of this amendment in the other body which was adopted there virtually by a unanimous vote. And some of the very liberal Members of that body, among others, incidentally, spoke in favor of that.

There were some objections made by others that you should provide some latitude in insuring safe and healthful working conditions.

So purposely, to try to cure that objection, I have added to the amendment that was offered in the other body language which specifically states an exception that "except where such restraint is necessary to insure safe and healthful working conditions."

I stood in the well of this House not many weeks ago and I was one of those who helped to write some amendments on the construction safety bill. I am interested in protecting and preserving the health and safety of our construction workers. I could not for the world, with this or any other action, be guilty of doing anything that would be a departure from safe working conditions.

Unfortunately, there have been, I think, some entirely false and misleading arguments raised against this amendment.

Actually, as I read some of the statements made by the heads of the construction trades—the AFL–CIO—I thought that never in the world has so much been wrought by one small amendment. In one fell swoop, according to his memorandum, I have been able to repeal in part the exemption that labor now has as to the antitrust laws.

The next thing is that we are trying in some underhanded way to accomplish that with this amendment.

Let me make it perfectly clear that those are extravagant statements that have no bearing in fact on what we are proposing to do with this legislation.

You know sometimes when I go down to one of these galleries of modern art, I think when I read the title on one of these dark pictures that that is where some of these messages come from that we are setting up an overlord over the construction industry.

That is another one—that we are making a czar out of Romney in the construction of housing in this country.

I thought of some of the paintings that you can look at in the gallery of modern art and as I was standing there I wondered whether they are really right side up or upside down.

I think that some of these people were standing on their heads when they read this amendment because it cannot possibly add up to that.

There are extravagant conclusions stated in this memorandum, that this is an antiunion amendment. It is not antiunion at all. It is prohousing. It is an amendment showing that this Congress is on record as interested in as forceful and as positive way as we can to give endorsement to this idea and the Secretary, I think, very boldly and courageously and with innovative methods announced in May of this year that we are going to have Operation Breakthrough and introduce housing systems and concepts into the housing market and we ought to develop the kind of aggregated volume in housing that will lead or provide us with the goal of 26 million units in the next decade.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) has expired.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, let me quote to you, for example, from a statement made by a labor leader of this country who I think feels exactly as I do with reference to this housing field.

I am quoting from some testimony offered recently, last year, before a committee of the Congress by Mr. Walter Reuther. This is what he said—and mark these words well:

> We have got to fundamentally change the whole economics of the housing industry if we are going to make the rehousing and rebuilding of America economically achievable. You can't rehouse American if it costs as much to build a Chevrolet house as people pay for a Cadillac. It's that simple. And so we believe that what has to happen is that we have got to take a whole new approach to the question of housing. We've got to develop a national approach so that we get the economies of scale.

That is the whole purpose behind the design competition that was announced in May of this year, and in response to which I am informed today that some 664 proposals have now been received on new and innovative housing systems concepts that can be used to mass produce housing in this country.

I merely wish to make this additional point. Of all the works that I have studied on the housing problem—and it is one in which I do confess a great interest—I think that "Building the American City," which is the very excellent report of the National Commission on Urban Problems, the one chaired by the very distinguished former senior Senator from my own State of Illinois, Paul Douglas, makes abundantly clear that if we are ever going to do anything about meeting the housing needs of our country, with all due respect to the gentleman from Indiana—and I voted for his amendment—we will not do it merely with mobile homes and by promoting financing in that area. We have to get something really new and innovative in the field of technology.

Let me quote only one particular paragraph on page 445 from the Douglas Commission report.

> There can be little doubt that prefabrication techniques, and large-scale production (on and off site) have produced cost savings in the past and should continue to do so in the future. Such savings are not merely theoretical. They have been proved.

And in the report they have documented in studies they have made in country after country in Western Europe that you can get savings up to 27

to 29 percent if you simply would get into the mass produced, industrialized system of housing. So there is no question but what this is the way to approach the problem.

Let me say one thing to my friends on this side of the aisle who are concerned about the arguments that some people in the laboring community have made, and as I have indicated in the quotation from Mr. Reuther. I think there are responsible labor leaders who will support us today if we have the courage to take the action that I am suggesting. This in no way interferes with the legitimate process of collective bargaining. It does not say, for example, that you cannot, by using the collective bargaining process, cushion the effects of technology. I can sympathize to some extent with those who think that the new materials, new methods, and new technology may lead to the loss of jobs. You still have the right, under an amendment of this kind, in collective bargaining, to cushion the impact of the introduction of these new methods.

But let me emphasize one more point, and then I wish to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana. Let me remind you that, according to a recent report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, we are going to need 122,000 new skilled tradesmen and craftsmen in the building trades between now and 1975. We are currently training about 22,000 a year. Even if we were to double that number, which is highly unlikely, we would end up with a net shortage of a half million construction workers by 1975.

There is work for everyone in this important field. There is no need to fear this amendment, to fear putting our stamp of approval on new methods and new technology because it is going to put people out of work. The very opposite effect will be experienced. It will make jobs, create jobs in America.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank my friend from Illinois for yielding. Would the gentleman mind telling the House what authority his amendment would give to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in accomplishing a breakthrough in this matter of building homes that he does not always have in applying what might be available or might become available in the way of advanced technology?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I think actually it is a very modest step. There is nothing in here that is punitive at all. There is no provision that he can go in and seek injunctive relief or anything of the kind, or that he can punish anyone. What it does do is to logically build on the premise that was created in 1966 when we set up this program under the Housing Act of that year.

In 1968 we introduced additional language providing that it shall be the responsibility of the Secretary to try to introduce new methods and new technology. Now I think we should go just a little bit further, and very logically suggest that in connection with programs administered by his Department—and I am referring to Operation Breakthrough—that he is going to have the right, in connection with public funds, to see that there is no restraint employed by way of contract.

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

(On request of Mr. BARRETT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman in a few seconds. Something occurred to me. I had this question put to me: Does it involve building codes? The language makes it clear that we are talking about restraints by contract and restraints by practice—not restraints by law. Clearly, a building code is something that is a matter of positive law. So we are not getting into that area, even though, I will be frank to confess to this committee, I think we ought to. I think housing codes are out of date in many areas throughout the country. But I have got to be honest and say we have not with the language of this amendment got into that particular area.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call to the attention of the Members the gentleman's statement earlier that this amendment was offered in the subcommittee in the Senate, and it was defeated 5 to 6. It was brought out in the Senate when there were only five Members on the floor. This amendment has not been explored on the Senate side to the extent that anybody on the Senate side knows exactly what is in it or what it will do.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I hope the gentleman has been listening to me for the last 10 minutes during which I have been trying to explain and understands full well what I have been trying to do in this amendment. Let me say at the appropriate time I will insert in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary on this matter.

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

(On request of Mr. WAGGONNER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, in answer to a previous question as to what authority the Secretary would have under the proposed amendment, that he does not have, I understood the gentleman to say, really nothing. But did I understand the gentleman to say that this amendment would give the Secretary, as the gentleman proposes, in advancing Project Breakthrough the same authority over all other HUD programs?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I did not, no, indeed, and I hope no such interpretation would be put on my remarks, because obviously there are other important housing programs that have got to be furthered. What I am saying, really, is in this particular area of trying to advance new technology, materials, and methods, that this will give the Secretary some encouragement in the furtherance of that.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman intends that the Secretary be limited in applying this new technology to Project Breakthrough? Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I think it is implicit in the language read by the Clerk what I am trying to do is to amend section 1010(a) of the Model Cities and Metropolitan Development Act. I am not going outside the provisions of that act with the amendment I have offered.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Unanimous consent was asked and granted not to continue with the reading of the amendment, and all of us did not have copies of the amendment. This was the reason for my question.

Then the gentleman intends to apply it to Project Breakthrough. Would the gentleman agree to an amendment intended to limit it to that?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Let me say I have been informed, as I said a moment ago, that today 664 of these proposals have been received by HUD. Of that number, only about eight or 12 will actually be located on sites selected around the country and then tested as possible prototypes of mass-produced housing.

I would hate to see all the other innovative designs and suggestions that have been made simply go down the drain because they do not come under the protection of this language. What we are trying to do is something a little bit broader than the gentleman suggests, but maybe with respect to eight or 10 units that we say "no restraint by contract or practice" shall prevent those from being erected. I want to see this spread across the country.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman says:

> Assure, to the extent feasible, in connection with housing construction, any major rehabilitation and maintenance under programs administered by the Department of HUD, that there is no restraint by contract or practice—

That is all-inclusive. This would not limit the authority of Project Breakthrough.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman is talking about the Model Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966. I do not see how I can possibly stretch that to go beyond programs covered in that act, which is model cities programs and other programs well known to the gentleman.

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

(On request of Mr. PERKINS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, specifically what restraints in contracts are presently interfering with new technol-

ogy and new methods that the gentleman is seeking to remove from the present law by his amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am not seeking to remove anything from the present law, I would say to the gentleman from Kentucky, but I think there have been some instances in the past where some segments of the construction trades have been less than anxious to see the introduction, for example, of prefabricated housing, and to see the introduction of new methods and new materials that would save on labor.

We are not trying to cut the price of labor, but we want to save time in the cost of construction and thereby save on financial cost and all the rest.

I applaud the fact that I believe there is a changing attitude on the part of many in the construction trades. I am aware of the action of the union in Detroit, where I believe a union of some 50,000 signed a contract for the production of industrial type housing. That is fine. I would applaud the effort they made.

They should not have any fear in having us write into law the fact that we in the Congress support this kind of movement and we hope they will continue to characterize a progressive, liberal spirit on the part of the construction trades in this country, so that they will accept new technology and new methods. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. PERKINS. I take it from the gentleman's statement that he is seeking to give the HUD cabinet officer additional authority over collective bargaining agreements.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. No; I cannot agree.

Mr. PERKINS. That he does not now have.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I cannot agree at all. This involves no interference at all with the collective bargaining process, nothing at all.

I just said a moment ago that if people are worried about new technology they are free to bargain as to how the effects should be cushioned.

Is the gentleman going to stand there and tell me, with the present housing needs of this country, we should permit an arrogant few to say they will not permit the introduction of new methods, new materials, new technology?

Mr. PERKINS. Specifically what restraints is the gentleman referring to which prevent the new methods and new technology in this area?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, Operation Breakthrough deserves the wholehearted and unreserved support of every American who is interested in providing safe and sanitary housing for the millions of our fellow citizens who do not have it now and who will never have it unless we develop new technology in housing.

The building trades have expressed to me and to others their concern about the amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). I do not foresee any reason for that concern. Skilled workmen in the building trades are and always will be in great demand and they always can be certain of their ability to obtain through collective bargaining the wages and working conditions they are entitled to enjoy. But all of the craftsmen and all of the engineers in the conventional construction business today cannot build the housing units this Nation needs and must have.

More than 600 organizations have submitted proposals to HUD on how to provide new housing and more housing under Operation Breakthrough. More than 200 prototype housing sites have been offered to HUD. I am pleased to say that two of the housing proposals and three of the sites come from my congressional district where we are determined to be a part of this technological breakthrough.

All of these proposals are now under intensive review and evaluation under the direction of Assistant Secretary Harold Finger.

The proposals are being evaluated by a Housing System Proposal Evaluation Board and five committees reporting to it. The Board will present its findings to Secretary Romney about mid-November so that he can select the best of the housing concepts proposed. More than 80 HUD professional staff members and representatives of other Federal departments are engaged in the evaluation process. The Board is composed of experts from all fields connected with housing, including architects, engineers, land planners, production specialists and financial and management experts. The interagency group includes representatives from the Departments of Agriculture, Transportation, Commerce, Defense, the Post Office Department, the General Services Administration, and the President's Office of Consumer Affairs. Other experts may be called from private industry as consultants if their specialized knowledge is required.

The House should demonstrate its support for Operation Breakthrough by the adoption of this amendment, giving Secretary Romney the authority he may need to put some of these ideas into effect. If we mean what we say about housing goals for our people, this is the time to prove it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 242]

Adams	Diggs	O'Konski
Anderson, Tenn.	Dingell	O'Neill, Mass.
Aspinall	Dowdy	Pepper
Baring	Edwards, Ala.	Philbin
Bell, Calif.	Fascell	Poage
Bolling	Foley	Powell
Brooks	Fuqua	Purcell
Brown, Ohio	Gray	Quie
Burton, Utah	Haley	Reid, N.Y.
Bush	Hanna	Reuss
Cahill	Hays	Rivers
Camp	Hébert	Robison
Clancy	Heckler, Mass.	Rosenthal
Clark	Horton	St. Onge
Clawson, Del	Ichord	Springer
Clay	Johnson, Calif.	Stuckey
Colmer	Jonas	Teague, Calif.
Conte	Kirwan	Tunney
Conyers	Kuykendall	Waldie
Corman	McCarthy	Watson
Culver	McClure	Whitehurst
Daddario	Mailliard	Wiggins
Dawson	Martin	Wilson, Charles H.
de la Garza	Meskill	Wold
Denney	Miller, Calif.	Wolff
Devine	Morse	Wydler
	Morton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOOD, 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. 13827, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 352 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.

Mr. FLOOD. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, it is contended that this amendment is intended to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to assure to the extent feasible that there are no restraints against the use of new technologies and material which may reduce the cost or improve the quality of housing construction and rehabilitation under HUD administered programs and that it is aimed at insuring the success of Operation Breakthrough.

We have no quarrel with the need for innovation and technological improvement in home construction, and this has been clearly spelled out in section 1010 (a) of the 1966 Demonstration Cities Act which encourages applying advances in technology to housing and urban development.

In fact, the Department of Housing and Urban Development informs me that Operation Breakthrough, about which we have heard so much, is a program under the existing language of section 1010(a). The Department has received 619 proposals for Operation Breakthrough, which proposals, we must recognize, take into consideration existing labor and other conditions and practices.

Now, let us look at the proposed amendment: the Secretary would be directed to assure that there is no restraint by contract or practice against the employment of new or improved technologies, and so forth.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these words I am going to read are not my words. I now quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 23, 1969, the proceedings of the Senate, on page 26712. Let me, Mr. Chairman, use the language of the gentleman who proposed this amendment. Mr. TOWER says:

> Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of Senators that the printed version of my amendment No. 199 has been modified to provide that this assurance be made "to the extent feasible." Therefore, there is a discretionary power on the part of the Secretary so it will not disrupt efforts to negotiate where contracts that perhaps would come under the ban expressed here are in existence.

I am still quoting the Senator:

> We have to ask ourselves, Are we going to improve housing technology so we can bring down the costs or not? There are certain labor practices that do tend to keep the cost of construction up because prefab-

ricated materials such as door, windows, cabinets, and things of this sort cannot be used because certain working rules prohibit them and the workers would walk off if they were used.

We have to agree to this amendment in order to keep section 1010 in the 1966 act.

This clearly puts the Secretary in the middle of all contracting between management and labor in the construction field, and it puts him in as a czar. For there is no basis or means of appeal. The amendment would not only give the Secretary the power to reverse Supreme Court decisions recognizing the rights of workingmen to preserve their work opportunities, but also authorize the Secretary to intervene with coercive sanctions to impose his ideas on the parties to collective bargaining agreements with respect to a great many matters.

The amendment also would create obvious conflicts between two Federal statutes. Subjects of mandatory collective bargaining under the Taft-Hartley Act could be deemed "restraints" by the Secretary if this amendment were adopted and became part of the law.

The amendment before us refers to a "practice" or a "contract" in which there is a restrictive practice. As I have pointed out, it is obviously aimed, therefore, at alleged union or work practices and contracts and not at restrictive practices contained in building codes. Yet these latter, and especially the lack of uniformity from town to town and political jurisdiction to political jurisdiction are the real obstacles to the application of new technologies. And this we know to be fact.

Nor is the amendment limited to Operation Breakthrough. It is applicable to all construction and rehabilitation financed under any HUD program including the FHA insured mortgage programs and the public housing program.

Now, what do we do here if this amendment carries? What can happen? We prevent the progress of housing construction and set the stage for possible widespread strikes in the construction industry all over the country.

This is a dangerous amendment and I strongly urge its defeat.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Pennsylvania quoted at some length the statement that was offered in the other body on the 23d of September in support of this amendment, specifically referring to what is likely to occur. That is, are we going to improve housing technology in order to bring down the cost of housing while the gentleman referred to specific labor practices that have kept up the cost of housing.

Is that why the gentleman is opposing the amendment, because the gentleman wants to perpetuate that kind of thing in the construction industry in this country?

Mr. BARRETT. I am glad the gentleman brought that up. May I say I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Illinois as a good lawyer, a good legislator and certainly a good debater. But I am not objecting to housing being built as rapidly as it possibly can through Operation Breakthrough. But what I object to is putting this power into the hands of one man who will make the decision and likely cause a disruption of our entire housing construction program throughout this country.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BARRETT. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Can the gentleman think of a more logical person that we should select in connection with programs in financing—incidentally, I take exception to the gentleman's interpretation a while ago because we are not talking about FHA financing at all; we are talking about programs administered by the Administrator of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania is somewhat confused in his interpretation of this particular amendment. I would like to take this time just to point out what I consider to be the facts.

This amendment does not, nor could it ever, reverse the decision of the Supreme Court. I think the gentleman knows that.

He also said it would apply to all HUD programs including FHA housing. There is no possibility of that being a fact. What this amendment does, and its intent is, to allow the Secretary and to direct the Secretary to use every possible method that he can to encourage improved techniques and new technologies and materials which may, and I quote the exact language of the amendment—"reduce the cost or improve the quality of such construction rehabilitation, and maintenance, and therefore stimulate expanded production of housing, except where such restraint is necessary to insure safe and healthful working conditions."

That is what the amendment is designed to do. It was passed in the other body on that premise.

I would point out to you that this amendment does not deal with the past. The gentleman from Kentucky asked what specific instances it would be addressed to. Let me give him a couple. In the case of a breakthrough project which was awarded in a city, the Secretary would be encouraged by this particular amendment in working with the members of the construction unions and with the contractors involved in the project—he would be encouraged and directed to urge that they adopt every possible modern technique that had been suggested in the breakthrough proposal—not to change their existing contracts at all, but to consider the fact that this was a new attempt at a breakthrough and a new attempt to achieve meaningful low cost housing for the American people.

It would be a matter of the bargaining process and it would enhance the bargaining process. We are not limiting it at all.

He says in the amendment: "to insure to the extent feasible."

Let me give you another example. When you go into a community which has applied for an Operation Breakthrough grant, you are dealing not only with the contractors and the contracting unions, but with city officials as well.

This requires the Secretary to encourage the local officials of that community to consider any new technology and its implementation in the application of their existing codes to the proposed project. Well, should we not do that? Should we not consider every step that we can to urge the local communities of America to get with it in accepting new technology and try to get low cost housing for the American people?

I do not understand the opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I asked the Department of Housing and Urban Development if there was a defined limitation on the Secretary's exercise of power. The best they could provide me with was the last two paragraphs of Secretary Romney's letter of September 23 to Senator TOWER which sort of defines the purpose of this amendment.

One of the paragraphs said that there is no "unreasonable" restraint by contract or practice.

Will the gentleman please explain the reason that in his amendment it only talks of restraint and leaves out the word "unreasonable"?

Perhaps the gentleman from Illinois can answer that question why does he leave out the word "unreasonable" from his amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to permit me to respond?

Mr. BROCK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I took it out because I thought it left an ambiguity because it did not say what the unreasonable restraints would be.

In my opinion, clearly "unreasonable restraint" would be one which affects health and safety. So that is why I spell it out and say "except for healthful and safe working conditions".

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Do you not think the phrase "unreasonable restraint" would rather limit the power of the Secretary of HUD rather than just the word "restraint" without any limitation? In other words, is there anything in this which says that a contract can be with nonunion labor? It seems to me that contracts can be made with nonunion labor with the consent of the Secretary. Is that the intent?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Absolutely. I would agree. There is nothing in here that would prohibit that.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. But the gentleman certainly is not proposing that we write that into this particular statute, is he?

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

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe, well intentioned as this amendment may be, that it would put

labor and management into a straitjacket—committed to the contractual guidelines ordered by HUD.

I believe the amendment would have a far-reaching effect on labor-management relations around the country. It would give a blank check to the Secretary to do anything he wishes in this area.

If enacted, the amendment as I see it would authorize the Secretary to drastically change existing bid requirements and deny a contract to a qualified contractor who was the lowest bidder on the project.

It is contended that the amendment would lower housing costs. But I am convinced it would do the contrary by allowing the Secretary to deny a contract to the lowest bidder if the contractor did not have a union contract he liked. Yes, and housing might well cost more especially if building methods or materials which look good on paper turn out to be a big failure in actuality, or if long-range maintenance costs increase through poor workmanship.

Under the amendment's provisions, the Secretary could also alter Government direction of substantive terms and conditions of collective bargaining agreements. And, regardless of the present contractual requirements of the National Labor Relations Act, he could set up his own requirements for contracts within his jurisdiction.

A recent study made by HUD shows that labor costs had been reduced from 33⅓ percent 12 years ago to between 16 and 18 percent today; material costs are now 43 percent compared to 33⅓ percent 12 years ago and the remainder costs in land development, broker's fees, and other tangible expenses which were also 33⅓ percent 12 years ago are now about 40 percent. Hence it is obvious that rather than increasing percentagewise to the cost of constructing housing, labor costs have decreased in proportion to total housing costs.

This clearly demonstrates that labor has been cooperating with new techniques and technology in the building of homes which is responsible for this 50-percent reduction in the cost of labor.

Under this amendment, as I see it, the Secretary would be given unprecedented dictatorial powers—powers that could cause disruption of labor-management relations and negotiations in this country and it would be a direct blow to our free enterprise system. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could arrive at an agreement to limit time. I wonder how many Members would like to speak on the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto cease in 35 minutes.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment I wish to offer, and I believe the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) also wishes to offer an amendment. How can we be protected and be assured of some time?

Mr. PATMAN. On amendments I would think they should be allowed 5 minutes, at least. I shall amend the request to 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto cease in 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. At 5 o'clock.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the Chairman has asked for 1 hour, not until 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. I made that statement; the Chairman did not.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The gentleman from Texas, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, has asked unanimous consent to limit debate to 1 hour on the amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. PATMAN. As I understand it, there are two amendments.

Mr. WAGGONNER. He further amended his request by saying 5 o'clock. It cannot be 5 o'clock and 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, my request is for 1 hour, without reference to 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto cease in 1 hour. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. REES), a member of the committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REES TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The Clerk read as follows :

Amendment offered by Mr. REES to the amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois: Strike out "in connection with housing construction, any major rehabilitation, and maintenance under programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development" in the proposed new paragraph (4) and insert in lieu thereof "in connection with the construction, major rehabilitation, or maintenance of any housing assisted under this section".

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. I might state at the outset I was very much impressed with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. I think he is correct. We must do everything possible to develop new housing concepts in this country if we are ever going to adequately house the American people.

The one problem I see with the amendment is that it pertains to all programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The amendment which I am proposing is a very simple one in that it restricts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) specifically to section 1010 of the code, which refers specifically to Operation Breakthrough.

I believe in looking at the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). It could be interpreted that it would pertain to all the HUD housing programs. It might pertain, for example, to FHA, which is administered by HUD. Likewise it might pertain to public housing. I do not think we want that. What we are really trying to do in Operation Breakthrough is to develop new concepts in housing. This is the first step.

I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) is necessary, but we should clarify this amendment so that it pertains specifically to this program and not to get into the gray area of every other program now being administered by the Department of Housing Urban Development.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any Members whose names appear on the list read by the chairman who desire to speak with reference to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. REES)?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance that I ask for this time to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. REES). I really think he is trying to be helpful and constructive, and he was kind enough to furnish me a few minutes ago with a copy of the amendment which he has proposed.

Frankly, I do not think it is necessary. It seems to me if Members will take the Model Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, to which the amendment I presented is offered as an amendment, we see it clearly does relate to this particular section 1010 which deals with the Operation Breakthrough program. So to that extent it seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman from California is addressing itself to something that, in fact, is unnecessary.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, again I would read the language in the gentleman's amendment that refers to this: "under programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development."

It does not say the programs administered by Model Cities or any other specific program. It means every program administered by that Department.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Could I ask the gentleman from California a question. Suppose as a result of the 674 housing system concepts that have now been received by HUD, that as a result of receipt of those proposals we do develop some concepts that really embrace initiative and new technological breakthroughs, would the gentleman be reluctant to see those employed in the Model Cities program as a whole? Would the

gentleman object to the Secretary having at least the moral suasion of his office, to be able to use the persuasion powers of his office to suggest that these ought to be employed in a model cities program, in an urban renewal program, as well as in some other programs directly operated under the Operation Breakthrough?

Mr. REES. The model cities program is already covered in section 1010 under subsection (3). All this would mean is if there is developed a good technique, fine, but then the technique has to be developed for the housing industry in general, and I believe it has to be sold to the housing industry in general and to the building trades unions in general.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be allocated to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). I believe this is a very important discussion and I should like to have the time used for that purpose.

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

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN and Mr. WEICKER yielded their time to Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, perhaps it will not be necessary for me to take all the time yielded, but I do appreciate the opportunity to reiterate something which was said earlier in the debate. Perhaps there are some Members on the floor now who were not then present.

According to the latest tabulation which I received today from the Department of Housing and Urban Development there are a total of 664 proposals that have been received from various firms and industries around the country under Operation Breakthrough. Some 217 sites have been proposed.

In connection with that program, as I understand it, under the selection and evaluation process now going on, sometime around the middle of November, after evaluation and review, the Office of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development will select about eight—possibly as many as 12, but no more than that—sites on which these new modular types of housing, housing prototypes, will be erected.

What I am afraid of is that if we narrow—which is essentially what the gentleman from California is proposing we do—this language in such a way that it refers only to those eight or 10 projects which are being administered by HUD under Operation Breakthrough, we will lose the potential advantage of all these other some 600 proposals that have been received, which may be found attractive by various segments of American industry to mass produce housing, but, because they are not specifically folded in under the language of the gentleman's amendment, it would be possible for craft unions to restrict the employment and the use of these other technologies, these other new materials that might be developed.

I do not believe the gentleman intends that result, but I am very much afraid if we adopt his amendment that is precisely what the effect will be.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REES. There are two sections. One is section (3), which is in the law now. The other is section (4), which is the gentleman's amendment. I shall like to limit section (4) specifically to this act, because this is what we are talking about, this specific program.

Let me read section (3), which is the law right now. It says:

(3) require, to the greatest extent feasible, the employment of new and improved technology, techniques, materials and methods in housing construction, rehabilitation and maintenance under programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development with a view to reducing the cost of such construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and stimulating the increased and sustained production of housing under such programs,

This is what the law says now, so if something is found in Operation Breakthrough there is already the power of the Secretary to require to the greatest extent feasible the use of these techniques in a contract the Department might sign with someone else, or a program which might be administered under the Department.

Operation Breakthrough, in dealing with the gentleman's language, when it talks about no restraint by contract or by law against the employment of new and improved techniques, is a further step.

Because we take this further step I think we should restrict it specifically to Operation Breakthrough, because you also have the interplay of section 3 there, which means if something is found, the Secretary does have the power to go in to the greatest extent feasible in order to promote this in all programs that are administered by the Department.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman, and I agree with his interpretation of the present subsection (3) of section 1010 (a). However, I wonder at this timidity. If it is a good principle, which we should really employ and which is important to the construction industry of this country, why should we circumscribe it to confine it only to those sites under Operation Breakthrough? As long as we have already written into the law this requirement, why should we be afraid to go on and take the logical next step, which would give authority to the Secretary to look critically at those restrictions which might otherwise be employed by way of practice and contract?

Incidentally, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER), if I may quote him here, reminded me 2 days ago that the New York Times carried a story where I think there was a strike—and I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York, and perhaps he can explain it better than I can—a strike against the Public Housing Authority because they did not want more than 10 rooms to be painted in a single day.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It was a question of where the New York Public Housing Authority, as quoted in the New York Times of yesterday, was employing nonunion labor. The reason was that the union was prohibiting their painters from painting more than 10 rooms per week.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. In other words, union labor was losing out to nonunion labor because of a restrictive practice that certainly makes no sense at all. Under the circumstances we should not be afraid in this Congress to do what they did in the other body and take what is a perfectly logical step, I believe, of suggesting that there is nothing wrong with saying that when programs are financed out of the Federal Treasury and when taxpayers' dollars are used in these programs, the Secretary who administers them ought to have some authority to look at, and do so with a critical eye—the kind of restrictive practice just mentioned by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Illinois on the amendment which he has offered. I believe it strengthens the bill and is necessary, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Again I will say in concluding, Mr. Chairman, that I think even though I know the gentleman attempted to be helpful with the limiting words of his amendment, I think there is every reason and every justification for adopting the amendment as it was offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) a question or two which I believe he can give me brief answers to.

Do you understand as I do section 1010 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 to provide authority only to conduct research and development? Does it provide for any other program except for research and development?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Well, the title as I have it here in my hand and the text of that section reads: "Applying Advances in Technology to House and Urban Development."

The first section, section (a) says:

(a) To encourage and assist the housing industry to continue to reduce the cost and improve the quality of housing by the application to home construction of advances in technology, and to encourage and assist the application of advances in technology to urban development activities.

That is the opening paragraph.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Can the gentleman name me one program provided for under section 1010 other than the authority for research and development?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Well, of

course, 1010, I point out to the gentleman, is a part of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3372). And that does embrace a variety of Federal programs, the Model Cities program, the Urban Renewal program and I think also the Neighborhood Development program.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Does the gentleman believe, having used the plural word "programs" twice in his proposed amendment, that it would be discretionary on the part of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to require the application of this technology that he becomes attracted to any housing program in the Department of Housing and Urban Development?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. No; that goes beyond, I think, the purview of the amendment. I do not think it says he can require. What he can do is to use the authority of his office to see that it just is not arbitrary and that it is not put into the contract, completely disregarding everything else. I do not think there is anything to the effect that they are to use it in connection with the administration of these other programs.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Then, we are giving him statutory authority with the adoption of this language?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Well, of course, we are amending the statute. Yes; it is statutory language, authority which he could use to the extent feasible. We are not clothing him with any absolute arbitrary power.

I would remind the gentleman of the contract review procedures that are now available with respect to anything that the Secretary does which would be available for review in this instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES) there were—ayes 40, noes 42.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. REES and Mr. WIDNALL.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 66, noes 50.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OTTINGER to the amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois: In line 6 of paragraph (3), after the word "contract", add: "building codes, zoning ordinances".

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make clear at the outset that I oppose the Anderson amendment, even though I very much appreciate that its purpose is a good one, to promote technological improvements in the building trades. I oppose it because I think that it intrudes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in an unwarranted way into the collective-bargaining process. It is particularly objectionable because it points its finger solely at union practices. I think it is very much an antiunion amendment as it is now drafted.

The amendment seeks to assure, to the extent feasible that there is no restraint by "contract or practice" against technological improvements. That language clearly means by union contract or labor practices, as made clear in the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois. Nothing is said about nonunion restraints on introduction of new technology.

The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has quite clearly recognized that an equal impediment to the adoption of technological improvements exists in building codes and zoning ordinances. In point of fact, the letter that the gentleman from Illinois sent to all of us urging support of his amendment quotes the Secretary as follows:

Any limitations placed on our ability to utilize the advances in technology to produce more housing, whether imposed by zoning, building codes, or labor practices, keep us from producing houses that this country urgently needs.

I feel very strongly that if this kind of amendment is to be adopted, that at the very least it should also affect the building codes and the zoning practices which restrict technological improvement equally with any labor practices.

With respect to labor practices, I would like to say that whatever may have been the case in the past—and I do not think the unions have been as responsive to innovation as they should have been in the past—that that is very rapidly changing. The unions themselves, the building trades unions have promoted an outstanding study of the problems of technological introduction and are now quickly instituting technological changes.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that if we are to build the housing needed in this country—and that is a very high priority—we are going to have to facilitate new building methods.

The way to accomplish this, however, is in cooperation with the unions—not by forcing changes down the unions' throats, as was Secretary Romney's attitude when he first introduced Operation Breakthrough. Many technological changes involve complicated readjustments in our work force. These adjustments should be worked out in an orderly way between labor and management—but mandated by the Government.

The Anderson amendment was not presented in committee. There were no hearings on it. The parties have had no opportunity to explore its implications. It is unfair to force adoption on the floor of such a provision under these conditions.

For these reasons, I urge defeat of the Anderson amendment—but as a safeguard against the possibility of its adoption, approval of my amendment to make the amendment applicable to the restraints of building codes and zoning ordinances.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK).

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address myself to the amendment. I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I believe it is an excellent amendment. He is fully correct in recognizing the limiting factor in terms of our breakthrough into the new technology that is created by some of the building codes. Any effort that this body can make to strengthen the hand of the Secretary and our homebuilding industry in this particular area is a significant step forward. I fully support the amendment of the gentleman.

I think there was some confusion on the amendment that was last presented. I do not believe the amendment of the gentleman from California will diminish the impact in this particular effort today to achieve breakthroughs. I think his amendment was constructive. I consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York constructive. I support him and I urge support of the full Anderson amendment, as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further discussion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER)? If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 67, noes 0.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe for the record we ought to evaluate the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois for what it really is.

In the first place, it was defeated in the Senate by a vote of 6 to 5 in the committee, and it was appended on the Senate floor with six Members of the Senate present. I think that record ought to be underlined and stressed here today.

I think everybody who has studied the subject matter recognizes the amendment for what it really is, which is a union-busting attempt.

The housing bill we are debating today is considered to be noncontroversial. Yet statements have been made that I think are open to question. For example, during the committee hearings, I asked a representative of the American Institute of Architects exactly what in terms of the cost of an average home being built in America today was represented by these so-called labor practices, and the representative said the most it would amount to would be not even 4 percent. So what are we talking about? We are talking about a thinly veiled attempt to give the Secretary of HUD the power to bust the unions in the construction trades.

What are we being offered to affirmatively by the Secretary? Mobile homes

is about the only thing emphasized in this Act of 1969. We had the Hoover bills of the depression and now we are to have crammed down our throats the rolling Romneys.

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) on his remarks, and I associate myself fully with his remarks.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, was the gentleman here when I read the fact that the restrictive practices in New York City knocked union painters off the job and as a result the nonunion painters were working for the city housing authority?

Mr. GONZALEZ. I was here when the gentleman explained the story he read in the New York Times, but I still do not think that makes a case for his thrusting off or palming off this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am not palming off anything.

Mr. GONZALEZ. But the gentleman uses this as an example to justify the amendment the gentleman is offering in an attempt to curtail this practice. It is commonly understood the people who have wanted this amendment have said so in very blunt terms on other occasions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. LLOYD).

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

I have to reflect on the fact that this amendment was just called a "union-busting amendment." It seems to me when we consider labor-management negotiations and contracts, we think too little about the public interest. This amendment is not designed to be anti-management or promanagement or anti-labor or prolabor. This is an amendment which recognizes that the public interest is paramount to both.

The idea of the Secretary of HUD being characterized as being associated with something called union-busting certainly does not check with the past record of the Secretary.

I recall that when he was Governor of the State of Michigan, when many were advocating a right to work bill for his State, he said:

> No, I am not in favor of a right to work bill for this State.

We should not be considering this bill from the standpoint of whether it is for or against a special interest. We have the challenge in this country of providing 20 million new housing units in the next 10 years. The interest which we in this House should consider paramount to all others is the public interest.

In my view, the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), is most decidedly in the public interest, which interest it is our duty to represent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague (Mr. ANDERSON) has the best intentions, no doubt, in this wholesale manufacture of housing he is advocating, but the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER) whose amendment passed unanimously, correctly stated that this Anderson amendment would destroy collective bargaining.

Bear this in mind: Everybody wants to have all these low-priced houses for folks in the low-income bracket. This amendment creates Secretary Romney of HUD as a building czar. Do they ever figure it takes 3 or 4 years for these electricians, plasterers, carpenters, machinists, bricklayers, and so forth, to become qualified mechanics?

Can anyone tell me where they are going to build millions of cheap houses without expert union labor? I would like to know what kind of a house they are going to sell to these low-income people.

We might as well be factual. This amendment will get the housing industry into a can of worms. It is going to promote friction among the various classified building trades among the people and the building trades, and between the building trades and the Government, which is a farfetched departure from the accepted and successful house and home construction we have always enjoyed. The only exception has been where "fly by night" building contractors have erected cheap subdivisions which degenerated into slums in a few years. We would have slums and ghettos inside of 18 months, with the so-called plaster-of-paris houses that are going to be built under Secretary Romney's plan. Union labor will not go in with Mr. Romney or anybody else to put up a lot of cracker-box homes. They claim the houses will be cheaper, but they have not said that contractors, lumber and building supply, or real estate will be lowered. If the houses will be cheaper, labor will have to provide the reduction in cost.

It is just such a fallacy that the amendment of my good colleague, Mr. ANDERSON, will give the public.

I will tell the Members where this would throw collective bargaining out the window. When we throw collective bargaining out the window, we will not have anybody to build these cracker-box houses that are intended to be built under this amendment.

In the first place, I will give an example. Contractors are required to bargain mandatorily on wages and hours and working conditions. If the collective bargaining agreement does not work out on that point, if he refuses and does not go into any contract, in that way he violates the Labor Relations Act.

If Mr. Romney cannot get expert mechanics, electricians, machinists, and so forth to build these houses, my gracious, what kind of houses are we going to have? The proposed plan may set back or postpone housebuilding perhaps for a year. There will be millions of people waiting for these cheap houses. They do not know what they are going to be, and they might wait for them if this "pie in the sky" building program ever gets organized on a practical foundation.

If the high-interest bankers and their "money monopoly" will forfeit some of their fabulous interest profits, we will have plenty of homeseekers who could start building millions of homes throughout the Nation in a few weeks.

If this billion and one-half home-building legislation is passed without the Anderson amendment, and low interest is provided by the banks and loan companies, we will have homebuilding prosperity by next January 1970.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN).

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. As Members fail to respond to their names, is the time then redistributed among the remaining Members who have not yet spoken? There was a fixed period of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was equally divided. The Chair has recognized Members whose names are on the list. The time will not be redivided.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PUCINSKI TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois:

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PUCINSKI to the amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois: In the last line, after the word "working" insert "and living".

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering is to provide some degree of safety in any effort to use low-cost materials in housing construction. This amendment seeks to make certain that the lives of people who will move into the projects after they are built are not endangered through the use of time-saving or low-cost materials. We have an exemption in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) which says the provisions of the amendment shall not apply "where such restraint is necessary to insure safe and healthful working conditions." I have merely added two words "and living" to the exception, making it read "working and living conditions." In other words, if at some point the people at HUD decide that they can save some money by using less safe material that will endanger the lives of those who occupy the building built, there will at least be recourse to challenge the use of such material or method under my amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I certainly will not take exception to the language that the gentleman proposes. I think that

the horrors he is conjuring up are rather remote, namely, that HUD would deliberately go out and do something like that.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I disagree with the gentleman. I have seen some of these short-cut methods used and I have seen people burned to death in buildings and I have seen enough fires in my life to know that defective materials were used against the code. That is my basic opposition to your general amendment. It would put the Federal Government into every community in this country and impair local building codes and safety standards. All I am trying to do is insure in the event your amendment is adopted that we will have some recourse to see to it that unsafe materials or questionable techniques will not be used in the construction of these houses. That is all I hope to do here, and I hope the amendment will be adopted and the gentleman will accept it. I want the legislative history to show that my amendment permits a challenge of any decision by HUD to use materials or techniques if it can be shown such action or approval by HUD jeopardizes or may jeopardize the health or safety of people who will occupy such housing.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am certainly willing to accept it. However, I am sorry that the gentleman in the same spirit of reciprocity is not willing to accept my amendment, because as far as making a czar out of Secretary Romney, the gentleman knows that in the 9 years I have been here I have never proposed making a czar out of any Federal official.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I did not use the word "czar."

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. And I wish to state that this language in my amendment, as it is limited by the language offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) will not make a czar of anybody.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Nobody knows what happens when guidelines come down the pike. I am sure my colleague is very sincere, but he and I have been here long enough to know what happens when you give bureaucracy the kind of power that we give it here in your amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any Members whose names were on the list read by the Chair who wish to speak for or against the Pucinski amendment? If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. It would give the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development more power with respect to collective bargaining agreements than now exists in any official or agency of the Federal Government. At the present time the National Labor Relations Act expresses the national policy on collective bargaining and labor management relations. If it is felt that there is any need to alter this policy, then I think the Congress should do it and it should not be left up to the discretion of a single officer of the Federal Government. At the present time, under the National Labor Relations Act, it is the function of the courts to ultimately determine whether or not a particular provision in a contract or practice is unlawful. The courts are constantly considering issues in various cases involving such provisions. We are told—and I have heard it said here on the floor in the course of the debate—that there is a difference in what the Labor Act makes unlawful and what it prohibits—then to that I would say if the Labor Act does not make a contract or practice unlawful, then it must be lawful and permitted under the act.

If there is a need for additional restraints, I firmly believe that these restraints should be imposed by legislation which has been carefully considered by the House Committee on Education and Labor after a thorough hearing into all aspects of the problem it seeks to remedy. I do not believe that this body wishes to grant to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development authority—he, himself—to determine what such restraints should be.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the proposal should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I think that regardless of where I might live, I would be very much concerned about the apparent inability of this country to provide enough decent housing for our people.

But coming from the State of Oregon, I am especially concerned because the health of the economy of my State depends upon the health of the lumber industry and upon the health of the housing construction industry. And, indeed, the physical and mental health of all our people depends to a great extent upon their access to decent low-cost housing.

I, therefore, view with special alarm the trend toward higher and higher housing costs for the working people of this country and the downward trend in new housing starts.

It seems to me if we can eliminate any restrictions which contribute to this upward trend in the cost of housing units or which contribute to the downward trend in the number of new housing starts, then this Congress, that has expressed its concern about the inability to provide decent housing, ought to vote to eliminate those restrictions. And, if there are new technological developments or techniques that would contribute to more and more housing and better housing at lower cost, then we ought to be in favor of taking advantage in every way possible of these new technological developments. It is for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Anderson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. ST GERMAIN).

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those who oppose the adoption of this amendment.

Those in support of this amendment have been careful to point out that this amendment is not intended to interfere with the normal relationships between employee and employer or the contracting union.

I cannot agree. Possibly this is the intent of the sponsors of the amendment, but that is not what the amendment says. Rather, it gives the Secretary complete authority to do what he feels advisable to "assure, to the extent feasible—that there is no restraint—against the employment of new or improved technologies, techniques, materials and methods."

I would therefore ask, as a matter of legislative history, that the sponsors of this amendment make a clear and concise statement in the RECORD to the effect that it is not their intent that there be any interference by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in normal labor-management relations or agreements arising therefrom.

In any case, it does not appear to me to be wise for the Congress to give broad authority to the Secretary in a case such as this without writing into the statute limitations or specific guidelines to be followed.

The Secretary under this amendment would apparently be able to use the various powers of his Department as a coercive sanction in providing governmental direction to the terms and conditions of agreements entered into under our free collective bargaining process by contractors budding on HUD-administered projects.

Additionally, as I understand history, the Congress has always been very jealous with its power to set the direction of the substantive terms and conditions of collective bargaining agreements. Yet, by this amendment, we are delegating that power to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development so far as agreements falling within the coverage of this amendment are concerned. I do not think we should abdicate such authority to the Secretary without having given careful consideration to whether this is the only way the problem, if one exists, can be attacked.

We are simply asked to approve a floor amendment, without hearings and without an opportunity to do some careful thinking, which may set a precedent for a continuing decrease of congressional authority or influence in this area and a corresponding malignant increase in the authority of the executive branch.

Our constituents did not send us here merely to act during the heat of a debate on the crucial issues facing our country today. They have sent us here to think issues through for them and to vote as we feel best in the interests of our Nation and our constituents.

I have serious doubts about whether this amendment will be good for our country in the long run, even though the arguments in favor of it have some appeal, and I therefore am not going to vote for the approval of any such amendment the sole consideration of which has been made on this floor with most Members absent.

Also of deep concern to me is the fact

that it appears this amendment could well create a conflict in the application of Federal statutes.

It would not matter that the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, does not make particular clauses in agreements unlawful. Although a clause in a contract might stand under Supreme Court interpretation of the Labor Act, its use could nevertheless be prohibited by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in programs administered by him.

For example, lawful subcontracting provisions are a mandatory subject of bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act, and a contractor may not refuse to bargain about them. Nevertheless, contractors who are parties to a collective bargaining agreement containing such a lawful clause could be ineligible as a result of a unilateral decision by the Secretary, to bid on work under programs established under an entirely different statute.

This has the appearance of a back-door amendment to the labor laws, and I for one, do not feel it is appropriate for the Congress to take such an approach to the problem.

We would be creating the possibility that every collective bargaining agreement entered into by contractors doing business with HUD would be reviewed by that Department. I am sure the Department would receive hundreds of requests from dissident employers and employees asking that their particular contract be reviewed. This could reopen old wounds and every labor issue which might be brought under the broad language of the amendment. Labor relations would be disrupted around the country, and rather than produce more housing, the amendment might well be counterproductive.

I would not want to see labor strife and unrest result from the adoption of this amendment. Before the Congress subjects collective bargaining agreements to the scrutiny of any Federal department, I think we should very systematically and prudently decide in our own minds what limitations we want placed on this review authority and how we may provide procedures by which strife and unrest could be prevented.

We cannot do that on the House floor. That is a job for the committee, and can only be done by a diligent and foresighted calculation of the complex problems involved and the ramifications of a particular phrase in the language of the proposal. I cannot support the adoption of this amendment under the present circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, we have now been debating this bill and the amendments thereto, and particularly the amendments, since yesterday afternoon. I call your attention to the fact that on numerous occasions the point has been made against certain amendments that not enough time has been spent and that no hearings have been held on these amendments.

Certainly, I think the debate on this amendment this afternoon has indicated that, prior to even thinking of adopting it, there ought to be hearings to allow both sides to be heard.

As a matter of fact, I, for one, have a great deal of admiration for the proponent of the amendment, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). Ordinarily, he is one of the clearest speakers in the House of Representatives. Yet, with all of his talent and all of his ability which has been demonstrated here in this debate, there is a great deal of question as to the application of this amendment—as to how far it goes and what it does or does not do.

So on that point alone I feel it should be rejected.

In conclusion, to those who feel that as a result of the Rees amendment that they do not have anything to worry about, I would like to point out to the Members that from here this bill will go to conference with the other body where stronger language was adopted by the other body. I, for one, do not want to chance its coming out of conference with the Senate language rather than the language as amended by the Rees amendment.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge the rejection of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Anderson amendment, even though I think it has been improved by adoption of the Rees amendment and the Ottinger amendment.

My opposition is certainly not directed toward the objectives of the amendment as I understand them—namely, to insure that there be no obstacles placed in the way of achieving our national housing goals by using the latest technological advances and materials—but rather the method of trying to achieve this by placing, without congressional hearings, unrestricted powers in the Office of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

One year ago, in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, we committed ourselves to achieving the production of 6 million dwellings for low- and moderate-income families over the next 10 years and for increasing other production to an average annual rate of 2 million dwellings.

We realize that to achieve this objective we would have to develop and use new and improved technology in the housing industry. Accordingly, in section 1704(c) of the 1968 housing bill we added a new subparagraph (3) to section 1010 (a) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

The Anderson amendment, as I understand it, would add a new subparagraph 4 with almost the same wording as subparagraph 3, which we adopted almost 1 year ago after extensive hearings.

The gentleman from Tennessee asks if we are opposed to the new techniques.

Let me read to you the 1968 law which was adopted after lengthy hearings. It expresses in a positive and inoffensive manner what the pending amendment expresses in a negative and possibly offensive manner. In subsection 3 of the 1968 law the Secretary is directed to "require, to the greatest extent feasible, the employment of new and improved technology, techniques, materials and methods in housing construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance under programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development with a view to reducing the cost of such construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and stimulating the increased and sustained production of housing and under such programs."

The subparagraph has been in effect for only 1 year.

No one came before our subcommittee asking for an amendment on the grounds that subparagraph 3 was unworkable.

On the other hand, I would be the last to claim that all problems in modernizing the housing industry are solved by subparagraph 3 even with the addition of the Anderson amendment. But there are right ways and wrong ways to achieve the objectives and the wrong way is to act hastily on the floor of the House without extensive hearings.

The right way is to consider through a congressional hearing the entire scope of the problems facing the housing industry as recommended by the Douglas Commission.

In accordance with the recommendation of the Douglas Commission, on July 17 of this year, I introduced, with 27 cosponsors, a bill to establish a nongovernmental institution called the National Institute of Building Sciences to bring all segments of the housing industry together in a partnership to bring about a dramatic expansion of housing production, and to solve some of the problems involved in housing costs, including perhaps the single largest cause: conflicting and obsolescent building codes.

Instead of incurring the hostility of organized labor, my bill would seek to enlist the cooperation of labor by providing that the operations of the National Institute of Building Sciences, "shall be directed by a council which shall be broadly representative of all sectors of the building industry including labor, all levels of government, and the consuming public."

I think that this is all that is necessary.

Further, I would seriously doubt that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development wants to be cast in the role of labor mediator for all existing contracts in the construction industry.

Therefore, I believe that we should vote down the pending amendment and proceed in the proper congressional manner with hearings on the bill to establish a National Institute of Building Sciences, and I hope the chairman of the committee can assure me that such hearings will be scheduled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARRETT yielded his time to Mr. ASHLEY.)

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has propounded an amendment which certainly has the intense interest of every Member of this body. He has said that we need, in order to achieve decent housing at a price that the American family can afford, the same kind of innovation and tech-

nological breakthrough that we witnessed in our space effort. I simply must wonder at the fact that, to the best of my knowledge, no legislation was ever enacted by this Congress with respect to our space effort comparable to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois today. Perhaps with it we would have gotten to the moon sooner that we did. The fact is we got there in a timely fashion without it.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no testimony on the part of this administration in favor of the substance of the Anderson amendment, and I think the reason there has not been is clear.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I did make what I consider to be a conscientious effort to get the views of the administration on this particular amendment.

Mr. ASHLEY. Precisely.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. And I think I have it. I have in my hand a letter signed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. ASHLEY. There is no question it is the view of the administration, but what I am saying is that after 8 months in office the administration still did not come before the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate and in testimony demonstrate a need for the substance of the gentleman's amendment. I am perfectly well aware, as I am sure all Members are, of the contents of the letter to which the gentleman refers.

The reason the administration did not see fit to testify is very likely the reason alluded to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD). The fact of the matter is that the Anderson amendment was adopted last year and is part of the law of the land today. The gentleman from Illinois would require the Secretary to "assure, to the extent feasible, in connection with housing construction, any major rehabilitation and maintenance under programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, that there is no unreasonable restraint by contract or practice against the employment of new or improved technologies, techniques, materials," and so forth.

Under the Housing Act of 1968, adopted last year, we have almost precisely the same language. I would ask the gentleman from Illinois what addition he feels his amendment makes to the language in the 1968 act, referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD) and most recently by me?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Of course, I think actually the language was added in 1968 in the amendments to the Housing Act in that year, and they merely in very general terms express the intent of the Congress that the Secretary explore the possibilities of using the new technologies.

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentleman but he is mistaken. Rather than the vague language the gentleman suggests, here is the language from the 1968 act:

The Secretary is directed to require the employment of new and improved technology, techniques, materials, and methods in housing construction.

That is not vague language. That is very specific language which was adopted last year. It is the law of the land today. I see no reason whatever to come forth with an amendment that now talks about "unreasonable restraints" without saying by whom, without defining what is unreasonable restraint, without suggesting the criteria for determining on the part of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development what would constitute an unreasonable restraint.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further at that point?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman agree, for example, with the kind of practice referred to earlier in the debate where a union would demand a contract that their members paint only 10 rooms a week despite the fact that a new brush or machine had been devised that would provide for painting of 10 rooms in a day? Would that be restrictive?

Mr. ASHLEY. It might very well be, but, if so, the Secretary is required under the law of last year to require the employment of new and improved techniques in construction. If there is an unfair practice now, if it is in restraint, if it is all the gentleman suggests, the law last year covers it and we do not need the amendment the gentleman is proposing. What I am suggesting is that this is duplication.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes to close the debate, first, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to support the Anderson amendment as amended by the Rees amendment. I think it is vital as part of Operation Breakthrough, which is in an imaginative way capturing the attention of the country and also much public support. It is gaining from day to day.

I do believe there is a misunderstanding as to what this amendment says and what it does. I think it is important as we close the debate to read the amendment in its amended form, which we will soon be voting on:

Assure, to the extent feasible—

And, Mr. Chairman, I emphasize that "to the extent feasible"—

that there is no restraint by contract or practice against the employment of new or improved technologies, techniques, materials and methods or of preassembled products which may reduce the cost or improve the quality of such construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance—

Mr. Chairman, this is very important—

and therefore stimulate expanded production of housing under such programs—

I also want to emphasize this—

except where such restraint is necessary to insure safe and healthful working conditions.

I believe that every Member of Congress will recognize the fact that we are falling far short of meeting the housing needs of this country. We have had many programs in existence for years which have failed to measure up to the needs and the goals of the people of our country.

We know what the situation is now. We have to do something about it. That means we are going to be in a period of change and that it will be healthy change as we review and move on with this program and other programs. Something must be done.

I do not believe there is anyone who recognizes this more than the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Romney, who has done his best in traveling throughout the United States to see at firsthand the problems. He has studied. He has not moved rapidly because he wanted to try to present a sane, good program to the country. This is a vital part of Operation Breakthrough.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), to close debate on this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

I think that every Congressman recognizes the immediacy of this country's housing needs and the necessity of developing technological breakthroughs to meet these needs. However, this amendment by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois is not a proper vehicle for meeting this need for a number of reasons, according to my opinion.

To begin with, there are very serious objections to this amendment. Its language is inflexible and rigid. It grants unlimited power to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development without any procedural safeguards. It is not a balanced or reasonable approach to this complex problem in that it focuses on unions while ignoring questions that have been raised regarding local building codes, the high cost of money and land, all of which play an important part in the cost of housing. It inevitably will create a conflict with the application of the National Labor Relations Act. Lawful agreements, working rules and practices which are mandatory subjects of bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act could be prohibited under this amendment by unilateral decisions by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

In view of these serious objections, any additional legislation on this subject properly should be developed only after extensive congressional hearings. This amendment was not a part of the administration's housing bill, nor was it even discussed at the hearings.

The necessity for a congressional hearing is pointed up by the fact that the proponents of this amendment state that it will permit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to use the powers of persuasion of his office to encourage technological breakthroughs. Yet the present Housing Act already contains a provision that requires the Secretary to encourage large scale experimentation of new technology. No adequate explanation has been presented why the additional legislation in this area is necessary.

It seems particularly appropriate that this amendment be the subject of a congressional hearing at which the Secre-

tary of Housing and Urban Development can present his case regarding the amendment and other interested parties can be given an opportunity to present testimony regarding this most complex issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois) there were—ayes 100, noes 77.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 130, noes 93.

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL: On page 44, after line 24, insert the following new section:

"Medicine Cabinets In Federally Assisted Housing

"SEC. 415. (a) The head of the appropriate Federal agency shall prescribe reasonable standards with respect to the type or design of latches hereafter installed on medicine cabinets in federally assisted housing with a view to preventing injury to young children as a result of gaining access to the contents of such cabinets.

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'federally assisted housing' means (A) housing constructed, rehabilitated, or otherwise provided with assistance under the National Housing Act, the United States Housing Act of 1937, section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, title V of the Housing Act of 1949, the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code; and (B) family housing constructed by the Department of Defense.

"(2) The term 'appropriate Federal agency' means (A) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to housing constructed, rehabilitated, or otherwise provided under the National Housing Act, the United States Housing Act of 1937, section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, or section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959; (B) the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to housing constructed, rehabilitated, or other provided under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, or the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961; (C) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration with respect to housing constructed or repaired with assistance under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act; and (D) the Secretary of Defense with respect to family housing constructed by the Department of Defense.

"(c) The respective appropriate Federal agencies shall, in prescribing standards under this section, seek, through consultation or otherwise, to achieve the greatest practicable uniformity in such standards."

And renumber the succeeding section accordingly.

Mr. WIDNALL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) is recognized in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I wish to say I have had an opportunity to go over the amendment and we see no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PUCINSKI

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PUCINSKI: On page 46, line 8, after "cost", insert:

"SEC. 415. All rules, regulations, directives, instructions and policies promulgated by the administrator under this Act shall be so promulgated within the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act."

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes.

What this amendment does is to require that all rules and regulations shall be published in the Federal Register so that you can see what the administration is doing—what the Administrator is doing. We have done this on other bills simply because there is a growing tendency to have guidelines to substitute for the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

I hope that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment. I think it is important in a bill like this where a tremendous number of people are involved and where whole industries are involved it is important for Members of Congress, it would help all of us if we knew in advance what the Department is planning to do with these provisions. It in no way interferes with the Administrator's management or conduct of the Agency.

It does not impede his operations. It does not take any of his powers away. All it says is that the Administrative Procedure Act which has been on the books for some 20-odd years and in view of the fact that in recent years guidelines have been developed to bypass the APA—all we are trying to do is to give the Congress the knowledge that we need.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, do you have a copy of the amendment? I have not seen it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have shown it to the chairman of the committee. I apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. Is it not true at the present time, the Department of Housing and Urban Development would be forced to do what you are talking about which is already in the act?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I regret to advise my colleague that is not true. The Administrative Procedure Act was passed by the Congress because the Congress realized that we here in the Congress cannot cross every "t" or dot every "i" and so this great authority was delegated to the administrator. So when the Administrative Procedure Act passed the Congress—all right, we delegate this authority but we want the administrator to tell the Congress what he is doing or plans to do about publishing it in the Federal Register—to publish his proposed rules and regulations. This was going on for a few years. Then about 10 or 12 years ago, and I must say this because most prevalent in the past administration, we saw the emergence of guidelines to bypass the Administrative Procedure Act.

What happens today is the guidelines are published and they are sent down range and nobody ever has a chance to look at them and no one ever has a chance to comment on them and when they are sent down range, they become effective. Two jurisdictions have already held that guidelines take on the color of law. So all we are saying here is that we are reemphasizing the fact that the rules and regulations shall be published in the Federal Register for all interested parties to study them before they become effective and comment upon them if that is their desire.

Mr. BROCK. I believe the gentleman has a desirable objective in mind in terms of broad policy that is going to be adopted in relation to a national program, but I think he is somewhat amiss of the mark when we talk about an operation breakthrough, because here we are trying new technology.

Mr. PUCINSKI. This applies to the whole act.

Mr. BROCK. I know, and it is going to destroy any possibility of a breakthrough.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) is correct, that the amendment would apply to the whole law, then nothing would destroy such a possibility. We are merely emphasizing that this is the intent of Congress. We want to see the rules and regulations that they propose for the administration of the act. That is all. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of an Operation Breakthrough is to let the Secretary have the flexibility to innovate, to be creative, to try something new on a one-time basis in a pilot project in a city somewhere in these United States. He has had 60-odd proposals. He may take 8, 10, or 12 of them and try them. To delay that operation, to open up a Pandora's box to every special-interest group to come in would defeat its purpose. Why we should not even try something new is beyond me. The gentleman knows that the bill he is talking about was designed to affect long-term programs that are going to become policy. They should not affect innovative experimentation.

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

Mr. BROCK. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. There is nothing in this amendment that could be disagreeable to the gentleman. I will ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read again, because there is nothing in the amendment that even approximates that. This amendment states that all rules and regulations shall become promulgated within the framework of the Administrative Procedure Act, which is now on the books. That is all. If the Secretary wants to fund a demonstration project, fine, he can do that, and nobody stops him. But if he wants to set up rules and regulations setting up demonstration projects, then he would publish those rules and reguations in the Federal Register for all interested parties to see.

Mr. BROCK. How about rules or regulations or policies affecting one experimental project?

Mr. PUCINSKI. It would not affect it.

Mr. BROCK. That is what the amendment says.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The Administrative Procedure Act, if my colleague will look at the act, provides the machinery under which an administrator shall publish in the Federal Register the proposed rules and regulations which he recommends for implementing an act—in this instance, the Housing Act.

All I am saying to my colleague is that in the last decade we have seen the emergence of government by guidelines, and no one ever sees the guidelines until they become literally law. All I am saying is that the administrator of this agency, as I hope the other agencies will also, will show the Congress and show the other interested parties what he proposes to do. That is all.

Mr. BROCK. I would frankly place more credibility in the gentleman's amendment if he had offered it on the health, education, and welfare bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman is correct. I did offer it. In fact, I have been offering the amendment to every major bill, simply because I think it would restore the responsibility of Government back to Congress, where it belongs.

Mr. BROCK. I fully agree with the gentleman's intent in that case. If it does not affect the demonstration or innovative project, then I cannot object to it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this same amendment was proposed in 1968 to the 1968 Housing Act and was defeated. We had hearings, and the gentleman did not appear before the committee in support of the amendment this year. We had reason to believe that he had either abandoned it or at least was not insisting on it.

The amendment is far reaching. It could involve many emotional questions in this country and get far away from any housing legislation.

We do not know how far it would go under the Administrative Procedure Act. I hope this amendment is voted down. It is dangerous. I hope it is voted down. The gentleman admits he has been trying to get it on other bills, and he has failed to get it on any bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. No; we got it through.

Mr. PATMAN. Not on a housing bill though.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct, and I regret that we did not get it on a housing bill, because the gentleman has seen the arbitrary rules and arbitrary standards being handed down in many parts of the housing bill over which Congress has nothing to say and no control. So I am hopeful that as long as the chairman did recall and refresh my recollection, that Members will realize what we are trying to do is to recapture control.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

This is going too far. We do not know how far the Administrative Procedure Act would go in the administration of this. It is going off in a different direction entirely from the housing bill. We do not know how dangerous it is or how ineffective it would be in enforcing the provisions of this law. I do not think we should go in this direction. I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment would be highly detrimental to the administration of this act, because of one word in his amendment that has not been discussed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), which says:

> All rules, regulations, directives, instructions and policies promulgated by the Administrator under this Act shall be so promulgated within the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

I do not believe the word "policies" has ever been in any bill before. I do not think it should be, and I think it would be something that would completely hamstring the operation of the act and the attempt we have been making to get expeditious action in moving in new directions.

It is also highly irregular to offer this amendment to the House without providing any copies even for the majority or the minority sides.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would not press the issue. The fact remains I am somewhat surprised that my colleague would be so concerned over an amendment to this act which requires nothing more than publication in the Federal Register of how they intend to implement an act approved by the Congress of the United States. It does nothing more. It makes these people tell the Members of Congress and all other interested parties what they plan to do with the legislation the Congress approves. It is just that simple.

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised the gentleman from Illinois offered this amendment. I have supported in the past similar amendments offered by the gentleman to other bills. I agree with the purpose he states, but the way in which this is offered, never having been offered to the committee, and copies not having been submitted to the majority and minority sides is irregular.

And I do not believe—the gentleman can correct me if I am wrong and I will yield to him for that purpose—that the amendment has ever been offered in the same form in which it is offered today, that is including the words "directives, instructions, and policies." I fear this goes well beyond what I have supported in the gentleman's efforts in the past, and that is that rules and regulations and guidelines which would take on the color of law be published in the Register. But now every policy that is considered by the Department of HUD and every directive which is sent from Washington to one of its regional offices will have to be published in the Federal Register, and we will inundate the office with paperwork and glut the Federal Register. I do not think the amendment is well thought through.

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

Mr. ERLENBORN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman misses the point of the amendment. The controlling factor is the Administrative Procedure Act. That is what controls. Whatever procedures are spelled out in the APA prevail.

I would not add anything to the APA. I would not touch it, amend it, or expand it. Whatever requirements are made of an administrator in the APA; those requirements would have to be abided by and adhered to under this amendment. So we do not do anything not on the books now, because the APA has been on the books since 1946. All we do is reaffirm the importance of the APA.

Mr. ERLENBORN. The gentleman misunderstands the point I am making. Certainly the Administrative Procedure Act does not require every policy adopted, every directive sent out, be published in the Federal Register. If it did, then the gentleman's amendment would be completely unnecessary. It is ill advised, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is human for each of us to think that everything we do here, or propose, has historic significance. With due allowance, therefore, for this tendency upon our part to see history being written in every vote, I would like to recall a little matter of perhaps some historic value which occurred a dozen years ago. It was the first teller vote ever held in the House on the issue of instituting a food stamp program. We lost. The vote was ayes 89, noes 128. That was on June 20, 1957.

That vote was historic and significant, in my opinion, more from a political standpoint than anything else. For as pointed out at the time by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) only one

Member of the House from the minority side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) went through the tellers in favor of food stamps in 1957. He has always supported this legislation.

Subsequently, as the years passed, some additional Members from the Republican side—a few—joined in this effort, but when the Food Stamp Act of 1964 was reported by the House Committee on Agriculture, every single Republican member of that committee voted against it. And so did the overwhelming majority of Republicans in the House.

TWO DIFFERENT ISSUES 12 YEARS APART RESULT IN IDENTICAL VOTE PERCENTAGES

Yesterday, we had an amendment before us on the housing bill which I feel is somewhat comparable, from a political standpoint at least, to the experience of June 20, 1957, on the food stamp issue. That was my amendment to create a Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation to provide direct loans, at 6½ percent or less, to credit-worthy middle-income families, earning $12,000 a year or less, to enable them to obtain the financing needed to buy homes they can afford. The HOMLC would operate only during periods when the private mortgage market cannot or will not provide mortgage money to middle-income families at reasonable rates—a situation such as right now.

The teller vote on this proposal yesterday was ayes 78, noes 111. It failed.

Mr. Chairman, it is a remarkable coincidence that the vote in favor of this amendment was just about exactly the same from a percentage standpoint—41 percent—as the vote in favor of the food stamp idea the first time the House had a teller vote on it, 12 years ago.

NO REPUBLICAN VOTES THIS TIME

What is even more remarkable is that this time, so far as I recall from counting the aye votes yesterday as a teller, there was not a single Republican Member of the House willing to come through the line in favor of the idea of enabling moderate-income American families to get reasonable financing for the purchase of a home. Not one.

If I failed to recognize any Republican faces in the line, I would be glad to apologize to any Member from the minority side who would wish to correct me on that.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this vote seemed to have turned into a partisan matter, with all Republicans present voting no and most of the Democrats present—not all, and not enough, but most of those present—voting aye. But the result was not surprising. It takes a while for Members on the other side of the aisle to recognize a good idea when it is presented here for the first time, or the third, or 10th. Eventually, as in the case of the food stamp idea, many of them finally come around. Now the big problem our Republican colleagues are trying to decide about the food stamp issue is not whether it is a good idea, but whether it should have only $340 million to spend this year, as present law provides, or $610 million, as proposed by the Nixon administration, or $1,250 million as agreed to by the Senate. And this year dozens of Members of this House from the Republican side are enthusiastically cosponsoring bills to expand, improve, and in other ways endorse the whole idea of a food stamp plan expanded to include everyone who is in need of food assistance in order to obtain an adequate diet at a price he can afford.

HISTORY INDICATES THE GOP ELEPHANT WILL EVENTUALLY LEARN TO RECOGNIZE A GOOD IDEA

I am sure many of our Republican friends will eventually see the value, also, of the Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation, but I am somewhat resigned to waiting 12 years for most of the Republicans here to see the light.

Hence, as I had to do in the food stamp matter 12 years ago, I am planning to concentrate my efforts in behalf of the HOMLC among my Democratic colleagues, knowing that those who examine the bill introduced by me and Mr. BARRETT, H.R. 13694, which I offered yesterday as an amendment to the housing bill, will enthusiastically support it. I intend to fight as hard for this measure as I did for the food stamp bill. And one day, I suspect, many Republican Members of the House will be making speeches here complaining, as they have done about food stamps this year, that the HOMLC had only $10 million in its revolving fund after 5 years and should have far more money to lend out.

They say the elephant never forgets. But the history of progressive legislation—from social security through to the present—shows that it usually takes the GOP elephant many years to learn anything—so that it will then have something to remember, and will know what not to forget.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to make a motion to recommit, after the Committee rises, based on the amendment presented to the Committee yesterday afternoon.

Very briefly, let us set the record straight, that urban renewal, under the present laws, has no requirement whatsoever for the creation of housing. The only requirements in the law today are those requirements stating that if housing is a part of the urban redevelopment plan then 20 percent shall be low- or moderate-income housing. But there is no requirement for any housing whatsoever.

The net result of this has been clear. Rather than create a situation in our cities whereby they can be developed in balance, both the commercial side and the living side, this particular piece of legislation really could be called the great shopping plaza renewal act or the office building renewal act. Far from assisting with the housing needs of this country, this very piece of legislation has gone ahead and created a problem which requires the Operation Breakthrough, which requires the model cities program, et cetera.

This specific amendment does not require that any housing be put in if the urban renewal project goes into an area where there is no housing. But if the project goes into an area with housing and tears down x number of units, yes, as a part of the plan then that number of units would have to be replaced. There is no shunting of the problem outside of the cities. It has to be handled on location.

To those who would say the one-for-one situation is restrictive so far as housing is concerned, I will say I believe it is a lot more restrictive for the person who is displaced from his home and has no other place to go.

This is very definitely a question of priorities. The relocation provisions under our present Urban Renewal Act do not create any more housing. All this does is to postpone the problem, and the backlog of housing units required just goes on the upswing.

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

Mr. WEICKER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I should like to commend the gentleman on the statement he is making. He is absolutely right. This is the same idea he tried to get through yesterday on the amendment. If housing is demolished in the process of urban renewal we must replace the housing for the people who theretofore had been living in the area.

This is a good amendment in the nature of a motion to recommit, and I intend to support it.

Mr. WEICKER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. McCLORY. I witnessed an urban renewal project where housing was destroyed for people who needed the housing most, and no provision was made for housing of those disadvantaged persons. I believe the gentleman's amendment is commendable, and I intend to support him.

Mr. WEICKER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WEICKER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the gentleman's motion to recommit. It ought to be in the law and it should have been in the law a long time ago, from the very first year that urban renewal was passed by the Congress. It is a good amendment and should have been adopted yesterday. I support the gentleman's motion to recommit.

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

Mr. WEICKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I only want to point out that I think the gentleman had better take a hard look at this. I do not want to consume the time of the Members at this late hour, but the majority of the low- and moderate-income housing is 50 percent, or really 51 percent, and not less than 20 percent.

Mr. WEICKER. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that requirement is only there if housing can be part of the urban renewal plan, but there is no requirement that there be any housing in there at all.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LONG of Maryland. I congratulate the gentleman on his motion and believe that it will solve a very important problem here. I intend to support his motion to recommit.

Mr. WEICKER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. How does the gentleman's amendment comply with a U.S. district court ruling in Chicago by Judge Austin, which may or may not be upheld on review, where the judge held that you have to build three housing units outside of a ghetto area before you can build one unit inside? Where you have an urban renewal project and put in a fixed number of housing units—and I support your concept, but I want to know how will this comply with this decision and how will you be able to build your homes if the principle enunciated by Judge Austin becomes final?

Mr. WEICKER. The principles enunciated by this Congress will overrule those enunciated by the judge. It was not the intent of this Congress to create an urban renewal act geared only to commercial interests in the United States. The Congress has not enunciated its principles up to now, and I believe this will help to do it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that there should be any question about the impact and the effect of this motion to recommit. If it is adopted, it will ruin and it will end the urban renewal program as we know it today.

I have been on the Subcommittee on Housing for 15 years, and I can assure you that I have worked hard to come to understand the program. I will yield to any Member on either side, any member of the Housing Subcommittee, who will not affirm what I am saying.

There are some 2,600 urban renewal projects in being today, either in construction or in completion. Not one-tenth of 1 percent of these projects could go forward if the motion to recommit were adopted and were to become law. The fact of the matter is that the gentleman is seeking to superimpose a judgment from Washington over that of the local community. Hear me out. There are projects in your districts that seek to reduce density by taking out substandard units and not putting in one for one, as the gentleman's motion would require. There are projects in your districts that seek new recreational space and new park space. It is necessary in some instances to take out units and not to replace them on a one for one basis in order to achieve this end.

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that if this motion to recommit is adopted, this Congress will be putting its judgment—insisting that its judgment be substituted for that of the local governing bodies.

Mr. Chairman, this motion to recommit has got to be opposed on the basis of the testimony of the Conference of Mayors, the Leagues of Cities and the Association of County Officials.

This motion, as I have said, Mr. Chairman, would absolutely end urban renewal as we know it today, and I repeat that I will yield to any member of the Housing Subcommittee to challenge me on what I say.

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

Mr. ASHLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. WEICKER. It is not going to destroy urban renewal. It is going to put the human element back into urban renewal where it should have been from the start.

Mr. ASHLEY. I refuse to yield further. I consider it presumptuous that the gentleman from Connecticut would tell our subcommittee it has been unmindful of the human element involved. If he feels so strongly, I would suggest that the gentleman might have come before the committee in a timely fashion rather than offering his amendment as he did yesterday without any prior notice, and now in the form of a motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, if this is so essential, then why did not the gentleman present himself before the committee with reference to this proposal? Why is this the first time that this matter has been presented?

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I am sure that the gentleman from Ohio knows about the history of the southwest section of Washington, D.C. A few years ago thousands of people were living in that area. However, under the urban renewal program the houses were torn down and the property was sold to wealthy people on which to construct high-rise apartments. My question is that those people who were put out of their homes are still without homes.

Mr. ASHLEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Alabama that the problem that he has suggested has come to the attention of our subcommittee. The gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking minority member of our subcommittee, has for years offered amendments which have been adopted to tighten up on these operations in order to assure that low-cost housing for families of modest income would be provided. These amendments have been adopted. They are a part of the law today.

But to insist upon a one-for-one replacement takes away the opportunity of lowering the densities of our poorer cities.

I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut that there is no addendum to his motion that says that there will be some means of accommodating the inner city people in the suburbs; no, not at all.

Mr. Chairman, this motion to recommit in my view is directed at and its sole intent is to lock into the cities those people who are living in the cities today. It can only perpetuate the terrible densities of our inner cities and the stifling conditions which breed unrest, crime, and violence.

The gentleman from Connecticut talks about assuring the human element in urban renewal. His motion, however, is only certain to continue the inhumanity characteristic of so much of our urban life and to preserve the unethical and immoral class structure of present-day suburbia.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, our country is facing a housing crisis of growing magnitude. It extends to the housing available to Americans of low- and middle-income levels. We have talked a great deal, going back to the days of World War II, about the need for vast building programs for housing. But each year we fall a little further behind in our housing goals.

I commend the Banking and Currency Committee for approving the full authorization for the model cities program. When this program was first passed under the previous administration, much hope was invested in it. In my own district in the Bronx, N.Y., we have started a model cities project. It has brought a feeling that there is indeed an urban future for us. I see new signs of enthusiasm within the model cities area. This program has gained widespread acceptance as a basic approach toward meeting the needs of low-income families in blighted areas through comprehensive use of the whole range of Federal programs. I am pleased that the committee has given this program its confidence by recommending the authorization that was envisaged in the original legislation.

I also want to indicate my support for such other provisions within this bill as low-cost loans for housing for the elderly and emergency flood insurance. I find it prudent that the committee has seen fit to include funds for the rehabilitation of older public housing projects. This is an important provision. Neglected houses and buildings, once vacated, become breeding places for crime and disease. This indicates the wide scope of this legislation, which I regard highly.

The bill contains two other important provisions to help our senior citizens. It makes an increase in the rehabilitation grants available to low income families in urban renewal areas who must fix up their property; and, the bill authorizes an additional $150 million for the 3 percent loan program to finance housing for the elderly and the handicapped. These provisions certainly have my strong support.

The bill, H.R. 13827, modifies the public housing annual Federal contribution formula which would restore the authority in the original 1937 Housing Act. These contributions have been limited by regulation—just to debt service—on public housing projects and today a number of local housing authorities find they cannot meet operating costs out of rentals. Management costs of public housing have spiraled along with other costs, while the average income of public housing occupants has remained virtually the same as the program serves a lower range of income groups, particularly senior citizens.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will make a number of important improvements in existing programs and provides authorizations to continue these programs through the next fiscal year. There are some problems the bill fails to remedy. In some respects it fails to face up to two needs of public housing in high cost areas. It establishes a limitation on construction cost per room which will mean that no new public housing can be constructed under federally assisted financing in the city of New York, and other such cities. Further, it fails to come to grips with the problem of urban space in that it makes no provision for disposal of excess Federal property at a reasonable price for low- and moderate-income housing. The existing cost limitation per unit of public housing has made it almost impossible for the NYC Housing Authority to construct new residential facilities for the past year, and I fear that our housing problem in New York City is going to become worse.

Mr. Chairman, I opposed the Anderson amendment, not because I fail to recognize the importance of using new technology for housing construction. I oppose it because it ignores the guarantees to the rights of labor that have been built up over the years. The trade union movement is as eager as the Congress to get new homes built quickly and inexpensively and has shown that it is adaptable to the use of new technology.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this housing bill. It makes many important improvements. I regret, however, that it does not go far enough. Our goal is not only more homes but a decent, safe, and sanitary home with a suitable living environment for every American family. This legislation is necessary to help meet this goal—but a whole range of community development programs including public works, transportation, health, education, job training, and, employment programs must also be implemented and funded—if we are to rebuild our ghettos and make our communities a decent place in which to live.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 13827, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969.

In passing the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the Congress established a clear national housing production target—26 million units of housing in 10 years, including 6 million units for low- and moderate-income families. Yet current statistics show that, this year, we may not achieve even 1 million housing starts, when the congressional mandate calls for 2.7 million starts annually. We are falling behind in our efforts to meet the congressional mandate in this area and the goals set by the Kerner Commission report.

It became clear during the testimony of the Honorable John V. Lindsay, mayor of New York, before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, on July 25, 1969, that one of the major roadblocks to the construction of public housing—an important part of our effort—is the statutory per-room cost limitation for public housing. I would like at this point to quote extensively from Mayor Lindsay's testimony:

> The fact is that all the federally assisted housing programs—public housing, homeownership, 236 rental assistance—face an impossible roadblock, and that is a roadblock that is endangering every housing program and is placing in jeopardy any hope whatever of meeting our national housing goals.
>
> To put it bluntly, this roadblock is leading the Nation to the imminent collapse of publicly assisted housing production. And when I speak of "imminent collapse", I am not using scare words and I am not exaggerating.
>
> This roadblock, Mr. Chairman, is the statutory cost limitations which control both low and moderate income housing construction.
>
> Over the last 20 years construction costs have increased by at least 125 percent nationally and 130 percent in high cost areas such as New York City. Projected increases are even more spectacular, as the cost of land, labor, and materials continue to rise at an alarming rate.
>
> Yet the cost limits for public housing and the mortgage limits for the Federal Housing Administration's programs have lagged miserably behind these increases. For example, as construction costs more than doubled in the last 20 years, cost limits for the public housing program were raised by only 26 percent in high cost areas.

The bill before us today would increase the basic per-room construction cost limitation for public housing from $2400 to $2640, and increase the additional per-room allowance for high-cost areas from the present $750 to $825. However, in view of the housing lag in New York City, my own county of Westchester, and other areas where construction costs are high, it is unfortunate that the committee failed to adopt the more flexible approach of the other body. Under the Senate bill, as my colleagues know, the Secretary would have discretionary authority to increase the basic limits by up to 45 percent in high-cost areas. I would think such an approach is necessary if we are to avoid the nightmare predicted by Mayor Lindsay—unless formulas are sufficiently liberalized, 30,000 housing units scheduled for construction in New York City alone in the next 18 months will not be built.

The other major provision of the Senate bill which is missing from the measure before us today is a new program to provide rental assistance to public housing tenants. Under current law, low-income Americans are eligible for Federal rent subsidies only if they live in private housing. As a result, as many as 90 percent of the low-income persons in this country live in private housing, often dilapidated slum housing, because public housing is unavailable to them. According to the New York Times, some 200,000 families live in substandard housing in New York City alone.

The Senate provision—originated by Senator BROOKE—authorizing $75 million annually to help pay the rents of tenants in public housing would pave the way for many of these citizens to move into safe and sanitary quarters. The Government would pay all costs of public housing for those families with no income; in those cases where a family's rent was more than 25 percent of its income, the Government would pay the difference.

Although I feel the measure before us would have been improved with the two changes I have discussed, several of the provisions in the House bill are useful, and should contribute to the increased effectiveness of the neighborhood development program, particularly. Like many of my colleagues, I have been disturbed by reports that only 35 of the 150 cities which have applied for funds under the neighborhood development program have received grant contracts. It is my understanding that some cities, because of delays in processing of NDP applications, lack of funds, and the possible loss of local grant-in-aid credit, have recently sought to return to conventional urban renewal programs. Hopefully, the setting aside of funds for NDP projects, extension of the period of eligibility for local grant-in-aid credit, and the provision of a 2-year budgeting period for NDP will help solve these problems.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I feel the House and the Congress must show a new sense of urgency if we are to meet the housing problems so urgently described by the Kerner Commission and others. I urge enactment of this bill as a necessary step toward reaching our goals in housing construction.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 13827, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969. I wish I could say that I am completely happy with this bill, but I am not. It does not go far enough. As the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT) said during general debate on this bill:

> In the midst of the greatest prosperity ever known by any nation in history, 6 million American families still live in substandard housing.

This is an incredible statistic when you consider the evidence of report after report indicating domestic unrest stemming from a No. 1 problem of proper—or in most cases, improper—housing.

While there is much to be proud of in this bill and the hard work put in it by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN), and all the members of that committee, I do not feel we can honestly say we have done all we can to truly improve the quality of life for all Americans in need of a decent home. The prices of new homes and interest rates on financing what they are today, of course, just does not make the dream of home ownership possible for all Americans.

We are in a crisis of confidence and hopefully the Congress will go much further next year in meeting the inadequate housing and poor living conditions which subtract so much from the total of a man's livelihood and his desire to produce.

I am pleased, however, that H.R. 13827 emphasizes the importance of the neighborhood development program—a new set of rules for carrying out urban renewal enacted in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

More than 280 communities, including my district—Schenectady, N.Y.—have NDP applications filed with HUD or

about to be submitted. If this program is fully implemented, this method of renewal will cure the phenomenon so prevalent in many communities where urban renewal activities, due to their slowness, have at times compounded the problems they were supposed to solve.

Thirty-nine other Members joined me in introducing an amendment to H.R. 13827 which would extend for 1 year the eligibility of noncash grant-in-aid credits under NDP. The Committee adopted the intent of my amendment as section 203 of title II of the bill. I, along with many other Members who have cities where these credits are essential to the success of their NDP program, are grateful to the efforts of the committee and the staff for including this section in the bill.

I am especially pleased with the language in the committee report which states that cities which have undertaken urban renewal under NDP be not more administratively restricted than those cities seeking assistance under regular renewal projects. After HUD urged cities, at their own expense, to prepare applications for funding under NDP, I feel that this recommendation in the report is extremely important and fitting. The fact that H.R. 13827 stipulates that $400 million in fiscal year 1970 urban renewal funds be earmarked for NDP and that at least 35 percent of all urban renewal appropriations in succeeding years be earmarked for NDP, is, in my view, equally important in seeing that NDP will continue to be what the program was intended to be—a change in the renewal process that would serve to accelerate renewal efforts.

As my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) pointed out during general debate, a bipartisan group of 85 of us here in the House joined in sending a letter to Secretary George Romney which expressed our concern over reports that HUD intends to place severe restrictions on the implementation of NDP.

I was pleased with the quickness of Secretary Romney's response to our letter when he stated in a telegram, presumably sent to all 85 signers of the letter:

> Wish to advise you: first, this department and this administration firmly supports the NDP concept as a valuable and flexible tool to aid cities in achieving their renewal objectives; second, we have no intention of taking any action that would weaken this tool for urban renewal; third, the October 3 press release on the two year provision does not require completion of renewal activities within that time and assumes certain types of activities involving federal financial assistance can and will continue beyond the two years; fourth, the press release of October 3 contains no reference to conversions to NDP. A final decision on this matter is yet to be made and your views will be carefully considered; fifth, this department has no intention of taking final action on administrative regulations for NDP until the House of Representatives acts on H.R. 13827.

I commend the Secretary for both the promptness and responsiveness of his wire. It is gratifying to be reassured that not only the Department of Housing and Urban Development, but the administration firmly support the NDP concept, and that they "have no intenton of taking any action that would weaken this tool for urban renewal." This wire is confirmation that the NDP program will be as comprehensive as expected by the cities and intended by the Congress.

Eventually, more detail needs to be spelled out on the issues of conversion and time limits referred to in our letter and in the Secretary's reply. We would like to know exactly what those "certain types of activities" are and what the programs of "Federal financial assistance" are which would permit a city to continue NDP projects longer than 2 years. Since the principle of conversion is an essential element of the NDP concept, we are disturbed to learn that at this late date a final decision is yet to be made as to whether additional cities will be afforded equal treatment with the initial 35 in being permitted to transfer or convert to NDP funds already under renewal contract and grant reservation. However, the Secretary's wire clearly demonstrates that he is fully informed of the provisions of H.R. 13827, and of its accompanying report language requiring that cities undertaking NDP "should be permitted and encouraged to do so under conditions which are not more restrictive than those imposed on regular urban renewal projects."

I am confident, therefore, that we can expect, in good faith, that any future regulations relating to time limits and conversion will be in conformity with the commitment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the administration to the concept of NDP.

At my request, the Department of Housing and Urban Development provided me with a listing of all NDP applications submitted or about to be submitted to HUD through August 31, 1969. Because NDP is so important to these communities, I include this list by region at this point in the RECORD:

NDP APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED OR ABOUT TO BE SUBMITTED TO HUD

REGION I

Bridgeport, Conn.
Danbury, Conn.
Danielson, Conn.
New Britain, Conn.
New Haven, Conn.
Portland, Me.
Presque Isle, Me.
Boston, Mass.
Haverhill, Mass.
Lawrence, Mass.
New Bedford, Mass.
Springfield, Mass.
Woburn, Mass.
Albany, N.Y.
Beacon, N.Y.
Binghamton, N.Y.
Corning, N.Y.
Elmira, N.Y.
Fairport, N.Y.
Fulton, N.Y.
Glens Falls, N.Y.
Lockport, N.Y.
Olean, N.Y.
Palmyra, N.Y.
Plattsburg, N.Y.
Schenectady, N.Y.
Syracuse, N.Y.
Troy, N.Y.
Utica, N.Y.
Yonkers, N.Y.
Newport, R.I.
Pawtucket, R.I.
Providence, R.I.

REGION II

Wilmington, Del.
Baltimore, Md.
Elkton, Md.
Montgomery County, Md.
Bridgeton, N.J.
Burlington, N.J.
Camden, N.J.
Cape May, N.J.
East Orange, N.J.
Englewood, N.J.
Flemington, N.J.
Hoboken, N.J.
Jersey City, N.J.
Lakewood Township, N.J.
Long Branch, N.J.
Millville, N.J.
Morristown, N.J.
Newark, N.J.
Newton, N.J.
Paterson, N.J.
Perth Amboy, N.J.
Plainfield, N.J.
Salem, N.J.
South Plainfield, N.J.
South River, N.J.
Wayne Township, N.J.
Wildwood, N.J.
Woodbridge, N.J.
Aliquippa, Pa.
Ambridge, Pa.
Beaver Falls, Pa.
Bethlehem, Pa.
Bradford, Pa.
Bridgewater, Pa.
Butler, Pa.
Eddystone, Pa.
Erie, Pa.
Franklin, Pa.
Harrisburg, Pa.
Johnstown, Pa.
Lancaster, Pa.
Latrobe, Pa.
Lebanon, Pa.
Masontown, Pa.
McKeesport, Pa.
Middletown, Pa.
New Kensington, Pa.
Pittsburgh, Pa.
Pittston, Pa.
Pottsville, Pa.
Punxsutawney, Pa.
Reading, Pa.
Scranton, Pa.
Tarentum, Pa.
Titusville, Pa.
Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
Charlottesville, Va.
Hampton, Va.
Petersburg, Va.
Portsmouth, Va.
Richmond, Va.
Huntington, W. Va.
Wheeling, W. Va.

REGION III

Alexander City, Ala.
Hartselle, Ala.
Troy, Ala.
Daytona Beach, Fla.
Fort Walton Beach, Fla.
Tampa, Fla.
Alma, Ga.
Chatham County, Ga.
Columbus, Ga.
Macon, Ga.
Rome, Ga.
Tallapoosa, Ga.
Bowling Green, Ky.
Covington, Ky.
Paducah, Ky.
Laurel, Miss.
Meridian, Miss.
Chapel Hill, N.C.
Charlotte, N.C.
Clinton, N.C.
Greensboro, N.C.
Salisbury, N.C.
Winston-Salem, N.C.
Rock Hill, S.C.
Bristol, Tenn.

Chattanooga, Tenn.
Harriman, Tenn.
Huntsville, Tenn.
Jackson, Tenn.
Jefferson City, Tenn.
Johnson City, Tenn.
Kingsport, Tenn.
Lawrenceburg, Tenn.
Memphis, Tenn.
Morristown, Tenn.
Nashville, Tenn.
Newport, Tenn.
South Pittsburg, Tenn.
Tullahoma, Tenn.
Union City, Tenn.
Winchester, Tenn.

REGION IV

Bloomington, Ill.
Carbondale, Ill.
DeKalb, Ill.
East St. Louis, Ill.
Rockford, Ill.
Springfield, Ill.
Anderson, Ind.
Connersville, Ind.
Elkhart, Ind.
Evansville, Ind.
Fort Wayne, Ind.
Gary, Ind.
Indianapolis, Ind.
Jeffersonville, Ind.
Mishawaka, Ind.
Richmond, Ind.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Ottuma, Iowa
Waterloo, Iowa
Bay City, Mich.
Detroit, Mich.
Garden City, Mich.
Hamtramck, Mich.
Hazel Park, Mich.
Lansing, Mich.
Madison Heights, Mich.
Muskegon, Mich.
Muskegon Heights, Mich.
Pontiac, Mich.
Romulous Township, Mich.
Duluth, Minn.
Hopkins, Minn.
Minneapolis, Minn.
South St. Paul, Minn.
Bismarck, N.D.
Minot, N.D.
Ray, N.D.
Akron, Ohio.
Canton, Ohio.
Cincinnati, Ohio.
Cleveland, Ohio.
Columbus, Ohio.
Dayton, Ohio.
Mansfield, Ohio.
Middletown, Ohio.
St. Bernard, Ohio.
Steubenville, Ohio.
Warren, Ohio.
Fort Pierre, S.D.
Mitchell, S.D.
Sioux Falls, S.D.
Stevens Point, Wis.
Wisconsin Rapids, Wis.

REGION V

Batesville, Ark.
Blytheville, Ark.
Crossett, Ark.
Eldorado, Ark.
Forrest City, Ark.
Heber Springs, Ark.
Hope, Ark.
Hot Springs, Ark.
Little Rock, Ark.
Magnolia, Ark.
Marianna, Ark.
Monette, Ark.
Morrilton, Ark.
Newport, Ark.
North Little Rock, Ark.
Osceola, Ark.
Pine Bluff, Ark.
Texarkana, Ark.
West Memphis, Ark.
Denver, Colo.
Greely, Colo.
Fort Lupton, Colo.
La Junta, Colo.
Longmont, Colo.
Pueblo, Colo.
Trinidad, Colo.
Wellington, Colo.
Galena, Kan.
Garden City, Kan.
Kansas City, Kan.
Lawrence, Kan.
Lyons, Kan.
Manhattan, Kan.
Merriam, Kan.
Salina, Kan.
St. Paul, Kan.
Wichita, Kan.
New Orleans, La.
Lee's Summit, Mo.
Mexico, Mo.
Smithville, Mo.
St. Louis, Mo.
Springfield, Mo.
Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Artesia, N. Mex.
Carlsbad, N. Mex.
Santa Fe, N. Mex.
Tucumcari, N. Mex.
Elk City, Okla.
Hugo, Okla.
Miami, Okla.
Oklahoma City, Okla.
Sand Springs, Okla.
Stillwater, Okla.
Tulsa, Okla.
Wilburton, Okla.
Alice, Tex.
Austin, Tex.
Edinburg, Tex.
Grand Prairie, Tex.
Hearne, Tex.
Lubbock, Tex.
San Antonio, Tex.
San Marcos, Tex.
Sinton, Tex.
Sinton, Tex.
Waco, Tex.

REGION VI

Ketchikan, Alaska.
Eloy, Ariz.
Scottsdale, Ariz.
Bakersfield, Calif.
Berkeley, Calif.
Campbell, Calif.
Coachella, Calif.
East Palo Alto, Calif.
Fontana, Calif.
Hawaiian Gardens, Calif.
Inglewood, Calif.
Kentfield Corners, Calif.
Laverne, Calif.
Lompoc, Calif.
Napa, Calif.
Oakland, Calif.
Oxnard, Calif.
Richmond, Calif.
Sacramento, Calif.
Salinas, Calif.
San Diego, Calif.
San Pablo, Calif.
San Mateo, Calif.
Santa Barbara, Calif.
Santa Rosa, Calif.
Vallejo, Calif.
Visalia, Calif.
Hilo, Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii
Havre, Mont.
Helena, Mont.
Coos Bay, Ore.
Eugene, Ore.
Portland, Ore.
Reedsport, Ore.
Salem, Ore.
Ogden, Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah
Longview, Wash.
Seattle, Wash.
Casper, Wyo.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 13827, the Housing Act of 1969 contains benefits for housing assistance not only for urban areas but most fortunately and quite properly has not forgotten the needs for rural housing.

As I read this measure for the first time I was quite concerned that the $100 million ceiling applying to rural housing mortgages has been removed. I was at first fearful that this left us in a sort of gray area. It took some study to figure this one out, but I am now convinced the removal of this ceiling was in reality something that would not hurt but could possibly help our rural housing programs.

Put differently, it certainly does not increase the authority of funding and instead actually increases it. Previously, there was a 100-million ceiling that had no longer been used by FHA for direct loans. This bill combines direct loan and the insured loan account for rural housing into what could be said to be one accounting or one bookkeeping system. This is just another way of expressing the proposition that both direct loan funds and insured funds are in one pot. Direct loans are still possible but there exists only one account. Ths is in accordance with what the Farmers Home Administration had asked for.

Those who have said the removal of the 100-million ceiling leaves rural housing with an empty package miss the point because the removal of the ceiling leaves no limitation of any kind except those budgetary limitations imposed by the administration. In the past, the FHA has had as much as 300 million direct loan funds and 300 million insured loan funds. The removal of this limitation permits the agency to work without a ceiling prescribed by law and secure in funds what they can, consistent with budget limitations.

Commendation is due the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) for his amendment which expanded the authority of General National Mortgage Administration to buy mortgages on rural housing. Actually this distinguished member of the Banking and Currency Committee was responsible for an amendment which would make such mortgages eligible for purchase under title I. While his amendment did not require GNMA to make these purchases it does provide the authority or permit them to make such purchases.

In terms of benefits to rural housing this measure removes the 5,500-population ceiling as being unrealistic and an arbitrary limitation. It should be recalled the limit 5 years ago was 2,500 population for Farmers Home Administration loans. Then, at that time, it was raised to 5,500. The measure we are considering today will remove the 5,500-population limitation and as long as the community is not a satellite of a city, loans could be made to a community of 10,000 or more. This means the FHA can now make loans both direct or insured to communities of over 5,500 population.

Another improvement as far as rural housing goes which I am delighted to endorse and happy to see included in this bill is the provision that the Secretary of

Agriculture is allowed to sell insured notes in blocks rather than individuals as heretofore. Under present law a prospective rural homeowner who wants to build as one of a group of three or four friends in the same general area would have to ask for one loan and the builder complete that unit before the builder could apply for another loan.

In other words, under present law a builder in a rural area must start and finish one dwelling at a time. He must complete one dwelling before he can get another loan. This present measure will make it possible for a builder to apply for eight or 10 loans at a time and proceed with the development of a small subdivision. The question could quite properly be asked, since this has been done for such a long time in our urban and suburban areas why have we not thought about this kind of thing for our rural areas?

H.R. 13827 may do a lot of things for the urban areas but it is also most important for those of us who represent rural areas. Let us never forget the Census Bureau, that out of a total of 5.9 million substandard housing units in the United States, 4.2 million, or nearly two-thirds, are in the rural areas. Here is a huge housing problem, but local banks serving rural communities are limited to the extent of long-term credit, leaving FHA the only vehicle for financing rural housing.

It has long been my point that it costs far less to revitalize rural communities which includes rehabilitation of rural housing than it will cost to rehabilitate the cities. On a dollar-per-dollar basis, money provided the rural areas provides an inestimably better return for the investment of Federal funds than money in urban areas. The reasons are clear. It is far more expensive to reconstruct housing units in high-priced urban land areas than a similar number in the rural areas.

Once we upgrade urban housing there is at least the implied invitation for discouraged rural people to migrate to the cities. But the worst aspect of the problem is that no matter how successful urban renewal projects may be they simply exchange the problem of today for a far greater set of problems tomorrow requiring infinitely more money to deal with more and more perplexing problems at some future date. In deed and in truth, the problems created by urban renewal programs may not even respond to money regardless of the amount.

Urban renewal projects when completed tend to attract additional rural folk to flock to the cities. It would be far less expensive to construct housing units to meet the housing needs for millions of people in a rural atmosphere than in metro-America. Then, too, there are limitless opportunities to America's industries to disperse, rebuild, and expand in the smaller cities of our land.

About 70 percent of our Nation's population lives on 1 percent of the land. Billions of dollars have been spent to combat housing shortages in the big cities. To this date they have provided nothing but first aid and done really nothing to alleviate the problem of the big cities.

Several polls have shown that people prefer homes in less populous areas if they could find adequate housing in these areas and if industry would follow the housing migration to our smaller cities.

That is why I have emphasized the rural housing aspect of this bill. The same kind of energy, money, and guidance heretofore devoted to the hopeless task of rebuilding our urban areas, if diverted to rural revitalization, would be eminently more successful in achieving the goals of not just better housing but better conditions of employment and a better America.

It is my considered opinion we cannot continue pouring millions of dollars into urban areas. Revitalization of rural America may indeed be the one last hope for rescuing America from the decay of urban blight.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, this resolution disturbs me greatly. It is being debated less than 3 weeks after the passage of the military procurement authorization bill for 1970. At that time the spending of $21 billion on weapons was approved. We approved that tremendous sum for systems of questionable need, doubtful utility and for which there was frequently no strategic military requirement. Now I should not have to tell you gentlemen of the urgent need in this country for adequate, low-cost housing. The established national housing policy of the United States is a "decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family." This minimal goal was set 20 years ago. And just what is the present situation? The Kerner Commission found that nearly 6 million families live in substandard housing. It was that commission's recommendation that we commit ourselves to build at least 6 million Government-assisted housing units by 1972. Furthermore, the Department of Housing and Urban Development says that the country needs—and is capable of producing—26 million dwelling units by 1978. Does the bill that is now before us even begin to meet these needs—the fulfillment of our national housing goal? I submit that it is woefully inadequate. For example, section 236(i)(1) of the National Housing Act increased by only $20 million the funds for interest reduction payments to owners of rental housing projects designed for occupancy by low-income families. Section 10(e) of the Housing Act of 1937 providing for loans for low-rent housing and slum clearance projects is amended by an increase of only $25 million. The housing crisis in America requires far more than this. It requires immediate and massive Government support—not a drop in the bucket and a promise for the future.

I am especially distressed that public housing rent increases in the District of Columbia, Detroit, and around the country did not elicit a response from any members of the Banking and Currency Committee in their report on this bill or on the floor from any other Members of this body. I speak specifically of the rent increase announced recently by the National Capital Housing Authority. For the 10,500 tenant families affected here in the District, this increase averages approximately $11 per month. For many of us this may not seem like a great deal, but to the poor it is an oppressive sum. Furthermore, the rent increase will hit the poorest families the hardest. The minimum rents for the cheapest apartments will be raised $10 per month—a 37-percent increase. This increase will require a minimum of 30 percent of the income of the poorest families be paid for rent. Where will this end? By law, rent supplements cannot benefit public housing tenants; these tenants are obliged to meet all operating costs of their housing unit. These costs, including maintenance expenditures, have risen tremendously in recent years. The Vietnam war has precipitated much of this inflation. The mistakes of our leaders are now being disproportionately borne by those least able to pay the price. I fully appreciate the need of public housing authorities for additional operating income. But I maintain that the very poorest of our public housing tenants can no longer be required to meet these increases, as necessary as they may be. This was perceptively recognized by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. While dealing in committee with the Senate version of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, they included provisions that would make possible annual rental assistance payments to the housing agencies so that families of very low income would not have to pay over one-fourth of their income for rent. I refer to section 211, title II of S. 2864. That is the least we can do, gentlemen. I therefore urge the conferees for the House, when they meet with those from the Senate, to work for the inclusion of these provisions in the final version of this act.

We can and should do more—much more. Earlier this year, I and 29 of my colleagues in this body introduced the Full Opportunity Act. Title V of that act provides the funds that would implement our national housing policy, and go a long way toward solving the housing crisis. In amending section 10(e) of the Housing Act of 1937, this act increases to $275 million the amount spent on public housing each year for the next 10 years. The 300,000 additional public housing units each year for the 10 years are in that way authorized. In like manner, this act increases rent supplements to $175 million each year for the next 10 years and provides for the financing of 2 million additional housing units over that 10-year period.

I am fully aware that these are large sums of money. But if we cared as much about advancing men's lives as we seem to care about advancing the means by which they are destroyed, we could raise this money with no new taxes. Yet we, in the face of this clear need and mounting crisis, continue to squander our tax revenues by fulfilling every military demand. The passage of the military procurement authorization bill earlier this month certainly highlighted for me this country's grossly distorted national priorities. This year we will spend over $100 billion on defense and defense-related expenditures. And what will we spend on housing? In this same time period all federally assisted housing programs, including model cities, will re-

ceive a little over $3 billion. This Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969 does little to alleviate this distortion. But until we resolve to assist those many afflicted by the present housing crisis in America, we can only continue to assist those few that the programs in this act will reach. And so again, I reluctantly urge passage of another inadequate Housing and Urban Development Act.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to explain that we will ask for separate votes as follows:

First, on the committee amendment, as amended by the Teague of Texas-Brock amendments relating to the temporary extension of flexible interest rates. I know a lot of the Members feel very strongly about this and many are conscientious and want to take the interest rate ceiling off for the next 2 years and some do not. So, there will be an opportunity for each Member to express his own conviction about whether he favors a high interest rate or a low interest rate.

Next, Mr. Chairman, there will be a separate vote on the Anderson of Illinois amendment, as amended. I believe it is well understood as to the application of the advances in technology in housing and urban renewal, the amendment which was adopted on page 30 after line 9 of the bill. On those two amendments we expect to ask for separate votes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOOD, 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. 13827) to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 580, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, Mr. Speaker, a separate vote is demanded on the committee amendment, as amended by the Teague of Texas and Brock amendments relating to temporary extension of flexible interest rate authority, shown as section 414 on page 44, lines 20 through 24 of the reported bill.

Also, Mr. Speaker, a separate vote is asked for on the Anderson of Illinois amendment, as amended, relating to the application of advances in technology concerning housing and urban development which was adopted on page 30, after line 9 of the bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely sure I heard the chairman of the committee correctly. But I understood him to say he wanted a separate vote on the committee amendment, as amended by the Teague of Texas and Brock amendments. Those are two separate amendments and I question whether or not we can vote on them en bloc.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the vote will be on the committee amendment, as amended.

Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the so-called Anderson of Illinois amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 30, after line 9, insert the following:

"Section 1010 (a) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (2);

"(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and'; and

"(3) by adding after paragraph (3) a new paragraph as follows:

"'(4) assure, to the extent feasible, in connection with the construction, major rehabilitation, or maintenance of any housing assisted under this section; that there is no restraint by contract building codes, zoning ordinances or practice against the employment of new or improved technologies, techniques, materials and methods or of preassembled products which may reduce the cost or improve the quality of such construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and therefore stimulate expanded production of housing under such programs, except where such restraint is necessary to insure safe and healthful working and living conditions.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 133, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: page 44, line 20, insert:

"TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF FLEXIBLE INTEREST RATE AUTHORITY

"SEC. 414. Section 3(a) of the Act of May 7, 1968 (Public Law 90-301), is amended by striking out 'October 1, 1969' and inserting in lieu thereof 'October 1, 1971', and by amending the proviso to such section to read as follows: *'Provided,* That not withstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, until October 1, 1971, to establish a maximum interest rate for guaranteed or insured loans to veterans under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, not in excess of such rate as he may from time to time find the loan market demands.'."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 163, noes 43.

So 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. WEICKER

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WEICKER. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WEICKER moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 13827) to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments: Page 20, after line 11, insert the following new section:

"REQUIREMENT OF SUBSTANTIAL RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT WHERE PROJECT INVOLVES DEMOLITION OR REMOVAL OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES

"SEC. 213. Section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) In the case of any project which includes the demolition or removal of any residential structure or structures and which receives Federal recognition after the date of the enactment of this subsection (whether or not it is a project taken into account for purposes of applying subsection (f))—

"'(1) the redevelopment of the urban renewal area shall include the provision of standard housing units for low and moderate income families and individuals at least equal in number to the total number of dwelling units in the structure or structures demolished or removed; and

"'(2) the portion of the total cost of such redevelopment which is attributable to the provision of standard housing units for low and moderate income families and individuals (as determined by the Secretary) shall be at least 35 per centum or, if greater, a percentage bearing the same ratio to 100 as the total appraised value of such residential structure or structures bore to the total appraised value of all the structures in the urban renewal area immediately prior to their demolition or removal (as determined by the Secretary, without regard to any decrease in such value which may have resulted from the imminence of such demolition or removal).'"

And renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the motion to recommit be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 116, noes 92.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count the House.

Two hundred thirty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. On the basis of the division, is not the motion to recommit agreed to?

The SPEAKER. The motion to recommit has been agreed to.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report back the bill, H.R. 13827, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, after line 11, insert the following new section:

"REQUIREMENT OF SUBSTANTIAL RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT WHERE PROJECT INVOLVES DEMOLITION OR REMOVAL OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES

"SEC. 213. Section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) In the case of any project which includes the demolition or removal of any residential structure or structures and which receives Federal recognition after the date of the enactment of this subsection (whether or not it is a project taken into account for purposes of applying subsection (f))—

"'(1) the redevelopment of the urban renewal area shall include the provision of standard housing units for low and moderate income families and individuals at least equal in number to the total number of dwelling units in the structure or structures demolished or removed; and

"'(2) the portion of the total cost of such redevelopment which is attributable to the provision of standard housing units for low and moderate income families and individuals (as determined by the Secretary) shall be at least 35 per centum or, if greater, a percentage bearing the same ratio to 100 as the total appraised value of such residential structure or structures bore to the total appraised value of all the structures in the urban renewal area immediately prior to their demolition or removal (as determined by the Secretary, without regard to any decrease in such value which may have resulted from the imminence of such demolition or removal).'"

And renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read, and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, nays 9, answered "present" 3, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

YEAS—339

Abbitt	Downing	Jones, Ala.
Adair	Dulski	Jones, N.C.
Addabbo	Duncan	Karth
Albert	Dwyer	Kastenmeier
Alexander	Eckhardt	Kazen
Anderson, Ill.	Edmondson	Kee
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, Calif.	Keith
Andrews, N. Dak.	Edwards, La.	Kleppe
Annunzio	Eilberg	Kluczynski
Arends	Erlenborn	Koch
Ashley	Esch	Kyl
Ayres	Eshleman	Kyros
Barrett	Evans, Colo.	Landrum
Beall, Md.	Evins, Tenn.	Langen
Belcher	Fallon	Latta
Bennett	Farbstein	Leggett
Berry	Feighan	Lennon
Betts	Findley	Lipscomb
Bevill	Fish	Lloyd
Biaggi	Fisher	Long, La.
Biester	Flood	Long, Md.
Bingham	Flowers	Lowenstein
Blackburn	Ford, Gerald R.	Lujan
Blanton	Ford, William D.	McClory
Boggs	Foreman	McCloskey
Boland	Fountain	McCulloch
Bolling	Fraser	McDade
Bow	Frelinghuysen	McEwen
Brademas	Frey	McFall
Brasco	Friedel	McKneally
Bray	Fulton, Pa.	McMillan
Brinkley	Fulton, Tenn.	Macdonald, Mass.
Brock	Galifianakis	Madden
Broomfield	Gallagher	Mahon
Brotzman	Garmatz	Marsh
Brown, Calif.	Gaydos	Mathias
Brown, Mich.	Gettys	Matsunaga
Brown, Ohio	Giaimo	Mayne
Broyhill, N.C.	Gibbons	Meeds
Broyhill, Va.	Gilbert	Melcher
Buchanan	Goldwater	Meskill
Burke, Fla.	Gonzalez	Michel
Burke, Mass.	Goodling	Mikva
Burlison, Mo.	Gray	Miller, Calif.
Burton, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	Mills
Button	Green, Pa.	Minish
Byrne, Pa.	Griffin	Mink
Byrnes, Wis.	Griffiths	Minshall
Cabell	Grover	Mize
Caffery	Gubser	Mizell
Carey	Gude	Mollohan
Carter	Hagan	Monagan
Casey	Halpern	Moorhead
Cederberg	Hamilton	Morgan
Celler	Hammer-schmidt	Morton
Chamberlain	Hanley	Mosher
Chappell	Hansen, Idaho	Murphy, Ill.
Chisholm	Hansen, Wash.	Murphy, N.Y.
Clausen, Don H.	Harrington	Natcher
Cleveland	Harsha	Nedzi
Cohelan	Harvey	Nelsen
Collier	Hastings	Nichols
Collins	Hathaway	Nix
Conable	Hawkins	Obey
Conyers	Hébert	O'Hara
Corbett	Hechler, W. Va.	Olsen
Coughlin	Heckler, Mass.	O'Neal, Ga.
Cramer	Helstoski	Ottinger
Cunningham	Henderson	Passman
Daddario	Hicks	Patman
Daniel, Va.	Hogan	Patten
Daniels, N.J.	Holifield	Pelly
Davis, Ga.	Horton	Perkins
Davis, Wis.	Hosmer	Philbin
Delaney	Howard	Pickle
Dellenback	Hull	Pike
Dennis	Hungate	Pirnie
Dent	Hunt	Podell
Derwinski	Hutchinson	Poff
Dickinson	Jacobs	Pollock
Donohue	Jarman	Preyer, N.C.
Dorn	Johnson, Pa.	Price, Ill.
	Jonas	Price, Tex.
		Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski	Schwengel	Ullman
Railsback	Scott	Van Deerlin
Randall	Sebelius	Vander Jagt
Rarick	Shipley	Vanik
Rees	Sikes	Vigorito
Reid, Ill.	Sisk	Waggonner
Reid, N.Y.	Skubitz	Wampler
Reifel	Slack	Watkins
Rhodes	Smith, Calif.	Watts
Riegle	Smith, Iowa	Weicker
Rivers	Smith, N.Y.	Whalen
Roberts	Stafford	Whalley
Rodino	Staggers	White
Rogers, Fla.	Stanton	Whitten
Rooney, N.Y.	Steed	Widnall
Rooney, Pa.	Steiger, Ariz.	Williams
Rosenthal	Stephens	Wilson, Bob
Rostenkowski	Stokes	Wilson, Charles H.
Roth	Stratton	Wright
Roybal	Stubblefield	Wyatt
Ruppe	Stuckey	Wylie
Ruth	Sullivan	Wyman
Ryan	Symington	Yates
St Germain	Taft	Yatron
St. Onge	Talcott	Young
Sandman	Taylor	Zablocki
Satterfield	Teague, Tex.	Zion
Saylor	Thompson, Ga.	Zwach
Schadeberg	Thompson, N.J.	
Scherle	Thomson, Wis.	
Scheuer	Tiernan	

NAYS—9

Abernethy	Burleson, Tex.	Landgrebe
Andrews, Ala.	Gross	Miller, Ohio
Ashbrook	Hall	Montgomery

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Quillen	Steiger, Wis.	Utt

NOT VOTING—80

Adams	Edwards, Ala.	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Fascell	Pepper
Aspinall	Flynt	Pettis
Baring	Foley	Poage
Bell, Calif.	Fuqua	Powell
Blatnik	Haley	Purcell
Brooks	Hanna	Quie
Burton, Utah	Hays	Reuss
Bush	Ichord	Robison
Cahill	Johnson, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Camp	Jones, Tenn.	Roudebush
Clancy	King	Schneebeli
Clark	Kirwan	Shriver
Clawson, Del	Kuykendall	Snyder
Clay	Lukens	Springer
Colmer	McCarthy	Teague, Calif.
Conte	McClure	Tunney
Corman	McDonald, Mich.	Udall
Cowger	MacGregor	Waldie
Culver	Mailliard	Watson
Dawson	Mann	Whitehurst
de la Garza	Martin	Wiggins
Denney	May	Winn
Devine	Morse	Wold
Diggs	Moss	Wolff
Dingell	Myers	Wydler
Dowdy	O'Konski	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. King for, with Mr. Utt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Morse.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Conte.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Anderson of California with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Adams with Mrs. May.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Camp.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Clancy.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Reuss with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Mize.
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Denney.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Petts.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Quie.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Foley with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Shriver.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Mann with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Wydler with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Winn with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Watson with Mr. Whitehurst.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING). If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 580, the Committee on Banking and Currency is discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 2864.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PATMAN moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2864 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 13827, as passed, as follows:

That this Act may be cited as the "Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. Section 305(g) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "$1,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500,000,000";

(2) by inserting "at par" immediately after "and to purchase"; and

(3) by striking out "$15,000", "$17,500", and "$22,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$17,500", "$20,000", and "$25,000", respectively.

TITLE I—MORTGAGE CREDIT

EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS

SEC. 101. (a) Section 2(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "1969" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1970".

(b) Section 217 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "or title X" and inserting in lieu thereof "title X, or title XI"; and

(2) by striking out "1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "1970".

(c) Section 221(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "1969" in the fifth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1970".

(d) Section 809(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "1969" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1970".

(e) Section 810(k) of such Act is amended by striking out "1969" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1970".

(f) Section 1002(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "1969" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1970".

(g) Section 1101(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "1969" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1970".

LOWER DOWNPAYMENTS FOR FHA-FINANCED SALES HOUSING

SEC. 102. (a) Section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$20,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000".

(b) Section 220(d)(3)(A)(i) of such Act is amended by striking out "$20,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000".

(c) Section 222(b)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "$20,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000".

(d) Section 234(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "$20,000" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$25,000".

MOBILE HOMES

SEC. 103. (a)(1) Section 207(a) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "trailer coach mobile dwellings" in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "mobile homes";

(B) by striking out "trailer court or park" in paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "mobile home court or park"; and

(C) by striking out "trailer coach mobile dwellings" in paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof "mobile homes."

(2) Section 207(c)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "trailer courts or parks" and inserting in lieu thereof "mobile home courts or parks".

(b) Section 207(c)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "$1,800 per space" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500 per space".

(c) The last paragraph of section 207(c) of such Act (immediately following paragraph numbered (3) is amended by inserting after "such term as the Secretary shall prescribe" in the first sentence the following: "(not exceeding 20 years in the case of a mortgage for a mobile home court or park)".

MAXIMUM MORTGAGE AMOUNT UNDER SECTION 220 MULTIFAMILY HOUSING PROGRAM

SEC. 104. Section 220(d)(3)(B)(i) of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) not exceed $50,000,000;".

MORTGAGE INSURANCE ON CONDOMINIUM UNITS FOR SERVICEMEN

SEC. 105. Section 222(b)(1) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting "or 234(c)," immediately after "221(d)(2),".

ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS UNDER SECTION 235 FOR PURCHASER ASSUMING MORTGAGE

SEC. 106. (a) Section 235(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "subsection (j)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (i) or (j)(4)".

(b) Section 235(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That if any cooperative member who has received assistance payments transfers his membership and occupancy rights to another person who satisfies the eligibility requirements prescribed by the Secretary and undertakes the obligation to pay occupancy charges, the new cooperative member may qualify for assistance payments upon the filing of an application with respect to the dwelling unit involved to be occupied by him".

AUTHORIZATION FOR ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS UNDER SECTIONS 235 AND 236

SEC. 107. (a) The second sentence of section 235(h) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "by $100,000,000 on July 1, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "by $125,000,000 on July 1, 1969".

(b) The second sentence of section 236(i)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "by $100,000,000 on July 1, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "by $125,000,000 on July 1, 1969".

INTEREST REDUCTION PAYMENTS UNDER SECTION 236 ON CERTAIN PROJECTS FINANCED UNDER STATE OR LOCAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

SEC. 108. The proviso in section 236(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "with respect to a rental or cooperative housing project" and inserting in lieu thereof "with respect to a mortgage or part thereof on a rental or cooperative housing project".

MAXIMUM RENTALS FOR UNITS IN SECTION 236 PROJECTS AND UNITS QUALIFYING FOR RENT SUPPLEMENT PAYMENTS

SEC. 109. (a) The second sentence of section 236(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "25 per centum of the tenant's income" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 per centum of the tenant's income".

(b) Section 101(d) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "one-fourth of the tenant's income" and inserting in lieu thereof "20 per centum of the tenant's income".

ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS WITH RESPECT TO EXISTING DWELLINGS UNDER SECTION 235

SEC. 110. Section 235(h)(3) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" at the end of subparagraph (A); and

(2) by striking out subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) 30 per centum of the total additional amount of contracts for assistance payments authorized by appropriation Acts to be made prior to July 1, 1971,".

SECTION 236 PROJECTS FOR ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED FAMILIES

SEC. 111. (a) Section 236(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after "occupancy by lower income families" the following: "(including a project designed primarily by occupancy by lower income elderly or handicapped families)".

(b) The second sentence of section 236(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "at intervals of two years" and inserting in lieu thereof "at intervals of five years in the case of elderly or handicapped families and two years in any other case".

(c) The second sentence of section 236(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "or such greater amount" and inserting in lieu thereof "or (except in the case of a dwelling unit in a project designed primarily for occupancy by lower income elderly or handicapped families) such greater amount".

(d) The First sentence of section 236(i)(2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "shall in no case exceed 90 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "shall in no case exceed (A) $5,500 a year for an individual or $6,600 a year for a couple in the case of an elderly or handicapped family, or (B) 90 per centum"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "in any other case".

(c) The second sentence of section 236(i)(2) is amended by inserting "in any project" after "accord a preference".

(f) Section 236(j)(2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A),

(2) by striking out subparagraph (B), and

(3) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(g) Section 236 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n)(1) In making and contracting to make interest reduction payments and insuring mortgages under this section in the case of projects designed primarily for occupancy by elderly or handicapped families, and in

administering the provisions of this section insofar as they involve or relate to such projects, the Secretary shall to the maximum extent possible apply the same definitions, terms, and conditions and utilize the same personnel, facilities, and procedures as in the case of loans under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959."

(b) As used in this section, the term "elderly or handicapped families" shall have the same meaning as in section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959.

10 PER CENTUM INCREASE IN MAXIMUM MORTGAGE AMOUNTS UNDER FHA INSURANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 112. (a) (1) Section 203(b)(2) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$30,000", "$32,500", and "$37,500" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$33,000", "$35,750", and "$41,250", respectively.

(2) Section 203(h) of such Act is amended by striking out "$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$13,200".

(3) Section 203(i) of such Act is amended by striking out "$13,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$14,850".

(4) Section 203(m) of such Act is amended by striking out "$15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$16,500".

(b) (1) Section 207(c)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "$9,000", "$12,500", "$15,000", "$18,500", and "$21,000" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,900", "$13,750", "$16,500", "$20,350", and "$23,100", respectively.

(2) Section 207(c)(3) of such Act is further amended by striking out "$10,500", "$18,000", "$22,500", and "$25,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,550", "$19,800", "$24,750", and "$28,050", respectively.

(c) (1) Section 213(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "$9,000", "$12,500", "$15,000", "$18,500", and "$21,000" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,900", "$13,750", "$16,500", "$20,350', and "$23,100", respectively.

(2) Section 213(b)(2) of such Act is further amended by striking out "$10,500", "$18,000", "$22,500", and "$25,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,550", "$19,800", "$24,750", and "$28,050", respectively.

(d) (1) Section 220(d)(3)(A)(i) of such Act is amended by striking out "$30,000", "$32,500", "$37,500", and "$7,000" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$33,000", "$35,750", "$41,250", and "$7,700", respectively.

(2) Section 220(d)(3)(B)(iii) of such Act is amended by striking out "$9,000", "$12,500", "$15,000", "$18,500" and "$21,000" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,900", "$13,750", "$16,500", "$20,350", and "$23,100", respectively.

(3) Section 220(d)(3)(B)(iii) of such Act is further amended by striking out "$10,500", "$18,000", "$22,500", and "$25,500" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,550", "$19,800", "$24,750", and "$28,050", respectively.

(4) Section 220(h)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,000".

(e) (1) Section 221(d)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "$15,000", "$17,500", "$20,000", "$27,000", and "$33,000 wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$16,500", "$19,250", "$22,000", "$29,700", and "$36,300", respectively.

(2) Section 221(d)(2) of such Act is further amended by striking out "$25,000", "$32,000", and "$38,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$27,500", "$35,200", and "$41,800", respectively.

(3) Section 221(d)(3)(ii) of such Act is amended by striking out "$8,000", and "$11,250", "$13,500", "$17,000", and "$19,250" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,800", "$12,375", "$14,850", "$18,700", and "$21,175", respectively.

(4) Section 221(d)(3)(ii) of such Act is further amended by striking out "$9,500", "$16,000", "$20,000", and "$22,750" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,450", "$17,600", "$22,000", and "$25,025", respectively.

(5) Section 221(d)(4)(ii) of such Act is amended by striking out "$8,000", "$11,250", "$13,500", "$17,000", and "$19,250" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,800", "$12,375", "$14,850", "$18,700", and "$21,175", respectively.

(6) Section 221(d)(4)(ii) of such Act is further amended by striking out "$9,500", "$16,000", "$20,000", and "$22,750" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,450", "$17,600", "$22,000", and "$25,025", respectively.

(7) Section 221(h)(6)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "$15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$16,500".

(f) Section 222(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "$30,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$33,000".

(g) (1) Section 231(c)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "$8,000", "$11,250", "$13,500", "$17,000", and "$19,250" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$8,800", "$12,375", "$14,850", "$18,700", "$21,175", respectively.

(2) Section 231(c)(2) of such Act is further amended by striking out "$9,500", "$16,000", "$20,000", and "$22,750" and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,450", "$17,600", "$22,000", and "$25,025", respectively.

(h) (1) Section 234(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "$30,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$33,000".

(2) Section 234(e)(3) of such Act is amended by striking out "$9,000", "$12,500", "$15,000", "$18,500", and "$21,000" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$9,900", "$13,750", "$16,500", "$20,350", and "$23,100", respectively.

(3) Section 234(e)(3) of such Act is further amended by striking out "$10,500", "$18,000", "$22,500", and "$25,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,550", "$19,800", "$24,750", and "$28,050", respectively.

(i) Section 235 of such Act is amended by striking out "$15,000", "$17,500", and "$20,000" wherever they appear and inserting in lieu thereof "$16,500", "$19,250", and "$22,000", respectively.

(j) Section 237(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "$15,000" and "$17,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$16,500" and "$19,250", respectively.

INCREASE IN GNMA PURCHASE AUTHORITY

SEC. 113. Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "exceeds or exceeded $17,500" in clause (3) of the proviso in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "exceeds or exceeded $22,000";

(2) by striking out "that exceeds $17,500" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "that exceeds the otherwise applicable maximum amount"; and

(3) by striking out "did not exceed $17,500" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "did not exceed the otherwise applicable maximum amount".

GNMA SPECIAL ASSISTANCE PURCHASES

SEC. 114. Section 305 of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Association is authorized to purchase pursuant to commitments or otherwise mortgages otherwise eligible for purchase under this section at a price equal to the unpaid principal amount thereof at the time of purchase, with adjustments for interest and any comparable items, and to sell such mortgages at any time at a price within the range of market prices for the particular class of mortgages involved at the time of sale as determined by the Association. Mortgages issued under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, except mortgages for above moderate income families issued under section 517(a) of such Act, are eligible for purchase under this section."

TITLE II—URBAN RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

URBAN RENEWAL GRANT AUTHORITY

SEC. 201. (a) The first sentence of section 103(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", of which increase at least $400,000,000 shall be for grants under part B, and which amount shall be further increased by $2,000,000,000 on July 1, 1970, of which increase at least 35 per centum shall be for grants under part B".

(b) The first paragraph of section 103(b) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof (immediately after the sentence amended by subsection (a) of this section) the following new sentence: "In making any grants under this title, the Secretary shall give priority to applications for projects which are identified and scheduled to be carried out as projects or activities included within approved comprehensive city demonstration programs assisted under the provisions of section 105(c) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966."

NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 202. (a) Section 131 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "annual" in subsections (b) and (c)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four month".

(b) Section 132 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "twelve-month period" in subsections (a)(1) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four month period"; and

(2) by striking out "twelve months" in subsection (a)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four months".

(c) Section 133(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "twelve-month period" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four month period".

(d) Section 134(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "annual" in paragraphs (3) and (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-four month".

(e) Section 134(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The approval by the Secretary of financial assistance for one or more twenty-four-month increments of a neighborhood developed program shall not be considered as obligating him to provide financial assistance for subsequent increments; except that amounts approved by the Secretary for the succeeding twenty-four-month increment shall be reserved for obligation out of grant funds which may be provided under section 103(b) for the fiscal year applicable to such subsequent increment."

(f) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to contracts under part B of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 executed on and after July 1, 1970; and any contract under such part B executed prior to July 1, 1970, shall, at the request of the municipality involved, be amended (effective on or after such date) to reflect such amendments.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF ELIGIBILITY OF LOCAL GRANTS-IN-AID FOR CERTAIN URBAN RENEWAL AND NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

SEC. 203. (a) The second paragraph of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(except the second sentence of this paragraph)" after "any other provision of this subsection"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In connection with any project for which an application is filed not later than the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969 and which has not received Federal recognition (other than a project to which clause (2) of the second sentence of section 133(a) applies), the three-year period referred to above shall be extended to a period of four years prior to the authorization by

the Secretary of a contract for loan or capital grant for the project."

(b) Section 112(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "No expenditure" and inserting in lieu thereof "Subject to the second sentence of this subsection, no expenditure"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In connection with any project for which an application is filed not later than the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969 and which has not received Federal recognition (other than a project to which clause (2) of the second sentence of section 133(a) applies), the seven-year period referred to in clause (1) of the preceding sentence shall be extended to a period of eight years prior to the authorization by the Secretary of a contract for a loan or capital grant for the project."

(c) Section 133(a) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "For" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, for";

(2) by striking out "the second paragraph" and inserting in lieu thereof "the first sentence of the second paragraph"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In connection with any neighborhood development program for which an application is filed not later than the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969 and for which no contract for financial assistance under the program has been authorized by the Secretary the three-year and seven-year periods referred to above shall be extended to periods of four and eight years, respectively, prior to authorization of (1) the first contract for financial assistance under the program which includes the urban renewal area benefited by the public improvement or facility, or the expenditures, for which credit is claimed, or (2) a contract for a loan or capital grant for an urban renewal project authorized after the date of the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, in an area which is benefited by the public improvement or facility, or the expenditures, for which credit is claimed and which was included in the neighborhood development program application."

INCLUSION OF ENCLOSED PEDESTRIAN MALLS AS ELIGIBLE URBAN RENEWAL ACTIVITIES

SEC. 204. (a) Section 110(c)(3) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after "playgrounds," the following: "pedestrian malls and walkways (including in the case of an enclosed mall or walkway any necessary roofs, walls, columns, lighting, and climate control facilities),".

(b) The first sentence of the second unnumbered paragraph following paragraph (10) of section 110(c) of such Act is amended by inserting after "provided" the following: "in paragraph (3) with respect to enclosed pedestrian malls and walkways and as provided".

REHABILITATION GRANTS

SEC. 205. Section 115(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "or (2) $3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "or (2) $3,500".

LOCAL GRANT-IN-AID CREDIT FOR CERTAIN FACILITIES BUILT ON BEHALF OF PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

SEC. 206. Clause (A)(ii) of the second proviso in section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "by a public university" and inserting in lieu thereof "by or on behalf of a public university".

INCOME LIMITATION UNDER REHABILITATION LOAN PROGRAM

SEC. 207. Section 312(a) of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"In making loans with respect to residential property under this section, priority shall be given to applications made by persons whose annual income, as determined pursuant to criteria and procedures established by the Secretary, is within the limitations prescribed by the Secretary for occupants of projects financed with below-market interest rate mortgages insured (in the area involved) under section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act."

SEC. 208. The proviso in the first paragraph of section 102(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by—

(1) striking ", if";

(2) striking ", the interest rate on such a loan from a source other than the Federal Government is greater than the rate at which funds could be made available under the Federal loan contract,";

(3) striking "from such sources" and inserting in lieu thereof "from a source other than the Federal Government"; and

(4) inserting "or a supplemental grant in an amount which he determines is necessary to enable a local public agency to obtain funds from a source other than the Federal Government" immediately following "contract rate".

LOANS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

SEC. 209. Section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out the third sentence.

PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 210. (a) The proviso in section 10(b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by inserting after "any contract" the following: ", although not limited to debt service requirements,".

(b) The first sentence of section 10(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "on July 1 in each of the years 1969 and 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "on July 1, 1969, and $170,000,000 on July 1, 1970".

ROOM COST LIMITATIONS FOR PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

SEC. 211. The first sentence of section 15(5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "$2,400", "$3,500", "$4,000", and "$750" wherever they appear and insert in lieu thereof "$2,640", "$3,850", "$4,400", and "$825", respectively.

MANAGEMENT AND SERVICES IN PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

SEC. 212. The last sentence of section 15(10) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1971".

ELIMINATION OF WORKABLE PROGRAM REQUIREMENT WITH RESPECT TO LOW-RENT HOUSING IN PRIVATE ACCOMMODATIONS AND OTHER LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING, AND WITH RESPECT TO MORTGAGE INSURANCE UNDER SECTION 221(d)(3) PROGRAM

SEC. 213. (a) Section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended—

(1) by striking out "or for annual contributions or capital grants pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for any project or projects not constructed or covered by a contract for annual contributions prior to August 1, 1956,";

(2) by striking out "or section 221(d)(3)";

(3) by striking out "(i)", and "or (ii) section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act if payments with respect to the mortgaged property are made or are to be made under section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965,", in the first proviso; and

(4) by striking out "or a contract for annual contributions or capital grants was entered into pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937,".

(b) The second proviso in section 10(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended to striking out "no such new contract" and all that follows down through "Housing Act of 1949, and".

(c) Section 23(f) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by striking out all that follows "this Act" where it first appears and inserting in lieu thereof "shall not apply to low-rent housing assisted or to be assisted under this section."

REVIEW OF RELOCATION PLANS UNDER URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM

SEC. 214. Section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Within one year after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and every two years thereafter, the Secretary shall review each locality's relocation plan under this subsection and its effectiveness in carrying out such plan."

REQUIREMENT OF SUBSTANTIAL RESIDENTIAL REDEVELOPMENT WHERE PROJECT INVOLVES DEMOLITION OR REMOVAL OF RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES

SEC. 215. Section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) In the case of any project which includes the demolition or removal of any residential structure or structures and which receives Federal recognition after the date of the enactment of this subsection (whether or not it is a project taken into account for purposes of applying subsection (f))—

"(1) the redevelopment of the urban renewal area shall include the provision of standard housing units for low and moderate income families and individuals at least equal in number to the total number of dwelling units in the structure or structures demolished or removed; and

"(2) the portion of the total cost of such redevelopment which is attributable to the provision of standard housing units for low and moderate income families and individuals (as determined by the Secretary) shall be at least 35 per centum or, if greater, a percentage bearing the same ratio to 100 as the total appraised value of such residential structure or structures bore to the total appraised value of all the structures in the urban renewal area immediately prior to their demolition or removal (as determined by the Secretary, without regard to any decrease in such value which may have resulted from the imminence of such demolition or removal)."

AUTHORIZATION FOR HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY OR HANDICAPPED

SEC. 216. Section 202(a)(4) of the Housing Act of 1959 is amended to read as follows:

"(4) There is authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed $500,000,000, which amount shall be increased by $150,000,000 on July 1, 1969. Amounts so appropriated shall constitute a revolving fund to be used by the Secretary in carrying out this section."

AUTHORIZATION FOR COLLEGE HOUSING DEBT SERVICE GRANTS

SEC. 217. Section 401(f)(2) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out all that follows "exceed" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000,000, which amount shall be increased by $4,200,000 on July 1, 1970."

TITLE III—MODEL CITIES AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

AUTHORIZATION FOR MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

SEC. 301. (a) Section 111(b) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" the third time is appears;

(2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and not to exceed $750,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, 10 per centum of the amounts appropriated pursuant to this subsection for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for any fiscal year thereafter shall be used for assistance to city demonstration agencies in smaller cities, and may be so used (to the extent specifically provided in such regulations) without regard to the limitation set forth in the first sentence of section 105(c)."

(b) Section 111(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANTS

SEC. 302. The fifth sentence of section 701(b) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended by striking out "and not to exceed $390,000,000 prior to July 1, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "and not to exceed $390,000,000 prior to July 1, 1971".

URBAN INFORMATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES

SEC. 303. (a) Section 701(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (10);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (11) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (11) the following new paragraph:

"(12) States, including statewide agencies or instrumentalities of a State or its political subdivisions which are designated by the Governor of the State and acceptable to the Secretary, for programs focused upon the needs of communities having populations less than one hundred thousand which provide information and data on urban needs and urban assistance programs and activities and technical assistance to such communities with respect to the solution of local problems."

(b) Title IX of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is repealed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR OPEN SPACE, URBAN BEAUTIFICATION, AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION GRANTS

SEC. 304. The first sentence of section 702 (b) of the Housing Act of 1961 is amended by striking out "and not to exceed $460,000,000 prior to July 1, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "and not to exceed $460,000,000 prior to July 1, 1971".

AUTHORIZATION FOR NEW COMMUNITY SUPPLEMENTAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

SEC. 305. Section 412(d) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by striking out "July 1, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1971".

COMMUNITY FACILITIES GRANTS

SEC. 306. (a) Section 702(c) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "1969" in clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "1970".

(b) Section 708(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

(c) The second sentence of section 708(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and not to exceed $100,000,000 for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1970".

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 307. (a) The first sentence of section 4(b) of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" the second time it appears; and

(2) by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof "; and $300,000,000 for fiscal year 1971."

(b) Section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out "1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1971".

TRAINING AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

SEC. 308. Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE VIII—TRAINING AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

"FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

"SEC. 801. (a) The Congress finds that the rapid expansion of the Nation's urban areas and urban population has caused severe problems in urban and suburban development and created a national need to (1) provide special training in skills needed for economic and efficient community development, and (2) support research in new or improved methods of dealing with community development problems.

"(b) It is the purpose of this title to provide fellowships for the graduate training of professional city planning and urban and housing technicians and specialists, and to assist and encourage the States, in cooperation with public or private universities and colleges and urban centers and with business firms and associations, labor unions, and other interested associations and organizations, to (1) organize, initiate, develop, and expand programs which will provide special training in skills needed for economic and efficient community development to those technical, professional, and other persons with the capacity to master and employ such skills who are, or are training to be, employed by a governmental or public body which has responsibility for community development, or by a private nonprofit organization which is conducting or has responsibility for housing and community development programs, and (2) support State and local research that is needed in connection with housing programs and needs, public improvement programing, code problems, efficient land use, urban transportation, and similar community development problems.

"FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

"SEC. 802. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide fellowships for the graduate training of professional city planning and urban and housing technicians and specialists as herein provided. Persons shall be selected for such fellowships solely on the basis of ability and upon the recommendation of the Urban Studies Fellowship Advisory Board established pursuant to subsection (b). Fellowships shall be solely for training in public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education having programs of graduate study in the field of city planning or in related fields (including architecture, civil engineering, economics, municipal finance, public administration, and sociology), which programs are oriented to training for careers in city and regional planning, housing, urban renewal, and community development.

"(b) There is hereby established the Urban Studies Fellowship Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board'), which shall consist of nine members to be appointed by the Secretary as follows: Three from public institutions of higher learning and three from private nonprofit institutions of higher education, who are the heads of departments which provide academic courses appropriately related to the fields referred to in subsection (a), and three from national organizations which are directly concerned with problems relating to urban, regional, and community development. The Board shall meet upon the request of the Secretary and shall make recommendations to him with respect to persons to be selected for fellowships under this section. Members of the Board shall be entitled to receive transportation expenses and a per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized for members of advisory committees created pursuant to section 601 of the Housing Act of 1949.

"MATCHING GRANTS TO STATES

"SEC. 803. (a) Subject to the provisions of this title and in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, the Secretary may make matching grants to States to assist in—

"(1) organizing, initiating, developing, or expanding programs to provide special training in skills needed for economic and efficient community development to those technical professional, and other persons with the capacity to master and employ such skills who are, or are training to be, employed by a governmental or public body which has responsibilities for community development, or by a private nonprofit organization which is conducting or has responsibility for housing and community development programs; and

"(2) supporting State and local research that is needed in connection with housing programs and needs, public improvement programing, code problems, efficient land use, urban transportation, and similar community development problems, and collecting, collating, and publishing statistics and information relating to such research.

"(b) No grants may be made to a State under this section unless the Secretary has approved a plan for the State which—

"(1) sets forth the proposed use of the funds and the objectives to be accomplished;

"(2) explains the method by which the required amounts from non-Federal sources will be obtained;

"(3) provides such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be reasonably necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under this section;

"(4) designates an officer or agency of the State government who has responsibility and authority for the administration of a statewide research and training program as the officer or agency with responsibility and authority for the execution of the State's program under this section; and

"(5) provides that such officer or agency will make such reports to the Secretary, in such form, and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Secretary to perform his duties under this section.

"(c) No grant may be made under this section for any use unless an amount at least equal to such grant is made available from non-Federal sources for the same purpose and for concurrent use.

"STATE LIMIT

"SEC. 804. Not more than 10 per centum of the total amount appropriated for the purposes of this title may be used for making grants to any one State.

"TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, STUDIES, AND PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION

"SEC. 805. In order to carry out the purpose of this title, the Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance to State and local governmental or public bodies and to undertake such studies and publish and distribute such information, either directly or by contract, as he shall determine to be desirable. Nothing contained in this title shall limit any authority of the Secretary under any other provision of law.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 806. There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of making grants and providing fellowships under this title, without fiscal year limitation, not to exceed $30,000,000. Any amounts appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

"MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 807. (a) As used in this title the term 'State' means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands; and the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for administrative and other expenses in carrying out this title."

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

AUTHORIZATION FOR PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS IN APPLYING ADVANCES IN TECHNOLOGY TO HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 401. Section 1010(a) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (3) a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) assure, to the extent feasible, in connection with the construction, major rehabilitation, or maintenance of any housing assisted under this section, that there is no restraint by contract building codes, zoning ordinances or practice against the employment of new or improved technologies, techniques, materials, and methods or of preassembled products which may reduce the cost or improve the quality of such construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance, and therefore stimulate expanded production of housing under such programs, except where such restraint is necessary to insure safe and healthful working and living conditions."

SEC. 402. The first sentence of section 1010(c) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "authorized"; and

(2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ", and (2) notwithstanding any other provision of law, to acquire, use, and dispose of land and other property as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of subsection (a)(1) of this section".

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOWER INCOME PERSONS IN CONNECTION WITH HUD-ASSISTED PROJECTS

SEC. 403. Section 3 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended to read as follows:

"EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR LOWER INCOME PERSONS IN CONNECTION WITH ASSISTED PROJECTS

"SEC. 3. In the administration by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development of programs providing direct financial assistance in aid of housing, urban planning, development, redevelopment, or renewal, public or community facilities, and new community development, the Secretary shall—

"(1) require, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, that to the greatest extent feasible opportunities for training and employment arising in connection with the planning and carrying out of any project assisted under any such program be given to lower income persons residing in the area of such project; and

"(2) require, in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that to the greatest extent feasible contracts for work to be performed in connection with any such project be awarded to business concerns, including but not limited to individuals or firms doing business in the field of planning, consulting, design, architecture, building construction, rehabilitation, maintenance, or repair, which are located in or owned in substantial part by persons residing in the area of such project."

URBAN PROPERTY PROTECTION AND REINSURANCE—ENTRY INTO REINSURANCE CONTRACTS

SEC. 404. Section 1222(d) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out all that follows "thereafter" the first time that word appears and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

URBAN PROPERTY PROTECTION AND REINSURANCE—STATE SHARE OF REINSURED LOSSES

SEC. 405. Section 1223(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) in any State which has not, after the close of the second full regular session of the appropriate State legislative body following the date of the enactment of this title, adopted appropriate legislation, retroactive to the date of the enactment of this title, under which the State, its political subdivisions, or a governmental corporation or fund established pursuant to State law, will reimburse the Secretary for any reinsured losses in that State in any reinsurance contract year, in an amount up to 5 per centum of the aggregate property insurance premiums earned in that State during the calendar year immediately preceding the end of the reinsurance contract year on those lines of insurance reinsured by the Secretary in that State during the contract year, to the extent that reinsured losses paid by the Secretary for such year exceed the total of (A) reinsurance premiums earned in that State during that reinsurance contract year plus (B) the excess of (i) the total premiums earned by the Secretary for reinsurance in that State during a preceding period measured from the end of the most recent reinsurance contract year with respect to which the Secretary was reimbursed for losses under this title over (ii) any amounts paid by the Secretary for reinsurance losses that were incurred during such period;".

STUDY OF REINSURANCE AND OTHER PROGRAMS

SEC. 406. Section 1235(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "one year following the date of the enactment of this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

EMERGENCY FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 407. Part A of chapter II of title XIII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"EMERGENCY IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM

"SEC. 1336. (a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, for the purpose of providing flood insurance coverage at the earliest possible time, the Secretary shall carry out the flood insurance program authorized under chapter I during the period ending December 31, 1971, in accordance with the provisions of this part and the other provisions of this title insofar as they related to this part but subject to the modifications made by or under subsection (b).

"(b) In carrying out the flood insurance program pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary—

"(1) shall provide insurance coverage without regard to any estimated risk premium rates which would otherwise be determined under section 1307; and

"(2) shall utilize the provisions and procedures contained in or prescribed by this part (other than section 1334) and sections 1345 and 1346 to such extent and in such manner as he may consider necessary or appropriate to carry out the purpose of this section."

EXTENSION OF FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM TO COVER LOSSES FROM WATER-CAUSED MUDSLIDES

SEC. 408. (a) Section 1302 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Congress also finds that (1) the damage and loss which results from mudslides is related in cause and similar in effect to that which results directly from storms, deluges, overflowing waters, and other forms of flooding, and (2) the problems involved in providing protection against this damage and loss, and the possibilities for making such protection available through a Federal or federally sponsored program, are similar to those which exist in connection with efforts to provide protection against damages and loss caused by such other forms of flooding. It is therefore the further purpose of this title to make available, by means of the methods, procedures, and instrumentalities which are otherwise established or available under this title for purposes of the flood insurance provide protection against damage and loss resulting from mudslides that are caused by accumulations of water on or under the ground."

(b) Section 1370 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 1370.", and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) The term 'flood' shall also include inundation from mudslides which are caused by accumulations of water on or under the ground; and all of the provisions of this title shall apply with respect to such mudslides in the same manner and to the same extent as with respect to floods described in paragraph (1), subject to and in accordance with such regulations, modifying the provisions of this title (including the provisions relating to land management and use) to the extent necessary to insure that they can be effectively so applied, as the Secretary may prescribe to achieve (with respect to such mudslides) the purposes of this title and the objectives of the program."

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM—ADOPTION OF LOCAL FLOOD CONTROL MEASURES

SEC. 409. (a) Section 1305(c)(2) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970, permanent" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1971, adequate".

(b) Section 1315 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1971"; and

(2) by striking out "permanent" and inserting in lieu thereof "adequate".

(c) Section 1361(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "permanent" and inserting in lieu thereof "adequate".

INTERSTATE LAND SALES

SEC. 410. Section 1403(a)(10) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended to read as follows:

"(10) the sale or lease of real estate which is free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, and adverse claims if each and every purchaser or his or her spouse has made a personal on-the-lot inspection of the real estate which he purchased and if the developer executes a written affirmation to that effect to be made a matter of record in accordance with rules and regulations of the Secretary. As used in this subparagraph, the terms 'liens', 'encumbrances', and 'adverse claims' do not refer to property reservations which land developers commonly convey or dedicate to local bodies or public utilities for the purpose of bringing public services to the land being developed, nor to taxes and assessments imposed by a State or other public body having authority to assess and tax property which, under applicable State or local law, constitute liens on the property before they are due and payable, nor to beneficial property restrictions which would be enforceable by other lot owners or lessees in the subdivision, if (A) the developer, prior to the time the contract of sale or lease is entered into, has furnished each purchaser or lessee with a statement, the form and content of which has been approved by the Secretary, setting forth in descriptive and concise terms all such reservations, taxes, assessments, and restrictions which are applicable to the lot to be purchased or leased, and

(B) receipt of such statement has been acknowledged in writing by the purchaser or lessee, and a copy of the acknowledged statement is filed with the Secretary in accordance with such rules and regulations as he may require."

REPORTS

SEC. 411. Section 1603 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by striking out "January 15" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 15".

RURAL HOUSING

SEC. 412. (a) Sections 513, 515(b)(5), and 517(a)(1) of the Housing Act of 1949 are each amended by striking out "October 1, 1969" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1970".

(b) Section 517(c) of such Act is amended by striking out all that follows "section" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(c) Section 517 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) Any sale by the Secretary of loans individually or in blocks, pursuant to subsections (c) and (g), shall be treated as a sale of assets for the purposes of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, notwithstanding the fact that the Secretary, under an agreement with the purchaser, holds the debt instruments evidencing the loans and holds or reinvests payments thereon as trustee and custodian for the purchaser."

(d) Section 517 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof (after subsection (k), as added by subsection (c) of this section) the following new subsection:

"(l) The Secretary may also, upon the application of lenders, builders, or sellers and upon compliance with requirements specified by him, make commitments upon such terms and conditions as he shall prescribe to make or insure loans under this section to eligible applicants."

(e)(1) Section 517 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof (after subsection (l), as added by subsection (d) of this section) the following new subsection:

"(m) The assets and liabilities of, and authorizations applicable to, the Rural Housing Direct Loan Account are hereby transferred to the Fund, and such Account is hereby abolished. Such assets and their proceeds, including loans made out of the Fund pursuant to this section, shall be subject to all of the provisions of this section."

(2) The first sentence of section 517(d) of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking out "(a) and (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a), (b), and (m)"; and

(B) by inserting "or otherwise acquired by" after "loans made from".

(3) Section 518 of such Act is repealed.

(4) Section 519 of such Act is amended by striking out "or the Rural Housing Direct Loan Account" and "or Account".

(f) Section 520 of such Act is repealed.

AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FROM GENERAL INSURANCE FUND TO SPECIAL RISK INSURANCE FUND

SEC. 413. Section 238(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "the sum of $5,000,000" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ", at such times and in such amounts as he may determine to be necessary, a total sum of $20,000,000".

SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

SEC. 414. (a) Section 5 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1425) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. No institution shall be admitted to or retained in membership, or granted the privileges of nonmember borrowers, if the combined total of the amounts paid to it for interest, commission, bonus, discount, premium, and other similar charges, less a proper deduction for all dividends, refunds, and cash credits of all kinds, creates an actual net cost to the homeowner in excess of the lawful contract rate of interest applicable to such transactions, or, in case there is no lawful contract rate of interest applicable to such transactions, in excess of such rates as may be prescribed in writing by the Board acting in its discretion from time to time. This section applies only to home mortgage loans on single-family dwellings."

(b) Section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Without regard to any other provision of this subsection, any such association is authorized to invest in shares of stock issued by a corporation authorized to be created pursuant to title IX of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, and is authorized to invest in any partnership, limited partnership, or joint venture formed pursuant to section 907(a) or 907(c) of that Act."

(c)(1) Section 404(d)(2)(B) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1727(d)(2)(B)) is amended by striking out "1966" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

(2) Section 6(b) of the Act of September 21, 1968 (Public Law 90–505), is amended by striking out "1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "1965".

(d) Section 12 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act (12 U.S.C. 1432) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Board, one or more Federal home loan banks may acquire, hold, or dispose of, in whole or in part, or facilitate such acquisition, holding, or disposition by members of any such bank, of loans (or interests in loans) having the benefit of insurance under section 221(d)(3), 221(h), 235, or 236 of the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter in effect, or any commitment or agreement therefor."

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF FLEXIBLE INTEREST RATE AUTHORITY

SEC. 415. Section 3(a) of the Act of May 7, 1968 (Public Law 90–301), is amended by striking out "October 1, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1970", and by amending the proviso to such section to read as follows: "*Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized, until October 1, 1971, to establish a maximum interest rate for guaranteed or insured loans to veterans under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, not in excess of such rate as he may from time to time find the loan market demands.".

MEDICINE CABINETS IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED HOUSING

SEC. 416. (a) The head of the appropriate Federal agency shall prescribe reasonable standards with respect to the type or design of latches hereafter installed on medicine cabinets in federally assisted housing with a view to preventing injury to young children as a result of gaining access to the contents of such cabinets.

(b) As used in this section—

(1) The term "federally assisted housing" means (A) housing constructed, rehabilitated, or otherwise provided with assistance under the National Housing Act, the United States Housing Act of 1937, section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, title V of the Housing Act of 1949, the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code; and (B) family housing constructed by the Department of Defense.

(2) The term "appropriate Federal agency" means (A) the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to housing constructed, rehabilitated, or otherwise provided under the National Housing Act, the United States Housing Act of 1937, section 101 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, or section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959; (B) the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to housing constructed, rehabilitated, or otherwise provided under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, or the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961; (C) the Administrator of the Small Business Administration with respect to housing constructed or repaired with assistance under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act; and (D) the Secretary of Defense with respect to family housing constructed by the Department of Defense.

(c) The respective appropriate Federal agencies shall, in prescribing standards under this section, seek, through consultation or otherwise, to achieve the greatest practicable uniformity in such standards.

MISCELLANEOUS AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

SEC. 417. (a) Section 235(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ": *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to continue making such assistance payments where the mortgage has been assigned to the Secretary".

(b) Section 236(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "*Provided*, That" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to continue making such interest reduction payments where the mortgage has been assigned to the Secretary: *Provided further*, That".

(c) Section 223(d) of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "A loan involving a project covered by a mortgage insured under section 213 that is the obligation of the Cooperative Management Housing Insurance Fund shall be the obligation of such fund, and loans involving projects covered by mortgages insured under section 236 or under any section of this title pursuant to section 223(e) shall be the obligation of the Special Risk Insurance Fund."

(d) Section 214 of such Act is amended by inserting "or mobile home courts or parks" in the first sentence after "construct dwellings".

(e) Section 1101(c)(2) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "value of the property or project" and inserting in lieu thereof "replacement cost of the property or project"; and

(2) by striking out "The value" and inserting in lieu thereof "The replacement cost".

FHA FINANCING FOR MOBILE HOMES

SEC. 418. Section 2 of the National Housing Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "(i)" after the words "for the purpose of" in the first sentence of subsection (a);

(2) inserting "; and for the purpose of (ii) financing the purchase of a mobile home to be used by the owner as his principal residence" before the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (a);

(3) inserting "(other than mobile homes)" after "the new residential structures" in clause (1) of subparagraph (iii) of the second paragraph of subsection (a);

(4) inserting the following new sentence at the end of subsection (a): "The Secretary is hereby authorized and directed, with respect to mobile homes to be financed under this section, to (i) prescribe minimum property standards to assure the liability and durability of the mobile home and the suitability of the site on which the mobile home is to be located; and (ii) obtain assurances from the borrower that the mobile home will be placed on a site which complies with the standards prescribed by the Secretary and with local zoning and other applicable local requirements.";

(5) inserting ", except that an obligation financing the purchase of a mobile home may

be to an amount not exceeding $10,000" before the semicolon at the end of clause (1) in the first sentence of subsection (b);

(6) inserting ": *Provided*, That an obligation financing the purchase of a mobile home may have a maturity not in excess of twelve years and thirty-two days" before the semicolon at the end of clause (2) in the first sentence of subsection (b); and

(7) striking out "real property" each place it appears in subsection (c)(2) and inserting in lieu thereof "real or personal property".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 13827) was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF OCTOBER 27

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and the agenda for next week.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the able minority leader's inquiry, we expect to request to adjourn over upon the announcement of the program for next week.

Monday is District day, and there are eight District bills:

H.R. 13837, to amend Healing Arts Practice Act;

H.R. 12673, to authorize blood banks to transfer blood components;

H.R. 9257, to amend the laws with respect to the parking or storage of motor vehicles;

H.R. 13564, to eliminate straw party deeds in joint tenancies;

H.R. 13565, to validate certain deeds improperly acknowledged or executed;

S. 2056, judge's survivors annuity refund;

H.R. 10335, revise District of Columbia's Criminal Code with respect to false pretenses and bad checks; and

H.R. 10336, to provide liens against property of hotel guests.

Also we have H.R. 13950, Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. This has an open rule with 3 hours of general debate.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week, a continuing appropriations resolution for fiscal year 1970. Then we continue with consideration of H.R. 13950, the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. Also H.R. 14001, the Selective Service Amendment Act of 1969, which has an open rule with 4 hours of debate.

H.R. 14252, the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 4244, pertaining to the Administrative Conference of the United States, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader the following question: This appears to be a very full schedule for next week, and I approve of the program that is outlined here wholeheartedly. From an analysis of this program, is there a high likelihood that there will be a session next Friday?

Mr. ALBERT. I should think there will be unless some change develops that I know nothing about at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, would the minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am somewhat intrigued by the fact that there is not a single authorization bill nor an appropriation bill scheduled for next week. Of course, I understand that the continuing resolution providing for continuing appropriations is on the schedule. Is it intended to pass all the regular appropriation bills at this session of Congress—I mean before January 1, or will some of the regular appropriation bills be carried over into next year?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield further——

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. This continuing resolution is for 1 month. I, for one, am glad it is for 1 month. I think we need to proceed with the regular bills. I hope that the regular bills will all be passed before this continuing resolution runs out.

Certainly, the gentleman is on one of the committees and recognizes better than I the problems relating to getting out authorization bills. The gentleman's committtee has one of the major authorization bills that is outstanding. All of the appropriation bills but one not requiring authorization have been passed by the House of Representatives but not by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I cannot let the gentleman from Oklahoma suggest that I am on one of the legislative committees that still has an authorization bill pending—I cannot let that go and pass by without some comment. The gentleman I am sure is aware of the fact that I am a member of the minority of that committee. I cannot move bills in and out of the committee.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman always underestimates his influence.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

GOVERNOR REAGAN ON TAX REFORM AND THE PROCEDURES OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, California's Gov. Ronald Reagan apparently does not like H.R. 13270, the tax reform bill overwhelmingly approved by the House last August 7. In a speech Tuesday night at Flint, Mich., Mr. Reagan asserted that the bill was "hatched in a back room, passed in the dark of night, and smuggled through the House."

He implied that the measure was somehow cooked up by the Johnson administration—"concocted in a back room by the staffs of a repudiated administration"—and he stated that the "flak and fallout" from the bill "threatens to drastically change the American economic system."

Even allowing for the license of a political party dinner, the Governor's words must sound strange indeed to millions of ordinary Americans to whom this bill would grant a long overdue measure of relief.

And they also must have a distinctly hollow ring for the members of our own Ways and Means Committee who labored so mightily to produce this historic legislation.

Rather than being "roared" through the Ways and Means Committee, as Mr. Reagan asserts in a rather peculiar choice of words, the bill was the carefully considered product of 30 days of public hearings and 38 days of executive sessions. Testimony was taken from 410 witnesses, surely a wide enough cross section to include even some of Mr. Reagan's friends.

The bill came to the House floor with the complete support of both the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee (Mr. MILLS), and the highly respected ranking minority member (Mr. BYRNES).

It was taken up under a rule providing 6 hours of debate, and was approved on a massive vote of 394 to 30. Evidently, few of Mr. Reagan's fellow Republicans in the House shared his disgust with the legislation, since they supported it even more preponderantly than the Democrats—176 to 10.

As for Mr. Reagan's contention that

the measure was in some way foisted on the House by Johnson administration officials, the facts clearly speak otherwise.

A look at the legislative history of the bill indicates that, if anything, President Johnson was himself lukewarm about tax reform. In fact, the only reason the administration prepared reform proposals for submission to Congress was because it was ordered to under terms of an amendment to the 1968 Revenue and Expenditure Control Act. And, interestingly, the amendment, directing the administration to submit a reform plan by December 31, 1968, was drafted and introduced by a Republican, Senator JAVITS.

Mr. Reagan's contention that Johnson administration left-overs also were responsible for much of the staff work on the tax reform bill also lacks substance.

Besides drawing on the expertise of its own staff and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Ways and Means Committee was ably assisted by Edwin S. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for the Nixon administration, and some of Mr. Cohen's colleagues from the Treasury Department.

By unanimous consent, and in a sense of fairness, I shall insert Governor Reagan's full remarks in the RECORD:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOV. RONALD REAGAN—REPUBLICAN FUND-RAISING SPEECH FLINT, MICH., OCTOBER 21, 1969.

Governor Milliken and I share the challenge of being governors of large industrial states. Most of our problems eventually get back to the matter of money. In this regard, Washington inevitably plays a major role. The federal government has preempted many of the sources of our income. To correct this, we are struggling to bring about some tax sharing.

Past administrations have also brought about an inflation of the currency which adds tremendous problems to the operation of a state government. But the current mischief causing us concern originated in the House of Representatives and is known as the Tax Reform Bill of 1969. It has been called the most revolutionary tax bill of our time. Tax Coordinator, a tax reporting publication, calls it "the most incredibly complicated tax law in United States history." In less formal circles it is known as the "Lawyers and Accountants Relief Act." This bill had its genesis in the surtax bill of 1968 sought by President Johnson to fight off the chickens of inflation which were coming home to roost.

The 1968 bill also required that the administration prepare a tax reform package for presentation to the 1969 Congress. The military would describe this as bobby trapping the position before withdrawal. With the inauguration of President Nixon, the Democratic leadership of Congress triggered the device.

What followed was unusual in the history of Congress. The most revolutionary tax reform bill of our time roared through the Ways and Means Committee, on to the floor of the House, and past the membership with virtually no advance notice or public hearing. The flak and fallout threatens to drastically change the American economic system.

There is a lot of noble oratory about closing loopholes and the sound of the tumbrels can be heard carrying the venal rich to their just punishment. Many of what our friends call loopholes are really the incentives which made the whole cockeyed tax structure work. Provisions for depletion, deductibility of gifts and tax free institutions were devices voted in by earlier congresses to promote worthwhile social objectives. Wasn't there a time when we felt that the discovery and production of raw materials was as important to our nation as the urban environment now? Are we no longer interested in supporting our schools and foundations? The booby trap has been extremely effective already.

Donations to private charities have ground to a halt since the passage of the House bill. Small colleges are threatened with extinction. Even such august institutions as the Institute for Advance Study at Princeton have publicly stated that their operations could be severely curtailed if the present bill is passed. Is this really in the best interest of our society, or is it simply another attempt by the bureaucrats to stifle anything but government owned and operated institutions? Is a man who gives away substantial sums of his invested capital every year using a gimmick, or is he benefiting society as was intended by the current tax law?

Of more direct concern to your governor and to me is the impending federal raid on municipal bond sales. The Bank of New York has accurately described the municipal bond market as "a disaster area in the finance world." Ever since House adoption of the current tax bill, interest rates on municipal bonds have sky-rocketed and sales have virtually stopped. In California our state water plan and needed campus facilities have been delayed because we cannot sell authorized bond issues.

And who gets the bill when municipalities and states must raise tax rates to compete in the commercial money market? The forgotten American—the low and middle income families whose property taxes will be raised once more to meet these increased borrowing costs.

And why should anyone have to be taxed for inflation? A man buys a house for $10,000. The local tax collector one day has to tell this citizen that it's now valued at $15,000—not because it's worth more but because dollars are worth less. If he sells his house for $15,000, the government tells him he's made a $5,000 profit even though he must pay $15,000 for an exactly similar house. Government taxes 25 or 50 percent of what it has declared is profit and in truth he is the loser.

The real issue is a bill hatched in the back room, passed in the dark of night, and smuggled through the House. Shouldn't we start anew and ask some more basic questions?

I would like to suggest something I believe is in keeping with our Republican philosophy—a new bill of our own embodying a new basic principle, namely, a limit on government's power to tax. Surely the right to earn, keep and disburse should be as inalienable a right as the others listed in the first ten Amendments to the Constitution?

Dr. C. Northcote Parkinson, that great chronicler of the modern bureaucracy, has noted that the percentage of gross national product intercepted by the tax collector is an excellent barometer of the stability of civilizations. When all taxes, federal, state and local, absorb a significant portion of a society's gross national product, there is trouble. "At 35 percent there is a visible decline in freedom and stability," he wrote. "At 36 percent, there is disaster, complete and final, though not always immediate."

Today, 37 cents of every income dollar in the nation goes to taxes.

In this decade alone, total taxes for the average United States family are up 73 percent. The average family of four, with a wage earner who makes $10,000 a year, has to pay $2,600 in taxes . . . and he works three months just to earn the money to pay them . . . and he's not going to stand for it much longer.

Why not consider a limit on the power of all government to tax? And a distribution of these taxing powers between the federal, state and local levels in order to prevent the current preemption of the taxing power by the federal establishment. Those who are always rejecting what they charge are simplistic answers should be happy for the problems involved are complex. But history on the one hand, and the angry mood of the taxpayer on the other, confirm that our society will not remain stable upon attempting to increase taxes further.

Let us hope the Senate will carry out its traditional deliberative role for, we have a tax bill before us, concocted in a back room by staffs of a repudiated administration. What it slipped through in the dark of night does not stand the light of day. Under the false claim that it will benefit the system it would destroy, the current bill carries the seeds of destruction of local government, of private educational and charitable foundations, and of the basic concepts of a free enterprise system which has fought the most successful war on poverty in the history of man.

The President should examine it with care, for as Governor Milliken and I are both well aware, the power of veto is one of the major responsibilities of any chief executive.

DANIELS-McGEE ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the date, Monday, October 20, 1969, marks what I believe to be a most significant event in the 49-year history of the Civil Service Retirement system. It has the significance of assuring that the system will have the ability to fulfill its future obligations to millions of past, present, and future Federal employees and their families.

It is with a deep sense of pride and gratitude that I take this time to commend the President's action of October 20 in approving Public Law 91–93, the Civil Service Retirement Amendments of 1969, which will maintain confidence in the financial integrity of the program and contribute importantly toward the financial security of both the active and retired Federal work force.

Further, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to be responsive to the widespread interest in its new and liberalized benefit provisions, I take this opportunity to present a series of questions and answers about the major changes made by this landmark legislation:

FINANCING THE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

1. Q. How is the financing of the system changed?

A. It is improved in three ways:

1. By an increase in retirement contributions so that they are sufficient to meet the normal cost of the system.

2. By authorization of appropriations to meet liabilities which result from future changes.

3. By authorizing the Treasury Department to pay interest on the existing unfunded liability of the system and for the cost of allowing credit for military service in computing annuities.

2. Q. How much will be deducted from an employee's pay as retirement contributions?

A. Seven percent of basic pay, instead of 6½ percent.

3. Q. When does this increased deduction begin?

A. The first pay period in 1970.

4. Q. Is the Government required to contribute to the retirement fund?

A. Yes, each Government agency matches the deductions from its employees' pay.

CREDIT FOR UNUSED SICK LEAVE

1. Q. In what kind of retirement cases may unused sick leave be added to the employee's service?

A. In two kinds:

1. Where the employee retires on an immediate annuity on or after October 20, 1969.

2. Where the employee dies on or after October 20, 1969 leaving a widow (or dependent widower) who is entitled to a survivor annuity.

2. Q. What is an immediate annuity?

A. One that begins no later than 1 month after separation from service. This would include an employee who retires at his own option, or who retires for age, disability, or because he was involuntarily separated without cause.

3. Q. How will credit for unused sick leave be allowed?

A. By adding the time represented by the unused sick leave to the retiring employee's actual service.

4. Q. For what purpose will unused sick leave be credited?

A. Only for counting the total number of years and months of service used in computing the amount of annuity.

5. Q. May unused sick leave be used for figuring the high average salary?

A. No.

6. Q. May unused sick leave be counted toward the minimum length of service necessary to retire or to qualify for a survivor annuity?

A. No.

7. Q. How much time credit is allowed for the unused sick leave?

A. Generally, each 8 hours of unused sick leave equals one day. Days are converted to months and years on a 260-day work year basis. On this basis, approximately 22 days equals 1 month.

8. Q. Is deposit of contributions to the retirement fund required to obtain retirement credit for unused sick leave?

A. No.

9. Q. Does the limitation on annuity of not more than 80 percent of the high average salary apply to annuity based on unused sick leave?

A. No. Additional annuity attributable to the sick leave credit is allowable over and above this limitation.

HIGH AVERAGE SALARY

1. Q. What change has been made in the average salary computation?

A. The "high-5" average salary formerly used in computing annuities is changed to "high-3". This is the largest annual rate resulting from averaging an employee's rates of basic pay in effect during any period of 3 consecutive years of civilian service, with each rate weighted by the time it was in effect.

2. Q. When does use of the high-3 average salary become effective?

A. It applies in the case of any employee who is separated from service on or after October 20, 1969.

3. Q. How is the high average salary figured if the employee has less than 3 years of service?

A. If an employee dies with between 18 months and 3 years of service and leaves survivors entitled to annuity (see following questions), his high average salary is figured over all his civilian service.

SURVIVOR ANNUITY—SPOUSE

1. Q. What change is there in the rights of widows?

A. The widow (or dependent widower) of an employee who dies on or after October 20, 1969, after as little as 18 months of civilian service is now entitled to survivor annuity. Formerly the minimum service requirement was 5 years.

2. Q. Must the minimum of 18 months be continuous service?

A. No. It may consist of 2 or more periods of service.

3. Are any of the other requirements for a widow's or widower's annuity changed?

A. All other requirements remain the same.

4. Q. How much survivor annuity is payable to a widow?

A. The 1969 Amendments guarantee a minimum annuity to the widow (or dependent widower) of an employee who dies on or after October 20, 1969. This amounts to 55 percent of the *smaller* of—

1. 40 percent of the deceased employee's high average salary, or

2. the regular annuity obtained after increasing the deceased employee's service by the period of time between his date of death and the date he would have reached age 60.

5. Q. Is this guaranteed minimum used in all cases?

A. It does not apply if the widow's annuity based on employee's actual service is more than the guaranteed minimum. In this instance, the widow's annuity is 55 percent of the annuity earned by the employee at the time of his death.

6. Q. In what situations will 55 percent of the earned annuity be more than the guaranteed minimum?

A. Whenever the deceased employee had sufficient service to produce a higher benefit. Also, since service cannot be projected beyond age 60 in any case, the guaranteed minimum is not operative where the employee dies after reaching that age.

7. Q. Was any change made in the benefit payable to the surviving spouse of a disability annuitant?

A. Yes. Formerly an employee who retired for disability could pass on to the surviving wife or husband only 55 percent of his earned annuity, even though he received a higher benefit under the existing guaranteed minimum disability annuity provision. Now, for a disability annuitant who retires on or after October 20, 1969, the widow or widower will receive 55 percent of whatever annuity the retiree receives, unless the employee at retirement had specified a lesser benefit.

SURVIVOR ANNUITY—CHILD

1. Q. What change is there in the rights of children?

A. Each eligible child of an employee who dies on or after November 1, 1969, after as little as 18 months of civilian service is now entitled to survivor annuity. Formerly the minimum service requirement was 5 years.

2. Q. Need the minimum of 18 months be continuous service?

A. No. It may consist of 2 or more periods of service.

3. Q. Are any other requirements for a child's annuity changed?

A. No. All other requirements remain the same.

4. Q. How much survivor annuity is payable to a child?

A. The 1969 amendments increase annuity to a child. If the deceased employee is survived by a husband or wife, each eligible child will receive 60 percent of the employee's high average salary divided by the number of children. Annuity to any child is limited to $900 a year, and the total to all children cannot be more than $2,700 a year.

If no husband or wife survives the employee, each eligible child will receive 75 percent of the employee's high average salary divided by the number of children. Annuity to any one child is limited to $1,080 a year, and the total to all children cannot be more than $3,240 a year.

5. Q. Are all children entitled to survivor benefits eligible for the increased annuity?

A. Yes. These increased rates apply not only to children who qualify after this amendment is enacted, but also to children who are now receiving survivor annuity.

6. Q. When are these increases in children's annuities effective?

A. November 1, 1969. They will be reflected in the December 1, 1969 annuity checks which pay annuity for November.

REMARRIAGE OF SURVIVING SPOUSE

1. Q. What effect does remarriage have on the survivor annuity of a widow or widower?

A. Basically, remarriage generally stops the survivor annuity. The new law permits continuance of survivor annuity, regardless of when the employee retired or died, if the widow or widower remarries (1) on or after July 18, 1966, and (2) after attaining age 60. Where such a remarriage has already occurred and the widow's or widower's annuity has been stopped, it will be resumed commencing October 20, 1969.

2. Q. If a widow's or widower's annuity is stopped because of remarriage, can it be resumed if the remarriage ends?

A. Yes, if (1) the remarriage occurred after July 18, 1966, (2) the widow or widower does not elect some other annuity which is acquired by reason of the remarriage, and (3) any lump sum retirement benefit paid is returned. Where a remarriage has already ended, the survivor annuity may be resumed effective October 20, 1969.

3. Q. If a widow's or widower's annuity has already stopped but the remarriage has ended, how can the annuity be resumed?

A. She or he must write to the Civil Service Commission giving full identifying information and full particulars about the remarriage and when and how it ended.

COST OF LIVING INCREASES

1. Q. Do the 1969 Amendments change the way cost-of-living increases in annuities are figured?

A. Yes. Cost-of-living annuity increases are still figured as formerly except that, under the Amendments, 1 percent is added to each cost-of-living increase that is developed by the Consumer Price Index.

2. Q. Does the extra 1 percent affect the 4 percent cost-of-living increase that is already scheduled for November 1, 1969?

A. Yes, it changes this 4 percent increase to a 5 percent increase.

3. Q. Who will receive the 5 percent cost-of-living increase due November 1, 1969?

A. All retired employees and survivor annuitants whose annuities commenced November 1, 1969 or earlier.

4. Q. What is the last day an employee may retire from service and have his annuity commence November 1, 1969?

A. October 31, 1969. Employees in a pay status and separated after that date will not qualify for the 5 percent cost-of-living increase scheduled for November 1, 1969.

5. Q. Is there any advantage for an employee to retire on or before October 31, 1969?

A. If the employee retires between October 20 and 31, he will not only have his annuity figured under the 1969 Amendments but also have the 5 percent cost-of-living increase added to his annuity. However, the 1969 Amendment liberalizations—high average salary computation, unused sick leave credit, etc.—will apply equally to persons who retire after October.

6. Q. Will the extra 1 percent be added to future cost-of-living increases that are developed by the Consumer Price Index?

A. Yes.

EMPLOYEES PREVIOUSLY SEPARATED

1. Q. What is the effect of this amendment on those already separated from Federal service?

A. The provisions of this new law do not generally apply to those separated or retired before its effective date. However, annuitants already on the rolls will receive the extra 1 percent annuity increase.

2. Q. Do the provisions of the new law apply to retirees who have been reemployed by the Government?

A. Yes, under certain conditions. The age

or optional retiree who is separated on or after October 20, 1969, and who has completed at least 1 year of continuous full-time civilian service as a reemployed annuitant will receive credit for any unused sick leave in determining his supplemental annuity. Should the retiree complete 5 years of such service, his annuity can be recomputed; in the recomputation, he will be eligible for all the benefits of the new law, i.e., sick leave credit, high average salary computation, and survivor benefits previously outlined.

COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY BILL

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at 4:40 this morning the body of the first of the coal miners who perished in the gassy grave of the Farmington, W. Va., disaster was recovered. Seventy-eight men were killed in the fiery explosions which rocked the No. 9 mine on November 20, 1968.

The Farmington disaster roused the conscience of the Nation to demand that action be taken to protect the health and safety of the coal miners. Although there have been no major disasters since Farmington, 182 coal miners have been killed and 5,465 injured since that terrible morning last November.

Mr. Speaker, the coal operators of this Nation have been lobbying to weaken the health and safety legislation which Congress will start considering soon. The National Coal Association has written a letter to every Member of Congress which threatens Congress with power shortages if we try too hard to protect coal miners. The letter, dated October 21, states bluntly:

> If Congress enacts a bill which closes many coal mines it will jeopardize the public welfare by bringing on a nationwide power and steel shortage. . . . If Congress forces the closing of coal mines, a serious shortage can become critical and the nation will face power blackouts.

Mr. Speaker, there is talk of compromise in the air. There are many who would water down and compromise this bill. Death is a very certain phenomenon, Mr. Speaker. How can we compromise on an issue like that? Can you compromise on a man's life, limbs, and lungs? The coal operators shed tears and spread fears that coal mines will be closed down. Would you rather close down a mine or close down a man?

As the widows of Farmington wait patiently for the recovery of the bodies of their husbands who perished at Farmington, let us in Congress rise to the challenge and enact a strong, meaningful, effective coal mine health and safety bill without compromise with coal miners' lives. The slaughter in the coal mines must stop.

ROGERS INTRODUCES 3-YEAR EXTENSION OF REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAM

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to extend and expand the regional medical programs for 3 fiscal years. The present authorizing legislation expires on June 30, 1969.

The basic structure of the regional medical program is to provide for education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and related diseases.

The bill that I am introducing would not change the basic purpose of this law, but would expand the field of activity to include other major diseases and conditions as well as heart disease, cancer, and stroke. This would enable a regional medical program to operate from a broader base and to work with such medical problems as arthritis and trauma.

Eventually, as the regional medical program continues to expand its scope of operation in providing up-to-date medical knowledge to the practitioners and providers of health care, the categorical emphasis of the program should be eliminated and the program properly coordinated with comprehensive health planning.

A basic purpose of the regional medical program is to afford the medical profession and the medical institutions the opportunity of making available to their patients the latest advances in the diagnosis and treatment of these diseases. The bill that I am introducing would expand this purpose to include prevention from these diseases and rehabilitation of those stricken with the disease.

I believe that this proposed change in the law will enable the regional medical programs to more fully carry out the intent of the original legislation by providing more extensive and current knowledge about these diseases and conditions to the providers of health care.

In addition, the bill that I am introducing would provide for the inclusion of representatives from official health and health planning agencies on the advisory group for the operation of the local regional medical programs. Under present law only representatives from voluntary health agencies are permitted to serve on such advisory boards and I believe that the program will benefit from having these official groups on the advisory boards at the local level.

Another change that I am proposing in the bill I am introducing would permit consideration of all regional medical program projects at the local level by the 314(b) comprehensive areawide health planning agencies established under the Partnership for Health Act, Public Law 89–749. This change in the basic law, I believe, will contribute to a more effective regional medical program and will better insure that consumer participation at the local level is meaningful.

I believe, too, that this change in the basic law would be consistent with the direction being taken by the national advisory council on regional medical programs. At its February 1969 meeting that council issued a policy directive which required that where applications for regional medical program projects include requests for the purchase of major patient care equipment, adequate evidence must be included to show that the project plan has been reviewed and, if necessary, approved by the appropriate local planning agency. And, in Memphis, Tenn., the regional medical program and the local 314(b) agency share the same advisory board and geographical area.

Moreover, I feel that by maximizing appropriate coordination at the local level, one of my principal concerns regarding the regional medical programs will be eased. During hearings last year on the 2-year extension of the law, I expressed concern that this program in too many instances was stopping at the university dean's office, rather than reaching the providers of health care, and the practicing physicians and community hospitals within a given region were not effectively receiving the most recent information on these diseases.

I realize that the regional medical program is still in its infancy, but I believe that increased coordination will be realized through utilization of the 314(b) agencies and that we will be making better utilization of our resources under this most worthwhile program.

A corollary to the provision in the bill which would permit review by the 314(b) agency is the question of decategorization of the regional medical program. At its inception, the regional medical program had categorical emphasis and this has been supported for the most part by the medical community, the medical schools and the major voluntary associations interested in the specific diseases at which the program was aimed.

As the regional medical program has entered the operational phases, it has become more broadly defined through interpretation and implementation. However, I do not believe we should abruptly decategorize the regional medical program, but rather should move gradually toward decategorization through a broadening of purpose of the program and through closer coordination with the 314(b) agencies. The bill that I am introducing today will, I believe, assist in attaining this objective.

Mr. Speaker, to date 55 regions of the regional medical program have been organized, and 44 of these have received operational grants reaching 75 percent of the Nation's population. Another six regional programs should enter their operational phase by the end of this year.

To date, for the 4 fiscal years the regional medical program has been in effect, more than $114 million has been distributed to the 55 designated regions for planning or operation.

At present, approximately 75 percent of the population of this Nation is located in regions which have received operational grants, and by the end of the present fiscal year, it is anticipated that almost all of the population will be covered by regions with operation grants.

State hospital associations in all of the 50 States participate in the program; all State health departments plus those in the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico participate in the program and more than 2,000 persons representing the medical and health resources of the regions serving on the regional advisory groups

which provide advice to the grantee in the planning and operational program and which must approve an application for an operational grant.

I believe the regional medical program is coming of age, and I am hopeful that early hearings on this legislation can be held in order to permit a determination on the proper direction for the program in the future.

WILSON APPLAUDS CHANGE IN ADMINISTRATION DRUG APPROACH

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

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been calling for a more realistic approach to the narcotic addiction and drug abuse problem. I hope that my statements in this area have played some small role in providing information and presenting various opinions that resulted in the change in administration policies regarding penalties for possession of drugs. I commend President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell for heeding the advice of not only concerned Members of Congress but of health experts and police officials throughout the country.

While I condemn the seller of narcotics and recommend the severest of penalties for such activities, it has been my opinion that existing and, up to a few days ago, administration proposed sentences were unrealistic and unfair for those who were merely users of marihuana and drugs. I have contended that, in regard to users, the problem should be considered largely a health problem rather than merely a law enforcement issue.

It appears that the administration has taken cognizance of this point and, apparently after intense internal discussions between Dr. Egeberg, Dr. Yolles, and other Health, Education, and Welfare officials with Justice Department officials with Justice Department officers such as John Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and, reportedly, Attorney General Mitchell himself, and has reassessed its former policy and announced a change therein.

At a time when recent National Institute of Mental Health surveys indicate that one of five college students smoke or have smoked marihuana, when reports from Vietnam estimate that 30 percent of our troops there smoke marihuana, when deaths from drug abuses are soaring throughout the country, the problem can easily be recognized as going beyond a law and order characterization. It is a health problem, granted a health problem of staggering proportions, but a problem that requires understanding, compassion, research and education as well as coordination and planning of improved law enforcement techniques. The administration has taken a step in the right direction.

For my colleagues information, I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article that appeared in the fall 1969 issue of the Law Officer, the official publication of the International Conference of Police Associations which deals with the drug abuse nightmare. In addition, I am including the text of the Washintgon Post editorial of October 23, which praises the recent testimony of Mr. Ingersoll before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency. Finally, I am inserting an article that appeared in the October 13, 1969, issue of the Los Angeles Times which discusses Operation Cooperation, the latter-day version of Operation Intercept.

Cooperation between the United States and Mexico is essential to reduce the illicit importation of narcotics from our neighbor to the south. The destruction of the sources of marihuana carried out by Mexican Army troops is, in my opinion, a better procedure than harming legitimate businesses on both sides of the border and inconveniencing thousands of tourists and workers. But destruction of marihuana plants is not the answer. Illegal importation of U.S. produced and subsequently exported amphetamines and barbiturates must be stopped. The sources of hard narcotics must be eliminated if possible. This may require increased cooperation between the United States and opium exporting countries such as Turkey.

A crackdown must be made on organized crime which is responsible for providing heroin to addicts throughout the United States. Let us not lose sight of the more serious threat posed to our society by the addict who must steal $150 worth of goods daily to feed his heroin habit due to the increasing and more visible and publicized use of marihuana. Narcotic addiction has cost our economy billions of dollars and thousands of lives. Any investment made by the Congress to counteract organized dope pushing must prove worthwhile in the long run.

Let us not pinch pennies in this area of law enforcement when the time for full and adequate funding comes up every year. Money spent in this pursuit will act to protect citizens from potential burglaries and robberies that they will otherwise experience at the hands of addicts. In addition, the addict must be treated and cured. Consequently funds expended for construction and staffing of treatment facilities represent another wise investment of the taxpayers' money. I urge my colleagues to consider this when the requests for funds for drug research, related law enforcement activities, construction of treatment facilities, training of competent personnel, and grants for dissemination of educational materials are before the House.

I now include the various articles mentioned above:

[From the Law Officer]

SENATOR SAYS AMERICA IN DRUG ABUSE NIGHTMARE

New federal drug laws are needed to deal with the spiraling problem of drug abuse and addiction in America, but the administration bill introduced last month calling for more stringent penalties for drug users is not the answer, several law and medical authorities indicated in narcotics hearings before the Special Committee on Alcoholism and Narcotics recently.

The committee's chairman, Sen. Harold E. Hughes (D-Iowa), joined in deploring the present approach to the "national nightmare" of drug abuse. The U.S. is dealing with the problem, he said, "in an atmosphere of fear and blindness that can only be compared to our attitude toward witchcraft in the 17th century. We know more about the craters on Mars than we know about the drug problem."

Sen. Hughes said he was "not pleading for any particular program or approach, but simply for an openmindedness and the willingness to admit that we are in a mess and need a fresh start."

Big-time crime reaps huge profits from controlling the illegal drug traffic, the Senator said. Addiction in turn is linked to all kinds of criminal acts ranging from mugging to murder, he added.

"Treatment for drug abuse is virtually non-existent because in point of fact addiction is not recognized to be the illness it is," Sen. Hughes said. "Under our law it is a crime. We are working from a prosecution rather than a public health approach. We are concerned with punishing people, not educating them or healing them.

"The tangle of existing laws governing drug use and distribution is hopeless to straighten out, because the fundamental premise is wrong—that drug addiction is a crime instead of an illness," he added.

Hughes told the committee, "We should have learned by this time that excessively harsh laws do not invariably deter people from breaking the law or even improve the possibilities for the authorities to do an effective job of enforcement.

Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, director, National Institute of Mental Health, testified before the Hughes committee that, "A conservative estimate of the total involuntary social costs of narcotic drug abuse (in the U.S.) amounts to $541 million per year." He said the cost to law enforcement alone is an estimated $61 million annually.

[From the Washington Post]

TEMPERING JUSTICE WITH REASON

There is an abundance of good sense in the administration's second thoughts about the treatment of drug victims. In their earlier approach to the problem, President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell seemed to take the view that all users of any sort of mind-affecting substance whatever—from marijuana to morphine, but, of course, not including alcohol or tobacco—were willfully possessed of demons which could be exorcised only through infliction of the most extravagant forms of punishment. They seem to have been persuaded, however—and the indications are that Dr. Roger Egeberg, the new Assistant Secretary of HEW in charge of health, had much to do with the persuading—that justice can usefully be tempered with mercy and reason in this difficult area.

John E. Ingersoll, director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, went before the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency Monday and recommended two sensible distinctions in regard to drugs. He urged that the punishment of persons who simply have illicit drugs in their possession for their own use should be different from the punishment of persons trafficking in drugs and seducing innocent victims into addiction. He proposed for the administration that first-time possession of any narcotic or dangerous drug be punishable by a $5,000 fine and a sentence of no more than a year. This seems to us excessively severe but a great deal more rational than the present law setting the sentence at two to ten years with a fine of $20,000 for narcotics and marijuana. He also urged that the mandatory minimum sentence for simple possesson of marijuana be lifted.

The second distinction sought by Mr. Ingersoll is that marijuana be regarded not as a narcotic drug but as an hallucinogenic. This, too, reflects elementary common sense. The use of marijuana does not produce addiction. As Mr. Ingersoll remarked in his testimony, "although it is termed an hallucinogen, we

need to know more about this particular drug, especially its long-term effects. Therefore, the department supports a provision that will allow for a study into the causes and effects of marijuana use."

There are two practical considerations that argue strongly for acceptance of these distinctions. One is that the excessive penalties now provided for any sort of illict drug use or possession make prosecution more difficult. "All too often," Mr. Ingersoll told the subcommittee, "because of the present penalty structure, there is real hesitancy on the part of prosecutors and courts to handle possession cases because of the potential high penalties involved. By allowing the court to prosecute the possessor who intends to sell as a felon and the possessor for one's own use as a misdemeanant, I beleve we will have better law enforcement and better respect for the law."

There is another important argument for this reversion to rationality. Many young Americans have come to feel that their elders have developed an obsession about marijuana reflecting prejudice more than reason. It has not been shown, these protesters say, that marijuana affects the mind or body any more harmfully than alcohol or tobacco. The contention deserves careful consideration and investigation. Marijuana is not necessarily dangerous and evil just because the young like to defy the old by resort to it.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Oct. 13, 1969]

MEXICANS REPORT RAID ON MARIHUANA PLANTATION—$40 MILLION WORTH OF DRUG BURNED, NEWSPAPERS SAY

(By Dial Torgerson)

Mexican Army troops raided a marijuana plantation and burned marijuana worth more than $40 million on the illicit drug market, according to reports Sunday in Mexican newspapers.

The plantation was near Tecolote, in the state of Guerrero, inland for Acapulco.

The raid apparently was an indication of the Mexican government's aggressive new attitude in attempts to control the domestic marijuana crop—one of the major purposes of Operation Cooperation, the latter day version of Operation Intercept.

Newspapers said the raid was led personally by the minister of national defense, Marcelino Garcia Barragon, who said Mexico would throw 40 small planes into the country's antidope drive.

WILL CARRY MACHINE GUNS

Authorities reported that the planes would be equipped with machine guns for use against smugglers who make deliveries by air.

U.S. officials said that although Operation Cooperation would involve fewer searches at 31 border checkpoints along the 2,000 mile U.S.-Mexican frontier, aerial and sea surveillance would not be relaxed.

For the first time since the operation shifted from "intercept" to "cooperation" cars began to roll more swiftly through border checkpoints Sunday.

Intercept called for car-by-car, person-by-person inspection of everyone entering this country from Mexico. Cooperation involves what the government calls "continued intensified surveillance," which is more relaxed than Intercept's careful searches.

Southbound traffic picked up as word of changed procedures spread. Inspections were still more severe than before Intercept's beginning Sept. 21. But they were less intensive and time-consuming, and crossing back into the United States took less time than under Intercept.

Federal officials said that at the San Ysidro crossing south of San Diego, border-crossing delays Sunday were only about 25% longer than prior to Sept. 21.

INSPECTIONS STILL IN FORCE

"While inspections have been relaxed, they have by no means been eliminated," said a spokesman for the Treasury Department, whom Customs officers are implementing the searches. "To assume so is erroneous. Intensified surveillance is continuing."

The spokesman said that under the new system there are fewer primary and secondary inspections, and primary checks involve fewer parts of the car.

The easing of inspections was worked out in meetings in Washington between U.S. and Mexican legal experts after the Mexican government agreed to more strenuous efforts to curb narcotic sources inside Mexico.

A federal spokesman said a 21-year-old Riverside waitress made the mistake of assuming the change in procedures meant "wave-through" checks at the border.

Authorities said Carol Ann Lough—who was charged with smuggling after 22,000 amphetamine pills were found in paper bags on the back seat of her car—told inspectors at San Ysidro:

"I didn't think you were still inspecting."

AN AIRY TOMB

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

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans are currently observing Clean Air Week. But in observing it, they are doing so with troubled minds and dirty lungs. Our fellow citizens are becoming increasingly aware that the problem of air pollution demands more attention than setting aside 1 week, during which we agonize about our contaminated atmosphere and hope for miraculous solutions. The public desires—and deserves—concerted action by this Congress. The public knows that our environment will continue to deteriorate as long as Congress coddles the polluters of the very air we breathe. Today, I am introducing the Air Pollution Abatement Act of 1969 which will make enforcement of stringent national standards the policy and practice of the United States.

Before I explain this bill, I want to go on record as recognizing the total problem of environmental pollution. Not only am I alarmed about the air we inhale, but also about the water which we drink and the ground which we till. Whatever the particular type of pollution, the end result is human pollution. It is man himself who pays for the contamination of his own life space. The Congress bears the responsibility of ridding this land of every environmental scourge.

But while I recognize the entire problem of environmental quality, I also realize that Congress must take specific action on concrete problems. While I will support all efforts to upgrade the quality of our environment, I also believe that Clean Air Week affords a unique and appropriate time to grapple with one aspect of that subject—air pollution.

This body knows that air pollution constitutes a bothersome problem. It has demonstrated such awareness in the enactment of the Clean Air Act of 1963 and the Air Quality Act of 1967. However, it is my earnest conviction that Congress must view air pollution as more than bothersome. We must attack air pollution as a public menace which merits our immediate action. Why is this so? Why must Congress stand up and tackle the airy menace? Because air pollution poses a serious threat to the lives and health of millions of Americans. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has stated:

> Analyses of numerous epidemological studies clearly indicate an association between air pollution . . . and health effects of varying severity. This association is most firm for the short-term air pollution episodes.
>
> The epidemological studies concerned with increased mortality also show increased morbidity. Again, increases in hospital admissions or emergency clinic visits, are most easily demonstrated in major urban areas.[1]

Stated simply: We pay for breathing bad air with our health—and perhaps our lives.

Air pollution also threatens to upset the ecological balance of the environment. For example, under certain conditions, direct sunlight can be reduced by one-third in summer to two-thirds in winter.[2] Thus air pollution robs us of the benefits and beauty of direct sunlight. Moreover, the presence of excessive amounts of carbon dioxide prevents plants from doing their usual job of absorbing carbon dioxide and producing oxygen.

Air pollution also increases the hazards and decreases the efficiency of transportation by reducing visibility. The presence of high concentrations of particulates can reduce visibility to as low as 5 miles[3] and thereby inhibit movement to and through polluted areas by both private carriers and those engaged in interstate and foreign commerce.

Not only does air pollution thus threaten us directly, it also costs millions of Americans millions of dollars each year—dollars which are spent on cleaning and maintainance costs. What an incredible waste of money. Surely it would make more sense to spend this money on controlling pollution instead of on eradicating its effects. It has been estimated that Metropolitan New York sacrifices $1 billion, yes, $1 billion, annually because of air pollution. That means that every man woman and child in New York City pays $70 a year so that others may poison the air.[4]

If I sound like an alarmist—in spite of the above facts—may I cite the distinguished opinion of a man who probably knows as much about environmental disruptions as anyone. Mr. David Gates, ecologist and director of the Missouri Botanical Gardens, warns that we may produce an earth populated by "half-starved, depressed billions gasping in air depleted of oxygen and laden with pollutants, thirsting for thickened, blighted water."[5] A reporter from New York

---

[1] *Air Quality Criteria for Particulate Matter*, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; p. 12–17.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 12–17.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 12–19.

[4] *A New Day*, Robert F. Kennedy. Bill Adler, ed.: New York: Signet Books, 1968. (p. 79)

[5] "Saving the World the Ecologist's Way," Robert W. Stock. *New York Times Magazine*, October 5, 1969. (p. 33)

Times magazine recorded these impressions and statements as a result of an interview with Mr. Gates:

Yet a touch of nostalgia almost of despair, constantly intrudes upon his conversation. "It's so difficult to make people understand the seriousness of the threat," he says. "They don't realize how much we've lost already. They don't realize that we live in a closed system, that the air and water, the plants and animals, are being irreparably damaged and there are no replacements. And it's not just a matter of esthetics. When we lose a wildlife species of a plant, we lose a genetic stock that future generations might need desparately for food."

Just before we parted, I asked him if he thought the trend toward human oblivion would be halted. "I don't know," he replied. "It's very likely we won't be able to stem the momentum, but we have to try. We're definitely not going to make it if we persist in fighting major wars, throwing away our energies. Priorities—it always come back to that. We have to learn to care about what kind of environment we're going to live in. The question is, Will we learn in time?" [6]

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gates is right. In spite of the awesome situation, we must try to enhance the quality of our environment. We must strive to rearrange our unbalanced priorities.

I believe that the passage of my bill would mark one stride toward these objectives.

The bill which I introduce today, the Air Pollution Abatement Act of 1969, does not attempt to deal with every aspect of air pollution. Rather, it seeks to deal primarily with stationary sources of pollution. I do not minimize the importance of pollution from vehicles. In fact, I am cosponsoring with my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY), the Low-Emission Vehicle Act, which seeks to eliminate vehicular pollution. But if we can reduce drastically the amount of pollution from stationary sources, millions of Americans will reap substantial health and financial benefits.

I would like now to outline four salient provisions of this measure, the Air Pollution Abatement Act of 1969.

First, this act would authorize the establishment of national standards for the control of emissions which cause or contribute to air pollution. These standards are needed because the current regulations in most States and cities are too weak to fight the war against air pollution. The standards which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare must establish according to this bill will safeguard all citizens of the United States, no matter where they live. This is not an attempt to pre-empt State or local enforcement. It is simply a recognition that in some areas ambient air quality standards are not adequate to protect public health, that in other areas adequate standards are not matched by adequate enforcement, and that no matter how good the standards and enforcement, it is not possible to wall good air in to one State and out of another.

Second, this act authorizes the Secretary to establish special standards to take effect when specified climatic conditions prevail which substantially increase the danger to human health from emissions into the atmosphere. In such situations the Secretary would have emergency shutdown powers. Such an authorization would enable us to protect urban areas which were threatened by air inversions or other unique atmospheric conditions.

A third provision of the bill would strengthen the enforcement provisions of the Clean Air Act. It would do so in two ways. First, any violator can be sued by either the U.S. attorney or an injured citizen and be forced to pay a penalty not less than $50 nor more than $2,000 for each violation. In the second place, the Secretary may issue cease-and-desist orders, which carry penalties from $1,000, and in some cases $10,000, for each day of violation. In at last giving the Secretary some meaningful, enforcement powers, the act leaves no simple escape hatches for offenders. Presently, violators of existing regulations pay only "slap-on-the-wrist" fines as low as $10. Recent advances in Pennsylvania offer some hope that State and local enforcement procedures may inprove. But the gravity of the problem does not allow us to wait for that to happen.

Finally, this bill includes a built-in safeguard for workers who might be adversely affected when their plants were shut down by cease-and-desist orders. Since the worker is not responsible for the pollution, he should not have to suffer for attempts to ameliorate the problem. Hence, this bill provides that workers who are adversely affected will be entitled to substantial unemployment allowances for up to 52 weeks, and sometimes longer, directly from the Federal Government. These allowances would insure that workers temporarily not working while air pollution control equipment is being installed, will not suffer.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the bill which I am proposing today may not entirely solve the problem of air pollution; it will not miraculously rectify a corrupted atmosphere. However, it will put some teeth in the national antipollution effort. It will enable the people and their government to wage war on the enemy around us; namely, air pollution and those who are careless enough or unscrupulous enough to cause it. In so doing, Congress will have allowed all Americans "to breathe a lot easier" and prevented the slow death of all forms of life in an airy tomb.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 14484

A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for the adoption of national standards governing emissions from stationary sources, to create a federal duty not to pollute the atmosphere, to provide additional public and private remedies for the abatement of air pollution, and for other purposes

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 "Air Pollution Abatement Act of 1969."

SEC. 1. Section 101(a) of the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857) is hereby amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4), and inserting in lieu thereof "; and" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(5) That the emission of atmospheric pollutants in any area of the United States adversely affects interstate and foreign commerce by inhibiting movement to and through polluted areas; by imposing additional costs upon persons engaged in commerce or in the manufacture of goods destined for shipment in commerce; by causing air pollution in states and nations other than that in which the emission occurs; and, because of differing state and local regulations, by creating cost differentials for the operation of industry in various parts of the nation.".

SEC. 2. Title I of the Clean Air Act, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 111 (42 U.S.C. 1857f) the following new sections:

"INJURIOUS EMISSIONS PROHIBITED

"SEC. 112. It shall be a violation of this Act for any person to cause or to permit the discharge, emission, or release into the atmosphere from any source whatever of odors or solid, liquid, or gaseous matter in such place, manner, or concentration as (1) to cause or significantly contribute to causing injury or damage to persons, to business, or to property; or (2) to endanger or significantly contribute to endangering the health, comfort, repose, safety, or welfare of the public; or (3) to constitute a violation of any State or local law, ordinance, regulation, or other provision respecting air pollution.

"EMISSION STANDARDS FOR STATIONARY SOURCES

"SEC. 113. (a) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, after reasonable notice and opportunity for interested parties to present their views, issue emission standards for all or designated emissions into the atmosphere from stationary sources. Such standards shall as a minimum ensure the elimination of health hazards and the upgrading of existing air quality. No standard shall allow any wastes determined by the Secretary to be amenable to treatment to be discharged into the atmosphere without an acceptable treatment or control.

"(b) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, after reasonable notice and opportunity for interested parties to present their views, issue special emission standards to apply when specified climatic conditions prevail which substantially increase the danger to human health from emissions into the atmosphere.

"(c) Standards set under this section shall take effect within one hundred eighty days from the date of issue. Standards shall be reviewed by the Secretary not less than once each year and shall be amended to take account of improved air pollution control technology and of increased knowledge of the effects of air pollution. Such amended standards shall take effect within one hundred eighty days from the date of issue.

"(d) It shall not be necessary to prove emissions in excess of the standards set pursuant to this section in order to establish a violation of section 112(1) or 112(2) of this Act, but such emission shall be prima facie evidence of such violation.

"REMEDIES

"SEC. 114. (a) Any person who causes or permits any emission in violation of section 112 or of standards set by the Secretary under section 113(a) shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not less than $50 nor more than $2000 for each violation. Each day on which such an emission is caused or permitted shall constitute a separate offense.

"(b) The penalties provided for in this section may be recovered in a civil suit in the name of the United States brought without regard to the amount in controversy, in any federal or State court in any district in

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 136.

which the alleged emission occurred or caused harm. If, after notice of probable violation to the State and political subdivision in which the probable violation is occurring, such State or political subdivision has not within twenty days indicated in writing to the United States Attorney for the district in which the violation is occurring an intention to file suit to restrain such violation under a law or ordinance of that State or political subdivision, or under this Act, it shall be the duty of such United States Attorney to file suit for the recovery of such forfeitures. If after thirty days notice by mail from any citizen injured by such emission, the United States Attorney does not institute a proceeding for the violation of sections 112(1), 112(2), or of standards set under section 313(a), any such citizen may upon notice to the United States Attorney do so on behalf of and in the name of the United States. When an injured citizen files suit on behalf of and in the name of the United States under the preceding sentence, such suit shall preclude additional separate suits by injured citizens, but the court shall permit the joinder of additional party plaintiffs, including the United States.

"(c) The United States or any injured citizen may sue for injunctive relief against any emission in violation of section 112 or of standards set by the Secretary under section 113(a). Such an action may be brought, without regard to the amount in controversy, in any federal or State court in any district in which the emission allegedly occurred or caused harm. The court shall specify a time for answer, not exceeding 20 days after service of the complaint. When such action is filed by the United States or an injured citizen, the defendant may be restrained from continuing such pollution pending hearing before the court upon an appropriate showing of irreparable harm. Upon default or answer the court shall immediately inquire into the facts and circumstances of the case and enter an appropriate order, which may include damages for injury and discomfort, costs, and reasonable attorneys' fees in favor of a successful plaintiff. In determining reasonable attorneys' fees, the court shall consider the time, effort and skill required to prepare the case as well as the amount recovered.

"(d)(1) If the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, determines that any person is violating section 112 or standards set pursuant to section 113(a), he shall issue and cause to be served upon such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from continuing violation within such time as may be specified in the order, but in no event more than sixty days from the date of receipt of the original notice of hearing.

"(2) Any person required by an order of the Secretary to cease and desist from such violation may obtain judicial review of such order by filing a petition for review, within twenty days after service of such order, in the United States court of appeals for any circuit in which the violation is found to have occurred or caused harm. A copy of the petition shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary or to any officer designated by him for that purpose and to the Attorney General, and thereupon the Secretary shall certify and file in the court through the Attorney General the record of the proceedings upon which the order is based as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Any information obtained in the course of investigations of violations of this Act may be used in pending or subsequent criminal prosecutions under title 18, United States Code.

"(3) Upon the filing of such petition, such court shall have power to affirm the order of the Secretary, or to set it aside in whole or in part temporarily or permanently, and to enforce such order to the extent that it is affirmed, and to issue such orders pendente lite as in its judgment are necessary to prevent injury to the public. The commencement of proceedings under this paragraph shall not operate as a stay of the Secretary's order.

"(4) No objection to the order of the Secretary shall be considered by the court unless such objection was urged before the Secretary or unless there were reasonable grounds for failure so to do. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive, and the standards set by the Secretary shall be binding.

"(5) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in the whole or in part, any order under this subsection shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"(e)(1) If the Secretary finds that any person is violating standards set pursuant to section 113(b), he shall issue and cause to be served upon such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from continuing violation. This order shall be effective immediately upon receipt, and for a period of time thereafter not to exceed seventy-two hours. The offender shall be required to pay his employees at their regular scale of wages during the time that the order is in effect.

"(2) Any person required by an order of the Secretary issued pursuant to this subsection to cease and desist from a violation may obtain judicial review of such order by filing a petition for review pursuant to subsection (d) of this section. The filing of a petition for review under this paragraph shall not operate as a stay of the Secretary's order.

"(3) If the Court shall find after a full hearing of the facts, that the order of the Secretary was not warranted, such person shall be entitled to such damages as he has incurred in complying with the order.

"(f) Any person who violates an order issued pursuant to subsection (d) of this section shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of $1,000 for each day of violation. Any person who violates an order issued pursuant to subsection (e) of this section shall forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of $10,000 for each day of violation These penalties shall be enforced by the procedures prescribed in this section.

"(g)(1) The Secretary shall have the power to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses, and the production of all books, papers, and documents relating to any matter which is the subject of a hearing authorized by this section. The attendance of witnesses, and the production of books, papers, and documents, may be required from any place in the United States at any designated place of hearing. On motion of the Secretary or of any party to a proceeding before the Secretary, any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which an inquiry under this section is carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, issue an order requiring such person to appear before the Secretary (and produce books, papers, or documents if so ordered) and give evidence touching the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"(2) For purposes of enforcement of this section or of sections 112 or 113, officers or employees duly designated by the Secretary, upon presenting appropriate credentials and a written notice to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, are authorized (i) to enter, at reasonable times, any factory, warehouse, office, or other business or service establishment with respect to which there is reasonable ground to believe that it is causing, permitting, or otherwise responsible for discharges into air in violation of section 112 or of standards set under section 113 or that it is engaging in any act or practice which threatens such a discharge, and (ii) to inspect, at reasonable times and within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, such factory, warehouse, office, or other establishment, and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished materials, containers, and labeling therein, and all other things therein (including records, files, papers, and processes, controls and facilities) bearing on such discharges or on such act or practice. A separate notice shall be given for each such inspection, but a notice shall not be required for each entry made during the period covered by the inspection. Each such inspection shall be commenced and completed with reasonable promptness.

"SEC. 115. Nothing in this Act shall forbid the setting of more stringent standards for emissions or for air quality by any competent authority, or shall interfere with the enforcement of any other public or private remedies against air pollution. All remedies provided for in this Act are in addition to legal or equitable remedies now existing or which shall hereafter be enacted into law.

"EMPLOYEE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 116. (a) Payment of an unemployment allowance shall be made by the Secretary of Labor to an adversely affected worker subject to subsections (b) (c) and (d) of this section. Such payment shall be made upon a showing on the part of the worker that he was totally or partially deprived of wages due to the operation of subsection (d) of section 114 of this Act.

"(b) The unemployment allowance payable to an adversely affected worker for a week of unemployment shall be an amount equal to 65% of his average weekly wage or to 65 percentum of the average manufacturing wage, whichever is less, reduced by 50 percent of the amount of his remuneration for services performed during such week.

"(c) The amount of unemployment allowance payable to an adversely affected worker under subsection (a) of this section for any week shall be reduced by any amount of unemployment insurance which he has received or is seeking with respect to such week; but, if the appropriate State or federal agency finally determines that the worker was not entitled to unemployment insurance with respect to such week, the reduction shall not apply with respect to such week.

"(d) Payment of unemployment allowances shall not be made to an adversely affected worker for more than 52 weeks, except that, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Labor—

"(1) such payments may be made for not more than twenty-six additional weeks to an adversely affected worker to assist him to complete training approved by the Secretary of Labor, or

"(2) such payments shall be made for not more than thirteen additional weeks to an adversely affected worker who had reached his 60th birthday on or before the date of discontinuance of his wages.".

JIM ELDER, U.S. HEAVYWEIGHT PRIZEFIGHTER EXPRESSES OUTRAGE AND PROTEST AS TO USE OF CASSIUS CLAY AS COMMENTATOR IN BOXING CONTEST BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SOVIET UNION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to commend Jim Elder, U.S. heavyweight prize-

fighter, a veteran of the war in Vietnam, and a participant in the amateur boxing contest between the United States and the Soviet Union being held at Las Vegas, Nev. Mr. Elder has issued a statement of outrage and protest against the network who has announced they will use as a commentator for these contests, Cassius Clay. Cassius Clay should not be the commentator for an event of this sort because of the overt disrespect he has shown to this Nation and its people and I, like Mr. Elder, consider this an affront to loyal Americans everywhere, although it will obviously receive much applause in some of the hippy circles. Maybe the American Broadcasting System feels that they need to appeal more to the hippies and yippies of America for support than they do loyal Americans, who, without fanfare and at great personal sacrifice, carry out the duties which citizenship in this great land entails.

The people of America are becoming fed up with those who will take the fruits and benefits of this great country and yet are unwilling to share in the responsibility for its continued existence. Cassius Clay, because of the unique position he holds within the sports world and the obvious impact this has on the American youth, has by his refusal to do his duty to his country and serve in the Armed Forces, as many other loyal American youth have done, demonstrated that he is not worthy of the confidence which many have placed in him.

Jim Elder points out that the conviction of Clay is still being appealed by Clay in an effort to attempt to evade through legal technicalities the responsibility of his act. Jim Elder says this is an affront to himself and other participants in this contest. I would like to add that this is an outrage against the American public and that, as an elected representative of the public and a member of the committee which has jurisdiction over the FCC, I have today written a letter of protest to the network involved and advised them that I consider their actions to be an affront to all veterans and loyal Americans and an obvious attempt to build the image of Cassius Clay at the expense of those who build this country through the sacrifices they make, even though they may not want to serve in the armed services; they know their duty and they do it, while Cassius Clay is only interested in the amount of money he can make with no thought of the duty he owes to this country.

FACT SHEET ON VIETNAM

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

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, of late, critics of our policy in Vietnam have been saying that President Nixon's policy is no different than that of his predecessors. Nothing could be further from the truth. The White House recently issued a fact sheet on Vietnam refuting this allegation and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

FACT SHEET

THE SITUATION AS OF JANUARY 20

Military conditions

The number of U.S. troops to Vietnam was still increasing. (When the men on their way there on January 20 finally arrived, it reached an all-time high in February). We appeared still to be seeking a military solution.

Military operations were characterized by maximum military pressure on the enemy, through emphasis on offensive operations.

Progress in strengthening the South Vietnamese Army was slow; resources being devoted to this effort did not receive high priority.

Political conditions

We found only a general and vague set of proposals for political settlement of the war. While they called for "self-determination", they provided no specific program for achieving it.

Mutual withdrawal of forces was provided for under the Manila Declaration, which envisioned that the allied withdrawal would be completed within six months of the withdrawal of North Vietnamese forces and the subsiding of the level of violence.

THE SITUATION TODAY

Military conditions

We have instituted a Vietnamization program which envisages South Vietnamese responsibility for all aspects of the war—coping with both Viet Cong insurgency and regular North Vietnamese forces—even if we cannot make progress in the political negotiations.

We have offered the withdrawal of U.S. and Allied forces over a 12-month period, if North Vietnamese forces also withdraw.

We have declared that we would retain no military bases.

We have begun to reduce our presence in South Vietnam by setting in motion the replacement of over 60,000 U.S. troops (12% of total troops or 20% of combat troops.) This is a meaningful act of de-escalation.

We have emphasized to our military commanders the requirement that losses be held to an absolute minimum, consistent with their mission to protect allied forces and the civilian population. (Casualties in the first nine months of the Administration are one-third less than during the comparable period last year.)

Political conditions

For the first time, concrete and comprehensive political proposals for settlement of the war have been made:

We have proposed free elections organized by Joint Commissions under international supervision.

We and the Government of South Vietnam have announced that we are prepared to accept any political outcome which is arrived at through free elections.

We have offered to negotiate supervised ceasefires under international supervision to facilitate the process of withdrawal.

We have expressed willingness to discuss the 10-point program of the other side, together with plans put forward by the other parties.

In short, the only item which has not been declared negotiable is the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their future, free of outside interference.

THE REAL ENEMY IS THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST APPARATUS OPERATED FROM MOSCOW

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on two items in the news this week.

The Soviet Union announces a military aid grant in excess of $1 billion to its puppet government in Hanoi. Our business-as-usual friends around the world have hastened to condone this war subsidy.

France pledges friendship and cooperation to Moscow; Sweden tries to explain that its aid to Hanoi is not anti-American; India wants to improve relations with Hanoi if it can find a formula which will not diminish the flow of U.S. dollars to Calcutta.

The second significant development began in this Chamber last week when the Export Control Act was extended.

We missed a golden chance for peace by helping end the war in Vietnam when we refused to prevent Americans from trading with nations aiding the enemy. We extended a law which permits fratricide for profit and even hides the identity of those unscrupulous American merchants who apply for this type of Red trade permit.

The other body has now amended the Export Control Act to make such Red trade far easier than it is now, by reducing from 1,300 to only 200 the categories of goods considered strategic and by seeking to liberalize such trade without even the formality of export permits.

All Americans must understand that the real enemy is not the backward peasants of an insignificant puppet state but rather the international Communist apparatus operated from Moscow.

Russian-made armament is killing our men. To the extent that American exports behind the Iron Curtain relieves the pressure on the Soviet production system, Russia is free to continue to produce weapons for use by Hanoi. It is insanity for us to aid the enemy with our dollars and our national production machinery, while we ask our young men to give their lives in a no-win war which we pretend is to contain Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this body should recognize what other Americans are discovering—that many of the same people who work diligently to support international communism in trade and propaganda measures are the very ones who cry loudest for immediate peace—peace at any price—in Vietnam, as long as that price does not include forgoing the profit of Red trade.

I insert several news clippings following my remarks:

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 21, 1969]

RED ROLE IN VIETNAM NEEDS AIRING

(By David Lawrence)

How many Americans know who are the real enemies of the United States in the Vietnam war? Two governments have helped the North Vietnamese to kill or wound tens of thousands of Americans in the last five years. So, when an enemy boastfully and officially acknowledges the military assistance it is giving the Hanoi government, the item might at least be expected to make news for our front pages.

This correspondent read many newspapers last Sunday morning and nowhere found printed a dispatch distributed by the United

Press International wire on Saturday night which read as follows:

"MOSCOW—A North Vietnamese delegation led by Premier Pham Van Dong left Moscow Saturday to return to Hanoi.

"Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin and other officials saw off the North Vietnamese at the railway station. The North Vietnamese will visit Volgograd, the former Stalingrad, en route to Hanoi.

"The delegation arrived last Monday and during its stay signed a new agreement for Soviet military and economic aid to North Vietnam for the coming year."

Reuters News Service sent over its wires in this country yesterday afternoon the following dispatch:

"HONG KONG—Russia declared its readiness to give all necessary assistance to the Vietnamese Communists until they achieve complete victory in South Vietnam, a joint Soviet North Vietnamese communique released today said.

"The communique issued at the end of a one-week visit to Russia by a North Vietnamese delegation led by Premier Pham Van Dong said . . . Russia fully supported conditions put forward by the Vietnamese communists for a settlement and demanded the U.S. put an end to its aggression and withdraw its troops from South Vietnam 'completely and unconditionally.' "

Developments of this kind have, of course, been reported in the press hitherto when similar action was taken. But somehow the information has never been given attention inside the United States, especially by dissenters who have been engaging in antiwar "demonstrations" and are supposed to be readers of the news in the press.

Yesterday morning, some papers did print on the front page an Associated Press dispatch on the subject which said that, according to U.S. government sources, the level of Soviet arms aid to Hanoi has dropped considerably in recent months but that this does not mean "any abandonment of Moscow's policy of large-scale material support for Hanoi's war effort."

The North Vietnamese, of course, need less and less antiaircraft equipment now because the United States has halted the bombing of the North. Also, the ground war in the South has been slowed down. The Associated Press said further:

"According to estimates from U.S. sources, total Soviet aid to North Vietnam reached a peak of about $700 million in 1967, of which about $500 million was military and $200 million economic. In 1968, the year in which U.S. bombing of the North was cut back in April and halted entirely in November, Soviet arms aid is estimated to have dropped to around $300 million."

But while military aid is being cut somewhat, economic aid is climbing. Red China is estimated to be continuing its assistance at the rate of approximately $200 million a year, more than half of which is in military items, primarily small arms and ammunition. Communist East Europe has been providing about $145 million of aid annually to North Vietnam.

Why hasn't this information been emphasized throughout the country? Why aren't the American people told how much the Soviets and the Red Chinese have done to bring about casualties in South Vietnam year after year? Do the critics in Congress approve of a continuance of diplomatic relations with any government that is actively helping the enemy?

What has the Senate Foreign Relations Committee done about this problem? Committee members snipe at their own government for trying to protect American troops in Vietnam by employing certain forces in Laos, but criticism of Russian and Red Chinese intrigue in Asia is being omitted. An open debate on Communist participation in the Vietnam war would be more constructive than the so-called "Moratorium" speeches that have been made in recent days inside and outside of Congress.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1969]

SOVIETS SIGN NEW AID PACT WITH HANOI

Moscow, October 15.—The Soviet Union will supply additional military and economic aid to Hanoi under agreements signed here today by the Soviet and North Vietnamese premiers, Tass reported.

The official Soviet news agency did not disclose the amount of the new Soviet aid. Previous estimates by Washington have put it at more than a billion dollars a year.

Tass said the new aid agreements were signed by North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong and Soviet Premier Kosygin. Dong arrived here for talks Monday after attending 20th anniversary celebrations of the Communist takeover in East Germany.

Tass said the two premiers signed agreements on Soviet aid and "the granting of new long-term credits, as well as documents on certain other questions of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation."

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 23, 1969]

SENATE VOTES TO EASE TRADE WITH RED BLOC

Reversing a 20-year-old policy, the Senate voted 49 to 24 yesterday to liberalize trade with the Soviet Union and its allies.

Over the Nixon administration's firm opposition, it approved a bill cutting from 1,300 to 200 the number of categories of goods considered strategic. American companies are barred from selling strategic goods to Russia and East European countries.

The administration backed a bill, passed by the House, which would have merely extended for another two years the 20-year-old Export Control Act.

An attempt by (blank) to substitute the House measure for the more liberal Senate version was defeated, 44 to 34.

The legislation now goes to a conference committee of House and Senate members which will seek to reconcile the different bills.

(Blank) cited these examples of goods for which an export license was required under the old law before they could be sold to the Soviets—disinfectants, cement, vaccine, yellow corn, textile finishing agents, fabrics, herbicides and insecticides. Requiring a license for such sales, he said, carries the "inherent implication that such sales are somehow questionable if not downright unpatriotic."

The Senate action would limit the "strategic goods" list to those items having a direct military use.

(Blank) rejecting the administration policy, argued that it was self-defeating for the United States to refuse to sell to the Communists goods that every other Western nation sells to them.

"Other Western nations think it incredible that we're letting them have all this business," (Blank) said.

But (Blank) called the Senate measure, sponsored by (Blank and Blank) "a menace to national security and an unwarranted affront to the President."

The bill would take two important steps toward easing present curbs on East-West trade:

It would eliminate the section that bans such shipments if they contribute to the economic potential of the importing country.

It would lessen the government's power to prohibit shipments contributing to the military potential of the recipient if a similar item can be obtained by the Communist nation elsewhere.

Sponsors of the bill said, however, that the President would retain full power to bar items of military or strategic significance, goods in short supply, or shipments that might conflict with U.S. foreign policy objectives.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 20, 1969]

SOVIETS TRIM ARMS AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

(By Lewis Gulick)

The level of Soviet arms aid to Hanoi has dropped considerably in recent months, apparently because of the end of the air war against North Vietnam.

In reporting the downturn in Soviet military shipments, to a level perhaps only half of the peak flow in 1967, U.S. government sources did not see any abandonment of Moscow's policy of large-scale material support for Hanoi's war effort.

The Soviets still are supplying large amounts of petroleum, weapons and ammunition, trucks and transportation equipment, communications and other items used by North Vietnamese forces, the sources said. The Kremlin announced last week a new agreement with Hanoi for further arms and economic assistance. (The terms of the agreement have not been disclosed.)

But North Vietnam no longer needs the quantities of expansive surface-to-air missiles (SAMS), sophisticated radar gear, antiaircraft guns and jet fuel, or replacements for bombed items. Also, the ground war in the South has slowed down.

According to estimates from U.S. sources, total Soviet aid to North Vietnam reached a peak of about $700 million in 1967, of which about $500 million was military and $200 million economic. In 1968, the year in which U.S. bombing of the North was cut back in April and halted entirely in November, Soviet arms aid is estimated to have dropped to around $300 million.

In 1969, it is estimated, Moscow's military assistance to Hanoi will decline further at about the same rate. Thus, the current flow, as measured in dollar value, could be down to one-half the 1967 peak.

Meanwhile, Soviet economic aid to North Vietnam is reported to have climbed some, to perhaps $230 million in 1968 and $250 million this year, and to have shifted in line with North Vietnam's changing economic picture.

Moscow's economic help is believed now to include less food than before, but more material designed to rebuild the North Vietnamese economy. Items include plant equipment, machine tools and fertilizer.

Hanoi's aid from her other giant Communist backer, Red China, is estimated to be continuing at a rate of around $200 million a year. Somewhat more than half of Peking's assistance is said to be in military items, largely small arms and ammunition. She has also sent in much food.

Communist East Europe is another provider for North Vietnam, but on a lesser scale. U.S. sources figure East European shipments to Hanoi last year totaled about $145 million.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 10, 1969]

FRANCE PLEDGES AMITY TO SOVIET

Moscow.—French Foreign Minister Maurice Schumann arrived yesterday for a five-day official visit and pledged that France would continue its policy of close friendship with the Soviet Union.

Schumann is the first French minister to visit Russia since Georges Pompidou succeeded Charles de Gaulle as French president in June. His visit to Moscow follows one to Washington, and he seemed to confirm that Pompidou would follow up his scheduled U.S. trip in February with one to the Soviet Union.

Schumann said his own visit "certainly will have less importance than others which will follow" and stressed that France wanted "continuation" of France's policy of cooperation with the Soviet Union inaugurated by de Gaulle's visit in 1966.

Schumann is to preside Monday at the opening session of meeting of the Franco-

Soviet Grand Commission on bilateral cooperation and will be joined by Finance Minister Valery Giscard d'Estaing.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 22, 1969]

SWEDEN INSISTS RELIEF IS AIM OF HANOI AID

(By Henry S. Bradsher)

After arousing a U.S. threat of economic sanctions in retaliation for Swedish aid to Hanoi, Sweden is now emphasizing its intention to provide "humanitarian" aid to both Vietnams.

That means medical supplies, hospital equipment and similar aid through the Red Cross so long as fighting continues in Vietnam, with reconstruction aid being sent to North and South after the war ends.

The explanations were given by the Swedish foreign minister, Torsten Nilsson, and a delegation of the Swedish parliament's foreign relations committee. Both have been visiting the United States.

Nilsson aroused the threat by remarks on aid to North Vietnam made at a conference of his governing Social Democratic party. The explanations have been numerous since then.

Olle Dahlen, a Liberal party spokesman in the parliamentary delegation, told reporters yesterday that a decision of parliament May 21 banned reconstruction aid until after the war ended. Some humanitarian aid already has been given to both sides through the Red Cross, he said.

Nilsson met in New York Monday with Secretary of State William P. Rogers to discuss a wide range of subjects. He stressed the humanitarian nature of current aid.

There was a hint in the attitude of U.S. officials now that such aid would not force implementation of a restriction on the U.S. Export-Import Bank. The bank is barred from providing credits to countries sending material—any material, humanitarian or otherwise—to a country engaged in hostilities with the United States.

The Scandinavian airline SAS, of which Sweden is a partner, has been expected to seek big new Export-Import Bank credits to buy American jet passenger planes.

An official decision on the credit question is still in the future, however.

Reporting on the Rogers-Nilsson talks, a State Department spokesman said the Nixon administration has not yet decided whom to send as U.S. ambassador to Sweden. The post has been vacant for a year.

Swedes believe it is vacant as a sign of displeasure with Sweden's establishment of diplomatic relations with Hanoi. The State Department declines to comment officially on this.

The leader of the parliamentary delegation, Arne Geijer, said he believed it was wrong to keep the post vacant.

Geijer is both chairman of the foreign relations committee and head of Sweden's trade unions organization. He held talks here with President George Meany of the AFL–CIO.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 12, 1969]

INDIA'S TREND TOWARD HANOI DISTURBS UNITED STATES

(By Inder Malhotra)

CALCUTTA.—A slow, subtle but considered change in India's policy toward Hanoi is creating fresh strain in India's relations with America, which for quite some time have been remarkably free from strain.

Americans have reacted with unusual sharpness to the Indian decision, still at a stage of thinking aloud, to upgrade the Indian Consulate General in Hanoi to an embassy, thereby giving full diplomatic recognition to North Vietnam, New Delhi is also unwilling to accord similar recognition to the American-backed government of South Vietnam because of its instability.

On the contrary, while refusing to recognize the provisional government set up by the National Liberation Front, India wants to maintain some contacts with the Vietcong.

WASHINGTON PUT OUT

There are reports that, in response, Washington has issued thinly veiled threats that the change in Indian policy toward Hanoi could mean termination of American aid to India.

There is an American law under which the President is authorized, though by no means bound, to cancel and to any country trading or consorting with Hanoi or Havana.

It would be wrong to say that the reported American warning has not caused any concern in the Indian capital, but its immediate result has been to strengthen rather than weaken New Delhi's resolve to improve relations with North Vietnam.

The process of improving relations with North Vietnam began with Foreign Minister Dinesh Singh's visit to Hanoi for Ho Chi Minh's funeral. It is intended to carry it further quickly by restoring trade and cultural contacts between the two countries.

RADICAL CHANGE

This is a far cry from only three years ago when the Indian need for American surplus wheat was desperate and Americans made wheat supplies conditional on an embargo on trade with Cuba and North Vietnam. At the time, the Indian government said it did not want to trade with Hanoi for reasons of its own, not because of American pressure not to do so. With Cuba, there was never any trade anyway.

New Delhi's stand may have been partially influenced by Hanoi's action at the time. Although Ho Chi Minh was a great friend of Nehru and enjoyed high prestige in India, relations between India and North Vietnam soured after Hanoi sided with China during the Chinese invasion of India in 1962.

Some thinkers in the Indian Foreign Office as well as outside have been advocating closer relations with Hanoi for some time, but the government has only now taken note of the demand.

IGNORING IDEOLOGY

The government recognizes that India ought to maintain friendly relations with all nations geopolitically important to it, regardless of ideology. Hence, the decision to befriend the Shah of Iran despite his pronounced friendship for Pakistan and to open legislation in North and South Korea.

North Vietnam's importance is seen to be ever greater. It is on China's periphery. After the American withdrawal from Asia, North Vietnam's prestige will be high. Through a friendly policy it can perhaps be induced to be more nationalist than communist. Those who attempt to see far into the future also think that a post-Ho Vietnam may someday be a bridge between India and a post-Mao China.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 22, 1969]

QUAKERS REQUESTS FOR PRISONERS LIST REJECTED BY HANOI

PHILADELPHIA.—A Quaker sociologist on a mission to North Vietnam to deliver medical supplies and find out the names of American prisoners of war says he asked Hanoi four times for a list of American servicemen but the requests were denied.

Dr. Joseph Elder said yesterday he delivered $25,000 worth of medical equipment, including tools for open heart surgery, to the North Vietnamese last week. The 39-year-old University of Wisconsin professor spoke at a press conference at the American Friends Service Committee.

Elder said he took 250 letters and a shipment of vitamins for prisoners from American wives who believe their husbands are Communist prisoners.

Elder said the U.S. government had granted his license to buy surgical supplies abroad and had validated his passport for travel to North Vietnam.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 22, 1969]

HANOI AIDE IN PEKING

TOKYO.—Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam arrived in Peking yesterday, the New China news agency said today. The Hanoi delegation arrived from Moscow.

UNITED NATIONS DAY

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

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 1945, the United Nations Charter entered into effect.

Two years later on October 31, 1947, the General Assembly of the international organization unanimously adopted a resolution declaring October 24 from this day forth be officially called United Nations Day and be devoted to inform the peoples of the world of the aims and achievements of the organization and to obtaining support for its activities.

Member governments were invited to cooperate in the anniversary of its observance. In the United States the President annually issues a proclamation designating October 24 as United Nations Day and suggesting appropriate methods for observing the anniversary.

In Proclamation 3924 issued on October 15, 1969, President Nixon urged, and I quote,

"Citizens of this nation to observe that day by means of community programs which will contribute to a realistic understanding of the United Nations and its associated organizations."

He called upon Federal, State, and local officials to encourage citizen groups and communications media to engage in appropriate observance in cooperation with the United Nations Association of the United States and other interested organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order today to call attention to the fact that tomorrow is United Nations Day and also to call attention to a House concurrent resolution which I previously introduced on September 18, 1969, and which I reintroduced today with 30 cosponsors which calls upon the United Nations to declare this day as a permanent international holiday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my resolution be printed in the RECORD together with a list of the 30 cosponsors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

H. CON. RES. 367

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that October 24, United Nations Day, should be a permanent international holiday.

Accordingly, the Congress recommends to the United States Representative to the United Nations that he propose to the General Assembly the declaration of this day as a permanent international holiday.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, included herewith is a list of the cosponsors of the resolution:

Joseph P. Addabbo of New York.
Jonathan B. Bingham of New York.
Phillip Burton of California.
Shirley Chisholm of New York.
Jeffery Cohelan of California.
Silvio Conte of Massachusetts.
John Conyers, Jr., of Michigan.
Emilio Daddario of Connecticut.
John Dellenback of Oregon.
Bob Eckhardt of Texas.
Don Edwards of California.
Leonard Farbstein of New York.
William Ford of Michigan.
Donald Fraser of Minnesota.
Gilbert Gude of Maryland.
Seymour Halpern of New York.
Julia Hansen of Washington.
Frank Horton of New York.
James Howard of New Jersey.
Robert Kastenmeier of Wisconsin.
Robert Leggett of California.
Spark Matsunaga of Hawaii.
Abner Mikva of Illinois.
Patsy Mink of Hawaii.
Charles Mosher of Ohio.
Bertram Podell of New York.
Edward Roybal of California.
Benjamin Rosenthal of New York.
William Ryan of New York.
Louis Stokes of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, the idea of having October 24 proclaimed as an international holiday is not an idea which I conceived of myself. I would like to pay tribute to the originator of this idea, Miss Dorothy Schneider of Santa Barbara, Calif., who is an active and long-time member of the Santa Barbara chapter of the United Nations Association of the United States.

Miss Schneider over the last several years has communicated with a large number of leading citizens of this country and of other countries suggesting that the idea of designating October 24 as an international holiday be acted upon.

She has received truly a tremendous number of favorable responses to her voluminous correspondence. These favorable replies include many Members of Congress, the Secretary General of the United Nations, other officials of the United Nations, and a large body of interested citizens throughout this country. The idea of such an international holiday has been transmitted to our own Department of State by our own Ambassador to the United Nations, and is receiving consideration by the Department of State at the present time.

I would like to indicate my own very strong support for this proposal originated by Miss Schneider and supported by so many other distinguished citizens as one way in which we may indicate our own continued dedication to the ideals which were originally the basis for the development of the United Nations charter. I think that this is a method by which we can all in this country and in other countries of the world pay tribute to the strong, universal feeling that we are hoping to move toward a world of peace, one in which there will be a structure of international law strong enough to resolve the many issues which create conflict in the world today.

In my opinion, there are many other ways in which our country could give support to these ideas, and this suggestion of designating an international holiday is only one of those many ways, one which I would say has much merit from the standpoint that it is not an idea which would cost a great deal of money. It is an idea which would focus the attention of people all over the world on the contribution of the United Nations and, hopefully, upon the needs for strengthening the United Nations in the role which it has played.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GUDE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and would like to commend him for his leadership in sponsoring this resolution, which I am pleased to cosponsor. I believe that the need for an effective international organization devoted to the ends of peace has never been clearer. The tension and armed conflict in much of the world are evidence that the United Nations has not been able to accomplish all that its founders hoped, and United Nations Day is a fitting reminder that we need to renew our efforts to strengthen the United Nations as an instrument of peace.

It is appropriate also on this occasion to make special note that the United Nations provides a world forum where we can urge the community of nations to live up to mankind's best standards for human and national conduct. I believe it is time the United States went on record as supporting these standards worldwide by ratifying the Conventions on Genocide, Abolition of Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association and the Right to Organize. It is a continuing reproach to us all that no action has been taken to support these conventions abroad when we have long been committed to their implementation at home. I am therefore taking this opportunity to reintroduce a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States ratify these fundamental principles of good conduct in the world community.

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his contribution.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

I take this time to commend the gentleman from California for his leadership in this connection and also the gentleman from Maryland for joining with the gentleman from California in sponsoring this proposal that United Nations Day be made a permanent holiday.

Further, in other respects I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California and suggest too that today there is a problem of maintaining the International Court of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, United Nations Day, 1969, comes at a time when it is all too easy to catalog the failures and shortcomings of the U.N. and to denigrate its role in influencing major world events.

On the other hand, there is ample evidence that some of the unspectacular accomplishments of the U.N. have made the world a bit safer. It is also useful to recall that the U.N. still provides a common meeting ground for the most implacable of foes. When I hear criticism of the U.N. because of its apparent impotence, I can draw comfort from the fact that it has been in business as long as it has, and that, despite its obvious defects, has managed to remain a going concern—although it is not always clear where it is going.

If the U.N. is to be more relevant in situations which threaten peace, our own country will have to provide much of the initiative in adapting the U.N. to the needs of the next decade. Our motivation need not be altruistic, but admittedly selfish. If the United States is to avoid the role of world policeman, it is almost axiomatic that the peacekeeping functions of the U.N. must be revitalized. If the financial burden and responsibility for developmental aid is to be spread more evenly, the U.N. is the logical vehicle for this task.

It is my sincere hope that our Government is now preparing for a significant effort in the coming year to reshape the U.N. in order to make it more relevant to changing times. However, before we can presume to take the lead in the renovation process, I think that it is necessary to first show by our actions, rather than by sweeping rhetoric, that the present administration is firmly committed to a growing role for the U.N. in our foreign policies.

There are two small pieces of unfinished business which should be taken care of without delay. I believe that the administration should publicly announce its intention to move ahead with repeal of the Connally amendment and should also seek to improve our anemic average in ratifying the U.N.'s human rights Conventions.

Mr. Speaker, to date, I am unaware of the public enunciation by the present administration of its support for repeal of the Connally reservation. This reservation restricts our Nation's acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in disputes with other nations regarding "matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States as determined by the United States." This self-judging aspect of our acceptance of jurisdiction has created understandable doubt in the international community of the good faith of our declared intention to accept the jurisdiction of the Court.

It is relevant to point out that most nations which have accepted the Court's statutory jurisdiction have done so without similar reservation. On a more practical plane, it is also apparent that the vital interests of the United States are protected regardless of any action the Court might take because of the U.S. veto power and the charter prohibition against U.N. intervention in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

Before we can take part in the anticipated efforts to seek ways to expand the role of the Court, which, incidentally, has only one case remaining on its docket, and is in real danger of becoming moribund, we should make it crystal clear that we have enough faith in the Court's integrity and relevance to relinquish our right to determine when it

should have jurisdiction. Imagine the state of justice in any society if one side of a dispute could determine whether he wishes to be judged for his action. The rule of law in international affairs is certainly not advanced by the poor example being set by the most powerful nation in the world.

Our sorry record with regard to ratification of the U.N.'s human rights conventions also stands out like a sore thumb. Out of the nine conventions which the General Assembly invited all member states to ratify by 1968, we have ratified only one, and this one dealt with slavery. Speak about being cautious. It is a particularly sad commentary that the Senate has failed to ratify the Convention on Genocide which would commit us as a nation to the prevention and abolition of genocide. Equally disappointing is our failure to accept the Convention on Political Rights of Women, and the Convention on Forced Labor which prohibits compulsory labor for the purpose of political coercion or punishment.

On September 18 of this year, President Nixon addressed the United Nations General Assembly. In restating our international commitment, the President stated:

> The more closely the world community adheres to a single standard in judging international behavior, the less likely the standard is to be violated.

But this, and other praiseworthy declarations, were not accompanied by any promises of concrete action by our country. While the two preceding administrations have gone publicly on record for repeal of the Connally amendment and previous Presidents have sought Senate ratification of human rights conventions, we have no indication yet as to where President Nixon stands on these two issues.

It is important to note that our adherence to the conventions would neither detract from, nor enhance, for that matter, the human rights already enjoyed by American citizens. On the other hand, U.S. adherence would lend weight to efforts for the achievement of human rights throughout the world. This would be a desirable goal both from a humanitarian viewpoint as well as an essential, long-range step to establish the proper conditions for world peace.

I fully realize that the two items I have raised today are not terribly crucial and not directly connected with the more burning issues facing our Nation or the U.N. at present. But, these are matters which are meaningful to those of us who can appreciate the smallest steps in the direction of world order and who, by now, do not expect giant strides along this path.

The stature of our Nation at the U.N. would be raised just a bit if we made the small effort required to demonstrate our faith in the U.N.'s promulgations on human rights and in its Court.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include with my remarks a series of approximately 35 letters endorsing the idea of an international holiday on United Nations Day. These letters are from various distinguished personages:

THE SECRETARY-GENERAL,
October 25, 1968.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Mr. Hoffman passed on to me your letter dated 12 October. I think it is an excellent suggestion that United Nations Day, 24 October, should be proclaimed an international holiday and observed as such in all Member countries.

I hope that some Member Government will some day take the initiative to put this proposal before the General Assembly and have it adopted.

I am also grateful to you for your good wishes and kind sentiments.

Yours sincerely,

U THANT.

UNITED NATIONS,
New York, February 20, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for your letter of 12 February and enclosures concerning your proposal that United Nations Day be proclaimed an international holiday. It is a very interesting idea and I wish you well with it.

Yours sincerely,

RALPH J. BUNCHE,
Under-Secretary-General.

PERMANENT MISSION OF AFGHANISTAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
August 25, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
United Nations Association of the United States of America, Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Further to our letter dated July 25, 1969, in acknowledgement of your letter dated July 23, 1969, regarding your proposal to proclaim United Nations Day an international holiday.

I wish to inform you that the Government of Afghanistan has decided to support your proposal, and will therefore lend its support whenever this proposal is considered in the United Nations.

Sincerely yours,

ARDUR-RAHMAN PAZHWAK,
Permanent Representative.

UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH—UNITAR,
New York, May 6, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: I thank you for sending me a copy of your correspondence with the United Nations Secretary-General concerning your proposal for a permanent United Nations Day international holiday. I think the proposal is an excellent one and I am glad to note that the United States Mission is taking the the initiative to bring it to the notice of the Committee dealing with the celebration of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations. I simply cannot imagine anybody dissenting from the proposal.

Sincerely yours,

S. O. ADEBO.

PERMANENT MISSION OF GHANA TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., June 11, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MADAM: Thank you for your letter of May 31, 1969 forwarding correspondence with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on your proposal for a United Nations International Holiday.

Such expressions of interest and faith in the United Nations give encouragement to all who are dedicated to the task of making the United Nations an effective instrument for the maintenance of world peace and order. I find your idea of an international United Nations Holiday a fitting recognition of what the United Nations has achieved for mankind in the sphere of peace and co-existence.

The Preparatory Committee for the celebration of the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations, of which I am Chairman, has been concerned with the planning of an appropriate progamme for the occasion, and I am glad the American delegation is looking into the possibility of introducing your proposal there. I would be happy to promote interest in the idea.

Yours faithfully,

R. M. AKWEI,
Ambassador, Permanent Representative.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
March 11, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for bringing your proposal to proclaim United Nations Day a permanent international holiday to my attention. Congressman Teague and Congressman Edwards have also forwarded your letters to me.

Your expression of support for the United Nations is most encouraging.

I have brought your proposal to the attention of the Department of State. At this time, your suggestion is under consideration for possible inclusion in our proposals for the United Nations Twenty-Fifth Anniversary celebration. You will be kept informed of any decisions.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. YOST.

U.S. MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., September 10, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for your letter of August 30 enclosing copies of responses you have received regarding your proposal that UN Day be proclaimed a permanent international holiday. You have a most impressive list of supporters and we appreciate your bringing these letters to our attention.

As Ambassador Yost wrote to you at an earlier date, we brought your proposal to the attention of the State Department and we have been in touch with the Department on this matter since that time. We understand that Mr. Fred Blachly has informed you that the Department feels your proposal should first be submitted as a bill in Congress. Until there is some indication that the United States will declare United Nations Day an official holiday in this country, we are not in a position to make any recommendations of this nature to the United Nations.

We hope you understand our position.

Sincerely,

JOHN MCH. STUART, Jr.,
Senior Adviser, Public Affairs.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR DOROTHY: How nice to receive your letter of February 22. It was fifteen years ago that I saw you in Marrakech, and I remember the interesting visit that we had.

I am all for making October 24th United Nations Day, and you can pass that word along to U Thant or any others who may be promoting the cause.

I have been to Santa Barbara several times, where I see you are in residence. I am Chairman of the Board of the Center for the Study

of Democratic Institutions, and I see that some of the people you have on your sponsoring list for UN Day are Center people, so you must be well acquainted with our work there.

It would be nice to see you any time you are East.

Yours faithfully,

W. O. DOUGLAS.

U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for your letter of February 15, 1969, enclosing a copy of your letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Honorable U Thant, regarding the proposal that a United Nations day be proclaimed an international holiday.

I think this suggestion has considerable merit, Miss Schneider, and I would expect to support it in the Senate.

With every good wish, I am

Sincerely,

GEORGE MCGOVERN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 26, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for your recent letter and for the materials you enclosed concerning your proposal that United Nations Day be proclaimed an international holiday.

I appreciate having your views on this subject and commend your basic idea that people should be more immediately aware of the brotherhood of man.

With kind regards.

ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Your proposal certainly has merit.

I hope greater recognition of the United Nations Day can be promoted.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. FRASER.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR PEACE THROUGH LAW,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Many thanks for calling to my attention your efforts to establish an international United Nations Day. This is a splendid idea which I will bring to the attention of my MCPL colleagues.

Sincerely,

F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for your recent letter requesting United Nations Day, October 24, be proclaimed an international holiday. Your request is excellent and would well serve to unite Member countries in a better spirit of understanding the words "United Nations"; therefore, you may be sure I will give your proposal my full consideration and attention.

Sincerely,

VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senator.

OFFICE OF THE PRIME MINISTER,
Ottawa, May 12, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: On behalf of Mr. Trudeau, I would like to thank you for your letter of May 3, and express his appreciation for your very excellent suggestion. A copy of your correspondence has been sent to Mr. Pelletier, the Secretary of State of Canada, for his consideration.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM G. MORRIS,
Secretary.

NICOSIA,
September 8, 1969.

OPEN LETTER TO DELEGATES OF THE 22D PLENARY ASSEMBLY OF THE WORLD FEDERATION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATIONS

"Wars begin in the minds of men". It is not enough to construct and to maintain organizations for the prevention of war and for the building of peace, unless the minds of men and women throughout the world accept the necessity of using and strengthening these organizations. Books of information, inspired speeches, and all the vast methods of publicity are not likely to succeed unless year by year the eyes and ears and, through them, the minds of people in every country are reminded of the possibility of establishing peace in the world through the United Nations.

We, therefore, Officers and Honorary Officers of the World Federation of United Nations Associations, suggest to the Twenty-second Plenary Assembly of WFUNA to appeal to every Government to institute in its country an Annual National Holiday on the twenty-fourth of October in the manner most suitable to its national customs. In this way, by constant and regular reminders, the idea that the United Nations is the only means by which war can be ended, can become a permanent thought in "the minds of men".

Ales Bebler, President; Leonard F. Behrens, Honorary President; Ahmed Matine-Daftary, Honorary President; S. D. Pandey, Vice-President; Y. T. Lee, Vice-President; Jan G. G. De Geer, Vice-President; Anton Canellas, Vice-President; Jean Picker, Vice-President; Franco A. Casadio, Chairman of the Executive Committee; N. J. C. M. Kappeyne van de Coppello, Treasurer; L. H. Horace Perera, Secretary-General.

THE UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO, THE GENERAL SECRETARY,
Trinidad, West Indies, August 7, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MADAM: Thanks very much for your letter of July 10.

At our monthly general meeting held yesterday (Wednesday, August 6), we studied your proposal and it unanimously agreed to support you in your quest for a permanent United Nations Day International holiday.

We feel that by having such an international holiday on such a special day, would be a step towards bringing the nations of the world, one step closer. Then we as United Nations Associations would strive to make that day meaningful, so that it may be viewed as a day for and with a purpose, and not just another holiday.

Pledging our support and with every good wish.

Yours sincerely,

AINSLEY A. SAHAI.

UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA, FEDERAL SECRETARIAT,
Brisbane, Australia, September 30, 1969.

MISS D. L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Further to my letter of the 25th July 1969 regarding your proposal for a permanent UN Day holiday.

At a recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the UNA of Australia, it was agreed that this suggestion be referred to various Divisions (Chapters) of our Association for their consideration.

I wonder if you are aware that this matter was discussed at the 22nd Plenary Assembly of WFUNA held in Cyprus earlier this month and that the full resolution was carried unanimously:

"Item 8 (d): Consideration of Plans for the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations.

I. The Twenty-second Plenary Assembly of WFUNA.

Considering it essential for the future of mankind that all peoples become increasingly aware of the importance of the United Nations for the world community,

Considering that United Nations Day, the 24th October, offers an excellent opportunity for informing the public about the United Nations,

Supports the idea that United Nations Day be celebrated in all countries as a national holiday, adapted to the custom and culture of the people concerned,

Expresses the hope that the next UN General Assembly will adopt a recommendation in this same spirit, and

Recommends that all UNAs promote this idea in their countries."

Yours sincerely,

A. J. SYMONDS.

WORLD FEDERATION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATIONS,
Geneva, July 16, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: I am in receipt of your letter of the 8th July and the many documents which you have attached.

For the moment, I wish only to say that I am including "the declaration of UN Day as a public holiday in all countries" among proposals which I am making to our Assembly for the commemoration of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations.

With my kind regards.

Yours sincerely,

L. H. HORACE PERERA,
Secretary-General.

WORLD FEDERATION OF UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATIONS,
Amsterdam, June 25, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thanking you for your letter of June 18th concerning your proposal for a permanent United Nations Day international holiday, I must say that I think it is an excellent suggestion. From those who have expressed approval I know personally Mr. U Thant, Dr. Bunche and I saw Mr. Hoffman still in the beginning of this year here in Holland. I might give you this comment that getting the approval of the authorities to grant a holiday on all the schools on the 24th of October will get young people accustomed with the idea that there exists a world-wide organization. I know that there is nothing which makes such an impression on young mankind than getting a day free of duties. I therefore hope that you will be successful and it would be of great support for you when the American association would make a proposal in the circle of WFUNA in order that you would get world-wide support for your suggestion.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

WORLD ASSOCIATION OF WORLD FEDERALISTS,
Ottawa, Ontario, March 24, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you so very much for your letter of March 8 and the several copies of letters from prominent persons in the USA who support your "United Nations Day" proposal.

Yes, you most certainly do have my permission to say I heartily approve of this imaginative idea. In gaining a broad base of support for UN Day becoming an international holiday I think we should be guided in part by the problems encountered in advancing similar proposals. In addition to encouraging our World Federalist National Organizations to take action at the National level, may I suggest that we also encourage United Nations Associations, in the USA and elsewhere, to take a position on the matter. Contact with the World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA) may also be helpful.

Please continue to keep me informed of your continued efforts to achieve a "one world" holiday for men and women of all nations.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW A. D. CLARKE,
Secretary General.

PARIS, *July 2, 1969.*

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: I think it is an excellent suggestion that United Nations Day, 24th October, should be proclaimed an international holiday and obesrved as such in all Member countries, as it is already in countries such as Cambodia.

I hope that the General Assembly will some day adopt this proposal and I will submit it to the next meeting of the Executive Board of the French Association for the United Nations.

Yours sincerely,

G. GEORGES-PICOT,
Honorary President,
World Federation of UN A's.

UAW, INTERNATIONAL
AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D.C., July 15, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Walter Reuther has asked me to convey to you his thanks for having sent him, in April, the material relating to a proposal that there be created an international and permanent United Nations Day holiday, and his warm approval of the idea. The UAW will be delighted to work toward realization of this objective and we will do what lies within our means to build public support for it. We would be pleased, meanwhile, to receive from you any ideas which you may have collected as to what date cr dates might be most reasonably sought as targets, and what other organizations have expressed a supportive interest in the idea.

Very sincerely yours,

VICTOR G. REUTHER,
Director, International Affairs Department.

XEROX,
OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN,
Rochester, N.Y., July 23, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you so much for your note of the 19th and the enclosures. I think this is an extraordinarily good idea and have so written to Arthur Goldberg of the UNAUSA Association. I'm sure the efforts of the Association would be more meaningful than that of any individual member.

Sincerely,

J. C. WILSON,
Chairman.

AMERICAN TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.,
New York, N.Y., July 3, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for sending me copies of the correspondence you have received in response to your suggestion that United Nations Day be proclaimed an international holiday. It is heartening to note that so many distinguished people support this proposal. Certainly common observance of UN Day by the nations of the world would help focus attention on our common stake in an effective international orgnaization. I shall take whatever opportunities are afforded me to express my own support of such an observance.

Sincerely,

H. I. ROMNES,
Chairman of the Board.

DUKE UNIVERSITY,
RULE OF LAW RESEARCH CENTER,
Durham, N.C., February 28, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for your letter of February 22, 1969, and the enclosures. It seems to me that the proposal that the United Nations Day be proclaimed an international holiday is a meritorious one, and I shall certainly do what I can to support it.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR LARSON,
Director.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
CENTER OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES,
Princeton, N.J., May 5, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: I wish to acknowledge your letter of April 30, in which you set forth your proposal for a permanent United Nations Day international holiday.

This sounds like a good idea, and I wish you the best of success with your proposal.

Sincerely,

CYRIL E. BLACK.

THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Minneapolis, Minn., September 30, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: I have read your letter of September 25 with the six attachments.

I commend you for your effort to secure from the United Nations a declaration to set aside October 24 as an International United Nations Day. You have my permission to add my name to the list of those who support this proposal.

I wish you well.

Sincerely,

FREDRIK A. SCHIOTZ.

AMERICAN BAPTIST CONVENTION,
Valley Forge, Pa., September 24, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Thank you for your letter of September 20 and its enclosures. I think your idea of encouraging the United Nations to set aside October 24th annually as an international holiday is a good one and I will be glad to lend my support to your proposal.

Cordially,

EDWIN H. TULLER,
General Secretary.

NATIONAL URBAN LEAGUE,
New York, N.Y., June 27, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: I am sorry to be so late responding to your letter of May 30th and hope you will understand the delay was not caused by any lack of interest in your suggestion. In fact, I feel the idea that we proclaim October 24, United Nations Day, an international holiday is an excellent one and you may be assured I shall do all I can to try to advance it.

Thank you also for sharing the other correspondence with me and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

WHITNEY M. YOUNG, Jr.

THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH,
Los Angeles, Calif., September 19, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: I like your idea of a permanent United Nations Day international holiday. I am glad to add my name to those who support this proposal and I hope it is adopted.

Thank you for writing and may the good Lord bless you always.

Sincerely,

Bishop GERALD KENNEDY.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY
OF DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS,
Santa Barbara, Calif., September 15, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: You may add my name to your list of those who approve of your proposal for a permanent United Nations Day International Holiday.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS,
President.

BETHEL, CONN.,
April 1, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: Yor letter of March 8 has just come to the attention of Miss Marian Anderson, and since she is in Seattle, Washington, she has requested that I acknowledge receipt of your message, in order not to delay reply too much longer.

Regarding your proposal that United Nations Day be proclaimed an international holiday, Miss Anderson agrees, and says she thinks it would be an excellent idea.

She thanks you for writing and sends you her best wishes for a joyous and peaceful holiday.

Very truly yours,

ELEANORE M. FRIESE
(For Marian Anderson).

THE AMERICAN MUSEUM
OF NATURAL HISTORY,
New York, N.Y., April 8, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: In answer to your letter of March 8, 1969, I believe that making United Nations Day an International Holiday is an excellent idea. I would suggest that the plan include flying the UN flag, the flag of the country and any flag of any smaller unit, city or state or province, together. This would undercut some of the more extreme nationalistic demonstrations.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET MEAD.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 6, 1969.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: That sounds like a pretty good holiday idea; I will wait with interest to see if it can be established.

Sincerely,

ERIC SEVAREID.

ANOTHER MOTHER FOR PEACE,
Beverly Hills, Calif., May 16, 1969.

Miss DOROTHY L. SCHNEIDER,
Santa Barbara, Calif.

DEAR MISS SCHNEIDER: The Steering Committee of Another Mother for Peace has voted unanimously to urge that United Nations Day be proclaimed an international holiday.

Such an international holiday would provide a focus for people everywhere in the world to join in support of the United Nations as the world organization to which we all look as the forum in which nations can

achieve world understanding. It could also provide a means of strengthening the organizations of the U.N. through which much of the practical work of building peace can be done.

Another Mother for Peace would therefore be pleased to endorse a resolution offered by the United States or any other member of the United Nations to establish October 24 as an international holiday.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY B. JONES,
Co-chairman.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, next year will mark the 25th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter. In 1947, October 24 was designated by the General Assembly as United Nations Day. Such a designation has been applied to this date in our country, proclaimed as such by the President. House Concurrent Resolution 367, introduced by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), proposes that United Nations Day be declared a permanent international holiday. I concur with this suggestion and support his resolution.

It is my fervent hope that we shall all live to see a day when the United Nations shall command more respect in our country and the world than it presently does. Sad to say, this organization has lost the faith and respect of many Americans because of the arbitrary and prejudiced actions of a few. Nonetheless, this has not diluted the viability and meaning of the central principles upon which the organization was founded.

In many areas of nonpolitical endeavor, the United Nations is making a series of contributions to the well-being of all mankind which will be long remembered after mighty armies and bawling dictators have passed from the international scene.

It is also my hope that the United Nations will be willing in the future to resist the strong on behalf of the weak, particularly in the case of Israel and the Middle East. The strength of the United Nations is in its championing of mighty principles rather than seeking the favor of mighty states. Only moral force based on growing international respect will accomplish for the U.N. what military force will never do.

Therefore, I place my faith and endorsement in an idea which happens to be embodied in an institution. Leaders of institutions change and erroneous policies followed by such institutions change with their passing. Such shall be the case with the United Nations. Its dreams and concepts are too soaring and necessary to be sacrificed because of temporary unfairness of a few. I support the resolution in the humble hope that the U.N. will continue to espouse the cause of all mankind, even Israel.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, October 24, the United Nations organization will celebrate its 24th anniversary. And in many parts of the world, people will pause, recall the events which led to the founding of that organization, reflect on its accomplishments and its failures, and look hopefully to the day when, with the help of the United Nations, peace, freedom, and improved opportunity for human advancement will be obtained.

I believe that all of us can join in those expectations and in wishing the United Nations organization success in helping to make them a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to serve this year as U.S. delegate to the 24th General Assembly of the United Nations. The General Assembly is a key organ of the entire United Nations system and is meeting presently in New York City.

In my capacity as U.S. delegate, I have had a good opportunity to become better acquainted with the work of the United Nations and with the problems which confront that organization. The latter, I may mention, are every bit as big and challenging as the problems which face our Nation and the rest of the world community in the second half of the 20th century.

Yet in spite of those problems, and its own shortcomings, the United Nations is a very vital and important organization which can make significant contribution to the cause of peace and human advancement—if its member countries will allow it to do so.

With this and the approaching 25th anniversary of the organization in mind, I suggested earlier this week to the delegates of the 126 countries which belong to the United Nations, that all of our countries use the next 12 months to formulate some conclusions about the role that we would want the United Nations to play in the future.

We should consider where the organization stands today and decide both where it should go in the next 25 years and how it ought to get there.

After making those basic decisions, I believe that we ought to reevaluate the structure of the organization and its affiliated specialized agencies and adapt it to the new requirements which the member countries may impose upon it.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if all the member countries of the United Nations were to take those steps and agree on reforms necessary to assure that resources channeled through the United Nations may continue to be used wisely and effectively, then the 25th anniversary of the organization will be a truly happy and memorable occasion.

Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago Ambassador Charles W. Yost, the permanent U.S. Representative to the United Nations, spoke at a luncheon arranged by the Cincinnati World Affairs Council. He described, much more eloquently than I can, some of the realities of international life which make the United Nations a very necessary and helpful institution. I believe that his remarks will prove of great interest to my colleagues and I am, therefore, placing them in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR CHARLES W. YOST, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

As your representative to the United Nations I deeply appreciate the recognition you are giving here in Cincinnati this week—as others are doing in many parts of the United States—to the United Nations as it reaches the age of 24.

This milestone in the life of this international organization happens to coincide with a moment in our history when the concern of many public-spirited citizens is turning inward to cope with pressing domestic problems—those of our cities, of the aspirations of ethnic minorities, of the search by a new generation of Americans for a more meaningful life. Meanwhile, internationally, one single question—peace in Vietnam—a question to which for historical reasons the United Nations has been able to contribute little—nearly monopolizes our national attention.

It would scarcely be surprising, if, in the clamor of these urgent American concerns, the sound of the UN's 24th birthday party were almost drowned out. Yet if that were to happen—and if ignoring or shrugging off the UN were to become an American habit in future years—this would be an ominous development for our country and for the world.

I do not say this in any mood of utopianism, but in sober realism. After all, a part of realism is the ability to see beyond the ends of our noses. I suggest that, in our hard national interest, we must be able to look *beyond* Vietnam, *beyond* the urgent and glaring crises of the moment, *beyond* our own shores—and address ourselves to the world problems of the 1970's. Among them we will find problems that affect the future security and well-being of our country—but which, because they are worldwide in scope, we cannot solve by ourselves. In their solution the United Nations and its family of agencies must play an important and, in some cases, an indispensable part.

Some of these problems have long since approached crisis proportions.

1. There is the crisis of an ever-mounting global arms race, especially in nuclear weapons and missile systems, which heavily strains the world's resources and yet fails to bring security to either side.

2. There is the crisis of human fertility, which is fast causing the world's population to outrun food supplies, which is aggravating immeasurably all our other problems, and which, unless it is soon brought under control, threatens within our children's lifetime to visit famine and chaos on vast regions of the world.

3. There is the crisis of the poor nations, most of them recently independent, whose insistent demand for a better material life is one of the most inescapable realities of our time.

4. There is the gathering world-wide crisis of the human environment—of depleted resources, polluted air and water, disfigured landscapes, overcrowded and disorganized cities.

5. And, on top of all these, it takes no prophet to foresee recurrent crises of international violence—especially among poor and politically unstable nations—any one of which, unless there is an impartial police force to keep the peace, could draw the major powers into direct and fatal confrontation.

All five of these world problems—armaments, population, development, environment, peacekeeping—are, in one degree or another, direct concerns of the United Nations. All of them are recurrent themes in UN debates; some of them are the subject of major UN programs and negotiations. Yet it cannot be said that the United Nations, or the community of nations, has any of them anywhere nearly under control.

A few months ago U Thant, speaking from his unique vantage point as Secretary General of the United Nations, spoke on this subject as follows:

"I can only conclude from the information that is available to me as Secretary General that the members of the United Nations have perhaps ten years left in which to subordinate their ancient quarrels and launch a global partnership to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment, to defuse the population explosion, and to supply the required momentum to world development. If such a global partnership is not forged within the next decade, then I very much fear that the problems I have mentioned will have reached such staggering proportions that they will be beyond our capacity to control."

You will notice that the Secretary General estimates that the nations have ten years in which to act. That may sound like a comfortable cushion of time, but it is not. Our situation might be compared to that of a community that has to finish building a dike before the floods come. Whether the next flood will come in ten years, or twenty, or five, is a matter of educated guesswork at best. But building dikes is a slow business. Even with ten years to go, there is not a single day to be lost.

The "dike" of which I speak, of course, is the United Nations, together with all the international agencies and programs that promote its purposes. Next year the United Nations' 25th anniversary will be duly celebrated with speeches and commemorative ceremonies. But the observances that really count will be renewed efforts to make the UN a more effective instrument of peace and progress among nations, and a more reliable dike against chaos and disorder.

Those efforts, as U Thant correctly pointed out, must be made by the member states. The UN, after all, has virtually no power of its own. Its success rests entirely on the readiness of its members to put their power at its service, and to subordinate their parochial concerns to the common cause of a more peaceful and secure world.

No country has a more vitally important contribution to make to this process than the United States. All five of the world problems I mentioned have three things in common that we Americans should remember: first, if not solved they threaten our own nation; second, we cannot solve them alone; third, they cannot be solved without us. As a nation uniquely great in its wealth and power, and deeply committed to the ideals of peace and progress, our country simply must continue to bear its share of the responsibility for the UN's future development as an instrument of world order. Other members must also do their part; but they will understandably look for leadership to the American Government and people.

As for the American Government, I can assure you that its support for the United Nations remains firm. Last December, even before his inauguration, Mr. Nixon with Mr. Rogers paid a call on Secretary General Thant at the U.N. headquarters. Their purpose was to give evidence, as Mr. Nixon put it at the time, of "our continuing support of the United Nations and our intention in these years ahead to do everything that we can to strengthen this organization as it works in the cause of peace throughout the world."

The President's appearance to address the General Assembly on September 18 was a further reaffirmation of that American intention. In his address the President spoke frankly of doubts that have arisen concerning the future world role of the United States.

"As for the United States," he said in reply, "I can state here today without qualification: We have not turned away from the world."

And the President concluded this part of his address with these words:

"It would be dishonest, particularly before this sophisticated audience, to pretend that the United States has no national interest of its own or no special concern for its own interests.

"However, our most fundamental national interest is in maintaining that structure of international stability on which peace depends and which makes orderly progress possible."

During its first nine months, the Nixon Administration has adopted concrete policies aimed at precisely that national interest in the "structure of international stability." It deliberately and firmly moved, insofar as lies in its power to move, from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation. It seeks urgently to engage the Soviet Union in negotiations for limitation of strategic weapons and in negotiations to help settle the conflict in the Middle East. It proposes a greater emphasis on the United Nations Development Program and other international agencies as channels for American assistance during the Second Development Decade. It vigorously and concretely supports United Nations efforts to help nations grow more food and reduce their rates of population growth; to protect the world's threatened environment and to share the benefits of space exploration.

These are proofs that the United States Government remains steadfast in its support of the United Nations. However, much more needs to be done by our Government and other governments before the United Nations can even come close to carrying out the missions we have assigned to it. Of course the Government of our free society cannot exceed what the people are willing to accept. Your support for the United Nations, and for our country's more effective participation in it, is a vital necessity if it is to succeed and if we and our children are ever to live in a safer world.

In saying this I have in mind particularly our children. To one like myself, who has been associated with the United Nations in one way or another since the days when the Charter was being written, it is still hard to realize that this institution—possibly the greatest political innovation of the twentieth century—is no longer new. It is older than today's college generation; older than a great proportion of our men in uniform; older than nuclear weapons, network television, Communist China, the space age, and all of those looming crises I was discussing a moment ago. Unless the United Nations is capable of continuous self-renewal—unless it can face new problems, accept new ideas, new blood, new young people—it will become obsolete and irrelevant just at the time when humanity needs it most.

It is encouraging, therefore, to see that in the preparations for next year's celebration of the United Nations' 25th anniversary, there has developed a strong accent on youth. Plans are being discussed now for a World Youth Congress to be held at the United Nations next year, composed of representatives of the young people of each member state. There are proposals to increase the recruitment of young people as international civil servants in the United Nations and in an international volunteer service corps. And our Government has also supported the inclusion of young people in the delegations of member states to next year's General Assembly itself.

Long after the last shot in Vietnam has been fired, the great problems of the family of man will continue to demand the devoted efforts of leaders and citizens, old and young, in every nation. If, as we review the record of the United Nations, we find that the efforts made in that organization are not good enough, let us not forget that the responsibility for that state of affairs lies with us, the members. As Adlai Stevenson once said, it is a bad idea to mock the UN's weakness, for when we do we are mocking ourselves.

Let us then dedicate ourselves—as he did himself in his last years—to making the UN strong enough to carry out our purposes, strong enough to preserve our civilization from our own excesses, strong enough to create a world fit for our children and our children's children.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has not yet reached middle age. Next year we will celebrate the 25th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter. And as it rapidly approaches 30, thought an age worthy of distrust by some, I hope the next 6 years see the United Nations grow stronger and gain in the trust and respect it receives from our citizens.

We are all familiar with the historical arithmetic of the two world wars. Add 25 years to the year World War I ended, 1918, and we reach 1943. By 1943, World War II was already 4 years in progress if we date its start from the invasion of Poland by Hitler.

If we add 25 years to the year World War II ended, 1945, we reach 1970, next year. We cannot overlook the great tragedies being currently played out upon the international stage. But, world war III has not started. We cannot give all the credit, however much there may be, to the United Nations for forestalling another worldwide holocaust. But we can recognize, and do today during this special order, the great contributions the U.N. has made to establishing harmony among nations.

It is to acknowledge this success that I join with my colleagues in supporting the resolve that October 24 be a permanent international holiday.

One aspect of the United Nations rightly receives the most public attention. This is that the U.N. provides a forum in which nations in conflict can verbalize their disagreements rather than making armed crossings of international borders.

I certainly believe this to be the United Nation's raison d'etre. But I am also impressed by the performance of the specialized agencies of the United Nations. One of these, the International Labor Organization, was awarded the 1969 Nobel Peace Prize October 20. The ILO is the third U.N. organization to be honored in this manner. The United Nations High Commission for Refugees received the 1954 Nobel Peace Prize and the U.N. Children's Fund was recognized in 1965.

Mr. Phelps Phelps, former U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic and Governor of Samoa, recently sent a letter to the New York Times concerning the activities of the agencies under the Economic and Social Council. He expresses very well the deep respect I have for the activities of these agencies.

The letter follows:

U.N. ACHIEVEMENTS

To the Editor:

Many assessments of United Nations accomplishments, or the absence of them, will be made on U.N. Day, Oct. 24 this year—the eve of its 25th anniversary. Many may be expected to assert that the value of the U.N.—lacking power to implement cease-fires and peace—is questionable. In assessing only political aspects, the activities of agencies under the Economic and Social Council are often overlooked. Yet these have proved invaluable to underdeveloped or developing nations.

Among these agencies are the U.N. Development Program, which sent 8,000 specialists throughout the world to promote economic and social progress, and in association with UNIDO, emphasizes regional organization, industrial expansion and social advancement. These cooperate with the Food and Agriculture Organization for improving and diversifying agriculture in developing countries.

Also frequently overlooked are the activities of UNESCO in training and education, of UNICEF, concerned with the welfare and education of children everywhere, of W.H.O.

for its health activities, and I.L.O., now expanding in vocational rehabilitation and advice on employment problems: also UNITAR, aiding research in U.N. political problems and training of diplomats, UNCTAD with its programs stimulating all aspects of trade and financing.

Not the least are the activities of the U.N. Human Rights Committee, which has ratified this year the Convention to Eliminate Racial Discrimination, its plans on behalf of youth, and the rights of women, not only in work, but in marriage and divorce.

Many U.N. agencies cooperate with the World Bank, the I.M.F., IDA, and the U.S. AID programs to make funds available for utilities and industrialization.

Therefore, those assessing the U.N. should consider these social and economic accomplishments.

PHELPS PHELPS.

Jersey City, N.J., October 16, 1969.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

RELATIONSHIP OF SMOKING TO HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PREYER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year those of us who serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce spent several weeks listening to expert testimony regarding the relationship of smoking to health. I heard all of those witnesses and I have read and reread their testimony. This effort to get the facts convinces me that we have not proved either that smoking causes lung cancer and other diseases or that it does not.

As nonscientists asked to decide whether a legal product such as tobacco should be prohibited from enjoying the same advertising privileges as other legal products and, indeed, whether the Government might move to other actions against the use of tobacco, we need conclusive scientific evidence that tobacco is harmful. Yet these hearings left us with more questions than answers. For example:

First. Why is cancer of the windpipe almost unknown when smoke passes through it to and from the lungs and it has the same lining as the lungs?

Second. What are we to accept as fact when expert witnesses testified regarding nicotine that, first, it constricts blood vessels; second, it expands blood vessels; and third, it has no effect on blood vessels.

Third. Why is the lung cancer rate in England twice as high as in the United States although Englishmen smoke one-half as much per capita as Americans?

Fourth. Why does the Public Health Service blame cirrhosis of the liver on alcohol, and heart disease on smoking although their own 1964 study shows that the statistical association between cirrhosis of the liver and smoking is higher than that between smoking and heart disease?

Fifth. Why did the overwhelming number of witnesses who testified on the basis of their own research indicate that they found no proof of a relationship between smoking and health whereas almost all of the contrary testimony came from people who based their statements on the research of others?

Sixth. Why is it that the raw data on which one of the most serious charges—that heavy smoking will shorten your life 8 years—is not released for independent evaluation?

Seventh. Why is it that, according to the Public Health Service, smokers who have stopped smoking have more ill health than those who presently smoke or never smoked?

Mr. Speaker, these are only a few of the questions that disturb me. Only recently scientists revealed that a study in Europe of identical twins—where one smokes and the other does not—failed to indicate any difference in the death rate.

I am impressed that thoracic surgeons from throughout the country have written me and sent me articles written by their colleagues which say that, on the basis of their own surgical experience, they doubt the validity of some conclusions made in the 1964 Surgeon General's report.

Secretary Finch recognized this gap in our knowledge about tobacco and health when he announced several months ago that he was urging a cooperative research program on the subject.

Clearly, we need a new, unbiased, completely scientific study of the relationship between tobacco and health.

Today, I am introducing a bill to set up a commission to determine whether such a relationship really exists.

This Scientific Research Commission on Smoking and Health would consist of seven members—all scientists. Six would be named by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare—three of them nominated by the Public Health Service and three by the tobacco industry. Because the legislation would require that the three nominated by one group be acceptable to the other, we will insure a commission of scientists respected by both sides of this controversy. A seventh member would be a scientist nominated by the six members mentioned above.

This group of respected experts in science would hear all the evidence, would subject research and those who do it to the scrutiny of their peers and, I am confident, answer the questions that bother so many of us today.

It would be a group free to conduct its own original scientific research and it would be independent of HEW or any Federal agency.

It is an intelligent and a fair way to protect the interests not of any one group of people but of all the people.

HOPE COMES TO ABRAHAM KAHALOA THROUGH NAB'S JOBS PROGRAM

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend one of the most valuable training efforts that has been devised to develop our Nation's manpower resources: the JOBS—job opportunities in the business sector—program, sponsored by the National Alliance of Businessmen.

This is one program that has really proved its worth, and I hope that it will continue to receive the full and enthusiastic support of the administration and the Congress.

We lit a candle of hope for the poor and disadvantaged of this country in 1964 by the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act. In declaring the war on poverty, the Congress affirmed its belief that the country can only achieve its full economic and social potential when every citizen is given the opportunity to develop to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in, and contribute to, the workings of our society.

The JOBS program, initiated in 1968 by the National Alliance of Businessmen, involved the private sector and the Federal Government in a partnership to hire and to train the hard-core unemployed. This program represented the first major involvement of the business community in manpower programs designed to aid disadvantaged individuals.

The success of the JOBS program can be nowhere better illustrated than in the story of Abraham Kahaloa of Hawaii.

Star-Bulletin writer Russ Lynch has written an excellent article about Mr. Kahaloa's struggles to extricate himself from the welfare rolls, from debt, and from the ranks of the hard-core unemployed through federally funded job training and the job placement work of the National Alliance of Businessmen's JOBS program. Because of the opportunity provided by the JOBS program, Mr. Kahaloa is now on the road to providing a better life for himself and his family.

Thomas Wolfe has written:

> To every man his chance—to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this . . . is the promise of America.

The JOBS program certainly will help to provide the opportunity for the fulfillment of that promise. As we seek to convert welfare recipients to income-earning jobholders, hopefully we can see an expansion of the JOBS program to permit an even greater emphasis on finding work for young jobseekers and providing them with meaningful opportunities to share in the abundance and blessings of this great Nation.

I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the RECORD the article, "JOBS Is Hope for Abraham," from the October 9, 1969, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

JOBS IS HOPE FOR ABRAHAM

(By Russ Lynch)

Four years ago, Abraham Kahaloa of Makaha gave up his struggle against pressing debt collectors and for a year joined the hard-core unemployed on Oahu's Leeward coast.

He relied on locally caught fish and poi to feed himself, his wife and eight children—three more had already been adopted out to relatives—and clothed his family with what little welfare money he was entitled to.

Today, the same Kahaloa—equipped with a new basic education and skilled job training—is fully employed as a second cook with Hawaiian Tug & Barge Co.

He is still taking on-the-job training, enjoys his work, has traveled all around the Islands and to the Mainland with the firm's vessels and finally, at age 38, is on the road to a better life for himself and his family.

Behind Kahaloa's success in pulling away from the down-and-out situation he had fallen into is federal-funded job training and the job placement work of the National Alliance of Businessmen's JOBS (jobs in the business sector) program.

Plus, of course, a genuine desire to improve himself.

Kahaloa told the Star-Bulletin how he was attracted into the job training program and how he wound up in such a hopeful position with the Dillingham Corp.'s maritime subsidiary.

During his jobless period, he started going to Model Cities meetings in the Makaha area where he learned about job training courses available in Honolulu under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

He went through a six weeks briefing through the MDTA programs, looking around at industries and services in which jobs were available.

Then he successfully completed an 18-week basic education course at the Honolulu Community College.

(He had tried adult education evening classes before, but "couldn't learn anything" in the two hour sessions, "because by the time you go the next night you've forgotten what you learned the last time.")

He took the cook's training course at the Community College, still under MDTA programs, and was finally ready for the National Alliance of Businessmen's program.

The NAB's JOBS program placed him with Dillingham's maritime division, where he quickly became second cook on the Dillingham-owned oceanographic research vessel, M.V. Mahi.

Ironically, Kahaloa first approached Hawaiian Tug & Barge for a job when he was only 18, but due to a lack of education and no job skill, he was not accepted.

Now he is on the job, learning new skills by performing them under the guidance of Dillingham's maritime food service manager, Hubert White, and the more experienced cooks.

Also under White is another former unemployed man, Alexander Kauhola, referred to the MDTA training programs through the State Employment Office.

Kauhola worked in a Waikiki restaurant for a time after undergoing his basic cook's training and then moved to the Dillingham subsidiary to take on-the-job training like Kahaloa's.

Dillingham's maritime services hired 29 men referred from the NAB's JOBS placement program in July and August.

Part of the reason for the Dillingham Corp. support of the program, of course, is the fact that Lowell S. Dillingham, president of the corporation, is Honolulu metropolitan chairman for NAB.

But retired Adm. H. S. Persons, appointed by Dillingham as JOBS executive director, made clear that Lowell Dillingham's personal enthusiasm and that of other JOBS workers has spread throughout the community.

Since the JOBS program started in April, 1968, and through September, Persons told the Star-Bulletin, a total of 866 people had been placed in jobs. Of the 866, a total of 616 are still employed.

LEGISLATION TO SAVE AMERICA'S CRUMBLING COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY

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

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey has more than 100 miles of ocean front and an equal amount of bay front. Commercial fishing over the years has been one of New Jersey's major industries.

In recent years, however, while world fishing has increased, the relative position of the United States has declined, critically affecting the local fishing industry in areas such as southern New Jersey.

Last year the total fish catch of the United States was the second smallest since 1942. America's share of the total world catch of fish dropped to 5 percent from 13 percent in 1956, thereby moving the Nation to sixth place from second place in worldwide catch.

While America's annual production has varied little since 1945, the world catch of fish has increased more than threefold. At the same time, the United States consumes about 12 percent of the total catch, making it the world's largest market for fish. The United States now imports more than three-fourths of the fish it consumes.

As a resident of southern New Jersey for most of my life, I have found that our fishing equipment and methods are at least 40 years too old. Our fishing fleet is technically outmoded. The boats are too slow and ill equipped. Most of the small, independent fishermen spend at least two-thirds of the work day traveling to and from the fishing grounds. As a result, our fishermen suffer higher unemployment and lower incomes than other workers of comparable age and skills.

Because the U.S. fishing fleets are in such dire shape, we cannot adequately compete with Russian ships and other foreign fleets that increasingly work waters near the American 12-mile limit.

I think it is high time we realize that we are in competition with countries which are superior not only in methods but production. The smallest Russian ship is about twice the size of our largest ship in the commercial fishing fleet. Their mother ships house canneries and freezing units which can function effectively at sea for 6 to 8 months at a time. These foreign vessels are fishing off American shores and are taking a good many of the catches which should be found in American canneries.

The increase of foreign fishing in American waters has a related significance to sport fishermen as well. Tourism is New Jersey's No. 1 industry and fishing comes close to being the No. 1 sport for everyone, young and old, male and female. The disappearance of fishing as a sport for everyone could be a serious blow to the State's large resort industry.

There should be a special effort to sustain the fishing industry which many scientists believe to be the source of our major food supply in the years to come.

The two existing programs which involve the commercial fishing fleets; namely, the Fishing Fleet Improvement Act and the fisherman's loan fund, have suffered the last few years due to insufficient funds.

I am aware that the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has worked long and hard on this problem, conducting extensive hearings before reporting out the Fishing Fleet Improvement Act. This legislation which recently passed in the House of Representatives included provisions for a 2-year extension of the program, broadening it to include the reconditioning, conversion, and remodeling of ships, and authorizing an appropriation increase from $10 to $20 million. Because the Fishing Fleet Improvement Act, a semigrant program to cover 50 percent of the cost of constructing new fishing boats in the United States, has operated unsuccessfully for 8 years due to underfunding, it is my hope the funds requested by the committee as well as the administration will be approved.

The Fishing Fleet Improvement Act also includes a provision to extend the fisherman's loan fund for 4 years. This program was initiated in 1956 authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make loans for financing and refinancing the operations, maintenance, replacement, and repair of fishing gear and vessels and for research into the basic problems of the fisheries.

In 1965, the program was amended to remove the 3-percent annual interest rate and a formula was adopted to provide for an annual payment to the Treasury from the loan fund of interest on the cumulative amount of appropriations available as capital to the fund taking into consideration the average cost of all outstanding interest-bearing Treasury obligations of comparable maturity. In 1965, the interest rate was 4 percent. It was anticipated at that time, the interest rate would not rise above 5 percent.

On August 6, 1969, however, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries announced that interest rates on fishery loans approved by the Bureau would be increased from 6½ to 7½ percent.

In addition, the high interest rates charged by commercial lending institutions have led to an unprecedented demand for fisheries loans from the Department, requiring the Bureau to limit such loans to $40,000 per transaction.

The fisherman's loan fund is due to expire in June 1970. Presently, there is only $1 million left in the fund. A $40,000 limitation on each of the remaining loans which can be given this year would barely scratch the surface in paying for the extensive engine repairs and new equipment required.

To make a more effective program, I am introducing a bill in the Congress of the United States today to provide for a system of low-interest loans for the

construction of new ships and new equipment. This proposal would improve the commercial fishing industry throughout the country and also stimulate related industries such as the ship builders and suppliers. My bill would appropriate $50 million so that all worthy applications which have been turned down may be reconsidered and expedited.

I am tired of being Santa Claus to the rest of the world. On the surface, it sounds like a great idea for all the do-gooders to encourage the United States to spend American tax dollars on developing the underdeveloped nations of the world. However, it would sound better to me if for the first time we would try to improve and develop some of the underdeveloped American industries first. This I think is a step that should have been taken a good many years ago.

President Nixon, during the campaign, and Vice President AGNEW, during a recent speech in Miami emphasized the importance of improving and modernizing our fishing fleet, which the Department of the Interior has indicated could be done in the next 7 years at a cost of $210 million.

This goal could be accomplished by coupling the new provisions of the Fishing Fleet Improvement Act with the enactment of my proposed legislation.

I believe my proposal, which has also been cosponsored by two distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DELLENBACK) and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. POLLOCK), would improve the commercial fishing industry by making the necessary money available to those worthy applicants who have received less money than they needed, or who could not afford to apply due to high interest rates.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, the entire question of tax reform this year has filled many pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of newspapers, and of professional journals. An endless number of hours have been spent in public and private discussions on the topic.

The Janesville Gazette, Janesville, Wis., recently ran a lead editorial on the issue. It consisted of a letter from an anonymous taxpayer to the Internal Revenue Service. The Gazette reproduced it without comment because the letter is comment enough in itself. I would like to do the same. Therefore, without further adieu, the letter:

DEAR ETERNAL REVENUE: Enclosed is my tax form, all filled out as you requested. You will notice that I owe you $86.23 and you are probably looking around in the envelope for the check. Well, you can stop looking because it ain't there. Let me explain.

You will notice that you took out upwards of $1,000 on me last year, which is usually enough under ordinary circumstances. But what with the expenses of the war and all, the government had to have the surtax to make ends meet. That's what did me in, and that's why I owe you $86.23.

I was all set to pay up when I found to my surprise that I didn't have the money. I guess I have been throwing my money around carelessly on stuff like rent and food and clothes and doctor bills. All these nonessentials took about everything I made, and I didn't even have $86.23 left over for you.

Well, that put me in a sweat. I knew that if I didn't come up with the money, you might have to cut back on some vital program like foreign aid. Then I remembered that my congressman just got a big pay raise, so I figured I would put the bite on him.

I called him up collect, and he turned me down flat. Told me congressmen had to eat too, but he said beans and bacon was good enough for him. He said it cost a lot of money to live in Washington and he was pretty strapped himself. He did promise to give me his heartiest handshake the next time he was in the district, though.

I was pretty low by this time until I remembered an item I read in the paper about companies that don't pay hardly any taxes because of this oil depletion allowance. Now it happens that I got an old '57 Chevy that uses oil awful bad. I have been meaning to get it fixed as soon as I get a little money ahead, which probably will be never. But anyway, I thought I might qualify for that allowance because it uses so much oil. But I checked with your man here in town and he said no dice, bud.

So there you are. About all I can tell you is I guess I have been doing like the government and spending more than I make. They call it a deficit, and that's what I got. But my $86.23 is just a drop in the bucket compared to their $400 billion or so, and I hope you will look at it in that light.

I don't want to tell you how to run your business or anything, but why don't you give the government a call and see if you can't get my $86.23 added on to that national debt? I don't see where that little bit more would make that much difference, and it would be a big help to me.

I will keep you in mind and will send you the money after I get my car fixed, whenever that is. I hope you won't worry about it, because I would rather owe it to you all my life than beat you out of it.

Yours truly,

A TAXPAYER.

COAL DUST CAN BE REDUCED BY VENTILATION AT THE FACE

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, some dramatic progress has been made in the reduction of coal dust through the use of high pressure axial flow fans. The Bureau of Mines has reported some extremely useful experiments, the results of which demonstrate that we are not being overoptimistic in our efforts to bring the coal dust levels in the pending coal mine health and safety legislation down to progressively lower amounts. In fact, I feel that the results of these Bureau of Mines experiments give support to the provisions of an amendment I support to require coal miners affected by the beginning stages of pneumoconiosis to be moved to an area where the respirable coal dust level is no more than 1.0 milligrams per cubic meter of air. The report follows:

THE EFFECT OF VENTILATION ON RESPIRABLE COAL MINE DUST

Recent experiments by the Bureau of Mines have indicated that increasing the ventilation rate and controlling the air flow pattern across the face would result in lower concentrations of respirable dust. This concept was also in accordance with the theory of small dust particle behavior and air motion.

To demonstrate the effectiveness of control ventilation, high pressure axial flow fans have been used in three mines, the Pittsburgh, Sewickley, and Pocohontas Seams. By maintaining air velocities between 70 and 100 feet per minute across the coal face, it was demonstrated that significant reductions in the concentration of respirable dust could be attained. In the mine in the Pittsburgh Seam, the average dust concentration was reduced from 5.72 to 2.56 mg/m³ or a reduction of 65 percent. In the Sewickley Seam the mine had existing dust control procedures somewhat better than that normally encountered in coal mines. Here it was possible to reduce the dust concentration from 3.0 to 0.66 mg/m³ or a reduction of 78 percent. In the latter case, however, there had been some reduction in production between the baseline experiment and the control experiment. However, when a correction for production deficiencies is made, the dust concentration would still be less than 1 mg/m³.

In the Pocohontas Seam a dramatic reduction was not attained. This particular seam is very friable and dust control is known to be a difficult task. Additionally, the incoming air was badly contaminated. However, under these adverse circumstances, it was possible to reduce the average dust concentration from 5.6 mg/m³ to 3.5 mg/m³.

Further studies are being planned and executed in other coal mines and the Bureau of Mines is purchasing an additional axial flow fan for experimental purposes.

Based on these limited studies, it would appear that it should be possible after further experience in mines using controlled ventilation, to reduce the respirable dust concentration to a value of 3 mg/m³ and, in time, in certain mines to an even lower value. These calculations were based on the production rate of the mines. In the case of the Pittsburgh Seam experiment, production was approximately 500 tons per shift. In the other two seams, the production rate was approximately 200 tons per shift. It has not been possible as yet to study the effect of increased production on dust concentrations while maintaining the desired air flow across the face.

It is evident that before the results summarized herein can be generally applied, it will be necessary to develop equipment not now available to the industry, permit industry time to set up production facilities to manufacture this equipment, and to assure its distribution throughout the industry. More important, time is required to develop skills on the part of operators of mining machines and similar equipment which they do not now possess. We have found that one of the most sensitive factors in attaining low dust levels is the skill and attitude of the machine operator. In short, the best known technology is not a match for a poorly operated machine.

FEELING OF PRIDE IN PUBLIC EXPRESSIONS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON MATTERS OF GREAT IMPORTANCE IN OUR NATION

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

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, I know that many loyal Americans share with me a deep feeling of pride in the Vice President of the United States for his recent public expressions on matters of great importance in our Nation. Mr.

AGNEW has demonstrated with great firmness and clarity that he believes in a strong America moving forward in all areas and yet mindful of the sincere wishes of her people—both the sometimes silent majority, as well as the vocal minority.

Our Vice President has spoken out in criticism of the leadership and objectives of the Vietnam Moratorium Day Committee and further movement of this kind, and it was not unexpected that this would aggravate those of whom he spoke.

Some members of the news media and other supporters of the October 15 demonstrations now cry "foul" and "shame" and attempt to deride and ridicule him and his position. Mr. Speaker, I would remind these people that less than 1 percent—by even the most liberal estimate—of the citizens of our great Nation have participated in these demonstrations of dissent which are dividing us. The vast and overwhelming majority at least are willing to support our Government. It would seem to me that by all reasonable standards, these so-called demonstrations should be directed at the Communists and not at our own Government.

Mr. Speaker, I would take this opportunity then to commend Vice President AGNEW for expressing his convictions in the forthright manner that he has, and I assure him that there are many of us who share those same feelings. It is a source of encouragement to me that someone in the high office of Vice President of the United States will stand up to "tell it like it really is" for all to hear.

OIL DEPLETION ALLOWANCE

(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, today, the Senate Finance Committee recommended a 4½-percent reduction in the oil depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 23 percent on both foreign and domestic production. The action of the Senate Finance Committee is totally unacceptable to those who had reasonable expectations and hopes of tax reform. A reduction in the depletion allowance to 23 percent is no tax reform at all since 23 percent is the average utilization of the present depletion allowance. The law provides so many other gimmicks that a 23-percent allowance represents the average needs of the oil producing industry.

It is absolutely incredible that the Senate Finance Committee should have restored the privilege of the depletion allowance for the benefit of American investors involved in the production of oil outside of the United States.

There is no rational legislative reason for extending the privilege of the depletion allowance to foreign produced oil. The combination of the depletion allowance and the foreign tax credit have made most of these profits tax free.

These tax-free profits of American investment in foreign oil have corrupted and misdirected American foreign policy in many oil-rich countries. This has resulted in American policies of costly military assistance in support of temporary rulers who will undoubtedly be removed when their people find out what is going on. There is no reason for the American taxpayer to subsidize these activities.

The action of the Senate Finance Committee on oil depletion and other vital provisions of the tax bill make a sham of tax reform.

I hope that the average taxpayer will watch what is going on and remember who done him in.

REEXAMINATION URGED OF THE ROLE OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO ITS CONSTITUTIONAL POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY TO DECLARE WAR

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

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge a reexamination of the role of Congress with respect to our constitutional power and responsibility to declare war. I am particularly concerned with the role of Congress in the commencement, maintenance, and eventual termination of the policy of U.S. military assistance in Southeast Asia.

It represents no lack of confidence in our President or his present policies for Congress to carefully reexamine its own role in the conduct of our Vietnam policy. A resolution has been signed by 108 of us, supporting the President in his expressed determination to withdraw our remaining ground combat forces in Vietnam at the earliest practicable date. I believe that the President has, and deserves, broad bipartisan support in his efforts to reduce our massive military efforts in Vietnam while yet giving to the present Saigon government every reasonable opportunity to protect those of its people who desire such protection.

The President necessarily has the primary control over foreign policy. As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, he may be called upon from time to time to make decisions which cannot await the deliberations of Congress.

Nevertheless, it is the primary responsibility of Congress, not the President, to determine the Nation's spending priorities, to raise armies, and to initiate the revenue measures which support such armies. Perhaps most important of all, the Constitution reposes in Congress, not the President, the sole power to declare war.

On August 10, 1964, by the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, Congress abdicated this power, delegating to the President the power to resist aggression with armed force in Vietnam. Later that same resolution was cited by President Johnson as his authority to escalate U.S. action in Vietnam to the level of a major war, requiring expenditures of approximately $30 billion per year. In conducting this war, it is possible that the United States has been led unwittingly into achievement of one of the earliest goals of communism, to wit: involvement of the capitalist countries in insurgency wars in distant lands, thereby endangering their economic stability and strength.

Under the Gulf of Tonkin resolution we now find ourselves bogged down in an infantry war 8,000 miles from home, in a country where winning of that war rests not on American abilities, resources or will, but rather on the nationalistic spirit and will to fight of two competing groups of Vietnamese.

That war costs us $30 billion per year; it costs the Russians and Chinese less than $2 billion per year. That war has endangered the stability of the American economy; it has been the major contributing cause of a spiraling inflation which has badly hurt large segments of our own population, as well as diminished our ability to effectively compete in international trade. Yet that war is undeclared. Congress has no more than acquiesced in the successive decisions of two Presidents, President Johnson's decision to escalate; President Nixon's decision to deescalate with such deescalation predicated upon conditions which only North Vietnam or South Vietnam can meet.

Our policy has never been to militarily defeat the North Vietnamese. Our military mission has been to assist in protecting South Vietnam from an insurgency of its own people and from intrusion of North Vietnamese army personnel from the north. Our hope, since 1954, has been that with enough assistance the South Vietnamese would be able to form a new nation and that the stamina and perseverance of our own forces would cause the North Vietnamese and Vietcong to suffer a decline in their ability to conduct a successful war in the south. Our military men have been instructed to assist the South Vietnamese Army. Our civilian personnel have been instructed to "build a new nation."

With these national policies in effect, it is quite clear that individuals instructed to carry out those policies have either been unable or unwilling to fairly apprise their superiors or the American public of their chances of ultimate success. Even today, there are no American military and State Department officials whom I have found willing to say that the South Vietnamese can "go it alone" 5 years from now if all U.S. combat forces are withdrawn. Both military and State Department leaders will say, "It is possible that the South Vietnamese can make it on their own but only if there is no aggression from the north." There is, of course, no way we can stop aggression from the north so long as the North Vietnamese stand firm in the resolve expressed 23 years ago in their Declaration of Independence.

Long ago we recognized that the geography and terrain of South Vietnam, a country some 800 miles in length with jungle cover for innumerable penetration routes from the north and west, would allow aggression from the north so long as the nationalistic will of the Vietnamese continued. General Westmoreland conceded in 1967 that closing the port of Haiphong and full-scale bombing of the north with conventional weapons could not prevent the North Vietnamese from continuing indefinitely the type of war they were then conducting in South Vietnam.

It seems clear that the North Viet-

namese and Vietcong learned from the Tet offensive in 1968, as General Washington learned in the early battles of the Revoluntionary War, that guerrilla forces could not necessarily afford pitched battles with the superior firepower, mobility, and discipline of regular troops. Consequently, since the summer of 1968, we have seen General Giap's forces withdrawing to a policy of limited infantry contact with an emphasis on attack by rocket and ambush. They have carefully husbanded their forces with the result that today, in October 1969, there are estimated to be more combat personnel of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese located in South Vietnam and along the Laotian and Cambodian borders than there were a year ago. There is no indication whatsoever that the North Vietnamese and Vietcong have abandoned their fight or their steadfast intention to continue the fight until the last foreign forces have left the country. Vietnam is one country, not two. The slogan "Vietnam for the Vietnamese" appears to be as important to these people as the Monroe Doctrine has been to the American people.

In my judgmcnt, then, there is no indication that the preservation of 500,000, 300,000, or 100,000 troops in South Vietnam will materially affect the ultimate question which must be answered: Can 17 million South Vietnamese, with nearly 900,000 men under arms and the finest equipment and training that America can provide, build a nation and withstand the aggression of the North Vietnamese, a nation of 16 million armed with the best equipment and material which can be supplied by Russia and China? The answer to this question does not lie in how long American forces remain in Vietnam; it lies in whether or not the will to fight and to create a new nation in South Vietnam is equal to the nationalism and will to fight of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong. This war can be won or lost only by Vietnamese, not by Americans.

For these reasons, and because of the tremendous adverse effects of this war on America, its institutions, and its people, it is my belief that the Congress of the United States should forthwith vote to rescind the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, effective December 31, 1970; that we should commend President Nixon for the substantial reduction in ground combat forces he has already directed and suggest to the President that our remaining combat forces be withdrawn at the earliest practicable date consistent with the safety of American troops and those South Vietnamese who desire to retire behind the shield of the South Vietnamese Army or to seek sanctuary elsewhere. I would further propose that we seek the assistance of the United Nations—and other nations in creating a free city or sanctuary zone in South Vietnam which would be protected by neutral Asian forces under the direction of an international commission or the United Nations itself. The purpose of this free city or sanctuary zone would be to provide safety to those Vietnamese who would fear retribution in the event of a change in the present government of South Vietnam, or by reason of the nature of the government which will hopefully one day govern a unified Vietnam.

I would further propose, in order that such a free city or sanctuary zone not prevent ultimate unification of all of Vietnam, that such city or zone be of limited duration, its government to be assumed after a fixed period of years by the government which then has jurisdiction over the terrain surrounding such sanctuary zone.

It is with these sentiments, Mr. Chairman, that I place in the RECORD at this point the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of August 10, 1964, and today introduce, for the consideration of the House, a resolution to amend the Gulf of Tonkin resolution, terminating its authority, effective December 31, 1970.

The above-mentioned material follows:

GULF OF TONKIN RESOLUTION

Maintenance of International Peace and Security in Southeast Asia

Pub. L. 88-408, Aug. 10, 1964, 78 Stat. 384, provided that:

"Whereas naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace; and

"Whereas these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression that the Communist regime in North Vietnam has been waging against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom; and

"Whereas the United States is assisting the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these peoples should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.

"SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

"SEC. 3. This resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise, except that it may be terminated earlier by concurrent resolution of the Congress."

H. CON. RES. 426

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia," approved August 10, 1964 (78 Stat. 384; Public Law 88-408), is hereby terminated as of December 31, 1970, pursuant to the authority of Section 3 of such joint resolution, except that such joint resolution may be extended by concurrent resolution of the Congress prior to December 31, 1970.

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Button, Mr. Gude, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Mosher, and Mr. Reigle.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADAMS, for October 23 through October 27, on account of official business.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. CELLER), for October 23, on account of official business.

Mr. MONAGAN, for October 27 through November 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. SANDMAN, for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES); and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. MATSUNAGA, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 60 minutes, on November 5.

Mr. RYAN, for 60 minutes, on November 5.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALPERN during the debate on the Anderson of Illinois amendment under the 5-minute rule on H.R. 13827.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANDGREBE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.
Mr. PETTIS.
Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia.
Mr. MCKNEALLY in three instances.
Mr. ZWACH.
Mr. HORTON.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.
Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.
Mr. KLEPPE.
Mr. DERWINSKI.
Mr. LUKENS in two instances.
Mr. CONTE.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts in two instances.
Mr. HALPERN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STOKES) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. GIAIMO.
Mr. DE LA GARZA in two instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in three instances.
Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in three instances.
Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.
Mr. STOKES in three instances.
Mr. PEPPER.
Mr. OLSEN in two instances.
Mr. RYAN in four instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.
Mr. MURPHY of New York.
Mr. FASCELL in two instances.
Mr. HUNGATE.
Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.
Mr. MATSUNAGA.
Mr. MANN.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.
Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.
Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.
Mr. CAREY in two instances.
Mr. HANNA in two instances.
Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.
Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia in two instances.
Mr. MELCHER in two instances.
Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 27, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1277. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program and selected manpower programs under titles I and II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Los Angeles County, Calif., Office of Economic Opportunity, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1278. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on foreign aid provided through the operations of the U.S. Sugar Act and the International Coffee Agreement, Department of Agriculture, Department of State, and Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1279. A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting the annual audit of the club for 1968–69, pursuant to law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 13565. A bill to validate certain deeds improperly acknowledged or executed (or both) that are recorded in the land records of the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 13837. A bill to amend the Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, 1928, to revise the composition of the Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 9257. A bill to amend the code of laws of the District of Columbia with respect to facilities for the parking or storage of motor vehicles; with amendments (Rept. No. 91–591). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 12673. A bill to authorize the transfer by licensed blood banks in the District of Columbia of blood components within the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 91–592). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia, H.R. 13564. A bill to provide that in the District of Columbia one or more grantors in a conveyance creating an estate in joint tenancy or tenancy by the entireties may also be one of the grantees; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–593). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Census and Statistical Systems of Certain Countries in Europe. (Rept. No. 91–594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 966. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 91–595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 14474. A bill to extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 14475. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 14476. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 14477. 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. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 14478. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe rules, regulations, and performance and other standards as he finds necessary for all areas of railroad safety and to conduct railroad safety research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mrs. MINK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. KOCH, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. ADDABBO, and Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD):

H.R. 14479. A bill to authorize the appropriation of increased annual amounts for the conduct of research by the Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse in the National Institute of Mental Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. HARRINGTON):

H.R. 14480. A bill to authorize the appropriation of increased annual amounts for the conduct of research by the Division of Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse in the National Institute of Mental Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUNT:

H.R. 14481. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 14482. A bill to protect interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the movement in such commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14483. A bill to provide that the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York shall be held at Brooklyn, Mineola, and Hempstead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 14484. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for the adoption of national standards governing emissions from stationary sources, to create a Federal duty not to pollute the atmosphere, to provide additional public and private remedies for the abatement of air pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 14485. A bill to amend sections 501 and 504 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the law relating to the counterfeiting of postage meter stamps or other improper uses of the metered mail system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 14486. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to extend the regional medical health program through fiscal year 1973, to broaden the scope of program to include all major diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 14487. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 35-percent benefit increase with a $100 minimum and subsequent cost-of-living increases, to improve the computation of benefits and eligibility therefor, to raise the earnings base, to eliminate the actuarial reduction and lower the age of entitlement, to provide optional coverage for Federal employees, and to liberalize the retirement test; to amend title XVIII of such act to reduce to 60 the age of entitlement to medicare benefits and make such benefits available to the disabled without regard to age, to provide coverage for certain governmental employees, and to include prescription drugs under the supplementary medical benefits program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 14488. A bill to protect interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the movement in such commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 14489. A bill to authorize and foster joint rates for international transportation of property, to facilitate the transportation of such property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. BOW, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CULVER, Mr. ESCH, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MANN, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 14490. A bill to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 14491. A bill to authorize the disposal of nickel from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIESTER (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. WHITE):

H.R. 14492. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to authorize elderly persons to exchange food stamps under certain circumstances for meals prepared and served by private nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 14493. A bill to direct the Commission of Fine Arts to study and recommend the establishment of an appropriate memorial in the District of Columbia in honor of Benjamin Henry Boneval Latrobe; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. REES, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 14494. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 14495. A bill making certain congressional findings and a determination of the need for a demonstration project dealing comprehensively with urban environmental pollution problems, and authorization of such a project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 14496. A bill to strengthen voluntary agricultural organizations, to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 14497. A bill to authorize the construction of a water intake facility at Quincy, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 14498. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to retrocede to the State of Arkansas the legislative jurisdiction now exercised by the United States over lands comprising a portion of Fort Chaffee, Ark., and which are necessary for the operation, maintenance, and public use of lock and dam No. 13, Arkansas River project, a civil works project of the Corps of Engineers near Fort Smith, Ark.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 14499. A bill to enact the Dangerous Drug Control Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. KOCH, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. NIX, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. REES, and Mr. MINISH):

H.R. 14500. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. CAREY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ST. ONGE, and Mr. MADDEN):

H.R. 14501. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STOKES (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HICKS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. VANIK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. RYAN, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 14502. A bill to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, to authorize advance funding of such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 14503. A bill to protect interstate and foreign commerce by prohibiting the movement in such commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCCLOSKEY:

H.R. 14504. A bill to extend to every person classified or processed under the Selective Service Act the right to legal counsel to the end that the rights and privileges afforded under law may be known and secured; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 14505. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 14506. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe rules, regulations, and performance and other standards as he finds necessary for all areas of railroad safety and to conduct railroad safety research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 14507. A bill to establish uniform voter qualifications and registration procedures in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 14508. A bill to remove any requirement of consecutive days of service during World War I with respect to the eligibility of veterans of World War I for benefits under title 38 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 14509. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDMAN (for himself, Mr. DELLENBACK, and Mr. POLLOCK):

H.R. 14510. A bill to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make low-interest loans for the financing and refinancing of new and used fishing vessels and increase the capital available for such loans; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 14511. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide candidates for congressional offices with certain opportunities to purchase broadcast time from television broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 14512. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 966. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.J. Res. 967. 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. HUNGATE:

H.J. Res. 968. 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. PREYER of North Carolina:

H.J. Res. 969. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a commission by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review and assess all available data on smoking and health including the carrying on of original scientific research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H.J. Res. 970. Joint resolution to supplement the joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 in order to provide for carrying out programs and projects, and for payments to State educational agencies and local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, and other educational agencies and organizations, based upon appropriation levels as provided in H.R. 13111 which passed the House of Representatives July 31, 1969, and entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 971. 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. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BURTON of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DELLENBACK, Mr. ECKARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, and Mr. FRASER):

H. Con. Res. 424. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of United Nations Day as a permanent international holiday, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself (Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 425. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of United Nations Day as a permanent international holiday; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLOSKY (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MOSHER, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H. Con. Res. 426. Concurrent resolution to terminate the authority of the Gulf of Tonkin Joint Resolution as of December 31, 1970; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Con. Res. 427. Concurrent resolution relative to American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. MOSHER):

H. Con. Res. 428. Concurrent resolution to terminate the authority of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution as of December 31, 1970; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H. Con. Res. 429. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the impact of the contracting housing market on the ceramic tile industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZION (for himself and Mr. DICKINSON):

H. Con. Res. 430. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the revocation of the United Nations economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUDE:

H. Res. 590. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the U.S. ratification of the Conventions on Genocide, Abolition of Forced Labor, and Political Rights of Women, and Freedom of Association; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 14513. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 14514. A bill for the relief of Bissell's Dairy, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 14515. A bill for the relief of Elmer A. Houser, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 14516. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Aguirre-Santini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

306. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Allan Feinblum, New York, N.Y. relative to establishment of an International Peace Institute, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—*Thursday, October 23, 1969*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, in whose word it is written, "If any man lack wisdom, let him ask God, who giveth to all men liberally and it shall be given him," fulfill this ancient promise in all Thy servants here. Graciously minister to all their needs, granting them newness of life, ample physical strength, sharpened intellects, and serene souls that when evening comes they may be found faithful in their love of Thee and in their service to their fellow man.

In Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, October 22, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

MARITIME PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-183)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

The United States Merchant Marine—the fleet of commercial ships on which we rely for our economic strength in time of peace and our defense mobility in time of war—is in trouble.

While only one-fourth of the world's merchant ships are more than twenty years old, approximately three-fourths of American trading vessels are at least that antiquated. In the next four years, much of our merchant fleet will be scrapped. Yet we are now producing only a few new ships a year for use in our foreign trade. Building costs for American vessels are about twice those in foreign shipyards and production delays are excessive. Operating expenses also are high by world standards, and labor-management conflicts have been costly and disruptive.

Both government and industry share responsibility for the recent decline in American shipping and shipbuilding. Both government and industry must now make a substantial effort to reverse that record. We must begin immediately to rebuild our merchant fleet and make it more competitive. Accordingly, I am announcing today a new maritime program for this nation, one which will replace the drift and neglect of recent years and restore this country to a proud position in the shipping lanes of the world.

Our program is one of challenge and opportunity. We will challenge the American shipbuilding industry to show that it can rebuild our Merchant Marine at reasonable expense. We will challenge American ship operators and seamen to move toward less dependence on government subsidy. And, through a substantially revised and better administered government program, we will create the opportunity to meet that challenge.

The need for this new program is great since the old ways have not worked. However, as I have frequently pointed out, our budget constraints at this time are also significant. Our program, therefore, will be phased in such a way that it will not increase subsidy expenditures during the rest of fiscal year 1970 and will require only a modest increase for fiscal year 1971. We can thus begin to rebuild our fleet and at the same time meet our fiscal responsibilities.

THE SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Our shipbuilding program is designed to meet both of the problems which lie behind the recent decline in this field: low production rates and high production costs. Our proposals would make it possible for shipbuilders to build more ships and would encourage them to hold down the cost of each vessel. We believe that these two aspirations are closely related. For only as we plan a major long-range building program can we encourage builders to standardize ship design and introduce mass production techniques which have kept other American products competitive in world markets. On the other hand, only if our builders are able to improve their efficiency and cut their costs can we afford to replace our obsolescent merchant fleet with American-built vessels. These cost reductions are essential if our ship operators are to make capital investments of several billion dollars over the next ten years to build new, high-technology ships.

Our new program will provide a substantially improved system of construction differential subsidies, payments which reimburse American shipbuilders for that part of their total cost which exceeds the cost of building in foreign shipyards. Such subsidies allow our shipbuilders—despite their higher costs—to sell their ships at world market prices for use in our foreign trade. The important features of our new subsidy system are as follows:

1. We should make it possible for industry to build more ships over the next ten years, moving from the present subsidy level of about ten ships a year to a new level of thirty ships a year.

2. We should reduce the percentage of total costs which are subsidized. The government presently subsidizes up to 55 percent of a builder's total expenses for