

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I want to express my appreciation to the members of the committee. The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, is not here just now. The Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) is a valuable member of the subcommittee, as is the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH). They were also conferees.

I want to express my appreciation to all members of the subcommittee. I think that the bill as it emerged in final form will be sound and good for the Nation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I would like to yield first to the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) if she wishes to speak.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I would like to say that we all owe the distinguished Senator from Mississippi a debt of gratitude for the dedicated way in which he has carried through on this bill—a very difficult bill. I at least want to thank him.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want to underscore and emphasize the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Maine, because I participated in this matter. I am sorry that official business

keeps the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who is the ranking minority member of the committee, off the floor, because he has worked so hard and so devotedly on the bill.

Of course, none of us is completely happy with the bill, as we hardly ever are, but we had to yield on those points in order to get a bill. All in all, we have done a good job. I think the whole Transportation Department will be stronger. Those of us who are vitally interested in the transportation area know it means much to our country, and particularly to the large city areas, where it is important to resolve transportation problems.

I am sure the distinguished Senator said this while I stepped out of the Chamber, but I would like to say it because it needs to be said. I think we ought to pay particular tribute to the efficient members of the staff, John Witeck, for the majority, and Bob Clark, the minority member, who devoted much time and effort to enable us, first of all, to bring a bill out of the subcommittee which the full committee would adopt, and then to carry the bill on the floor, and then to assist us in asserting the Senate's position in conference. Without them, we could not have done it. Their assistance has been invaluable.

Again I pay tribute to the distinguished chairman. It is wonderful to work with him. The time he has devoted

to this bill has paid off, in my opinion, for the good of the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am most grateful for the fine work he has done this year and in preceding years and on the authorizing committee. I know he has made many outstanding contributions. I join him in his tribute to our staff members. They always go the second mile and are very efficient.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1969, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, December 20, 1969, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 19, 1969:

AMBASSADOR

Henry J. Tasca, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Greece.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, December 19, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The people that walk in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined.—Isaiah 9: 2.

O God, to whom glory is sung in the highest, while on earth peace is proclaimed to men of good will, grant that good will unto us, unto the citizens of our land, and unto the nations of the world that peace may live in our hearts and in the hearts of all people.

Guide, strengthen, and give wisdom to our President, our Speaker, Members of Congress, and all who labor with them that there may be justice and good will at home and freedom and peace between the nations of the world.

Make us humble in faith, genuine in love, concerned about the needy that the Christmas spirit may live in our lives and find expression in daily living throughout the new year.

In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments

in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 15209. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15209) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. HRUSKA, and Mr. ALLOTT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15090) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2917) entitled "An act to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States."

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

S. 740. An act to establish the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to amendments of the Senate to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

H.R. 9233. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to promote the efficient and effective use of the revolving fund of the Civil Service Commission in connection with certain functions of the Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. McGEE and Mr. FONG members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 70-3.

APPROPRIATION FOR INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES ADOPTED BY SENATE

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, yes—

terday the other body by a vote of 80 to zero adopted an amendment which added \$2,000,000 to the appropriation for Indian health services in this country.

The amendment was one offered principally by the senior Senator from Oklahoma, Senator HARRIS, with 11 Senators as cosponsors.

I think a case was made on the floor of the Senate that overwhelmingly justified the addition of these funds. Generous use in the Senate debate was made of a report recently submitted by two Members of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs pointing out drastic shortages of medicine and of personnel in three Indian hospitals in Oklahoma.

I hope and earnestly pray that the House conferees will accept the addition of this money without a great deal of delay and without a great deal of controversy, because it is urgently needed if we are to give quality medical care to our first Americans. There is good reason to believe that we are today seeing needless deaths and needless prolonged illness in our Indian hospitals because of the shortages which prevail. I earnestly beseech our conferees on behalf of the House to accept this addition of funds that has been added in the other body.

TIME TAKEN UP BY QUORUM CALLS

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

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it seems appropriate on this 19th day of December, as this Congress is limping toward a belated adjournment, that we give some consideration to all the factors which contribute to a really unnecessary situation. For obvious reasons we cannot go into all of them at this time, but there is one which deserves the attention of the Members of this House, particularly since the Legislative Reorganization Act is pending before the Rules Committee.

Perhaps it has not occurred to you that we had in the 90th Congress 397 straight quorums—completely useless straight quorum calls consuming an average of 30 minutes apiece—which means a loss of the equivalent of 24 working days per Member of this body. We have already had 172 of these straight quorums this year. It seems to me that all of us can put this time to better use. If someone can come up with anything that resembles a justification for this type of useless routine, I certainly would like to hear it.

SEASON'S GREETINGS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, once again, this newsletter reaches you amid the spirit of the holiday season, that time of year during which Americans gather within their groups of family and friends to participate in what, to them, is basic in their respective beliefs and traditions.

This is the joyous season in which Americans, of whatever religious convic-

tion, find common bond in man's belief in God and in man's determination to preserve the dignity and freedom which God intended.

From myself, my family, and staff—to you and yours—go every good wish for the full blessings and joy which only this holiday season can afford.

MEDICAL SCHOOLS ARE UNDERFINANCED

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the medical schools and medical students in our country are undergoing a difficult period of underfinancing.

I have a letter from the dean of the University of Kentucky Medical School, in which he states that 45 percent of the students currently in the health professions programs project financial deficits during this academic year, and that the total amount of these shortages will approximate \$100,124.

Almost certainly some of these students may be forced to withdraw unless supplemental funds are found. In view of the critical health needs of the State of Kentucky, and the very limited economic reserves available to most of our students—for example, 39 percent of the students in their first year classes are from families where annual gross income is under \$10,000. I feel that any and all steps toward restitution of these funds should receive your immediate attention.

The administration has asked that the medical schools in the United States graduate 1,000 more physicians this year. Can we afford, then, to cut back our aid to medical schools and our medical students at this time when we have been asked for an increased number of graduates? Are the necessary funds to be withdrawn?

I strongly urge, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees on the HEW bill include sufficient funds for loans for the medical students and for the medical schools, so that these young physicians so necessary to improvement of the health of the United States may be graduated.

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY IS A LEGITIMATE FEDERAL PROJECT

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the last few weeks, I have mentioned some urgent reasons why construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway should begin. This project affects some 23 States directly and many others indirectly. However, it is often-times difficult to think about its effect in those terms. I would like to discuss briefly today, nine counties in Alabama that will be contiguous to the waterway and will certainly directly benefit by the commerce and industry the project will stimulate.

These nine counties lie in the southwestern region of the State. Eight of the counties are considered rural by Office of Economic Opportunity standards. Seven must participate in the Department of Agriculture's food stamp program. The other two participate in the commodity distribution program. All are well below the national average in health personnel and hospital beds per 100,000 population ratio.

With respect to income, all nine counties have more families with incomes below \$3,000, on the average, than the rest of the Nation. To cite 1969 statistics:

In one county between 25 and 35 percent of the families earn less than \$3,000. Another has between 35 and 50 percent in this category. Five of the counties have 50 to 65 percent who earn less than \$3,000. And two counties have incomes of less than \$3,000 going to between 65 and 80 percent of the families.

Remember that the new poverty level has been set at just under \$3,000. When I say to you that the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway will provide new life for one of the poorest areas of the South, I am not just whistling "Dixie."

In terms of buying power per capita the figures are even more demoralizing. The range lies between \$883 to \$1,636.

I have mentioned many times in connection with the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway project, the great effect it will have on moving people off welfare rolls and onto payrolls. Let me cite to you a few figures that indicate the level of employment in these areas: I will use two counties as examples.

In Choctaw County, based on 1960 population figures, 8,891 were in the eligible labor force of males over 14 years of age. Of this group only 3,644 were actually employed. That is less than 40 percent of the eligible males. In the case of the 8,979 females of the same age only 1,308 are working—less than 15 percent.

In Washington County 10,639 males over 14 years of age were in the eligible labor force. Of this group only 4,671 were employed—less than 45 percent. In the case of the 11,243 females of the same age only 2,262 were working—around 20 percent.

Large amounts of taxpayers' dollars are poured into these counties to help the people of the area. But these tax dollars are doing nothing to permanently alter the situation and only bring the promise of continued dependency on the Federal Government. For a mere \$316 million over 10 years, this Federal Government can build a project that will help put an end to this perpetual cycle of welfare, poverty assistance, and hand-outs. I hope the President and this Congress will back such a project wholeheartedly.

PUTTING OUR FISCAL HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, what I am about to say may make me the most unpopular Member of this body. I am willing to take that risk.

The risk I am taking is of no consequence compared to the risk to our country's well-being that many of my colleagues seem willing to take simply to serve what they conceive to be in the interest of their own political well-being.

I have been checking voting records. I have been amazed to find many of those who voted against continuation of the surtax to be consistently voting for increases in Government spending.

As much as I would like to have this session of Congress adjourn that we may have a vacation period before the opening of the next session, I am advocating that the President veto any appropriation bill which he finds excessive. I am advocating that the President veto any so-called tax reform bill sent to him that materially reduces much-needed revenue. I am advocating that the President keep us here and do whatever may be necessary to put our fiscal house in order.

Never in my many years' service in this House have I witnessed such disregard for the economic health of our country and the welfare of our people suffering from the ever-increasing prices.

ANOTHER INCREASE IN WHOLESALE PRICES

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday we were presented some events that allegedly indicate that results are showing up in the administration's fight against inflation. We were given "tangible evidence that we are beginning to make some progress in relieving those excessive pressures on the economy that have been driving up the cost of living."

But today, we are presented with some hard realistic evidence that appears to contradict the optimistic attitude of the administration.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics revealed that overall wholesale prices rose 0.6 percent in November. This is the largest monthly increase since May. This increase brought the Wholesale Price Index up to 114.7, an increase of 4.7 percent in the past year.

When wholesale prices go up, retail prices usually follow suit. Thus, increases in prices for the wholesaler are usually passed on to the consumer.

The wholesale price of food rose 3 percent during this period. If retail prices rise by a like amount, the housewife will have to buy 3 percent less food or spend 3 percent more money in order to provide the same menu she offered her family in May.

Perhaps the administration's "evidence" does not consider the needs of the average consumer. Perhaps the evidence is relieving the inflationary pressure only for a privileged few. The evidence from the Bureau of Labor Statistics illustrates higher prices for those of us who do our own shopping in the grocery store—those of us who do not believe that "progress" of this type is to be welcomed.

BLACK PANTHER INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, following the announcement that the Justice Department will have a grand jury investigation in the city of Chicago, the State's attorney of Cook County held a press conference. I feel that Mr. Hanrahan's observations should be noted. Therefore, I am including his statement in the RECORD at this point:

Assistant Attorney General Jerris Leonard of the Department of Justice today told me that because the Black Panthers had refused to be interviewed by the FBI it was impossible for the FBI to complete its preliminary investigation.

As a consequence of this refusal by the Black Panthers, Mr. Leonard told me the Department of Justice was forced to abandon its preliminary investigation and would now try to get Black Panther testimony through a Federal Grand Jury.

This decision by the Department of Justice was made despite the continuing willingness of our officers to be interviewed by FBI agents.

It is outrageous that the Department of Justice would abandon its established practices because of the refusal of the Black Panther party to tell the truth to FBI Agents. It is amazing that the Black Panthers, who claim their civil rights were violated, would refuse to support their claims by giving the facts to the FBI.

PERMISSION FOR HOUSE MANAGERS TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15149, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 15149, a bill making appropriations for foreign assistance for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF RECORD WITH RESPECT TO H.R. 9334

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Speaker recognized me for a unanimous consent request to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 9334, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 39800, shows that this is what occurred, although the number of the bill shown in the RECORD is incorrectly shown as H.R. 9634.

The error in the number was also repeated in the message to the Senate later on yesterday, the Senate was mistakenly informed that the House had concurred in the amendments of the Senate to H.R. 9634, rather than in the Senate amendment to H.R. 9334.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be corrected to show that I asked for the con-

sideration of H.R. 9334 instead of H.R. 9634.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be directed to request the Senate to return to the House of Representatives the message on the bill (H.R. 9634) to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to improve and make more effective the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 341]

Abbutt	Foley	O'Neill, Mass.
Adams	Fraser	Ottinger
Alexander	Fulton, Tenn.	Patman
Anderson, Tenn.	Gallagher	Pelly
Andrews, Ala.	Gray	Pepper
Ashbrook	Grover	Pike
Ashley	Gubser	Pirnie
Baring	Hall	Poage
Bolling	Harvey	Powell
Brock	Hébert	Pucinski
Cahill	Hungate	Rees
Carey	Karth	Reifel
Celler	Kirwan	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Kleppe	St Germain
Clancy	Kluczynski	Sandman
Clark	Kyros	Scheuer
Clay	Lipscomb	Sisk
Conyers	McCarthy	Skubitz
Corman	MacGregor	Stephens
Dawson	Martin	Sullivan
Diggs	May	Teague, Calif.
Eckhardt	Miller, Ohio	Tunney
Edwards, Calif.	Morse	Vanik
Erlenborn	Morton	Watkins
Farbstein	Moss	Whitehurst
	Myers	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR HOUSE CONFEREES TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT SUNDAY, DECEMBER 21, TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13270, TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the conferees on the part of the House I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight Sunday, December 21, to file a conference report to accompany H.R. 13270, the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

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 do so only so that the Members of the House might have an understanding of the situation—this does not mean that the conference committee will not finish its work today. The timing of the request for Sunday night is to give an opportunity to put the language of the report that has to be filed and the amendments that have been agreed to into proper form.

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

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman bringing up the matter because it is true that a number of changes have been made in both the House bill and the Senate bill that require variations in the language of one or the other or both of those bills. That language, being part of the Internal Revenue Code, has to be drawn and included in the conference report. Our decisions undoubtedly will be completed fairly soon.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. At least we hope so.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we, as the gentleman knows, stayed in session last night and left the House about 5 minutes of 3.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This morning.

Mr. MILLS. This morning. We did so thinking that we could get through last night, but the hamburgers we had for supper in the conference room, and the little bit of milk we drank, stimulated us at least until 3 o'clock, and when we saw that it was not going to furnish enough stimulus to our minds to enable us to stay there all night we broke up with the understanding that we would come back today and complete our decisions. I would hope very earnestly that we will not be in conference very long today.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Under the program that has been announced, would the report be available for Members on Monday?

Mr. MILLS. That is hard to predict. I certainly hope it will be. I understand the Government Printing Office is heavily loaded at the moment and will be from now until we adjourn or recess or whatever we do.

I was told yesterday that on a similar request, to have until midnight to file a report, that the report was not available in printed form, in that connection, until or by at least noon the next day.

I would think, if it is agreeable with the Speaker and the majority leader—and I would like to get his opinion on this, so that the membership may be given now some idea of the time—that on Monday or Tuesday we would vote. Very frankly, it might be better to predict now that we will be ready to vote sometime on Tuesday than to have to undertake to do it on Monday, although I would like for it to be possible to do it Monday, but because of the possibility that the report itself would not have

been printed and available to the membership in time for them to have a look at it, it might be best to consider setting it for Tuesday.

I do not mind asking unanimous consent, but the only way we can schedule it and take it up before it is available, as I understand the rules, is to ask unanimous consent that we may take it up even though it has not been printed. I do not think I want to make that kind of request.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Well, I would add that I do not think that I could accede to that kind of request.

Mr. MILLS. Of course not.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. This bill encompasses so much and it is so vital that every Member should have an opportunity to see what has been done in conference. This is particularly true in this case because of the possible differences between the House bill, the Senate bill, and the conference decisions.

The big difference frankly so far, I think we can predict, will be the difference that we will have between the Senate bill and the conference report.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I think that there will be more similarity up to this point, in the conference report and the House bill, and I think I can take all of you into our confidence and say that in the bill that passed the House we recoup through our reform provisions over a period of time, an estimated \$6.9 billion, and that when the Senate completed its action on the bill that amount had been materially reduced perhaps by as much as one-half.

My recollection is, and I would like the gentleman's memory to assist me here—but my recollection is that the decision so far made within the conference, with respect to the reforms, would bring the amount back close to the House bill, so we would recoup some \$6.5 billion through the reforms.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would not agree with that figure because the gentleman has added into that figure the extension of the surtax.

Mr. MILLS. No, no.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And the excise tax extension also when you are talking about the \$6.5 billion figure.

Mr. MILLS. No, no, I am not adding it—I am not adding those. I am adding, and what we are talking about, are those items listed as reform items—as reform items—and not the 5 percent surcharge for 6 months of 1970, or the excises.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am talking about the balance between the two.

Mr. MILLS. I am not talking about 1970. I am talking about the figure in the conference report which corresponds to the figure in the House-passed bill—or \$6.9 billion. This of course, is not the immediate figure but a figure over a period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that we are almost in line with the House-passed bill so far as the recoupment through reform is concerned. That is the point I wanted to make.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. I do not want to quarrel with those figures.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am glad

to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, of course we are hoping that the situation is such, but it might be possible to bring it up on Monday and we are hopeful of that even if it be late on Monday.

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

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

Mr. MILLS. That suits me fine. So many Members have asked me the question about when we might take this up, that I thought we needed to have this colloquy so that it would be understood that after today the only thing that is holding it up is the completion of the conference report by our technicians, and the printing of the conference report.

If it is made available to us on Monday and Members have an opportunity to look at it on Monday, we could, of course, bring it up on Monday.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, we are very hopeful, the House is, as the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the committee know, that we might get out on Monday. But I would like to state that should we fail to be able to do so, by reason of the fact that the report is not printed and available, we would hope on Monday to ask to come in quite early on Tuesday and see if we could finish it on Tuesday.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would emphasize to the gentleman that we are not only getting many inquiries about when we will conclude action but we are also getting many inquiries about what we have done. It seems to me we have to allow ample time for Members to find out what we have done before they will be prepared to vote on this legislation.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader, in light of what he just said about what he would hope to do in reference to Tuesday, if we should meet on Tuesday, is there any harm in asking unanimous consent now that we come in at an earlier hour on Tuesday so that we know in advance that that would be the plan if we should meet on Tuesday?

Mr. ALBERT. I would prefer not to make that request right now. We have had discussions about coming in at 10 o'clock on Tuesday. We may make the request later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. But we do have the majority leader's statement as to his intention.

Mr. ALBERT. I understand the Speaker will recognize me for the purpose of making such a request to come in no later than 10 o'clock on Tuesday if we do not have the report on Monday.

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

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would strongly urge that this policy be followed, and that at the proper time a request be made that we meet at 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning. Many of us have reservations for

the Tuesday noon plane for the west coast. It is hard to get reservations, by the way, at this time of the year. Many of us want to be home with our families at Christmastime. This is said without any degree of criticism of the committee. I know what a terrific job they have had and the problems they have had. I would hope that every step will be taken by the leadership to permit some of us who live on the west coast to have an opportunity to fulfill our reservations on Tuesday in order that we might be home for Christmas.

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

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

Mr. LANDRUM. With reference to what the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLFIELD) has had to say, the same statement applies to some of us who live on the east coast and on the Atlantic seaboard. While I fully appreciate the situation in which my distinguished chairman and my friend from Wisconsin find themselves, we have been told here that we certainly could have this report available to us on Monday, and if we have to wait until Tuesday to vote, then it occurs to me the leadership ought to be able now to give us some indication of what hour we can expect to get out of here. I have been trying to make reservations for 2 weeks, and I have not been able to get them. I know others who are in the same situation. I am trying to discharge my responsibilities. If someone does not make a request and get some information as to what we can expect, this whole business is going to wind up in a dilemma.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. May I take the House into my confidence. I have been advised by some Members they would object to coming in early on Tuesday. So I would like to work that out, at least, before I make the request.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if I might make a suggestion. It is not my desire to in any way hold up the sine die adjournment of this session of the Congress, but we ought to have a copy of the conference report in hand when it is called up. May I make the suggestion that we extend the time for consideration of the conference report? Under the rules, an hour would be allocated to its consideration. When the conference report comes before the House for consideration, could the time for discussion of the conference report be extended, say, to 2 hours?

I am sure we would get far more from having the opportunity, if we cared to use it, to ask questions of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) and the other members of the Ways and Means Committee.

I would be perfectly willing to come in at an early hour if the time for discussion of the conference report could be

extended. This conference report will have tremendous ramifications and it is highly technical. I am confident the House will learn far more of the actions taken in conference by extending the time for discussion than it will in any other way.

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

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I think the point made by my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, is a good one. This is perhaps one of the most all-inclusive tax bills that the Congress has had an opportunity to consider since I have been a Member of the Congress. There is very little of the Internal Revenue Code that is not affected or changed by it.

Members will recall we had an excessive amount of time to discuss the bill when we had it on the floor under general debate. If it would facilitate the matter in any way, I would not be averse as we call up the conference report, if the Speaker and others think it parliamentary in order, to ask unanimous consent that on this particular conference report the time might be extended for an additional hour so that we can have that 2 hours. We might not use all of it, but I would not want to deprive any of my colleagues of the opportunity of asking the gentleman from Wisconsin or me or any other House conferees any questions the Members might have about the conference report. I think most Members would have some questions about the very voluminous conference report.

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

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. It seems to me from the colloquy that has developed here involving the leadership, that the final item of business for this first session will be the adoption of the conference report on tax reform.

I would just like to ask the leadership if they would tell us when we can expect to vote—since we are clarifying the tax issue—on the HEW conference report and the foreign aid conference report.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, those are matters that are still within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. We intend to discuss those matters with the distinguished chairman, and we will advise the House just as soon as we can.

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

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader, inasmuch as I have had a number of inquiries this morning and this afternoon, about whether or not, in the light of these developments, we would meet tomorrow for a session on Saturday.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, the answer to that, as far as I know, is yes, because we have other conference reports that we must dispose of.

We would like to come down to Monday with no other business than the tax bill, if possible. We want to meet tomorrow to finish all the other conference reports, if possible.

I would like very much to go along with the suggestion made by the gentleman from Iowa and concurred in by the chairman of the committee. I would suggest that the gentleman ask that permission. I cannot see any possible harm that would come from it, and possibly considerable good would come from it, if this bill is ready on Monday and Members can have the extra time so we might dispose of this bill on Monday.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It might be possible, Mr. Speaker, that with the additional time there would be more of a possibility of considering it on Monday under circumstances assuring every member of an opportunity to know what is in the bill.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

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

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the colloquy that has just occurred, I ask unanimous consent that when the conference report is considered—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas has one unanimous-consent request pending now, that the conferees have until midnight Sunday to file the conference report.

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

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING AN ADDITIONAL HOUR FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13270, TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the conference report to accompany H.R. 13270, the Tax Reform Act of 1969, is called up for consideration by the House that there be an additional hour—a total of 2 hours—to consider the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make an observation. The Chair does not like to make observations from the chair, but this is an unusual situation, and colleagues will understand.

The Chair agrees with the statement made by the majority leader, that it is hoped to get the conference report up

Monday. That is the strong conviction and strong hope of the Chair, that the conference report will be brought up Monday.

All Members realize Christmas is only a few days off and this is important to Members. If a satisfactory climate can be developed—and evidently a satisfactory climate has been developed with the extension of the additional hour, which the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) wisely suggested—the Chair is of the strong hope that the chairman of the committee and the members of the conference committee will be in a position where the conference report will be called up on Monday next.

CONSIDERATION OF TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I should like to make a suggestion for consideration.

It is customary for us to receive galley prints of the reports before they are in final print. If the gentleman would order a few extra galley prints for the Members who are especially interested and would like to look at the report before the printed report is available, it might be of assistance.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I doubt in this instance if it would be possible for us to comply with the suggestion. We will need until probably 11:55 p.m. Sunday night to even file this. The galleys we will have will be full of errors, to begin with, and will have to be corrected. If we submit them to the Members there might be so many errors in them initially that they really would not get a true understanding of the conference report.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman's suggestion is satisfactory.

Mr. MILLS. I am hoping to get it out and available early Monday morning.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 3(a), Public Law 91-129, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Government Procurement the following members on the part of the House: The gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON); and the following member from outside the Federal Government: Joseph W. Barr, of Maryland.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14751, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14751) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of

Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, 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 Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 18, 1969.)

Mr. SIKES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the conference report approves \$1,560,456,000 in new obligational authority to support the military construction programs of the several military services in fiscal year 1970. This amount is \$356,844,000 below the Nixon budget estimates and \$997,994,000 below the Johnson budget. It is \$115,022,000 below comparable appropriations for fiscal year 1969. It is \$109,897,000 above the House-passed bill and \$42,990,000 below the Senate-passed bill.

It will be recalled that this measure passed the House on November 13 before the conferees on the authorizing bill had reached agreement. It was necessary therefore to make adjustments to the House-passed appropriations bill to reflect the final outcome of the authorization legislation. This partly was due to the fact that meritorious projects were added in conference. A detailed list of these and other changes to the House bill is contained in the conference report.

Some of the major items approved for the Army which were not contained in the House-passed bill are an instruction facility for \$2,830,000 at Fort Knox, Ky., which will provide needed space for armor and reconnaissance training; a maintenance instruction facility for enlisted aircraft mechanics at Fort Rucker, Ala., for \$3,636,000; an administrative and classroom building in the amount of \$9,891,000 which will allow barracks buildings currently being used for the purpose to be returned to their proper use, at Brook Army Medical Center, Tex.; and a cadet activities center at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., for \$16,814,000. The continuing problem with cost escalation at West Point is a very serious one. For that reason, the conference report contains language to force the Army to deal aggressively with this problem and to encourage them to stay within cost estimates. In a related action at West Point, the authorizing legislation deleted \$3,399,000 which had been requested by the Army to cover a cost overrun for a hospital and supporting utilities at West Point.

The major Navy projects which were allowed by the conferees over the House-passed bill include: recruit barracks and

a mess hall at the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Fla., in the total amount of \$10,308,000; barracks at the Naval Training Center, San Diego, Calif., Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, Calif., and the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif.; and \$11,988,000 to replace facilities at the Naval Construction Battalion Center, Gulfport, Miss., which were damaged in Hurricane Camille. The major item deleted from the House bill in the conference action was a hospital at Camp Pendleton, Calif., in the amount of \$19,805,000. There has been a substantial cost overrun on this project and it cannot be built in the required scope for the amount which was authorized.

For the Air Force, the conferees added to the House bill: a composite recruit training and housing facility in the amount of \$7,789,000 at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., the sole Air Force recruit training center; three data processing plants, at Barksdale Air Force Base, La., Sheppard Air Force Base, Tex., and Keesler Air Force Base, Miss.—these facilities are necessary to house "phase 2" data processing equipment for the Air Force, which is already installed or on order. The remaining facilities in support of this program were denied. Airmen dormitories at George Air Force Base, Calif., Luke Air Force Base, Ariz., and a WAF dormitory at Loring Air Force Base, Maine, were restored. At the request of the several services, the following items to replace items which were destroyed by fire were included in the Senate bill and have been retained in the conference: an officers open mess at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; a refueling vehicle depot at Keesler Air Force Base, Miss.; and an officers open mess at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.

For the Department of Defense agencies, the conferees restored various items which had been deleted in the House-passed authorizing bill. However, the reductions made in the House-passed appropriations bill for Department of Defense emergency construction and reductions from unobligated balances were largely retained.

For family housing, the committee of conference recommends \$688,476,000. This represents every penny authorized for fiscal year 1970. It will provide 4,800 units of new family housing, a number that is totally insufficient when compared to the needs in this area. I take this opportunity to express once again the feeling of the committee that family housing construction has been insufficient in the past and that the current deficit in military family housing must be met in a realistic manner in the future.

I would like to point out that it has been the policy of the Congress in the past not to provide for the purchase of bulk milk dispensers with funds appropriated for military construction or, in fact, in other appropriations for the Department of Defense. There are no funds contained in this bill for the purchase of bulk milk dispensers and none of the funds contained in this bill are to be so used.

Mr. Speaker, I now insert a table which shows the action taken on the bill for fiscal year 1970:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

[In thousands]

	Appropriations, 1969	Budget estimate, 1970	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						Appropriations, 1969	Budget estimate, 1970	House	Senate
Military construction, Army.....	\$548,126	\$395,600	\$240,446	\$297,597	\$287,228	-\$260,898	-\$108,372	+\$46,782	-\$10,369
Military construction, Navy.....	291,513	397,200	271,605	305,377	300,028	+8,515	-97,172	+28,423	-5,349
Military construction, Air Force.....	222,141	389,100	253,505	302,349	284,327	+62,186	-104,773	+30,822	-18,022
Military construction, Defense Agencies.....	83,396	74,500	28,720	43,165	33,915	-49,481	-40,585	+5,195	-9,250
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	2,700	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	+12,300			
Military construction, Air National Guard.....	8,300	13,200	13,200	13,200	13,200	+4,900			
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	3,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	+7,000			
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	5,000	9,600	9,600	9,600	9,600	+4,600			
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	4,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	5,300	+1,000			
Total, military construction.....	1,168,476	1,309,500	847,376	1,001,588	958,598	-209,878	-350,902	+111,222	-42,990
Family housing, defense.....	583,700	694,418	689,801	688,476	688,476	+104,776	-5,942	-1,325	
Portion applied to debt reduction.....	-82,898	-86,618	-86,618	-86,618	-86,618	-3,720			
Subtotal, family housing.....	500,802	607,800	603,183	601,858	601,858	+101,056	-5,942	-1,325	
Homeowner assistance fund, defense.....	6,200					-6,200			
Grand total.....	1,675,478	1,917,300	1,450,559	1,603,446	1,560,456	-115,022	-356,844	+109,897	-42,990

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG), the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, while this conference report does not suit me in all of its aspects, I signed the report. I think we have reached a good compromise with the other body on this bill. The question of adequate military construction for the Defense Department is something that is of concern to all of us, and I believe this bill for fiscal year 1970 is a step in the right direction but a rather small step in the overall need for modern defense facilities. I do concur in the remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT).

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the conferees, but I was dissatisfied with the report, so I did not sign it.

I want to explain that I did attend each of the five meetings of the conferees, but the committee and the Congress, I feel, are not appropriating enough funds for operation and maintenance of the defense plant and facilities. Family housing is inadequate and most other facilities need rehabilitation and modernization. Unless we provide more funding for our defense plant and facilities, they will continue to deteriorate. My principal reason for not assigning the conference report involves a classified matter. I do not believe the classification of the item was necessary, but nevertheless I am bound by the classification and therefore I cannot discuss the project, but it was important and is essential to our national security. Deferment of the project jeopardizes our national and individual security. I think the project should be funded. For that reason I did not sign the conference report.

Mr. SIKES. 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.

AUTHORIZING CLERK OF THE HOUSE, IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 14751, TO MAKE CORRECTION IN TEXT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 473) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 473

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 14751) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, is hereby authorized and directed to make the following correction in the text of the House engrossed bill:

On page two of the House engrossed bill, strike out "Public Law 91- " and insert "Public Law 91-121."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the matters discussed in connection with the conference report on the military construction bill and to include certain statistical facts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14580, FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14580) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, 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 pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of December 18, 1969.)

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have just finished a very difficult conference, and we have not been able to bring back everything that we wanted to.

This was not because we did not do our best.

We found that we were not in a strong bargaining position.

Time was not on our side.

We were dealing with people whose attitude toward U.S. foreign policy in general and toward military assistance in particular differ from those of a majority of the Members of the House.

We did not reach a meeting of the minds on basic issues, and we had to accept compromises that no one liked.

Although we failed to bring back several provisions of the House bill which Members of the House regard as important and which the House conferees also recognize as being important, there is some good news.

For those who believe that we always spend too much money on foreign aid, I can report that we bring back a total figure of \$1,972,525,000, which is \$221,375,000 less than the amount in the House bill.

On the other hand, for those who believe that the foreign assistance program is essential to the implementation of U.S. foreign policy, the bill we bring back retains both the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Inter-American Social Development Institute which were approved by the House.

Even with the limited funds which will be available in the next 2 years, it should be possible to make significant improvements in our efforts to assist other countries by making use of these two new organizations.

We did not succeed in retaining the specific authorization of military assistance funds for the Republic of China and for Korea.

The Senate refused absolutely to go above a total figure for military assistance of \$350 million. This is an increase of \$25 million above the amount in the Senate bill. Under the circumstances, the House conferees believed that any earmarking of funds for the Republic of China or Korea, which are already included in the worldwide total, would result in such a reduction in the military assistance available to help other countries maintain their defenses that it would be detrimental to our own security.

The Senate bill included a provision that would limit the number of military personnel who could be brought to the United States for training to 50 percent of the number of civilians brought to the United States under the Hays-Fulbright bill. This would have had the effect of cutting the number of military trainees by more than half. We got the Senate to agree that the military trainees could be equal to the number of Hays-Fulbright students.

The bill as it passed the House included a lot of language which was a revision and updating of existing law. The Senate bill left existing law alone pretty much except for specific amendments which they thought were important.

After 3 days of argument about specific provisions in both bills, the conferees agreed to follow the procedure of amending existing law rather than incorporating the revisions and restructuring contained in the House bill. As a result, much of the language of the House bill was eliminated but comparable or related provisions of existing law remain in effect.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will consider the bill we have brought back from conference on its merits. I know that some will be inclined to vote against the conference report as a protest against our foreign policy or because certain sections of the bill did not survive the conference.

I am sure that I speak for all of the House conferees when I say that I am convinced that this is the best we can do. I do not believe that sending the bill back to conference would enable the House to get anything more than we already have.

I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield to me?

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

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

I believe the gentleman said that the conference provided \$221 million less than the House bill. Is that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. That is right, \$221 million.

Mr. GROSS. However, it is still some \$200 million above the actual appropriation for last year.

Mr. MORGAN. The gentleman is correct. I think the gentleman also understands that the final figure for this year's appropriation has not been settled. I want to assure the gentleman that there is a great deal of difference in the two

appropriation bills as they passed this body and the other body, and they will have to be worked out in conference to determine the amount to be appropriated this year.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I understand that we have not yet acted on the conference report on the appropriation. But the authorization bill is some \$200 million more than was actually appropriated for the foreign aid program last year.

Mr. MORGAN. The figure was somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1.7 billion appropriated last year.

Mr. GROSS. This is the program that started out many years ago as a 5-year program, and is still with us, and apparently always will be with us.

I should like to note, if I may have the indulgence of the chairman, that I am opposed to the conference report, and will vote against it if there is to be a rollcall. I do not intend to ask for a rollcall because I have made my record clear as to my position on foreign aid on many previous occasions. However, I do want the record to show that I am opposed to the conference report.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say to every Member of the House that the gentleman from Iowa is a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I am sure every member of the committee knows his position about this type of legislation.

I also want to tell the Members of the House that he is a very valuable and hardworking member of the committee. His constructive criticism is very frequently helpful and I am very glad to have him aboard my committee.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR).

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has reviewed the major points that were agreed upon in the conference. As he has noted, the House conferees worked very diligently to sustain the House position. Although we were obliged to yield on a number of points, we were successful in bringing back to the House a bill that included a number of features which will improve the administration of this program.

In my opinion, it is quite significant that the Senate agreed to a 2-year authorization, as provided for in the House bill. This will give the executive branch time to carefully scrutinize the Peterson Commission report which is due early next year, and to consider new directions for the program beginning with fiscal year 1972.

Also, the House conferees were able to retain the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, an important new concept upon which the Foreign Affairs Committee held extensive hearings. While the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not include OPIC in its bill, this feature was added on the Senate floor, and we were pleased that authorization for the corporation was retained in conference.

The total authorization of \$1,972,525 is a reduction of more than \$200 million from the figure of \$2,193,900 originally authorized by the House. Although this is a sizable cut, it does provide a figure approximately the same as that authorized a year ago.

The Senate conferees accepted the House language pertaining to authorization for a prototype desalting plant in Israel, with an amendment authorizing \$20 million instead of \$40 million, and a requirement that the President determine the feasibility of developing such a plant.

The authorization for military assistance was a particularly difficult area upon which to reach agreement. We finally agreed upon the figure of \$350 million for worldwide military assistance—which is the same allocation the House had given this category—but we were unable to retain line items for South Korea and the Republic of China.

In summary, the House conferees worked hard to sustain the House position and the result is one we should support. I urge that the conference report be approved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union continues its insidious efforts at undermining the balance of power in the troubled Middle East. The Communists are pouring a seemingly unending stream of military armaments into the hands of sworn enemies of the beleaguered State of Israel and are challenging the seapower of the free nations in the area.

The United States must reaffirm its long-standing policy of protecting Israel's integrity, and over the years I have strongly supported measures to this end, including last year's authorization of the sale of at least 50 F-4 Phantom jet fighters to Israel in an effort to restore a balance of power in this area. This sale has been successfully negotiated and delivery of the jet fighters began in September of this year at the rate of four a month, with the completed delivery scheduled for the end of this fiscal year.

The military threat to Israel persists as the Middle East arms buildup continues to spiral, and will not, in the long run, result in a peace to that volatile area. However, war is virtually assured if Israel's enemies are allowed to gain the upper hand militarily and to upset the delicate balance needed to preserve peace.

Israel must be allowed to live in peace. An all-out Israel-Arab confrontation must be forestalled. And the best way to insure this is to provide Israel with the jet fighters—to offset Communist planes—it needs to defend itself.

In addition to providing military support, the United States is also moving to meet the critical water shortage problems of the area.

Contained in this current authorization—in section 219 under technical cooperation and development grants, title II—is one of the most significant long-range efforts to break through this serious economic and water shortage problem. This section provides for a large-scale water treatment and desalting prototype plant to be constructed in Israel “as an integral part of a dual-purpose power generating and desalting project.” The U.S. participation includes the “financial, technical, and such other assistance as the President deems appropriate to provide for the study, design, construction, and, for a limited demon-

stration period of not to exceed 5 years, operation and maintenance of the water treatment and desalting facilities of the dual-purpose project." The sum of \$20 million is provided for to accomplish this "program for peaceful communication."

This is the beginning of a needed long-range development program to stabilize Israel and perhaps will show the way to further stabilization of other countries in the area where water problems exist. I strongly support this effort.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. LENNON. 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 pro tempore. 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 208, nays 166, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

YEAS—208

Adams	Feighan	Madden
Addabbo	Findley	Mahon
Albert	Fish	Mailliard
Anderson, Calif.	Flood	Mann
Anderson, Ill.	Foley	Mathias
Annunzio	Ford, Gerald R.	Matsunaga
Arends	Ford,	May
Aspinall	William D.	Mayne
Ayres	Frelinghuysen	Meeds
Barrett	Friedel	Melcher
Beall, Md.	Fulton, Pa.	Mikva
Bell, Calif.	Garmatz	Minish
Biaggi	Gialmo	Mink
Blester	Gibbons	Monagan
Bingham	Gilbert	Moorhead
Blatnik	Gonzalez	Morgan
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	Mosher
Boland	Green, Pa.	Murphy, Ill.
Brademas	Griffiths	Murphy, N.Y.
Brasco	Gubser	Nedzi
Brooks	Gude	Nelsen
Broomfield	Hamilton	Nix
Brotzman	Hanley	O'Hara
Brown, Mich.	Hanna	O'Neill, Mass.
Buchanan	Hansen, Idaho	Ottinger
Burke, Mass.	Harrington	Patman
Burton, Calif.	Hathaway	Patten
Bush	Hawkins	Perkins
Button	Hays	Philbin
Byrne, Pa.	Heckler, Mass.	Pickle
Byrnes, Wis.	Helstoski	Pike
Cederberg	Hicks	Pirnie
Cohelan	Hogan	Podell
Conable	Holifield	Preyer, N.C.
Conte	Horton	Price, Ill.
Corbett	Hosmer	Pryor, Ark.
Coughlin	Howard	Quie
Culver	Jacobs	Railsback
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, N.Y.
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Daniels, N.J.	Karth	Riegler
Davis, Wis.	Kastenmeier	Robison
Dellenback	Kazen	Rodino
Dennis	Kee	Rogers, Colo.
Dent	Keith	Rooney, N.Y.
Dingell	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Donohue	Kyros	Rosenthal
Dulski	Lloyd	Rostenkowski
Dwyer	Lowenstein	Roth
Edmondson	McClory	Roybal
Ellberg	McCloskey	Ruppe
Erlenborn	McCulloch	Ryan
Esch	McDade	St. Onge
Evans, Colo.	McEwen	Sandman
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Scheuer
Farbstein	McKneally	Schneebell
Fascell	Macdonald, Mass.	Schwengel
		Shriver

Smith, Iowa	Thomson, Wis.
Smith, N.Y.	Tiernan
Springer	Udall
Stafford	Ullman
Stanton	Van Deerlin
Steiger, Wis.	Vander Jagt
Stokes	Vanik
Stratton	Vigorito
Symington	Waldie
Taft	Weicker
Teague, Calif.	Whalen
Teague, Tex.	White
Thompson, N.J.	Widnall

NAYS—166

Abernethy	Fountain	Obey
Adair	Frey	O'Konski
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fuqua	Olsen
Baring	Galifianakis	O'Neal, Ga.
Belcher	Gaydos	Passman
Bennett	Gettys	Pettis
Berry	Goldwater	Poff
Betts	Goodling	Pollock
Bevill	Griffin	Price, Tex.
Bow	Gross	Purcell
Bray	Grover	Quillen
Brinkley	Hagan	Randall
Brown, Calif.	Haley	Rarick
Brown, Ohio	Hammer-	Reid, Ill.
Broyhill, N.C.	schmidt	Rhodes
Broyhill, Va.	Harsha	Rivers
Burke, Fla.	Harvey	Roberts
Burleson, Tex.	Hastings	Roe
Burison, Mo.	Hechler, W. Va.	Rogers, Fla.
Burton, Utah	Henderson	Roudebush
Cabell	Hull	Satterfield
Caffery	Hungate	Satterfield
Camp	Hunt	Saylor
Casey	Hutchinson	Schadegberg
Chamberlain	Ichord	Scherle
Chappell	Jarman	Scott
Clancy	Johnson, Pa.	Sebelius
Clausen, Don H.	Jonas	Shibley
Clawson, Del.	Jones, N.C.	Sikes
Cleveland	Jones, Tenn.	Skubitz
Collier	King	Slack
Collins	Kuykendall	Smith, Calif.
Colmer	Kyl	Snyder
Cowger	Landgrebe	Stagers
Cramer	Landrum	Steed
Crane	Langen	Steiger, Ariz.
Daniel, Va.	Latta	Stubblefield
Davis, Ga.	Lennon	Stuckey
de la Garza	Long, La.	Talcott
Delaney	Long, Md.	Taylor
Denney	Lujan	Thompson, Ga.
Derwinski	McClure	Utt
Devine	McDonald,	Waggonner
Dickinson	Mich.	Wampler
Dorn	McMillan	Watson
Dowdy	Marsh	Watts
Downing	Meskill	Whalley
Duncan	Michel	Whitehurst
Edwards, Ala.	Miller, Ohio	Whitten
Edwards, La.	Mills	Williams
Eshleman	Minshall	Winn
Fisher	Mize	Wyatt
Flowers	Mizell	Wylie
Flynt	Mollohan	Wyman
Foreman	Myers	Young
	Natcher	Zion
	Nichols	

NOT VOTING—59

Abbt	Dawson	MacGregor
Alexander	Diggs	Martin
Anderson, Tenn.	Eckhardt	Miller, Calif.
Andrews, Ala.	Edwards, Calif.	Montgomery
Ashbrook	Fallon	Morse
Ashley	Fraser	Morton
Blackburn	Fulton, Tenn.	Moss
Bianton	Gallagher	Pelly
Bolling	Gray	Pepper
Brock	Hall	Poage
Cahill	Halpern	Powell
Carey	Hansen, Wash.	Pucinski
Carter	Hébert	Rees
Celler	Kirwan	Reifel
Chisholm	Kleppe	St Germain
Clark	Kluczynski	Sisk
Clay	Leggett	Stephens
Conyers	Lipscomb	Sullivan
Corman	Lukens	Tunney
	McCarthy	Watkins

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. Rees for, with Mr. Montgomery against.

Mr. Pucinski for, with Mr. Andrews of Alabama against.
Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Carter against.
Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Martin against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Watkins against.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington for, with Mr. Abbt against.
Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Alexander against.
Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Pelly against.
Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Lipscomb against.
Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Blackburn against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
Mr. Cahill for, with Mr. Kleppe against.
Mr. Halpern for, with Mr. Lukens against.
Mr. Tunney for, with Mr. Brock against.
Mrs. Sullivan for, with Mr. Reifel against.
Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Hall against.
Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Clark with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Leggett.
Mr. Blanton with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. St Germain.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Sisk with Mr. Pepper.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Eckhardt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14794, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14794) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 18, 1969.)

Mr. BOLAND (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLFELD). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are three amendments that are in actual disagreement. I will offer motions that the House insist on its disagreement with the Senate amendments.

Under the position of the managers on the part of the House, the conference agreement would be \$102 million less than the budget request and \$55.7 million more than the House amount.

If the House gave in to the Senate position on the amendments in disagreement, the conference agreement would be only \$2 million less than the budget request and \$156 million more than the House amount.

The first amendment in disagreement, No. 2, involves language which would permit the Secretary of Transportation to transfer personnel into the Office of the Secretary.

During the first 2 years of the new Department, in order to help in the establishment of the new Department, we granted broad transfer authority to the Secretary. We think the Department is now sufficiently mature to budget for positions where positions are required.

Congress has a right to know where and how funds appropriated will be spent. No other department of Government has the authority in question. We feel that it is time to return to the regular order.

The other two amendments in disagreement involve liquidating cash in the highway program. In the hearings, we were informed that the President felt that in order to hold the line on spending, some reduction would be made in highway construction and that it was estimated that \$100 million of the \$4.5 billion requested would not be utilized. We felt that this 2-percent reduction was reasonable and we went along with the President. At a time when reductions are being made across the board, it is unreasonable to expect that the highway program would not be affected.

In the items agreed to in the conference, the House position on the Coast Guard Reserve prevailed, but \$9.2 million was added to the House amount for acquisition, construction, and improvements for the Coast Guard.

For the FAA, the House agreed to the Senate increase of \$50,000,000 for grants-in-aid for airports: We had hoped that the new airways-airports legislation would have been passed by this time and the new program be in effect, but it has not passed and the \$50,000,000 will permit the continuation of the present program.

The funds agreed to for the SST program are \$10.9 million less than the House amount. The lateness of the year makes the sum provided adequate.

An increase of \$2 million more than the House amount is provided for Traffic and Highway Safety. The increase is for high priority research projects. In my opinion—and it is the opinion of the majority of the members of the sub-

committee—the additional funds should be spent in the area of experimental safety cars. There is \$1 million in the House-passed amount for this program, but the work has been proceeding too slowly.

The total amount which has been appropriated, including the \$1 million which the House appropriated in the bill this year, and the \$500,000 in the previous appropriations, account for the \$1,500,000 for this program to build a prototype safety car. We think the department has been dragging its feet in this area, and have provided \$2 million over the House bill for contract research, and we hope that the Department of Transportation will use this money in the direction of providing prototype cars.

The Senate added \$7 million for this program and directed that the \$7 million be used for the development of a safe prototype car. It would build some 15 cars, and the \$7 million would fully fund the program. The concept of the car has not as yet been established. It is the judgment of the members of the subcommittee that the design and specifications ought to be established before the program is fully funded. When the design and specifications are justified and indicate a justification for a continuation of the development and building of the prototype then, at least in my judgment, the House will go along with the program.

I might also say that the conference agreement provides \$214 million for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, \$6 million less than the House amount. The cut made by the Senate is in research and demonstration grants. The full amount of \$176 million requested in the budget for capital facilities grants is provided by the terms of the conference.

I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MINSHALL).

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of our subcommittee has pointed out, I regret the disagreement on the two items he has mentioned. I think it is important that the House insist on its position.

I would like to add one thing to the comments of my good friend from Massachusetts about this experimental safety car program. For the information of the House, there was inserted on the floor of the other body an amendment providing for \$7 million to construct a so-called prototype safety car. In my opinion, this is just the beginning of a multi-million-dollar boondoggle. I do not know why in heaven's name the Government of the United States should get into the car-building business, when any of the "big three" automobile manufacturers would be willing to build them on their own at a much less cost.

I agree especially with the fact that we have included \$50 million in the conference agreement for grants-in-aid to airports. As the chairman has mentioned, the user tax legislation is not yet passed, and there will apparently be a need for this money in the year ahead to provide adequate funds to help the States to build some of these airports throughout the country.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts spoke quite rapidly, and I was not able to keep up with all the figures he gave. Do I understand the approximately \$56 million is largely as a result of the airport program?

Mr. BOLAND. Yes, \$50 million of the increase is attributable to the grants-in-aid to the airports.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I should have said \$56 million about the figure approved by the House.

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The bulk of that goes for the airports?

Mr. BOLAND. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the statement just made that \$7 million was appropriated for a prototype automobile because there is concern about the safety factors being built into the automobile, there are two points I would like to raise.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction? There is no \$7 million in this conference report for the building of a prototype safety car. The amount of money which was included by the conferees was \$2 million, which we hope the Department of Transportation will use for this purpose.

The Senate did add an amendment for \$7 million for the purpose to which the gentleman from New York is now addressing himself. The \$7 million, according to the debate in the Senate on this item, would fully fund the development of 14 prototype safety cars. These cars, as the gentleman so well knows, are based on the Traffic Safety Act of 1966. That is the basic authority for the department to go ahead and construct the cars.

At least in my judgment, and I think in the judgment of many of the Members, the Department has been dragging its feet in this area. It was the hope of this subcommittee, and I believe the majority of this House and of the Senate, that the Department of Transportation will address itself to this problem. There is no way in which the Department is ever going to find out what the safety factors of a car ought to be unless they build a complete prototype. I agree with the gentleman in this respect.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I am generally in agreement with what has been said by the gentleman with respect to the manufacture of prototype safety automobiles; but I am concerned not alone with the question of safety, because Government action in this area will benefit mainly those who own automobiles and only incidentally nonowners like those who are injured by automobiles.

I am also concerned about auto-caused air pollution because it affects everyone who breathes. I believe the Department of Transportation should be working on prototype engines that will do away with

air pollution. This means testing alternatives to the present internal combustion engine.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether or not these prototypes will include experimental engines on automobiles, which will contain engines other than the internal combustion engines, like steam, electric, or turbine, so that all people who suffer today as a result of the polluted air will benefit from this, and not just those who operate automobiles or those who are injured by automobiles or who ride in automobiles.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the gentleman from New York by saying that his feelings are shared by this committee, and, I am sure, by the Members of this House.

As the gentleman knows, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and specifically the Public Health Service, is engaged in the matter of pollution caused by the internal combustion engine.

I would agree with the gentleman that one of the ways to meet this problem is by a cooperative effort on the part of HEW and the Transportation Department to get at the problem the gentleman speaks so eloquently to.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. If the gentleman will yield further, it is just that I should like the legislative history to reflect that the Congress' intention is not alone for the prototype to be concerned about safety in the building of the automobile. The Department of Transportation also should concern itself, in building that prototype, with the internal combustion engine, and building prototype automobiles with different types of engines in order that the questions of smog and air pollution may be developed.

Mr. BOLAND. At the moment, the matter of pollution really is within the jurisdiction of HEW. It is hopeful that there will be some coordination between DOT and HEW in this area.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Illinois, a member of the subcommittee and a conferee.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the conference I agreed with the conference report with two exceptions.

I excepted on amendment No. 9, which appropriates \$50 million for grants-in-aid to airports. The House had put none of this money in the bill.

In view of the statements which have been made by President Nixon, about conserving construction money at this time, I have a hunch that the President may freeze these funds. There are more important uses for this money at this time and I do not believe this appropriation should have been approved. I excepted to it.

The other appropriation to which I excepted was the allocation of funds for the supersonic aircraft. I have made my position abundantly clear in the House before this time, and I will not go into it further. Unfortunately, it is not possible to have a rollcall on the appropriation.

I am particularly delighted with the action by the conference on an amendment pertaining to the construction of or the possible addition of funds for the jetport in Miami. As the Members of the House will recall, I offered an amendment to prohibit the expenditure of the funds for any airport in Florida which was likely to interfere with the ecology of the Everglades without first there having been made a study by the Departments of Transportation and Interior.

Under the language of this bill, I believe it is noteworthy that the amendment which has been incorporated signals the awakening of millions of Americans to the importance of environmental issues in the coming years. The fact that there was no opposition in either House is indicative of the wide consensus which has been built up concerning the high priority which must be given to protecting our national heritage.

The Everglades is a particularly spectacular example of that heritage, a dynamic mixture of wildlife and natural beauty unmatched anywhere in the country. The Everglades, for all its vibrancy, is fragile in terms of ecological balance. That must be maintained so that the area will not degenerate into a swamp.

The Congress by its action today is taking a long step toward insuring that the Everglades will continue as a part of our great wilderness natural heritage to be handed down to the coming generations.

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

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Is the subcommittee recommending to the House that we insist on more funds for the SST than agreed upon in the conference?

Mr. BOLAND. No. The conference agreed on the sum of \$85 million for the SST. When the bill left the House we had \$95,958,000 for the SST. The Senate reduced this to \$80 million. When we got to conference, some of the House conferees believed that was not a sufficient amount of money to continue with the orderly development of the prototype phase, phase 3. So the conferees added \$5 million to the Senate amount.

Mr. OTTINGER. The conferees are not in disagreement?

Mr. BOLAND. No. It is not a matter in the amendments in disagreement.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I just wanted to comment on the discussion which went on regarding air pollution and the automobile engine. As the chairman of the subcommittee has stated, this really is handled by HEW in the air pollution program.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has already started hearings on clean air. We have heard from automobile companies and the Department of Transportation. We will continue these hearings next year. A great deal of progress is being made. We mean to keep pressure on to meet this problem, but I believe we are beginning

to recognize it. It is really not a part of the appropriation in this bill. As you say, your bill goes more to safety, and the air pollution problem is concerned with HEW, and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is very much on top of it and will continue to be. I am encouraged by the testimony from a number of individual companies that they are working on different types of engines to try to solve the problem. We hope they will continue this type of work.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My question is with regard to the supersonic transport. How much will this lead to, this \$85 million being appropriated here, in total expenditures?

Mr. BOLAND. How much would it lead to?

Mr. MELCHER. In the next few years in the way of appropriations.

Mr. BOLAND. This is an appropriation for the fiscal year 1970. It will be \$85 million. I presume that when the budget for fiscal year 1971 comes in, the amount requested might reach as high as \$350 million. By that time, it will bring the total appropriations probably to about \$1 billion. The Federal share of the cost of research and development, for the production of two prototypes, plus 100 hours of test flying, will come to about \$1.2 billion or \$1.3 billion.

Mr. MELCHER. Does this amount and the apparent succeeding steps that will lead to more than a \$1 billion appropriation from the Treasury—and I do not know whether the gentleman from Massachusetts is prepared to answer me, but perhaps somebody on the minority side can answer this question—does this have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the President?

Mr. BOLAND. This was a recommendation submitted by the President of the United States and by the Bureau of the Budget. This item came up as a budget amendment in October.

Mr. MELCHER. This expenditure for the supersonic transport, which I understand has serious problems with the sonic boom and the airplane when built may not be able to be used over the continental United States as a result—this appropriation leading up to the \$1 billion expenditure does have the approval of the President and the Bureau of the Budget and it is the same administration and Bureau of the Budget that are calling necessary funds for education and health expenditures inflationary. It is one and the same group, is it not?

Mr. BOLAND. I prefer to have the minority respond to that.

Let me say that this program also had the approval, of course, of President Johnson and President Kennedy.

Mr. YATES. But the answer to the gentleman's question is yes, is it not?

Mr. MELCHER. I would like to hear from the minority side.

Mr. MINSHALL. I would like to point out to the gentleman that the supersonic transport program, as I mentioned when

we discussed and debated this bill, has had the approval of both President Johnson and President Kennedy and has had the approval of every Congress during those administrations. Of course, this House overwhelmingly approved the supersonic transport program when we voted on it this year during the debate on the Department of Transportation bill, and the Senate did accordingly.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. For a correction on what the gentleman from Ohio said.

The gentleman is correct that the supersonic transport has been approved in the Committee of the Whole during various debates. However, there has never been a record vote in the House directly on the question of the supersonic transport because the parliamentary situation did not permit it.

Mr. MINSHALL. The gentleman is correct. We approved it in the Committee of the Whole, but it was overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. BOLAND. We have been all through this debate on the SST for a number of years.

I now yield to the gentleman from Montana further.

Mr. MELCHER. I would like to point out that both President Johnson and President Kennedy placed education and health before the supersonic transport, but now we find the supersonic transport ahead of health and education. The administration wants to cut back the health and education funds, but not this appropriation.

Mr. MINSHALL. The gentleman is just making a political statement that is com-

pletely politically motivated and does not need any comment.

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

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

Mr. YATES. I think the gentleman from Montana has made a very valid point. The President has indicated and the press has carried stories that he will veto the appropriations that the Congress has approved for education. On the other hand, he has approved funds for the SST. In one case his words are clear. He will not veto appropriations for the SST, but he will veto certain items which are contained in the HEW appropriation bill for education and health if they exceed a certain amount.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. I would say concerning the SST, the leadership in this field has been gained by Russia and by Britain and France.

As you know, last year, at my own expense, I visited the factory where the Concorde is being manufactured in England. They are far ahead of us. If we are afraid of the sonic boom, I might mention this fact: The Concorde is so constructed that it will fly at a lower rate of speed over the continental limits of the United States and will cause no more trouble than the 747.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we should reestablish our leadership in this field and I support the SST program.

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

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

Mr. PICKLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I notice in that section of the report pertaining to the Federal Railroad Administration, amendment No. 23, shows that you appropriate \$11 million for the high-speed ground transportation research and development program. I assume that this is for the regular research and development program?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PICKLE. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, no money, then, is recommended for the high-speed ground demonstration project, the facility project, which has been recommended, and the site, about which concern has been expressed?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is correct. It is not in the budget and it is not in the bill.

Mr. PICKLE. In other words, the administration has not made a recommendation as to the site?

Mr. BOLAND. The Department has not made a recommendation as to the site.

Mr. PICKLE. Does the gentleman know why this decision has not been made?

Mr. BOLAND. No, I suppose it is because they still are considering a number of sites and have not come to a conclusion on where that site will be. I presume this would be the reason for the delay.

Mr. PICKLE. I suppose that is correct, but I think it is regrettable that we have lost some 15 months time in this valuable project and I would hope that we can get a firm recommendation soon.

Mr. BOLAND. Under leave to extend, I place in the RECORD a summary table showing the actions of Congress on the bill:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR 1969 AND BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1970

[In thousands]

Item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1969	Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, 1970	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						New budget (obligational) authority, 1969	Budget estimate, 1970	House bill	Senate bill
Office of the Secretary.....	\$16,150	\$32,900	\$24,020	\$30,270	\$27,120	+\$10,970	-\$5,780	+\$3,100	-\$3,150
Coast Guard.....	544,274	565,434	541,319	560,419	550,519	+6,245	-14,915	+9,200	-9,900
Federal Aviation Administration.....	892,174	1,057,458	1,139,358	1,173,700	1,178,550	+286,376	+121,092	+39,192	+4,850
Federal Highway Administration.....	31,644	43,590	36,600	46,637	38,600	+6,956	-4,990	+2,000	-8,037
Federal Railroad Administration.....	18,570	20,250	15,350	17,400	16,400	-2,170	-3,850	+1,050	-1,000
Urban Mass Transportation Administration.....	175,000	252,000	221,500	201,500	215,500	+40,500	-36,500	-6,000	+14,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.....	(550)	(630)	(600)	(600)	(600)	+(50)	-(30)		
Total, title I, Department of Transportation.....	1,677,812	1,971,632	1,978,147	2,029,926	2,026,689	+348,877	+55,057	+48,542	-3,237
Total, title II, Related Agencies.....	128,084	118,842	116,873	117,227	117,050	-11,034	-1,792	+177	-177
Total, titles I and II, new budget (obligational) authority.....	1,805,896	2,090,474	2,095,020	2,147,153	2,143,739	+337,843	+53,265	+48,719	-3,414
Consisting of appropriations:									
Fiscal 1969.....	(1,600,896)					(-1,600,896)			
Fiscal 1970.....	(205,000)	(1,840,474)	(1,875,020)	(1,947,153)	(1,929,739)	(+1,724,739)	(+89,265)	(+54,719)	(-17,414)
Fiscal 1971.....		(250,000)	(220,000)	(200,000)	(214,000)	(+214,000)	(-36,000)	(-6,000)	(+14,000)
Memorandums:									
Appropriations to liquidate contract authorizations.....	(4,241,970)	(4,682,000)	(4,519,279)	(4,631,657)	(4,526,279)	(+284,309)	(-155,721)	(+7,000)	(-105,378)
Appropriation for debt reduction.....	(126)	(131)	(131)	(131)	(131)	(+5)			
Rescission of unobligated funds.....	(-30,000)					(+30,000)			
Grand total.....	(6,017,992)	(6,772,605)	(6,614,430)	(6,778,941)	(6,670,149)	(+652,157)	(-102,456)	(+55,719)	(-108,792)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I protest once again, and certainly not for the last time, the inclusion of funds for the supersonic transport.

In addition to the sheer waste of taxpayers' dollars involved in the SST, a substantial question is presented concerning the affront to the environment caused by the sonic boom and airport

noise of the proposed plane. Assurances that the SST would not be allowed to fly over populated areas, accompanied by a certain amount of wobbling, were made during the House debate on the SST last November 18.

In order to set the matter to rest, I addressed the following letter to President Nixon on November 24:

NOVEMBER 24, 1969.
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The House debate on November 19 over your request for \$96 million to continue development of a supersonic transport (SST) showed that many Members of the House were concerned about

potential "noise pollution" from this aircraft—both sonic boom and airport noise.

It would help to lay to rest this concern if you gave Congress and the American people your formal assurance on two points:

(1) That no commercial supersonic aircraft will be allowed to fly over populated areas at boom-producing speeds, and

(2) That no commercial supersonic aircraft, U.S. or foreign, will be certified by the Federal Aviation Administration if the airport noise which it generates (both community noise and sideline noise) is greater than that from the most noisy commercial subsonic aircraft certified at that time by the FAA.

Assurance on the first point would implement a suggestion of your Ad Hoc Task Force on the SST. The Environmental and Sociological Panel of that Task Force said that:

"It is essential that the public be formally assured by appropriate authorities that commercial supersonic flight over land will not be permitted and that SST design, development, and economic considerations are and will remain restricted to over water routes."

This recommendation was reinforced by Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, Director of the Office of Science and Technology, in a letter to Transportation Under Secretary James Beggs: "Surely we must have a policy statement that there shall be no supersonic operations by the SST over any populated areas."

In addition, Dr. Raymond L. Bisplinghoff, Dean of the School of Engineering at MIT and a consultant to the FAA Administrator on the SST program, told the Administrator in a February 7, 1969, memo on the new Boeing SST design:

"A very useful public statement at the present time would be one indicating that the B-2707-300 design was conceived from the very beginning as an overwater machine and that under no circumstances could it ever be operated over populated land areas."

With regard to the airport noise problem, the assurance I ask would carry out the intention of Congress as expressed in Public Law 90-411 (July 21, 1968, 49 U.S.C. 1431) "to afford present and future relief and protection to the public from unnecessary aircraft noise. . . ."

I hope to hear from you shortly.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

My letter produced the following reply from the White House:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 4, 1969.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. REUSS: Thank you for your letter to the President regarding the concern of many Members over the possibility of "noise pollution" by the supersonic transport.

I know the President will be interested in the points you raised in your letter on this matter. We shall call your letter to his early attention and be in further touch with you. With cordial regard.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Deputy Assistant to the President.

So we still do not know whether the SST will be allowed to fly over populated areas.

Mr. BOLAND. 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.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 11, insert the following: "Provided, That whenever the Secretary determines that staff functions being performed elsewhere in the Department could be performed more economically and effectively by the Office of the Secretary, he may, during the current fiscal year, transfer such functions to the Office of the Secretary."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 14 and 15 be considered en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 14: Page 10, line 16, strike "\$4,419,279,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,519,657,000."

Senate amendment No. 15: Page 10, line 20, strike "\$3,533,765,964" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,634,143,964."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOLAND moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 14 and 15.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the conference report and on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report on the Department of Transportation appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 13270, TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 761) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 761

Resolved, That there shall be printed concurrently with the conference report to accompany H.R. 13270, "A Bill to Reform the Income Tax Laws," three thousand additional copies for the use of the House Document Room.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 2325) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for additional positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2325

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 5108(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out "2,577" and inserting in lieu thereof "2,772";

(b) Section 5108(b)(2) of such title is amended by striking out "28" and inserting in lieu thereof "44";

(c) Section 5108(c)(1) of such title is amended by striking out "64" and inserting in lieu thereof "90";

(d) Section 5108(c)(2) of such title is amended by striking out "110" and inserting in lieu thereof "140";

(e) (1) Section 5108(c) of such title is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (8), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (9) and inserting "; and" in place thereof, and by inserting the following new paragraph:

"(10) The Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, subject to the standards and procedures prescribed by this chapter, may place a total of eight positions in the Smithsonian Institution in GS-16, 17, and 18."

(2) Section 5315 is amended by inserting the following new paragraph after paragraph (91):

"(92) Assistant Secretary, Smithsonian Institution."

Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and for other purposes", approved May 29, 1959, as amended (50 U.S.C. 402, note), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. The Secretary of Defense (or his designee for the purpose) is authorized to—

"(1) establish in the National Security Agency (A) professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and (B) professional positions in the physical and natural sciences, medicine, and cryptology; and

"(2) fix the respective rates of pay of such positions at rates equal to rates of basic pay contained in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the

General Schedule set forth in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

Officers and employees appointed to positions established under this section shall be in addition to the number of officers and employees appointed to positions under section 2 of this Act who may be paid at rates equal to rates of basic pay contained in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule."

SEC. 3. Of the additional positions authorized to be placed in GS-16, 17, and 18 by the amendment made by subsection (a) of the first section of this Act, forty-five positions shall initially be allocated by the Civil Service Commission to those positions which the Commission determines are identical or substantially identical to positions now classified in GS-16, 17, or 18, but which have not been identically classified because of the numerical limitations contained in section 5108(a) of title 5, United States Code, prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HENDERSON

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDERSON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That (a) section 5108(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out '2,577' and inserting in lieu thereof '2,727'.

"(b) Section 5108(b) (2) of such title is amended by striking out '28' and inserting in lieu thereof '44'.

"(c) Section 5108(c) (1) of such title is amended by striking out '64' and inserting in lieu thereof '90'.

"(d) Section 5108(c) (2) of such title is amended by striking out '110' and inserting in lieu thereof '140'.

"Sec. 2. Section 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide certain administrative authorities for the National Security Agency, and for other purposes', approved May 29, 1959, as amended (50 U.S.C. 402, note), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4 The Secretary of Defense (or his designee for the purpose) is authorized to—

"(1) establish in the National Security Agency (A) professional engineering positions primarily concerned with research and development and (B) professional positions in the physical and natural sciences, medicine, and cryptology; and

"(2) fix the respective rates of pay of such positions at rates equal to rates of basic pay contained in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule set forth in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

Officers and employees appointed to positions established under this section shall be in addition to the number of officers and employees appointed to positions under section 2 of this Act who may be paid at rates equal to rates of basic pay contained in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON).

The amendment 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.

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2325, as amended.

I believe that every Member of this body who knows me and my voting record would agree that I have not made it a practice to support or sponsor expensive programs or proposals of doubtful or

questionable worth. I have consistently voted in favor of spending cuts and economy.

But the way to save money so far as personnel is concerned is to hold down programs. When Congress authorizes a program or creates a department or agency and delegates responsibility to it, then it is completely false economy to establish such rigid and arbitrary manpower and salary ceilings that the program or agency cannot be efficiently managed and operated.

All of us know that an essential ingredient of a successful business operation is good, capable management. All of us know that in our leading industries in the private sector, the competition for executives with demonstrated management, scientific, and engineering ability is extremely intense.

The same is true of the Federal Government. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission appearing before the Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee on November 9 indicated the administration's strong support of subject legislation and pointedly stated the case of the departments and agencies in these words: "In 1967 and 1968, the Commission described the needs for additional quota spaces as pressing but today in 1969, the need has ceased to be pressing, it is critical."

I feel that every Member of this body and the taxpaying public wants the various programs of the Federal Government to be managed and administered by executives who have the ability to administer them wisely, economically, and in accordance with the intent of the Congress.

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 2325, as amended, is to provide for the establishment of certain management, administrative, scientific and research and development positions in the three highest Federal career service salary grades, which are needed for the successful and efficient conduct of new and/or expanded programs and functions authorized by the Congress and other essential Government activities.

AMENDMENT

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House amended S. 2325 by rejecting 45 additional supergrades earmarked for regional office adjustments in several departments and agencies, and eight supergrades and one executive pay level IV position earmarked specifically for the Smithsonian Institution. The Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee in its public hearing did not receive sufficient evidence to warrant the additional supergrades for regional office adjustments. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee does not consider it wise to earmark specifically supergrades as S. 2325 provided, as passed by the Senate, for the Smithsonian Institution.

POSITIONS AUTHORIZED

S. 2325, as amended by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, authorizes 150 additional positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 of the General Schedule for allocation among departments and agencies in the executive branch in accordance with procedures established and administered by

the U.S. Civil Service Commission to carry out the congressional policy laid down in Public Law 87-367:

Provides 16 additional top-grade positions for the Library of Congress;

Increases by 26 the number of positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 in the General Accounting Office;

Increases by 30 the number of positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the Department of Justice; and

Removes the quota restriction on the number of engineering and scientific positions in the National Security Agency, Department of Defense.

PUBLIC HEARING

The Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee on November 5, 1969, held a public hearing on H.R. 12476 by Messrs. DULSKI and CORBETT. The Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Hon. Robert E. Hampton, supported subject bill, providing for all items as now reflected in S. 2325, as amended by the committee.

Chairman Hampton did not request any supergrade positions in addition to those provided in subject bill as amended.

Favorable reports were received from the heads of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the General Accounting Office, and the Library of Congress. There were no adverse reports.

JUSTIFICATION

For the Civil Service Commission pool there are now 2,577 spaces available for the Commission to allocate among the departments and agencies of the executive branch according to priorities of need.

Subject bill would increase this number to 2,727. The Congress has not increased the number of spaces in the Commission "pool" since 1966, when 177 were, at that time, given to the Civil Service Commission. However, since 1966, Congress has authorized large expansions in several existing programs and created many new ones. Examples of these programs are:

Highway safety, Department of Transportation;

Air and water pollution, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

Drug abuse and control, Justice Department;

Urban renewal, Department of Housing and Urban Development;

Vocational rehabilitation, the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation now has 110 supergrades and their last increment was 35 in 1966. There are currently no supergrade vacancies in the Bureau. The additional positions, according to FBI officials, are needed for increased activities in the criminal, security and civil fields. For example, from 1956 to date, the FBI primary investigative jurisdiction has increased from 140 categories to over 180. In turn, six additional field offices have been established.

The General Accounting Office would have an increase from 64 to 90 supergrade positions by enactment of subject legislation. In 1966 GAO received 25 of these positions. Currently there are no vacancies. Comptroller General Elmer

Staats has indicated to the committee an urgent requirement for 14 supergrade positions for the accounting, auditing and investigative responsibilities and 12 positions for legal, policy, technical and administrative functions.

Library of Congress now has 28 supergrades and this number would be increased by 16 to 44. The Librarian of Congress, Hon. L. Quincy Mumford, has indicated such reasons as the following for additional top jobs in the Library: the application of computers to control and to use information stored in card catalogs, the expansion of the Copyright Office, and increased use of automation for the Legislative Reference Service.

National Security Agency would be extended the same authority and flexibility afforded most of the other Federal agencies as to hiring top-level scientific and engineering personnel. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission recommended this legislative change. Enactment of this provision would place the National Security Agency on an equal basis with most other agencies relative to the recruitment of highly skilled scientific personnel, especially in the cryptologic science.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROL OVER ALLOCATION OF SUPERGRADE POSITIONS

For the past few years the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee have felt that the present system of controlling supergrades is as realistic and feasible a procedure as we have been able to develop. The various departments and agencies go the Civil Service Commissioners and indicate positions for review as to supergrade levels. The Commissioners evaluate each position as to whether it justifies a supergrade level. If it is, then the agency must justify priority over the requests of other departments and agencies. Likewise, the Commissioners evaluate the qualifications of each supergrade nominee. This procedure insures to Congress that the Civil Service Commission serves as the monitor of needs of Government for supergrade positions.

An alternative to this system would be for each congressional committee to legislate the supergrade requirements for the various departments and agencies over which it has jurisdiction. Thusly, there would be no control over these top-level jobs with such legislative procedure. The present system will only work if required positions for the Civil Service Commissioners to allocate to departments and agencies are made available. The pool of available positions at the Commission is now "dry."

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION RESPONSIBILITY

The committee strongly recommends that the Civil Service Commission, in carrying out its responsibilities in allocating the 150 additional authorized supergrade positions, be most careful to allocate them to the departments and agencies that have the greatest need in view of the total number available. Any action to distribute these positions without regard to their need will certainly lead to a serious undermining of the confidence of the Congress as to the

Commissioners' stewardship over the control of supergrades.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

In his official report to the Congress on March 18, 1969, for the enactment of legislation providing for additional supergrades, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission stated that, "Under current plans, from 20 to 25 of these additional supergrade positions would be made available to the government of the District of Columbia." This committee has received no testimony or no evidence whatsoever that would justify additional supergrade positions for the District of Columbia government.

The District of Columbia government currently has 60 city officials at the supergrade level. These are positions that, at the lowest supergrade level, pay more money than that earned by 27 of our State Governors. Only 15 of our State Governors are paid salaries higher than those now paid to the District of Columbia Corporation Counsel, the Directors of Highways and Traffic, Program Development, Public Safety, and Public Health, all of which are at the GS-18 level.

I believe that the District of Columbia government is currently overloaded in high-paying positions and see no justification for additional allocations by the Civil Service Commission of any of the positions being made available in this bill.

COSTS

It is estimated that for the 222 supergrade positions, plus an estimated increase of some 15 supergrade-level engineering and scientific positions in the National Security Agency, as provided by S. 2325, as amended by the committee, the annual cost will be approximately \$2.4 million.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of continued congressional control of top management positions in the Federal Government and in the interest of efficient administration of our Government, I urge the House to act favorably on S. 2325, as amended.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I have agreed to the passage of this legislation. I have done so only in an effort to maintain at least some control on the part of Congress over the number and allocation of Federal employees in grades 16, 17, and 18.

These supergrades should never have been permitted. It is a device to provide higher pay that was supposed to be used sparingly as a reward for meritorious service of the highest order. There are now several thousand of these employees and the executive branch of Government must be put on notice that with respect to supergrades and scientific and professional employees any further increases in the foreseeable future will meet with this Member's opposition.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members

may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Senate bill just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS AND AUTHORITY FOR SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House may proceed with special orders at this time and that subsequent to the disposition of all special orders, the Speaker may declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether this has been cleared with the leadership on this side of the aisle. Can the gentleman from Oklahoma indicate that?

Mr. ALBERT. It has not been cleared with the leadership. We would assume that the leadership would be agreeable to it because we have cleared all the business that is before the House, and we are hopeful that the other body might send over a conference report or two this afternoon because we have a total of eight conference reports yet to dispose of prior to adjournment.

In view of that, we would expect that everyone would be agreeable to the request.

Mr. PETTIS. May I further ask the gentleman from Oklahoma, may we then reasonably expect that there will be business tomorrow?

Mr. ALBERT. We feel quite certain that there will be business tomorrow.

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

Mr. PETTIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, could the majority leader inform the membership as to the time frame? In other words, if we are not called back by some time certain, could we consider that we are through for the day?

Mr. ALBERT. I have not discussed this with other Members of the leadership. I can assure the gentleman, we would not make this an unreasonably long day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT)?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as it happened I was unavoidably kept away from the floor of the House a little while ago and did not get to vote on the foreign aid conference report. If I had been here, I would have voted against it and I would like for the Record to show that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's statement will appear in the Record.

THE LATE THORNTON HARDIE

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas has lost one of its great civic leaders, a widely known and highly respected lawyer, a forceful and eloquent figure on the political scene, a courtly respected gentleman.

Mr. Thornton Hardie came to El Paso as a young graduate of the University of Texas Law School in 1913. He has practiced law in El Paso for more than 56 years; certainly he was one of the senior members and former presidents of the El Paso Bar, a distinguished legal scholar, and the senior member of the highly respected firm of Hardie, Grambling, Sims & Galatzan.

Excellence in legal training and practice, in civic life, and especially in the field of education, were basic themes of his life. For 6 years, he served our State with great distinction as a member of the board of regents of the University of Texas system, as chairman of the board for 2 years, 1961 to 1963. He also served as a member of the Texas Council for Higher Education, and was a member of the Philosophical Society of Texas.

In politics, Mr. Hardie was an eloquent defender of those principles of constitutional government which he believed essential to our Nation's well-being. Opponents and allies alike respected his great ability and admired his unflinching courtesy and courtly bearing.

In our community of El Paso, he was honored in the field of business, having served as vice president and director of the El Paso National Bank, director of the Southern Union Gas Co., and the Rio Grande, El Paso & Santa Fe Railroad Co.

His imprint upon the city of El Paso and the State of Texas has been great beyond measure. His memory will remain bright among his four children, all of whom are outstanding civic leaders, 18 grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren, his brothers and sisters, and his many friends.

Other Members of this body, who had the good fortune to know Mr. Thornton Hardie, I am sure will join in the sentiments that here was a citizen whose career of service deserves our admiration and respect.

MIDDLE EAST RESOLUTION AMENDMENT

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, daily the fighting in the Middle East increases, daily the tension multiplies, daily the toll of Arabs and Israelis killed mounts—and each day the likelihood grows that open warfare will erupt between nations in that part of the world. If that fateful, violent day comes again as it did in 1957 and 1967, the position of the United States may well determine the future of mankind. The military and political support which our Government gives to one

side or the other will drastically affect the outcome of any war in the Middle East, whether it spreads beyond the immediate bounds of the conflict, whether it involves a confrontation with the Soviet Union, and whether once again American boys are called upon to put their lives on the line to support their Government's foreign policy.

Does the United States have a commitment that might draw us into a conflict in the Middle East? If it exists, how does it compare with the commitment our Nation undertook in Vietnam? Who would make the decision as to whether our interest justifies military action? What is the possibility of the United States becoming embroiled, through a Vietnam-like process of gradualism, in another undeclared war—this time perhaps posing an even greater risk of escalation to a nuclear confrontation?

These are questions the Congress and the American people are entitled to ask, particularly at this moment of mounting crisis in a region with which our country has so many cultural, religious, ethnic, and economic ties.

The answers will come as a surprise—indeed, a shock—to most Americans, including, I daresay, most of the Members of Congress.

Still in full force on the statute books is a resolution enacted by Congress in 1957 which states a broad area of national commitment to the preservation of the integrity of nations in the Middle East. It is far more specific than the formal obligations cited as justification for our entry into the conflict in Vietnam. In fact, the all but forgotten Middle East Resolution makes the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution pale by comparison. It places in the hands of the President the exclusive authority to make the determination that military action is required and to order into action military forces without limit. It relieves the President even of the necessity of consulting with the Congress, as well as the necessity of securing advance congressional approval.

It leaves open the possibility of another Vietnam-like experience, another undeclared war—this time bringing into basic confrontation the vital interests of the world's two superpowers.

What President—and especially one now dealing with the agony of disengagement from the Vietnam tragedy—would wish to use this awesome power without first consulting thoroughly with the Congress and gaining from the Congress specific approval. Surely, President Nixon would be the last person intentionally to permit the military doctrine of gradualism to draw the Nation into another large-scale undeclared war.

Indeed, President Nixon's statement this week that he approves of the Senate appropriation bill amendment forbidding ground combat troops from being introduced into Thailand and Laos suggests that the President would likewise welcome congressional restraint on similar authority in the Middle East.

This estimate of Presidential intention, while reassuring, does not relieve the Congress of its own responsibility to the American people. Under the Constitution, the power of the sword is vested in

the Congress. This power it unwisely surrendered in 1957, and this power it must regain. To argue that the resolution is dormant and would never be cited is scant comfort.

In the fall of 1964, President Johnson would have scoffed at a forecast that he would use the Gulf of Tonkin resolution and the SEATO treaty as justification for sending a half-million men into war.

Such a possibility has not been ruled completely out in the Middle East. During the 10-day battle in November between the Lebanese Army and Arab guerrilla forces, Secretary of the Navy John H. Chafee told a London news conference, "I think certainly the United States is not anxious to become involved in land deployment in the Mediterranean." But if circumstances became serious and required it, he said, "I think we could do it." He added that, "I think the United States would need very strong reasons for landing troops from the 6th Fleet."

No one can forecast with accuracy the passions and pressures which may be generated by future events and brought to bear on institutions of our Government.

If experience has taught us anything, it has shown how fragile peace really is, and how difficult it is to draw the fine line between U.S. involvement as a provider of noncombat military support and U.S. involvement in combat itself.

Difficult though it may be, the Congress must assume responsibility for that line drawing. The chore cannot wisely be left to the President, even one as experienced and chastened as Mr. Nixon.

The power of the sword—one of the two great powers reserved by the Constitution to the legislative branch—is clearly and exclusively established as a congressional prerogative by this mandate of article I, section 8 of the Constitution, "The Congress shall have power to declare war."

There are some, myself among them, who believe that Congress has not adequately fulfilled its responsibility in this regard in the past. Irrespective of differing views on points of history, each of us surely wants to guard the legislative prerogative of power over the sword in any future conflict which might entail the use of U.S. troops.

If war should break out in the Middle East—and there is every indication that this is a real possibility—the Congress should formally and officially participate in any decision fixing the role the United States would take in such a conflict. The Constitution says we must, and the people who elected us have the right to expect us to exercise our judgment in just such a circumstance.

Yet, in the event of war in the Middle East, would the Congress be called upon to exercise its constitutional authority before our military forces are used?

Under existing law, as interpreted when it was enacted, it is clear that the decision could be made to send American combat troops in almost unlimited numbers into the Middle East to fight on any side or as a buffer between sides without specific approval by the House or the Senate.

The Middle East resolution, passed in

the early months of 1957 when the menacing military posture of the Soviet Union seemed to threaten the stability of the countries of the Middle East, states:

The United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any such nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: Provided, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States. Pub. L. 85-7.

This act has never been repealed. It has no specified date of expiration. It is permanent law.

Let there be no mistake. This resolution, passed under circumstances in the Middle East which have radically changed in the intervening 13 years, requires neither consultation with Congress nor congressional approval before the President can send American men to fight in a war.

When Secretary of State John Foster Dulles testified on the resolution before the Joint Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees he made that point abundantly clear in response to this question put to him by Senator Kefauver.

Senator KEFAUVER. But can you give us that as an assurance, that before the Armed Forces of this Nation will be used under circumstances which might bring about a substantial conflict, that the President would ask for a declaration that a state of war existed?

Secretary DULLES. Not prior to their use; no sir.

And in response to Senator FULBRIGHT's query, "Who determines whether or not a country is Communist dominated?" the Secretary of State replied, "That determination would be made by the President."

This broad delegation of congressional power is far greater than the grant of authority in the SEATO treaty which President Johnson often cited as authority for American military actions under the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Under article IV of the SEATO treaty, each party to the treaty pledged, in accordance with its "constitutional processes," to "act to meet the common danger" resulting from "aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties."

The hearings on the SEATO treaty in 1954 made it perfectly clear that some form of congressional action would be required to authorize military action under article IV. Senator Wiley, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unmistakably clarified the meaning of the phrase "constitutional processes" when he asked Secretary of State Dulles the following question:

Senator WILEY. So whether it were the threat mentioned in Section 2 [of article IV] or the common danger resulting from open attack, action could be taken only after consultation with Congress?

To this, the Secretary of State unqualifiedly answered "yes."

Again, later in the hearings, the Sec-

retary of State affirmed that the President "would act through the Congress if it were in session, and if not in session [he would] call Congress."

There was no similar pledge by Secretary Dulles in the hearings on the Middle East resolution. To the contrary, as indicated to Senator Kefauver above, the Secretary specifically stated that the President need not consult first with the Congress, nor seek any kind of congressional authority or supportive action, prior to committing U.S. Armed Forces to fight in the Middle East. Secretary Dulles did say that the President might, under certain circumstances, call Congress into session after he had committed troops and the war had already begun. This comment demonstrated clearly the degree to which the resolution relieved the Congress of its war-making power.

The only military action taken under authority of the Middle East resolution unquestionably supports this interpretation.

When President Eisenhower sent U.S. Marines into Lebanon without prior congressional approval on July 14, 1957, he cited the Middle East resolution—passed 16 months earlier—in support of his action, although the aggression was being carried out exclusively by Arab nationals using Soviet weapons. As further justification, he listed the pattern of conquest by the Communists in Greece in 1947, Czechoslovakia in 1948, China in 1949, Korea and Indochina in 1950, and stated:

We now see in the Middle East . . . the same pattern of conquest with which we became familiar during the period of 1945 to 1950. This involves taking over a nation by means of indirect aggression; that is, under the cover of a fomented civil strife the purpose is to put into domestic control those whose real loyalty is to the aggressor.

Referring to the Korean war, President Eisenhower went on to say, "All the world knew that the North Koreans were armed, equipped and directed from without for the purpose of aggression."

Times have changed since the Congress passed the Middle East resolution over a decade ago. The nature of the conflict has changed. Although Soviet power remains and in some respect is much greater, who can say with precision that any country in the Middle East is, in the words of the resolution, "controlled by international communism"? The fierce independence and nationalism of Arabs is only partly nurtured by Soviet ambition and aid. To the deep wounds of many years are added the scars of the 7-day war. Tension and conflict are seen more in nationalistic terms today than in terms of confrontation between the free world and international communism.

At the same time the Soviet threat has taken on a more menacing, although changed, character. The Soviet Union is now a superpower whose nuclear weapons are acknowledged to be in the same class as those of the United States. It is also a first-rate naval power, operating extensively for the first time throughout the Mediterranean.

If a confrontation should occur between the United States and the Soviet Union over the Middle East, our country would no longer hold the decisive ad-

vantages of yesterday, even though the danger of intimidation of these states by massed displays of Soviet ground forces no longer seems so great.

These changes make all the graver the risks entailed by a confrontation with "international communism" in that region. Such a confrontation may come. The time may also come when the United States will find it clearly in its interest to go to war. But the stakes are now so mountainous as to make absolutely vital formal congressional approval before any such decision is effected.

The Congress can deal expeditiously with a challenge in whatever manner is appropriate. Let no one doubt the capability or the capacity of the Congress to act with dispatch if the occasion merits it. The comment of Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, later to be President, at the hearings on the Middle East resolution are as instructive as they are ironic. Referring to the request in the resolution for \$200 million to support U.S. economic and military aid, the Senator told Secretary Dulles:

I think that you can trust the Congress to act with reasonable care on matters vitally affecting this Nation and not to drag their feet. I know of no disposition to do so. It seems to me if the Secretary of State and the President feel the need for further information before they reach a conclusion, that they will give the Congress the same privilege they reserve for themselves.

The attitude of the American people has also changed quite markedly over the last decade. We have learned from bitter experience the limitations of limited wars.

We have learned that a war effort which has been denied the unifying force of formal congressional support and approval is gravely shortchanged. We have found that a limited military response ordered on his own by the President can lead the Nation into a paralyzing and seemingly bottomless quagmire. From this experience, I believe the Congress has become convinced that the American people will not support U.S. involvement in a foreign war unless and until such involvement has been given formal approval by the Congress.

Because of these two changed factors, plus the constitutional responsibility mentioned earlier, I am today introducing an amendment to the Middle East resolution. It would clearly spell out the role of Congress in any decision to commit U.S. forces to the Middle East under the authority of that resolution.

Retaining all the basic language of the resolution, the amendment would add three significant words, "and the Congress," to the operative clause permitting the commitment of armed forces. It would cause section 2 of the resolution to read, in pertinent part:

Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President and the Congress determine the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: Provided, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty

obligations of the United States and with the Constitution of the United States.

This amendment does not in any way lessen our commitment to peace, justice, and national security in the Middle East. Nor does the amendment in any way lessen our commitment to stand fast against Communist encroachment in that part of the world. Outright repeal of the Middle East resolution might very well have that effect.

Acceptance by the Congress of the amendment I propose would have the undeniable effect of reaffirming congressional support for and commitment to a stable, peaceful, independent Middle East. At this point in our history when the shadow of Vietnam seems to dull many of our commitments around the world, it would be wise for the United States to renew its commitment to stand fast against Communist penetration in this part of the world.

My amendment restores Congress to its proper decisionmaking role, recognizing that before the United States can constitutionally commit armed forces to preserve "the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East," approval by the Congress, as well as the President is required.

This amendment would not infringe upon the legitimate right—in fact the duty—of a President to commit troops in the Middle East or elsewhere under certain limited circumstances without prior specific approval by the Congress. As Commander in Chief, the President has the implied power to repel attack and to protect the lives and property of U.S. citizens.

However, these exceptions to the general rule of prior congressional approval cannot properly be interpreted loosely. Thus, a President cannot cite as authorization the need to protect American lives or property when in fact there is no clear and substantial showing of danger to such at the time of the intervention.

Similarly, the power to repel attack is not an unlimited one. The right of self-defense is undeniable, but this authority permits only a limited response to a specific situation, and it terminates when the need for self-defense terminates. Beyond this, any intervention by American forces must be preceded by specific congressional approval.

The need for action on this amendment is urgent. If the volcano of war does erupt in the Middle East, the United States may well decide to send troops to help restore peace and stability to that part of the world. But let the decision to do so result from the constitutional processes which form the strength and security of our Nation and in which the role of Congress is fixed by the Constitution and not by the pleasure of the President. Let the decision to send troops, or not to do so, result from a synthesizing debate and vote—actions which will help forge a unified public will behind national policy. Such a unified will can best be forged on the one great anvil of democracy, the Congress of the United States.

MYLAI INVESTIGATION

(Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on November 20 I took the floor to ask for a complete investigation of the alleged atrocities at Mylai. I am glad to see that the Congress and the Department of Defense are conducting in-depth investigations.

Yesterday I received a letter from Mr. Raymond J. Kappel, secretary of the Fairview Park, Ohio, Jaycees, detailing a meeting in July 1968, at which Ronald Haeberle showed his now-famous color photographs taken at Mylai.

Mr. Kappel, who did not attend that meeting, wrote the letter in his capacity as secretary of the group, at the request of fellow Jaycees who were present when the pictures were shown. I have discussed Mr. Kappel's letter with a member who was there, and he states that the facts are accurately represented.

I know that my colleagues are tremendously concerned with the alleged events at Mylai and, accordingly, I am making this letter part of the RECORD and am sending copies of it to the appropriate Department of Defense officials:

THE FAIRVIEW PARK JAYCEES, INC.,
Fairview Park, Ohio, December 11, 1969.
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Rayburn Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MINSHALL: The Fairview Park Jaycees have been deeply disturbed by the alleged massacre at My Lai on March 16, 1968. We also are concerned about the sensationalism of the publicity concerning My Lai.

On July 10, 1968, Mr. Ronald Haeberle presented a slide show on Vietnam at our monthly meeting. The main theme of his presentation was Vietnam countryside until the final few slides, which showed Vietnamese people, whom Mr. Haeberle said were killed as a result of a military search-and-destroy mission. The slides were the same as photographs that are now getting sensational publicity by the news media. We were sickened by the photographs. We questioned Mr. Haeberle as to how these deaths occurred. He stated that his unit was on a search-and-destroy mission and that the village was a V. C. stronghold; that the villagers were warned two days in advance by dropped leaflets and voice communication that the village was going to be destroyed, and that they should leave, and that anyone remaining would be considered a V. C. The manner in which he made his presentation generally left the group with the impression that this act was justifiable.

As to what occurred in My Lai, we now question the use of these pictures by various publications and news media, 1½ years after they were taken.

We feel that the Government should thoroughly investigate the alleged massacre, and that the truth should be determined.

Sincerely yours,

RAY KAPPEL,
Secretary.

THE MAIL ON MYLAI

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the House a sentence from a letter recently received from a man in Keene, N.H.:

I am an interstate bus driver (28 years old), and if a thug accosted me and robbed

me, you can bet the news in reporting the incident would say "alleged assault," but here (the massacre) they almost never bother to say "alleged."

And here is another sentence from the same letter:

Politicians often think people are fooled by the press, but this is not true.

This letter from young Mr. Greg Murphy, of Keene, N.H., sums up very well the feeling expressed in the overwhelming majority of the mail received by our committee on the Mylai investigation.

The main thrust of concern among those who write to us is that the news media have tried and convicted the American soldiers in Vietnam before the case has been proved and that our committee should investigate the whole matter in depth and not prejudice the case.

I think Mr. Murphy has summed up very neatly the reaction many of us here have had to the reporting of this story in his reference to the fact that the papers did not even bother to use the word "alleged." Our mail would indicate that a similar reaction has been experienced by people throughout the country.

Our committee has received over 325 letters, and new batches of mail are delivered daily. There is a great interest on the part of the American people. The mail comes from all parts of the country and from people in all walks of life. Of course, we have received letters critical of our procedures and critical of statements I may have made in public interviews. But a staff review indicated that the mail is running approximately 20 to 1 in favor of our manner of procedure.

Those who write to us seem to be principally concerned that we get all of the facts before jumping to conclusions and that we assure that the rights of the American soldiers involved are protected. The people are greatly concerned that these matters will reflect unfairly on all of the GI's who have served in Vietnam.

The most frequent comment in our correspondence is concerned that the press and TV reports have assumed the guilt of the men accused before any investigation or any court-martial is completed.

Again, I want to say to Members of the House that the subcommittee I appointed under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HEBERT) will press forward with a thorough investigation and will not rest until all of the facts are in. That subcommittee will determine if there has been a massacre, if there was who was guilty, and the extent to which the Army's system is at fault. That subcommittee will be diligent to protect the rights of individuals.

We shall not be swayed from our constitutional responsibilities by the glare of the TV lights or the slant of the editorialists.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services on his fine statement and, because he has used a letter of one of my

constituents, I would like to thank him for having selected that particular letter. I think it is fairly typical of letters I have received from other constituents. The motto of the State of New Hampshire has been and it still is, "Live free or die." There are many tough-minded, thoughtful people in the Granite State.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to thank the gentleman.

PRESS COVERAGE OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION OF THE MYLAI INCIDENT

(Mr. NICHOLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.)

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest the comments of our colleague, Congressman BOB SIKES, of Florida, concerning the press coverage of the Armed Services Committee investigation of the Mylai incident. I agree with him 100 percent, and I want to add my endorsement to his statements about Chairman MENDEL RIVERS and the chairman of the special subcommittee looking into the Mylai incident, Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana. It is an honor and a privilege to serve with these gentlemen, and I know that they have only the good of America at heart in this or any other matter which comes before our committee.

If there is any man in the Congress who would do a better job of investigating these charges than Congressman HÉBERT, I do not know who he is. As a career newspaperman for some 20 years before coming to the Congress, he knows that there is no use to try to whitewash or cover anything as important as this. Chairman RIVERS and Congressman HÉBERT want only to see that justice is done in this case.

While the press is quick to publicize incidents such as that which allegedly occurred at Mylai, they seldom make an effort to bring to the public's attention both sides of the situation. For instance, the Columbus, Ga., Ledger, on Tuesday, December 16, ran a picture which was taken some 2 weeks before the incident showing Vietcong women and young boys carrying arms in Mylai. Such a picture would not, of course, be of interest to certain newspapers because it would not help their case in prosecuting those Army officers who have been accused of participating in this incident.

I believe any man going into an area where he knew women and children were part of the Vietcong force would be particularly wary of anyone. I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Columbus Ledger be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

ARMY PHOTO SHOWS VC UNIT STATIONED IN MYLAI AREA

A photograph of a Viet Cong unit based in the My Lai (4) area was made available Monday by a man who had served with the 11th Infantry Brigade at the time of the incident of March 16, 1968, which has brought charges that G.I.'s committed murder against Vietnamese civilians.

He said the photograph came from a roll of film captured in a Viet Cong basecamp in the Song My village area (My Lai was one

of the hamlets of this village) two weeks before the My Lai raid.

An officer who had served with the 11th Brigade during its organization and as both a field commander and staff officer, he said the photograph was developed by the brigade public information office photography laboratory, some copies retained by that office, others given to intelligence sources.

Identification of some of the individuals in the group of 38 armed Vietnamese, including three young women and several very young boys, was made by 11th Brigade intelligence offices, he said.

Kneeling in the center of the group one arm akimbo, with a holstered pistol, is the military leader of the unit, he said.

Standing at the far left, without a weapon, in peasant garb of black pajamas, and obviously older than the armed guerrillas, is the unit's political officer, he said.

Third from right, with a U.S. M-1 rifle, posed on one knee, is a "combat hero" and squad leader in the unit, the officer said.

Men in the photograph have a 60 mm. mortar, carbines, and M-1 rifles of U.S. manufacture and Mat 49 submachineguns of French manufacture—typical Viet Cong armament as opposed to North Vietnamese regulars who carry Chinese-Communist manufactured weapons of Russian style.

One man, standing on the right of the one identified as the political officer, wears a North Vietnamese regular's field uniform, as does the squad leader in the front row. (The man by the political officer was believed to be his body guard, the officer said.)

PFC. CHARLES F. TYSON III, LOVED HIS NATION AND HIS HOME, MARTIN COUNTY, FLA.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 10, 1969, a special Veterans Day memorial service was held at Martin County High School, Martin County, Fla., to honor Pfc. Charles F. "Chuck" Tyson, an alumnus of that school, who gave his life in Vietnam.

Charles Tyson graduated from Martin County High School in June 1968. His favorite pastimes were surfing and swimming, both very popular in beautiful and scenic country located on the Atlantic Ocean, just north of West Palm Beach.

On September 17, 1968, Charles Tyson enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps. He completed his basic training with flying colors and was very proud to be a marine.

In March 1969, he arrived in Vietnam and on March 29 observed his 20th birthday as a member of 3d Platoon, Company M, 3d Battalion, 5th Marine Regiment.

Private first class Tyson was assigned as a rifleman in the 1st Squad of the 3d Platoon of M Company and on the afternoon of June 21, 1969, Company M was engaged in a search-and-clear operation approximately 4 miles east of the Marine base at An Hoa, Quang Nam Province, Republic of Vietnam. The enemy was encountered and during the ensuing battle, Pfc. Charles Tyson was struck by small-arms fire and was killed. He was buried on July 8, 1969, at Fern Hill Cemetery, Stuart, Fla., in Martin County with military honors.

His commanding officer as well as his

fellow marines had a deep affection and respect for Charles Tyson for they knew he was a sincere and dedicated marine who loved his country, and particularly Martin County.

His thoughts were of Martin County High School, Stuart, Fla., when he wrote to his parents in January of this year, prior to his departure for Vietnam. I would like to enclose that letter at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

JANUARY 29, 1969.

TO MY LOVING MOM AND DAD: Even though I don't like to mention such things, it is a necessary step that must be taken. If by some odd stroke of fate I should not return from my coming tour in Vietnam, there are a few things I would like done.

1. First to be buried at Stuart, Florida.
2. To take the flag from my funeral and give it to Martin County High School. In addition I want \$500 to be used to erect a monument to all those students past, present, and future who have given their lives in defense of their God and country. With an inscription by Nathan Hale, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country."
3. \$2,000.00 from my insurance policy to be used in 2 \$1,000.00 scholarships for the most deserving male and female students of Martin County High School.
4. The rest is to be used by the two of you as you see fit.

Pfc. CHARLES F. TYSON III.

The wishes of Pfc. Charles F. "Chuck" Tyson were carried out at the Martin County High School on November 10.

The flag from his casket was presented to the Martin County High School by Charles' parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leonard R. Tyson, who now live in South Bay, Fla., a short distance from Stuart, where Mr. Tyson is now acting chief of police. That flag now flies over Martin County High School and has a very special meaning to the students there.

The monument for which Charles bequeathed \$500 will be designed by the students of Martin County High School and will be constructed in the courtyard. Charles' parents will give a savings bond to the student who contributes the most toward the design of the monument.

A scholarship is being established at the school to provide \$1,000 each to the most deserving male and female student at Martin County High School as Charles requested.

Mr. Speaker, words are most inadequate to express one's respect and admiration for this young man. Yet, I do not believe Pfc. Charles F. Tyson III would want us to linger in sorrow, but would rather have us heed the words of Nathan Hale in these troubled times:

I regret that I have but one life to give for my country.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Nation will continue to be strong as long as we have young men of this caliber.

THE NORTH AND SOUTH MUST HAVE EQUAL TREATMENT IN DESEGREGATION

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the southern strategy of the Nixon administration is to treat the South in exactly the same manner as the other sections of the country. Day before yesterday a decision was rendered by a three-judge Federal panel and a suit brought by the Justice Department against my State of Georgia, requiring the State school board to administer the desegregation of the schools. The three-judge Federal panel, after listening to the pleas of the Justice Department attorneys, set forth certain mathematical racial balance requirements wherein each school in each district must have so many Negroes and so many whites. This is done under the guise of equal protection of the law. I maintain that equal protection of the law provides that there should be no discrimination against any person because of his race, creed, or color, and that to force a child out of his neighborhood because of his race, creed, or color is, in fact, denying him equal protection of the law.

I have in my hand a copy of an article appearing in our Atlanta Constitution, Tuesday of this week, wherein 2,000 white schoolteachers are protesting a recent Federal appellate court decision ordering mathematical proportional integration of each school faculty. In Atlanta, this means 57 percent black teachers in each school and 43 percent white teachers in each school. I disagree that this is equal protection of the laws, but returning to my major point, I have today written Attorney General Mitchell a letter and I have asked him to carry out his announced intention of treating all sections of the country as equals, and to file suit against Northern States who have segregated schools such as in Detroit, Chicago, and New York, and force proportional balance on them as Attorney General Mitchell's suit has done to the State of Georgia. If my President, of whom I am very proud, and his Attorney General are sincere in their statement that the southern strategy is to treat the South as the rest of the Nation then let us have the same action which Attorney General Mitchell brought against Georgia, brought against Northern States. I insert the text of my letter and news article at this point:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 19, 1969.
HON. JOHN MITCHELL,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Please note the attached newspaper clippings, wherein mathematical racial balance is being required by the Federal courts in schools in the State of Georgia.

Much of this is due to your action and the Justice Department suits, including the one which you brought against the entire State of Georgia.

Will you bring this same type of action against Northern states wherein there are racially identifiable schools?

If racial balance is to be forced on the South by Federal court action initiated through the Justice Department and implemented through busing, pairing and school closing (356 closed thus far), should not the same be forced on the North?

It was within your power to bring suit against Georgia, which you did. Will you now bring suit against Northern states, which

is also within your power? I would be completely distressed to find that you favor a system of double standards wherein racial balance is required in the South but not in Chicago, Detroit, New York and other areas. This I sincerely hope is not the case.

If you expect the South to vote Republican, treat us no differently than any other part of the country. Do not oppress us; treat us as equals and file suit against the racially identifiable schools in the North.

May I please have an early reply.

Kindest regards,

Yours very truly,

FLETCHER THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution,
Dec. 16, 1969]

WHITE TEACHERS VOW TO FIGHT FACULTY
DESEGREGATION ORDER
(By Richard M. Miles)

The Atlanta Education Association, representing some 2,000 white city school teachers, Monday night declared a recent federal court decision ordering proportional integration of school faculties as discriminatory and vowed to fight the ordered Feb. 1 desegregation of classroom teachers.

The resolution passed on the heels of a warning from Atlanta School Supt. John Letson, who said, "There will be no shenanigans. We will work as professionals."

Letson had told the group that he saw no way Atlanta schools could avoid mixing their teaching staffs 57 per cent black and 43 per cent white—in each school—as ordered by the Fifth District Court of Appeals in October.

Gaining a three-to-one margin after two hours of heated discussion and bickering, the resolution read:

"Our individual and collective civil rights are being discriminated against by the Fifth Circuit panel of U.S. judges, therefore, I move that we as an association draw up:

"1. A resolution explaining the undemocratic procedures, results, etc., thus requesting the reverse (sic) of their decision; and
"2. Our executive committee look into the legal feasibility of an immediate suit to change the court order."

Introduced by Kathy Byrd, a teacher at Hutchenson Elementary School, the resolution's architect and fervent spokesman was Hutchenson Principal A. D. Jones.

Jones told a reporter later, "Yes, I'm against integration. And I want our teachers to have a right to make their own decisions."

During the debate on the resolution, sometimes spiked with personal attacks, Jones said, "We ought not take this sitting down as an association.

"We ought to move for a delay until this is done all over the country—that is, I see this as discrimination against us."

Jones meant by local discrimination that other regions of the nation are not being forced to integrate their faculties in each school on a ratio equal to the racial ratio of teachers in the entire system as is the case in Atlanta.

Letson said when questioned by a Constitution reporter, however, that the only local discrimination was that the Atlanta area had a greater percentage of Negroes than some other sections of the country.

Therefore, any mixing in the Atlanta school system would more obviously change the complexion of the entire system.

Letson also said that faculty integration would probably crystallize sentiment against city-county government consolidation.

"I think it would have the opposite effect (thus not stimulating consolidation desires) because the Atlanta system is about 60-to-40 Negro-to-white; the Fulton County system is about 75-to-25. If we consolidated, the overall system would have a ratio of about 50-50."

AEA is the local unit of the Georgia Edu-

cation Association and has no Negroes on its rolls. The Gate City Association is the Negro teacher association in Atlanta.

No Negroes attended the Monday night meeting, although they teach at schools in which AEA members teach.

Questioned before the passage of the resolution about what the city school board would do if such a move evolved, Letson would only say:

"The Atlanta school system has never offered any kind of resistance to court orders." He added, "I intend to find a way to implement the court order."

How?

"We'll just play it by ear," he said.

Earlier in the evening, Letson told about 200 teachers and representative delegates, who were authorized to vote, that the Board of Education would establish three criteria for achieving racial balance on faculties:

1. The assignments must be approached in a positive manner and with fairness to all persons—teachers and students—concerned.
2. That he hoped the teachers could act as professionals and "all work together" in drawing up a plan.

3. "Come what may . . . this is another challenge to a professional approach . . . We must look at the long term advantages of a well-devised plan of faculty integration," he said.

Leading off the Monday session of the AEA, Georgia Educational Association's E. C. Mitcham Jr., set three goals for the GEA during the upcoming General Assembly:

1. Making sure Georgia education gets at least \$60 million of the total \$125 million legislators will deal out this session;

2. Take steps to inaugurate a program providing for a statewide kindergarten program;
3. Making provisions for reducing the pupil-teacher ratio to 25 to one.

Mitcham said that the "General Assembly will probably put a freeze on taxes at the present level" and that it would therefore be a tight squeeze for education to get the funds it needs to improve and expand.

[From the Washington Post]

COURT ORDERS GEORGIA TO OVERSEE
INTEGRATION

(By Bruce Galphin)

ATLANTA, December 17.—A federal court ordered the Georgia State Board of Education today to assume responsibility for local school desegregation and to withhold state funds from districts that do not comply. Both phases of the ruling in the case create new law.

This is the first time that a state board has been named the agent to achieve desegregation.

The three judges of the Northern District of Georgia sat en banc for the first time since Georgia's original school integration case 11 years ago. They ordered the State Board to comply with the order by early spring of next year.

The withholding of state funds is a potent weapon, because in Georgia about two-thirds of all public school funds come from the state treasury.

The federal ruling also presumably means that dozens of school districts in Georgia that have lost federal funds because of non-compliance with HEW guidelines now will be eligible to reapply for them as soon as the order is carried out.

The order was signed by Judges Sidney O. Smith Jr., Newell Edenfield and Albert J. Henderson Jr. It dwelt on the confusion in the South resulting from a lack of uniform integration standards and set forth the court's own definition.

These are the minimum standards the court set for a "unitary" school system:

The ratio of minority students in each school must be between one-half and 1½ the actual school population ratio.

A similar range shall apply to faculty and staff.

All facilities and employment shall be uniform at each school.

Extra curricular activities must be opened to all people, faculty and staff regardless of race.

As an example the court said that if a system were 40 per cent black and a school had an enrollment of 400, that would mean that 80 to 240 Negro pupils would have to be enrolled.

The court's standard for faculty integration appears to fall short of the exact ratio recently ordered by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The order said it was neither requiring nor prohibiting the closing of school buildings, the rezoning of school attendance districts, "freedom of choice," busing, pairing of schools nor neighborhood schools. "All of these are but means at the disposal of every local school board to achieve the necessary result," the ruling declared.

The court said the State School Board and Department of Education are better equipped to "monitor the progress" of desegregation than the court. It said the courts would be overwhelmed and "all other legal business (would) cease" if the courts were to take on the task of district-by-district and school-by-school integration.

"Moreover, the prospect of the courts acting as administrators or 'super school boards' is contrary to the concept of the judge's traditional role, and is anathema to our system of local public education," it said.

The suit against Georgia and the state Board of Education was an innovation. It was the first time the Justice Department had sued an entire state in a school case. There is a statewide school desegregation order in Alabama, but it was brought by private plaintiffs.

The order applies to 81 of Georgia's 191 school districts. The others either are in compliance with HEW standards or already are under court jurisdiction.

Gov. Lester A. Maddox called the decision "a violation of the laws of our land." But he added the decision would not be appealed to a higher court.

"There is only one remaining appeal," Maddox said, "and that is with the parents, both black and white, who can come to the defense of these children who have been betrayed."

In their order the judges told the State Board of Education to obtain compliance plans from individual school districts by March 1, 1970, and to submit them to the court by April 1. The state is forbidden to disburse any state funds to a district not meeting the court's deadlines.

A SAGA OF 30 YEARS, A TRIBUTE TO BILL HENRY

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it has just been brought to my attention that this month marks the 30th anniversary of my good friend Bill Henry's outstanding column, "By the Way," in the Los Angeles Times. I shall append this memorable column to these remarks.

Thirty years may seem a long time to write a daily newspaper column but, as many of my colleagues know, this is but one of Bill Henry's talents. Throughout the Nation he is best remembered, perhaps, as the voice who for many years summarized the news each evening over

the CBS radio network; here in Congress as the chairman of the radio correspondents' galleries who added the word "television" to its title, and headed the national political convention coverage for both major party conventions ever since 1952.

I know Bill best, however, not as a political commentator and columnist but as a sports enthusiast whose interest began back in 1911 when he reported on the Occidental College football games while studying as an undergraduate there. It was Bill Henry more than any other one person, who made the Olympic games in Los Angeles in 1932 an outstanding success, and he has been an adviser to and member of the U.S. Olympic Committee ever since. He was a great sports reporter and sports editor, and I am inclined to believe that sports remain his first love.

Bill was one of the first American war correspondents of World War II. In Europe for an Olympic meeting he was pressed into service by CBS and his newspaper for the Russo-Finnish War of 1939, was later assigned to the RAF in Europe and to the South Pacific. He wound up in Washington in 1942, and has been a friend and confidant of every President since.

His column of December 7, follows:

A SAGA OF 30 YEARS

(By Bill Henry)

It's been 30 years—Dec. 10, 1939—since the day this column first appeared in this space. A lot of things have happened since then, probably more changes than any other three decades since the beginning of time. I had been called home from my proud position as the first American uniformed war correspondent with the Royal Air Force in World War II, and, as I look back now, I realize the truth of the old French saying, "The more things change the more they are the same."

That summer I had been in Helsinki while the great powers attempted to head off World War II by negotiation nearby, just as the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. have been trying to head off a holocaust these last few weeks. That had been followed by a mysterious war—that-wasn't-a-war as hard to explain as our hostilities with Hanoi in 1969. People called it the "phony war," and all sorts of incredible things had happened. An RAF friend of mine named Cobber Kain had shot down several Luftwaffe planes and on one occasion I had even been hailed as a hero when I showed up in my uniform at the wreckage and the two frightened German airmen had tried to surrender to me.

SAME PROBLEMS TO WRITE ABOUT

I had flown home from the war front in a big Boeing seaplane whose passenger list was headed by Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy, who remained a headline personality for the ensuing 30 years. As we soared from Lisbon to the Azores and Bermuda he worried about what he should say to the reporters when we arrived, and I wondered what pearls of wisdom I should include in my maiden effort as a roving columnist. I had written on a myriad of topics during my years on The Times, but my sudden reputation had been made as a war correspondent and I was succeeding a chap who had written mostly about the tendency to put too much lettuce and not enough mayonnaise in drug-store sandwiches.

Censorship then, as now, was a red-hot topic and on the advice of Franklin P. Adams, who has been a bigtime column writer for many years, I included in my first column an "Epitaph to a Censor" which had been dashed

off in an idle moment by one of the RAF blue-pencil boys. It went as follows:

"Here at length in sweet repose
A censor lies; But who God knows.
When raving pressmen shot him dead
Filled like his pencil, full of lead
E'en in the graveyard, he was game;
Arose and blackened out his name."

NOTHING IS SOLVED

So, it would appear, the passage of 30 years, with the invention of the H-bomb, the glorious vision of the United Nations, and even the space age, the human race seems obsessed with many of the same problems that provided the headaches of 30 years ago. We seem to be capable of thinking up new problems to worry about without having the capacity to solve the problems we already have. The only refuge of the columnist that I have found is to follow the thinking of the late Alexander Woolcott whose definition of the columnist art was, "Writing is the art of putting black words on white paper in succession until the impression is created that something has been said."

Bill Henry made his first broadcast in the days of the crystal set—1923. He has had nearly a half century of broadcast affiliation and has worked for each of the major networks throughout his career.

His intense interest in athletics led him into sports announcing during these early days. In 1932 he served as technical director of the Olympic Games in Los Angeles. Aside from covering these games, the most recent in Tokyo in 1964, he authored a book "An Approved History of the Olympic Games," in 1948.

He joined NBC in 1952 and aside from general assignments, he served as anchor man on the platform of eight national conventions. In that same year, NBC won the coveted "Headliner's Award" for convention coverage and was attributed in large part to the excellent reporting of Bill Henry as the lead commentator.

After the nomination of General Eisenhower, 67 VIP's mounted the platform to wish success to Ike. Henry identified each of them without missing a single name.

I salute Bill and wish him many more happy anniversaries.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to associate myself with the tribute which the distinguished minority leader has paid to Mr. William M. Henry who is known to all of us as Bill. For the last five national conventions he has presided over the radio and television arrangements and he is loved and admired and respected by all the political leaders of both parties of our generation.

My fellow Oklahoman Will Rogers said he never knew a man he did not like; I have never met anybody who did not like Bill Henry and very few who did not feel like he was a personal friend. This is a rare and wonderful quality, especially in the news business covering the world of politics.

Since he served as aide to Vice President Nixon on his 1956 and 1957 goodwill trips to Africa and around the world, I suppose that Bill's sympathies are with the present Republican President, but from my own dealings with him and from the way he has treated me in his reporting I would never have known. He is always fair and honest and always in

good humor, which is all anyone can ask of any newsmen.

The honors that Bill Henry has received in nearly 60 years of reporting are too many to mention; president of the Radio Correspondents Association here, a National Headliners Award, an International Olympic Diploma, a Freedom Foundation Award, a fellow of Sigma Delta Chi, these are only a few.

I am sure I speak for all my colleagues when I wish Bill many more years of entertaining and enlightening us in his "By the Way" column and on the air.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Bill Henry has been writing for the Los Angeles Times for 58 years in one capacity or another, and for the last 30 as the author of one of its most popular columns, "By the Way." I have seen times change and the Times change, and they even endorse me nowadays, but I can remember when the only friendly words I could expect to find in my morning paper were those of Billy Henry.

Now I have heard Bill's heart is with the Republicans, but the fact is that Bill's heart is big enough for everybody, and that his friendship was never partisan, and fairness and good nature were always his trademarks. We Californians are especially proud of this distinguished native son who has contributed so much to his fellow men in his full career. He has literally walked with kings, queens, emperors, and presidents, but he certainly kept the common touch, and I am honored to salute him on this anniversary.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Republican members of the California delegation, many of whom have the privilege of calling Bill Henry a good and close friend, I would like to join in expressing our appreciation of his many years of straight and decent Washington reporting and wish him many more.

I can understand why he prefers the southern California climate of his "By the Way" Ranch to the Nation's Capital at this season of the year, but we hope he will be back on the campaign trail next year. He has been more than a great reporter and news analyst, he has been a warm and wise counselor to many of us, in both parties, just as he was many years ago to another new Member of this body who is now the President of the United States.

My heartfelt congratulations to Bill and his charming wife Corinne on the 30th anniversary of his ever-popular column.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the 30th anniversary of Bill Henry's column, "By the Way."

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

There was no objection.

FREER TRADE

(Mr. MOLLOHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon yesterday committed his administration to a "freer exchange of goods among nations," with the ultimate goal of dismantling trade barriers altogether.

I think we all support the idea of freer trade, and we all realize that expanded world trade will open vast markets to the United States. At the same time, we know that we cannot allow this Nation's industrial plant to be anything other than self-sufficient. We cannot allow imports to so dominate the markets of this Nation that industries vital to our political and economic independence are jeopardized.

I submit to the Congress that it is unwise for this Nation to be substantially dependent upon any nation for either raw materials or finished products in industries of basic importance to our national welfare when the sudden shift of world events can deprive us of channels of commerce overnight.

It is wiser by far to insure that we maintain competence in all important industries if we wish to remain a commercially and politically independent power in today's world.

The flat-glass industry and the hand-glass industry have been forced into a serious decline by the failure of the Government to work out a well-reasoned trade policy which can afford enough protection to an industry to preserve the country from substantial dependence upon foreign imports for its products in this area. The lessons of this failure are now being learned by the steel industry, the textile industry and the electronics industry. The problem before us in all these industries is to prevent them from being so seriously compromised by imports that the country's industrial ability in these areas is prejudiced.

Last year, the United States increased its exports by just under 10 percent, but its imports increased by nearly 24 percent. The President contended that this was due largely to inflation, but I think we would be remiss if we were to overlook the fact that the economies of other nations, many of which we helped to rebuild following the last war, are aggressively and capably pursuing a far-ranging export program. The United States, with its vast wealth, is naturally a prime target of these programs.

Consequently, I hope this Congress will in the next session very carefully consider the entire range of our Nation's commitments to herself and to the rest of the world. Within that framework we must mold a trade policy which will allow us to maintain our own industrial capability in all vital industries, and pursue with the other nations the goal of larger economic benefits that an expanded world trade can provide.

A DISPLAY OF PURE POLITICS

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days, in the 11th hour of this session of the Congress, we have been treated to the most amazing and brazen display of power politics in the modern history of our country.

Within the last few days, as the most important legislation considered by this Congress is in conference committees, when its fate is hanging in the balance, we have seen an amazing display of a flood of letters and messages coming to the congress from President Nixon in a direct attempt to intimidate Members of Congress in their consideration of that legislation.

If the Members will pick up this morning's paper, they will discover that in at least four areas the President is attempting to influence the people now sitting in the conference committees, by threatening to veto the legislation they are even now considering in our behalf.

Just as an example, he threatened last night, by letter to the Senate, that he will veto the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill which this House passed by a vote of 393 to 16 on July 31.

He is going to veto, according to this morning's paper, the committee mine safety bill, because he does not like it, even though the House passed it by a vote of 389 to 4 and just two nights ago reiterated its support for that legislation by passing the conference report on a vote of 333 to 12.

We passed a pay increase for all Federal employees, in an attempt to try to keep pace with the increase in the cost of living. That bill, H.R. 13000, passed this House by a vote of 311 to 51. The President threatened "I will veto the Federal Government employees' pay bill because it is inflationary." But if you will look at yesterday's Washington Daily News, you will find a headline story that says, inflationary or not, if he can make an under-the-table political deal to buy his postal corporation scheme he will no longer consider it inflationary, and he will sign the bill. In other words—he now offers what appears to be a greater increase in pay than the Senate voted in the bill he said he would veto—if we will buy the corporation.

A bill that is passed by Congress, he considers to be inflationary when he cannot get what he wants with it. However, it ceases to be inflationary when he can use it to get something else he wants to accomplish, even while asking us to buy a pig in a poke.

The social security bill passed on the floor of this House by a vote of 397 to 0. Nothing could be more bipartisan than that. The veto threat for a social security benefit increase comes despite the fact that the elderly and the disabled on fixed incomes are most in need of additional income if they are not to be deprived of adequate food and the other basic necessities of life. The social security increase voted by both Houses would do nothing more than to help them keep pace with the present cost of living.

I submit that the President of the United States has forgotten that we are a three-part coordinate Government, and he is now attempting to substitute White House power politics for the will of the people as expressed by its elected Repre-

sentatives in the House and in the Senate.

The doctrine of separation of powers among the three branches of the Government has served this Nation well for nearly 200 years. I, for one, do not propose to see it scrapped now.

The appropriations committees and both Houses of Congress have deliberated conscientiously to produce a bill which will continue, to a minimum degree of effectiveness, basic domestic programs in the use of health, education, labor, and the attack on poverty. It is our responsibility to our constituents to do so. We represent the American people. We cannot be intimidated by anyone, even the President of the United States, into abdicating our responsibility.

In his 11th-hour communication to the Senate last night, December 18, the President of the United States demonstrated once again that education appears nowhere on the priority list for his administration. In telling us that he would veto the Labor-HEW appropriation, H.R. 13111, as too expensive, he sided with those who would rather look at shiny military hardware than take the hand of a hungry and homeless child. This is the gut issue in our deliberations.

The Nixon administration has a lot of interesting educational moonshots on the launching pad, but the President hides behind the Bureau of the Budget when someone asks where the money is to pay for the fuel. We are promised a "right to read" program, and the Nixon budget cuts out the money for school libraries and textbooks. We are going to build up our community colleges, but my strongest magnifying glass fails to reveal an additional penny requested for higher education. We are going to feed an extra 3 million youngsters in the school lunch program, but the administration has not told us how.

Is it not tragic that the poor, who live in desperation, may watch the man who lights the national Christmas tree, veto a bill that would give their children a better education?

I propose that we repudiate this hypocritical administration and show the American people, our constituents who look to us for help, that we have the intestinal fortitude to override Mr. Nixon's veto—if indeed he dares do such a thing.

It is abundantly clear that education today is not a luxury but a necessity. It is equally clear that necessities have priority over all else as the expenditure of funds is determined.

Living within ones means is surely an admirable characteristic but going without food is hardly a way to live within family means.

Education of our children is the lifeblood of our Nation. There is no choice to be made. This necessity of our national welfare must be the highest priority.

To use education funds to buy time or gain political advantage is a cruel hoax on the American people.

MORTGAGE MONEY CRISIS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of the Members are aware that earlier this fall the Federal National Mortgage Association announced that it would no longer purchase FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages covering 1- to 4-family properties located in the District of Columbia. This came as result of fears by FNMA that covered loans made at the prevailing rates in the District might be declared in violation of the provisions of the District of Columbia Code limiting the legal interest rate, including points, to 8 percent per annum.

This has had a very adverse effect on the economy, business community and progress of housing in Washington. In addition to the lack of funds available for financing home purchases by moderate income families, the development of low-income ownership housing under section 235 of the Housing and Urban Development Act is being severely restricted, as well as efforts of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency in relocating persons displaced by urban renewal projects.

Showing his concern over this problem, Mayor Walter E. Washington has met with various concerned elements of the community, District of Columbia government officials, and Housing and Urban Development and Federal National Mortgage Association officials, the result of which was unanimous support for legislation temporarily exempting FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed loans from the District of Columbia usury laws. The Mayor expressed the support of the District of Columbia government for this legislation as an intermediate step to alleviate the situation while a review of the interest rate policies is undertaken by the District government. This review, presumably, will be followed by further recommendations.

After familiarizing myself with the problems involved, I am in agreement with Mayor Washington and others that such a temporary exemption is desirable. I have, therefore, today introduced such legislation in response to this immediate need of the District of Columbia.

I recommend this bill to your attention and urge prompt action by the House District of Columbia Committee and by the House of Representatives on this bill.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in 1967, there were 918 amateur and professional opera companies in the United States that presented 5,487 performances.

PANAMANIAN COUP AND COUNTER-COUP, DECEMBER 15-16, 1969, DRAMATIZE NECESSITY FOR ACTION ON CANAL SOVEREIGNTY RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the ousting on December 15, 1969, of Gen. Omar Torrijos, commander of the National Guard of Panama, followed by his restoration on December 16, does not surprise anyone acquainted with the history of that country. It merely conforms to its characteristic of endemic revolution, endless intrigue, and political instability.

The facts in the incident are simple. While General Torrijos made a secret visit to Mexico City to attend horse races, two of his subordinates, Col. Ramiro Silvera and Col. Amado Sanjur, led a coup and proclaimed themselves, respectively, as the commander and deputy commander of the National Guard. Lt. Gen. Rodrigo Garcia, who remained loyal to Torrijos, refused an appointment as Chief of Staff, slipped out of the country, flew to El Salvador to inform Torrijos who had gone there from Mexico, and accompanied him back to Panama.

In a dramatic return to Panama on December 16, Torrijos was acclaimed as a hero, reasserted his control of the National Guard and imprisoned the ring-leaders of the revolt. About 18 persons related to the officers under arrest took refuge in the U.S. Canal Zone territory. General Torrijos has announced that he will dismiss Col. Jose Maria Pinilla and Col. Bolivar Urrutia, who have been serving respectively as figurehead provisional President and Vice President of the military government.

In view of the failure of the major papers of Washington to publish realistic editorial appraisals of the significance of the coup and counter coup and many requests from my colleagues for my views, I would stress that these are mere occurrences in a land of inherent political instability and that more such events can be expected in the future. Also, I would emphasize that the December 15-16 coups in Panama better than anything I can say illustrate the criminal stupidity of the treaty proposals to cede to Panama any sovereignty over the Canal Zone or any part in the management and defense of the Panama Canal.

This situation is in nowise a casual one that can be shrugged off by the United States. Our Nation has a tremendous responsibility involved and must keep its authority unimpaired. It is naive and stupid to think otherwise. The fate of the world may depend on what we do at Panama and all experience shows that it is best for Panama, the United States, and the world at large for the United States to continue its undiluted authority in the premises.

Mr. Speaker, starting on October 27, 1969—Theodore Roosevelt's Birthday—more than 100 Members of this body have sponsored identical resolutions that oppose cession of any sovereign rights or jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal to any other nation or any international organization. Because of the imperative necessity for making the position of our Government clear, I urge prompt action by the House on the indicated resolutions that were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs,

which committee has not yet acted thereon.

PARENTS LOSE COOL ON DRUG ABUSE

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, among the new entrants in the American language is the phrase, "Don't blow your cool." This admonition was first served up to us over-30 types by young people who later classified most adults as "up tight."

Working on behalf of effective drug abuse education legislation, I and my colleagues on the Select Education Subcommittee had to confront this phenomenon. Drug abuse, we found, often opens the widest chasm between the generations.

We learned that the motives for using and abusing drugs are as important to education as the chemical properties of the substances themselves. Presenting the facts and offering sympathetic counseling will do more for effective education than will the table-pounding, jail-threatening approach. Indeed, the "hard line" method may actually harm education, for it can cause young people to "turn off" completely.

Some how-not-to-do-it methods are illustrated very clearly in a recent Wall Street Journal article written by Jack Morris. The drug education bill passed by the House on October 31 is an attempt to make facts and understanding prevail over the fear and fantasy described so well by Mr. Morris. Mr. Speaker, I include the article in the Record at this point:

PANICKED PARENTS: HASTILY FORMED GROUPS SPRING UP ACROSS UNITED STATES TO FIGHT DRUG PROBLEM—THEY SEEK TO HALT SPREADING USE BY YOUTHS, BUT TACTICS OF SOME CALLED UNSOUND—HARD-LINE APPROACH IS BEST

(By Jack H. Morris)

A Smithtown, N.Y., citizens committee, alarmed over the growing use of drugs by teen-agers, recommends that all high school students be given blood and urine tests to determine who's using what. The school board in Clifton, N.J., considers imposing saliva tests. Parents in Montgomery County, Md., outside Washington, urge school authorities to ban publications and muzzle teachers that suggest marijuana laws be liberalized. And under parental pressure, the Grossmont High School District near San Diego attacks the problem by expelling drug experimenters in wholesale lots.

Such developments are taking place in hundreds of suburbs and small towns. Across the country parents' groups and concerned citizens are banding together in committees, councils and ad hoc organizations to "do something"—almost anything—to combat the drug problem.

"Parents are in a panic and they simply don't know how to proceed," says John Baringer, director of health programs in the Tucson schools.

WIDENING THE GAP

In New York state, where a recent survey found parents more concerned about drug abuse than muggings, unemployment, racial tension or poor schools, 57 communities have launched drug study groups since last spring and state officials say 72 more groups are being formed. At least four committees are

operating at the state level in Massachusetts; so many local bodies are digging into the problem there that regional councils have been set up to keep track of them all. Indeed, in many communities around the nation it's not uncommon to find a formal committee appointed by the board of education or town government vying for expert witnesses and newspaper publicity with a loosely organized group of overwrought parents.

The Nixon Administration is giving strong backing to the use of local committees to attack the drug problem, though perhaps not to some of their more extreme activities. Earlier this month the President told a conference of 41 governors that "we all must go back to our communities and wage a campaign—a campaign of education and information" about teen-age drug abuse. Mr. Nixon added that while he had previously thought that the answer to the drug problem "was simply to enforce the law," he now sees the solution in the hands of local groups of parents and educators.

The primary concern of most committees is to prevent more youngsters from being drawn into drug use. Many groups claim that their reasoned approach has struck a responsive chord among potential experimenters. Some have received small Federal grants to help carry on their projects. Nevertheless, there is growing concern among the nation's health officials that many of the parents' groups, however well-meaning, may be widening the generation gap by their frenzy.

IT CAN'T HAPPEN HERE

"It's frightening to see so many of these committees handing out information on a subject on which they have only fragmentary knowledge at best," says Dr. George Mizner, professor of psychiatry at the University of Colorado Medical Center and a student of the "drug culture." In many cases, he adds, high school students are better informed about drugs than their parents or teachers.

Many suburban and small-town parents are uninformed about drugs because until recently they simply could not believe the problem would arise in their orderly communities—and thus largely ignored it. But now they are coming face to face with the drug crisis.

Domenic Conti, a real estate salesman in the Philadelphia suburb of Willingboro, N.J., for instance, was so taken aback recently when his PTA group learned that dozens of children were sniffing glue in the woods behind an elementary school that he immediately formed Code W, an organization to alert to parents to the drug danger. "This just hit us right square between the eyes," recalls Mr. Conti. "We had no idea this was going on here."

VISITORS UNWELCOME

The Montgomery County War on Narcotics League had much the same beginning. It was hammered together last spring by Malcolm Lawrence, the former commercial attache to the U.S. embassy in Switzerland, who had just returned to the Washington area with his nine children. When two of his children reported they had been offered marijuana during their first week of school, he jumped into action.

In a seven-point plan of attack, his group last month urged the Montgomery County Board of Education to censor "mind-bending" literature and dismiss teachers who counsel known drug users instead of turning them over to police. Other proposals include: Closing the school ground to unauthorized persons, compelling students to remain at school for lunch (on the theory they might meet a pusher if they walked home) and closing down the school smoking area (Mr. Lawrence believes it is difficult to tell what students are smoking).

So far, the board has taken no action. It has its own advisory committee, which has just concluded a survey of student attitudes

toward drugs. That group is headed by a professor of government at Georgetown University and counts a number of doctors, psychiatrists and educators, plus three students, among its 17 members.

It was a similarly prestigious committee composed of a state district court judge, an attorney, a physician who has worked with narcotic addicts, a Methodist minister and a 17-year-old high school student, that proposed blood and urine tests in Smithtown, N.Y. The tests, which would cost about \$3.50 each, wouldn't detect marijuana or LSD, two of the more popular drugs among students. But they could spot use of barbiturates, amphetamines or morphine derivatives.

Although the New York Chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union has threatened to sue if any child is forced to take these tests without his parents' permission, John V. N. Klein, Smithtown supervisor, contends the committee's stand has been well received in his Long Island suburb. Another of the recommendations calls for a speakers bureau to ferret out and condemn any voices in the community that say marijuana isn't a dangerous drug or that minimize the drug problem.

The hard-line Smithtown approach contrasts with the increasingly lenient view of marijuana use being taken by a number of national health officials and narcotics experts.

"A youngster who smokes one marijuana cigaret isn't a dope fiend," Dr. Stanley F. Yolles, director of the National Institute of Mental Health and associate administrator of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, told a Senate subcommittee hearing in September. "It is extremely unfortunate," he added, "that by the continued exaggerated emphasis on the supposed dire evils of marijuana smoking, we make it extremely difficult to tell people what the real risks of use of specific kinds of drugs are."

POLLS UNDERSCORE CONCERN

A few community groups share this attitude. At United Community Services of Metropolitan Boston, which advises several local drug committees, staffer Marion Freeman tells member groups: "You must distinguish between drug use and abuse. If you preach total abstinence, forget it." She suggests that "safe" drugs be approached the same way alcohol usually is, stressing temperance and sensible use. "I'm not saying you must teach the pleasures of drugs, but at least you must be honest in explaining their dangers," she adds.

But such views apparently aren't widespread among adults. In a nationwide poll in September, Sindlinger & Co., an opinion research firm, found 91% of the public is concerned over teen-agers' use of marijuana, 85% oppose its being legalized and 84% express the fear that marijuana is very harmful to the user. (By contrast, only 33% view alcohol as very harmful.) Similar findings were uncovered in a Gallup poll in October.

"I'm positive that a hard-line approach is the best way," says Rexford Hall, a retired lumber dealer and the former president of the school board for the Grossmont High School District in California, where 342 students have been expelled in the past two years for using drugs. Although the public supports the school's policy of automatic dismissals, a committee of teachers and professionals in the area has asked the board to reconsider and to distinguish between youthful experimenters and hardened pushers.

The major weapon in most drug committee arsenals is education—and they aim it at parents as well as students. Chemicals that smell like marijuana are burned at PTA meetings so parents can tell whether that odor in their son's room is really pot. Booklets are prepared cautioning mothers to keep tabs on their children's belongings—a lost transistor radio or misplaced clothing may

have been exchanged for drugs—and to be alert to changes in their offspring's personality or behavior.

CHANGES IN CURRICULUMS

Some teachers fear the groups are overdoing it. After reading one group's booklet describing the effects of various drugs, a Maryland teacher exclaims: "My God, after a day in class with these kids, I've got all the symptoms—tiredness, depression, red eyes, hypertension. . . ."

Parent groups in nearly every state are clamoring for changes in school curriculums. Most seek improved drug education classes and the introduction of such classes at the junior high or elementary level. But other groups are criticizing courses they feel are too explicit.

For example, schools in several California and Arizona cities have come under attack for courses exploring why students use drugs. Opponents contend such courses encourage students to make individual choices instead of relying on the traditional values of church and home. Teachers in other systems have been berated for prying when, to illustrate the positive as well as negative aspects of drugs, they asked students to list items found in their family medicine chests.

There is some justification for this uneasiness. Consider this question being asked fifth-grade students this fall in Saratoga Calif.: "A person should never try LSD . . . (A) With others present (B) Without an older companion present (C) In the morning (D) All of the above. The answer listed as correct is B.

OUT OF CONTEXT?

The question was drafted by Raytheon Co., the Lexington, Mass., defense contractor, which has branched into educational publishing. Company spokesmen contend the question is taken out of context from material dealing with safeguards for those youngsters who are going to use drugs regardless of their harmful effects. "We certainly don't favor indiscriminate use of this material—it's pretty straight-forward—but we don't believe you should keep kids ignorant and hope for the best, either," a spokesman says.

Daniel Ungaro, superintendent of the Saratoga schools, says that some of the Raytheon questions are "terrible" but that the material comes on film strips and it isn't easy to edit out sections without destroying the continuity. Also, he says, the company's material in general is far better than much of what is being passed off as drug information today. "Some of the stuff we've seen makes (drug) trips look so good that the kids would be eager to take them," he says.

To help combat erroneous material, the National Institute of Mental Health is supplying schools and drug committees across the country with reams of factual material on drug use, which it claims is neither "screchy nor preachy." Armed with an \$800,000 appropriation, the agency has handed out some 11 million pieces of literature and thousands of posters, radio spots and TV scripts since March. A volunteer committee of businessmen in Washington, D.C., stuffed more than a million pieces of NIMH material in utility, bank and business billings last month.

The NIMH program is aimed at the suburban teen-ager. A psychedelic poster asks this question about drugs: "Will they turn you on, or will they turn you off?" And a radio commercial with an acid rock beat strikes chords of idealism by reminding youngsters they can change what's wrong in the world if they keep their heads—straight. A separate campaign for ghetto youths plays on black pride by depicting heroin as "slavery, 1969."

A number of parents' groups have gone beyond education to attack what they believe to be the root cause of drug use. A committee formed by Lenape Regional High School,

Medford, N.J., has just opened a phone line, manned by trained volunteers who will listen to student gripes, complaints and problems on any subject. "We're finding that those who use drugs often have no communication with their parents," a leader of the organization says. "If we give them someone to tell their troubles to, they'll be less likely to turn to drugs."

PESTICIDE CONTROL

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to find the editorial which follows in the Meriden Journal of December 8.

The promptness with which this newspaper responded to my statement advocating greater control over pesticides clearly shows the public support in this country for legislation directed at this goal.

Since the editorial speaks for itself I simply append it to my previous statement for the information and illumination of my colleagues:

MONAGAN FOR PESTICIDE CONTROL

U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan has joined the battle for more rigid control of pesticides. He is drafting legislation that would grant to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare authority to ban or limit the use of pesticides whenever their use presents a potential health hazard. The bill would also give the Secretary of the Interior authority to cancel the registration of pesticides if they constitute a danger to fish or wildlife, or to environmental contamination.

Monagan in a recent speech claimed the Department of Agriculture ignored a total of more than 1,600 objections registered by HEW to proposed registrations on grounds of health and safety. He said the department had consistently failed to take prompt cancellation action in cases of this kind. Monagan, chairman of the Special Studies Subcommittee of the House, accused USDA of a "public be damned" attitude in failing to establish procedures for warning pesticide purchasers of potential hazards.

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act provides that before pesticides can be sold in interstate commerce a manufacturer must register his product with the Department of Agriculture and attest to its safety and efficacy. Up to now, more than 45,000 pesticide formulations, involving more than 900 individual compounds have been registered.

Monagan has raised his voice with special emphasis in a cause that needs strong support. The recent moves against DDT have made the public aware of dangers which have been too poorly comprehended. But DDT still has its defenders, and they command strong influence in Washington. They would like to take shelter under the wing of the Department of Agriculture, for most of them are farmers. Evidently the department has listened sympathetically to their complaints.

SURVEY FAVORS LICENSING OF OPERATORS OF RECREATIONAL BOATS

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on December 8 I introduced H.R. 15140, a bill to provide for a coordinated boating

safety program. In my remarks following the introduction, I stated that the growing popularity of recreational boating had brought with it many problems. These, I noted, were the increasing number of deaths due to carelessness in the operation of these boats; increasing numbers of personal injuries, increasingly costly property damage, and a host of problems for the U.S. Coast Guard, as well as for States having recreational boating programs.

If enacted, I stated that the provisions in my bill could substantially ameliorate many of the problems now plaguing the sport of recreational boating. I further stated that one of the benefits which I hoped would result from passage of my bill would be the certification of all operators of recreational boating—that this one factor alone would amply reduce the present high death and accident rate on our waterways.

I am encouraged now to see that certification of operators of recreational boats is recognized by boaters themselves as a necessity for safety on our waters. In a survey of 10,000 boat owners recently undertaken by Boat Owners Association of the United States, 69.9 percent favor licensing or certification of all boat operators.

This BOA survey received eminent attention by Mr. Dick Handler, whose excellent column, "Sportsmen's Corner" is a regular feature of the Waterbury-American of Waterbury, Conn. Because I believe all persons interested in recreational boating should have an opportunity to see the BOA survey as it appears in Dick Handler's December 4 column, I include the column in the RECORD:

SPORTSMEN'S CORNER

(By Dick Handler)

Over two-thirds of the nation's boating public surveyed in an extensive poll has virtually asked for licensing of all recreational boat operators, according to results of the survey taken by the Boat Owners Association of the United States.

The results of the nationwide survey of 10,000 boatmen across the country show that 69.9 per cent favor licensing or certification of all boat operators. The Boat-U.S. Survey results, which were made at five major boat shows during 1968 and a mail poll of members of the survey organization, conflict directly with previous industry-sponsored surveys and the views of a number of state and federal boating administrators.

The report categorized the 10,000 replies into four major classifications: Geographical region, operator experience, size of boat and power boat vs. sailboats. In each instance the report shows a majority of boatmen heavily favoring the licensing of operators.

According to the survey, the attitude of boatmen toward licensing appears to be fairly uniform throughout the various geographical boating regions. The margin by which all areas favored licensing was in the 60 percent range, except for the New York Area (New York, Connecticut, New York, Connecticut, New Jersey), which showed a high of 73 per cent.

The Boat-U.S. report cites the operator's license to be the strongest apparent influence on attitude toward licensing. Of boatmen with three or more years of experience, 67.6 per cent favor licensing, while those with less than three years experience favored licensing by 81.4, by far the largest plurality in any category.

The survey results indicated the owner of the larger size boat is less inclined toward licensing than the smaller boat owner. Although owners of boats 26 feet and over reported to be 65.4 percent in favor of licensing, owners of boats under 26 feet voted a significantly higher 71.2 percent in favor.

Sailboat and power boat operators showed little difference in opinion on the licensing issue. A total of 71.1 percent of the sailboat operators voted in favor of licensing as did 68.2 percent of the power boat operators.

The results of the survey show an unexpected endorsement for the most stringent control alternatives presented in the survey. The report indicates 78 percent favor licensing ALL boat operators rather than limiting licensing to only certain age groups or certain types of boats. In addition, 52 percent report favoring a licensing program, administered by states under standards set up by the federal government rather than by either the state or federal government alone.

Another surprising result of the survey is the attitude of boatmen about the qualifications for an operator's license. The highest vote, 46 percent of those surveyed, favored a written and operating test, while 38 percent called for the completion of an approved course as the qualification for an operator's license.

Geographically, the licensing or certification for operators of pleasure boats was favored by 62.6 percent in the Northeast (Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Maine); 66 percent in Mid Atlantic (Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, Washington, D.C.); 67.3 percent in Southeast and Gulf area (North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas); 65.4 percent in Florida; 68.3 percent in Midwest area (Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota); and 62.9 percent in all other states.

In licensing, 81.4 percent of those with under three years experience favored it, 67.6 percent in the three or more years group, and 75.9 percent of those who did not specify their experience.

Favoring licensing were 71.2 percent of the owners of boats under 26 feet, 65.4 percent in the 26-foot and over group and 69.9 of those who did not specify the size of their boat.

In the power vs. sail group, 68.2 percent of the power owners favored licensing while 71.1 percent of the sail favored it. Another 69.9 percent of the boat owners who did not specify their type of boat favored licensing.

On the question of who should be licensed, 77.6 percent said all operators, 8.9 percent said certain age groups and 13.5 percent said certain boat types. On the subject of what qualifications, 38.4 percent said complete approved course, 13.8 percent said written test, 46.2 percent said written and operating test and 1.6 responded "other."

Asked whether the state or U.S. government should do the licensing, 23.2 said federal government, 24.6 said states, and 52.2 said states under federal standards.

The survey was taken by mail within the Boat-U.S. Organization, an almost-10,000-member group, and at the five major 1968 boat shows: New York, Boston, Suffolk Downs, Washington and Chicago.

A uniform 8x5 inch preprinted poll card was used. Each card listed the questions. Each completed poll card was checked for duplication. More than one card received from the same person, or member of a family (same surname and address) were excluded from tabulation. All poll cards collected or received by mail were turned over to an independent auditor for data reduction and compilation.

The survey corroborates the results of a sampling involving 1,600 responses conducted by Boat-U.S. in 1967. In that poll, 67 percent of the respondents favored licensing.

THE ANNUAL BOXCAR SHORTAGE CRISIS: NEW PROPOSAL FOR AN OLD PROBLEM

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, India and the other developing nations suffer from chronic distribution and storage equipment shortages at harvest time. Much of the crop in those struggling lands is lost each year to rat and insect infestation, weather damage, and the other hazards that grain is vulnerable to when not properly protected.

Storage facilities must be available throughout the year in widely diverse locations, but transportation facilities must be kept in reserve—or used for other purposes—during the growing seasons to be called upon at harvest time for fully responsive, efficient, and timely movement of produce to major terminals and processing centers.

Our technicians have so advised agribusiness and government representatives in the third world.

Regrettably, the United States suffers from the same infirmity and the situation in our case is wholly inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment millions of bushels of grain are lying out on the ground in the Middle West, exposed to the elements and subject to substantial losses. This distressing condition is caused by a chronic boxcar shortage which has escalated to crisis proportions in the western regions.

This annual loss, this example of national inefficiency, must be countered and overcome before the next harvest season.

A NEW PROPOSAL FOR AN OLD PROBLEM

The solution to this technically complex and heretofore baffling problem may have been devised at last. The proposal has come—not from the shippers and producers or from the Interstate Commerce Commission—but from the affected railroads themselves. It is the culmination of an intensive 4-year study commanding the best brains in the business.

The plan realistically acknowledges that railroads, when it becomes economically advantageous to "hoard" boxcars belonging to other lines and pay assessed per diem rates, will do so rather than return them to their owners.

The harvest season brings with it huge localized transportation demands for limited periods of time. It should be clear that no system of regulating the distribution of boxcars is acceptable unless it has the ultimate effect of inducing eastern and southern lines to return cars to the Midwest and Far West during the harvest season. This new proposal takes positive steps to achieve the essential flow of cars to points of critical need.

Per diem rates for control of foreign boxcars are to be increased to realistic levels, and the destructive "mileage" requirement is to be eliminated. Mileage payments have the effect of discouraging the very result most hoped for, for lines will pay the lower per diem rate while awaiting cargo to move in the direction of the boxcar's destination.

Workable incentive rates may be imposed by the ICC in cases of localized

shortage, to effectively require a flow to the area of most critical need.

Together these various penalties and per diem assessments, based entirely on "time held" and not on "mileage traveled," will encourage railroads to divest themselves of foreign cars when those cars are desperately needed elsewhere. Railroads will further be encouraged to increase their own inventory of rolling stock.

In 1966, I was a cosponsor of legislation which was designed to eliminate localized boxcar shortages. The bill became Public Law 89-430, but the ICC reported that it could not implement the system of incentives contemplated in the act. Needless to say, the problem did not go away.

Therefore, I am today introducing legislation to implement the plan that I have been discussing. It establishes per diem rates and permits the ICC to impose additional penalties for boxcar hoarding. It has been devised by those who must live with it—the railroads that have been frustrated year after year in their efforts to provide top-flight service to their customers.

This legislation is the result of an exhaustive study, and I join thousands of shippers and millions of producers in the sincere hope that it will solve this embarrassing problem. It is particularly embarrassing since the western lines have looked to Government to assist them in solving it for so many years and they have looked in vain.

I urge the earliest possible hearings and prompt action by Congress on this legislation, for we must insure that effective steps are taken before the annual period of crisis rolls around next year.

PASSPORT OFFICE

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the other body has added to the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 15209, the amount of \$310,000 for the Passport Office of the State Department. In view of the recommendation of the Director of the Office that a passport issuing facility be established in Connecticut, this addition is good news for our State.

Since this bill has already passed the House, it is not possible to effect any change in the original bill but I want to express the hope that the conferees will leave this item in the bill during their discussions of the different versions of the two bodies.

The critical nature of the passport problem in Connecticut needs no further advertising and the need for action is obvious. If this addition, which was made through the efforts of Senator DODD, can be retained in the bill it will help to provide in Connecticut the type of service that should be made available to applicants for passports.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the

Chair. The bells will be rung 15 minutes before the House reconvenes.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the support of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2577) entitled "An act to provide additional mortgage credit, and for other purposes".

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

S. 2543. An act to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of horses which are "sored," and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 2577, LOWERING INTEREST RATES, FIGHTING INFLATION, HELPING SMALL BUSINESS, AND EXPANDING THE MORTGAGE MARKET

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2577) to provide additional mortgage credit, 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of December 18, 1969.)

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with, since the report is available now and is printed.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished chairman of the committee or other members of the committee take some time to explain the conference report for the benefit of the membership?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. PATMAN. And adequate time will be yielded to the minority.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on S. 2577 met in

conference yesterday and agreed to the following conference language:

First, regarding the extension of regulation Q, the House insisted upon and prevailed in its position that regulation Q authority be extended to March 22, 1971, in place of the Senate provision which would have provided an extension of this authority only to September 22, 1970.

Second, the language in both bills concerning extension of rate control authority to nonfederally insured financial institutions was almost identical. The provisions contained in the House and Senate bills on this subject were adopted without objection in both Houses and affect only the State of Massachusetts. The language adopted in the conference provides temporary authority to extend Federal deposit rate control over nonfederally insured financial institutions where State officials lack comparable authority and only in those instances where noninsured savings deposits in the State exceed 20 percent of total savings deposits. It is anticipated that the State authorities in Massachusetts will move immediately to extend their authority over these noninsured institutions as soon as the State legislature can consider this matter.

Third, the language contained in the House bill which would have established a secondary market authority for the Federal Home Loan Bank System was adamantly disagreed to by the Senate and the conference report does not contain this provision.

Fourth, the language in the House bill over which there was no disagreement and which would simplify the premium structure of the FSLIC and make additional funds available for housing was accepted by the Senate conferees.

There was little difference between the language of the House and Senate which would provide authority to the Federal Reserve Board to establish rate regulations and reserve requirements for commercial paper issued by banks or bank holding companies. The House language prevailed in conference.

The language in both bills was identical concerning the establishment of authority for the Federal Reserve Board to establish reserve requirements on Eurodollar borrowings.

The House-passed bill changed the law for national banks and would have allowed them to make mortgage loans up to 90 percent of the appraised value of the property and permit maturities up to 30 years, instead of the present limit for maturities up to 25 years. There was no similar language in the Senate bill. This language was deleted in conference based on the reasoning that there had been no indication whatsoever that national banks wanted or would take advantage of this liberalized authority to make loans on home mortgages.

Regarding the FDIC and FSLIC insurance, the House bill provided for an increase in the maximum insurance protection for commercial banks and savings and loan deposits from the existing \$15,000 to \$25,000. The Senate bill contained no similar language. The Senate conferees agreed with an increase in principle, but insisted and prevailed in their

view that the amount should be increased from \$15,000 to \$20,000, and not to the \$25,000 as contained in the House bill.

The House bill provided for Presidential standby authority to request the Federal Reserve to institute selective credit controls when necessary to curb inflation. Comparable Senate language provided for the suspension of our anti-trust laws to permit reinstatement of the Korean war-type of voluntary credit control agreements. The conferees decided that both provisions should be included in the legislation, based on the rationale that the President should have all necessary powers and discretion to fight inflation, including both standby credit control authority and the right to encourage voluntary agreements to restrain credit. Therefore, the conference report before you contains both the House and Senate language on this subject.

The House amendment provided authority for the use of \$70 million of direct lending for the Small Business Administration in its small business investment company loan program. The Senate conferees agreed to accept the House language with an amendment so that any possible constitutional question would be eliminated. The conferees, however, it should be noted, were insistent upon the principle contained in Title III of the House bill, namely that the \$70 million of funds be made available immediately for the small business investment company program out of the business loan and investment funds.

Finally, the Senate bill contained language which amended the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to provide authority for the purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury of Home Loan Bank obligations in an amount of an additional \$3 billion. The Senate amendment also amended the provision of this section relating to the terms and conditions of such purchases.

The House insisted upon the addition of a further amendment to make sure that the additional borrowing authority would be of some practical assistance to the housing industry and thereby accepted the Senate language with an amendment to the effect that this new authority contain a direction as to the circumstances of its utilization. The determination of whether and when these circumstances arise involves the exercise of judgment and the responsibility for this decision as contained in the proposed agreed language would rest ultimately with the Secretary.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee this question: There is some concern in Texas that this application of Federal regulations to uninsured savings and loans or uninsured banks would affect a bank in Texas. Does the gentleman understand this to be the situation?

Mr. PATMAN. It is my understanding that it applies exclusively to Massachusetts and to no other State.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. And the legislative

history is such that the amendment is drafted so as to make the letter of the law applicable only to the State of Massachusetts. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Next is the creation of a secondary market for conventional home mortgages through the Federal Home Loan Bank System.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman now dealing with section 206?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, title II of the House bill. We agreed to accept both, I will state to the gentleman from Iowa—one which the House passed with reference to it and also the voluntary one passed by the Senate, the Korean war title.

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

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

Mr. BOW. In the House bill as it passed, as I recall there was a provision providing that if there were insufficient funds appropriated, that the Small Business Administration should immediately advise the executive branch and the executive branch should clear the item so as to provide the funds. I see by the report that the gentleman is filing that that language has been stricken; am I correct in that?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman and, in my opinion, that action helps to improve the bill considerably.

Mr. Speaker, I will now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, our chairman has accurately described what took place in the conference, and actually many of the things that were in the motion to recommit are now embodied in the bill. I think the one point that caused a great deal of controversy on the House floor was the question of controls, and the conferees in their wisdom decided to accept both the Senate version and the House version, and give the option to the President if he felt controls were necessary to be invoked, even controls as were voluntary controls during the Korean war period that were embodied in the Senate bill, and the ones embodied in the House bill.

We feel that this is a satisfactory solution to the impasse that we had reached within the conference.

The other measures that have been taken have eliminated some of the high points of the controversy when the bill was on the House floor, and while the three minority members on the conference did not sign the conference report, this was because we had not seen it in final form as drawn up, and there was some question of some language that we felt had to be resolved in our own minds.

This has been resolved, and I believe that all three Republican conferees—or minority conferees—will vote for passage of the measure and I would urge adoption of the conference report.

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

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

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

Let me see if I get this straight on the subject of authority for institution of credit controls: section 205 of the House bill, there was no change in that; is that correct, insofar as the House version?

Mr. PATMAN. No change in that part. The only change we added on is the authority to institute voluntary controls.

Mr. GROSS. Was there any change in section 206, the extent of controls and the eight paragraphs contained therein which delegate in my opinion unconscionable power to the President to invoke controls? Was there any change in this?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, of course that is a matter of opinion, but we do not think it is unusual. The President does not have to use this. You know, in controls, if you wait until they must be put on right then, it causes much more trouble than if you anticipate the possibility of controls in advance, and give that power to the President. Knowing that power is there, it has some effect by itself, and then later on if the President wants to apply the controls to a part or all of the economy it is up to him to do it.

Mr. GROSS. I have no desire to prolong this here this afternoon—this was pretty well debated the other day, the extent of these controls—but the gentleman is saying to me categorically that there was no change in section 206, extent of controls?

Mr. PATMAN. In section 205 there is no change.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. PATMAN. There is no change in section 205.

Mr. GROSS. There is no change, they remain the same? What about section 206?

Mr. PATMAN. I have not gotten to section 206. The gentleman asked me to yield, and I went back to the particular question the gentleman asked, but there was a little change in section 206.

Under (10) the Board, upon being authorized by the President under section 205 and for such period of time as he may determine by regulation:

(10) prescribe maximum ratios, applicable to any class of either creditors or borrowers or both, of loans of one or more types or of all types.

(A) to deposits of one or more types or of all types.

(B) to assets of one or more types or of all types.

(11) prohibit or limit any extensions of credit under any circumstances the Board deems appropriate.

Then the gentleman is saying, you added two more paragraphs to the nine that are enumerated in the bill; is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned September 22, 1970, I believe, as being too close to an election. Since when has the gentleman from Texas become gun

shy with respect to an election or to politics?

Mr. PATMAN. It is not the politics of it so much as the fact that Congress probably would not be in session at that time. It would be a deadline at a time when Congress would not be in a position to give much consideration, and that is really the argument that persuaded us in this respect.

Mr. GROSS. Let me take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Texas as being the greatest optimist in the Congress and in this country, if he thinks that this Congress is not going to be in session next September 22. This is beyond comprehension—here we are almost on Christmas eve and we are in session. I hope the gentleman is right, but I fear that even with his long experience here, he is misjudging the situation that may prevail next year.

Mr. PATMAN. I am hopeful that we will get through earlier next year and oftentimes that does happen in an election year.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, just 2 days ago the House passed S. 2577 after substituting the language of H.R. 15091, as amended. Passage was by a vote of 259 yeas to 136 nays. As I said on Wednesday, this bill is vital to those in need of decent housing and a protection to those who are paying exorbitant interest rates, and also in the best interests of the country as an anti-inflationary measure. The action of the House on Wednesday was a display of responsibility and a manifestation of congressional concern over the tight money policies of our Government and the continuing inflation of our economy.

We now have before us the conference report on that measure, reconciling the differences between the House and Senate. This measure reaffirms the congressional desire and intent to take action against the inflationary pressures in our economy. It provides several methods to supply much-needed funds to the home mortgage market under conditions which it is hoped will tend to lower home mortgage interest rates. One of these is an increase in the insurance of savings accounts in federally insured banks and savings and loan associations from \$15,000 to \$20,000.

The measure also provides much-needed funds to small business through the SBA. And from the viewpoint of credit restraint provides the authority and tools for selective areas of control.

I strongly urge its adoption by the House.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman and the ranking member as well as the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency for this conference report which possibly may be the most outstanding piece of legislation we have passed in this session of the Congress so far as get-

ting the country back on the track economically.

I want to call your attention to the Wall Street Journal of this morning in reference to a statement by Arthur F. Burns, the chairman designate of the Federal Reserve Board. I quote from the Wall Street Journal:

BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Easier credit is a possible goal after the contents of the tax bill and budget proposals are known, Arthur F. Burns, chairman-designate of the Federal Reserve Board, told a committee before his Senate confirmation. He said he hopes resolving of doubts about the Nixon Administration's fiscal policy will lay the foundation for easing credit "within the next two to four weeks." His comments buoyed stock prices, with the Dow-Jones industrial average spurting 13.86 points to 783.79, on volume of almost 16 million shares.

Mr. Speaker, I think this Congress in passing this bill by a big, substantial majority last week gave notice to the White House as to how the Congress felt about loosening up and opening up and getting some industries operating and helping small business and making a drive toward reducing interest rates.

This piece of legislation, I think, is what spark-plugged the statement by Mr. Arthur F. Burns. Of course, you read the statement in this morning's paper along the same line where the headline is "Burns Confirmed for Fed, Hints Easier Money Policy."

So, Mr. Speaker, your committee really got the economy of this country moving in the direction of an upward trend.

I have in my hand a letter which I received this afternoon. It comes from the Bank of Indiana, 575 Broadway, Gary, Ind. I shall read one paragraph and then ask to have the remainder of the letter printed in the RECORD:

While our own SBIC cannot benefit, we urge your approval as being beneficial to the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELANEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

BANK OF INDIANA,
Gary, Ind., December 16, 1969.

HON. RAYMOND J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RAY: It has been brought to my attention that H.R. 15091, which contains a directive to the President to release the sum of Seventy Million (\$70,000,000) Dollars in direct loans for Small Business Investment Companies, may come to a vote on Wednesday or Thursday of this week.

I was unable to reach you by phone and hope that this arrives in time for you to give serious consideration to a vote of approval.

Both Ray Daly and myself have been closely associated with the program for a number of years, both in its infant stage as well as on its current ripening stage, and we are firmly convinced that its horizons and benefits are unlimited.

While our own SBIC cannot benefit, we

urge your approval as being beneficial to the country as a whole.

Best personal regards.

T. J. RADIGAN,

Vice President and Trust Officer.

P.S.—For your information, negotiations are again underway to effect a sale of the Hotel Gary. Steve Divich is interested.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished majority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, yielding this time to me. I would like to yield at this time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STANTON) to make some comments, and then I shall follow his remarks.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minority leader yielding. I shall take only a minute or two to explain to the minority Members, who, unitedly on Wednesday night stood in opposition to this bill, what has occurred. As you will remember, it was our side of the aisle that felt that the Senate-passed version, S. 2577, was far superior to the bill that was presented before the House at that time. As a member of the conference, I am proud to tell the minority Members that the conferees did not change more than one or two sentences of the entire S. 2577, the Senate-passed version. That was our motion to recommit.

So I would like once again to impress upon the Members the fact that as we look forward to fighting inflation and creating more housing in this country in the immediate future, that we do not lose track of what the President said, that the most necessary thing we can do in this Congress at this time in this country is to curtail spending in this particular Congress.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, first, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for laying out the factual situation in relation to the conference report, the bill that went from the House to the conference, the bill that was offered as a motion to recommit by those of us on our side, the bill that came from the committee, and the bill that was passed in the House, which a good many Members on our side thought was an inflationary proposal. We believed then and we believe now that the motion to recommit which we offered, which was virtually the Senate bill, was good legislation. It almost passed. I think the vote was 206 to 193. I am delighted that the final version of this legislation as it is in the conference report more nearly reflects the original Senate version and the motion to recommit. The net result is that we have good legislation and not the kind of legislation that left the House and was rammed through the House several days ago.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA) such time as he may consume.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of our great committee for yielding to me. I commend the committee on making available to the country one piece of legislation which I think will have more effect in 1970 than almost anything else the Congress has done, if the President see fit to use all the power made available in this legislation.

I suggest to the Members that, absent constructive changes, we are going to see in 1970 an upward movement in economic activity and a downward movement in the gross national product. An upward movement in price and in unemployment and a downward movement in the standard of living. I suggest the tight money policy standing alone would have kept us in this kind of posture. I am hopeful the administration will see fit to use and will know there are other tools that have to be brought into effect if we are not going to continue to have a depression in those sectors of the economy involving the people least capable of handling it, those people in small businesses, the poor people, the builders, the construction workers, and the people looking to the Government for assistance in the many programs which have helped us since the last depression.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the chairman and the members of the conference committee for the work they have done.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as a conferee on the part of the House on S. 2577, I join in urging House concurrence with the conference report. When constituents ask us during the holiday period, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, or have done, about high interest rates and the unavailability of mortgage funds for the purchase of homes, this bill can be cited a responsible and effective answer. This bill provides the tools to the President of the United States to combat inflation, and to channel credit into those areas of the economy which the national interest dictates.

Instead of big businesses continuing to borrow all of the money they need at whatever interest rate—conscionable or unconscionable—they are asked to pay, necessary funds could be channeled instead into loans for housing, into State and local bond issues to build schools or provide essential needs, into loans for small business, and so on.

The bill before us represents largely a consensus of Democratic members of the House Committee on Banking and Currency. Not all of us were in favor of every single provision, but we all joined in cosponsoring or endorsing a Democratic approach to the serious problem of inflation. I am sorry the minority party conferees from the House decided not to sign the conference report. Eventually, I think they will join us in deciding that the powers we are now giving to the President in this bill will be of tremendous help to a Republican President in saving this country from a continuation and worsening of the credit inflation we are now in.

A BILL TO FIGHT INFLATION, HELP HOUSING AND SMALL BUSINESS

Chairman PATMAN, of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has explained the provisions of the bill as agreed to in conference. The Treasury is being authorized and instructed to lend up to \$4 billion to the Home Loan Bank Board, on request of that agency, to lend in turn to savings and loans for home mortgages. We add \$70,000,000 of funds to the small business investment companies. We control the inflationary use of Eurodollars now being lent in this country at

very high interest rates. We provide clarification of Federal Reserve Board powers in regulating commercial paper issued by banks and their affiliates—which represents about 10 percent of all commercial paper now being issued. Another part of the bill deals with the much broader problem of commercial paper issued by nonbank sources, which is probably one of the most inflationary trends in the entire economy.

We extend until March 22, 1971, instead of September 22, 1970 as provided in the Senate bill, the power of the regulatory agencies to control interest rates paid by banks on savings accounts, or by savings and loans on share accounts. This authority—regulation Q—expires at the present time at midnight December 21.

FEDERAL INSURANCE ON DEPOSITS

Two of the major provisions of the bill as finally agreed to in conference originated in separate bills I had introduced earlier this year. One is the provision raising the limit of Federal insurance on bank deposits or savings and loan accounts from \$15,000 to \$20,000, as my bill, H.R. 14836, had provided. In committee, this figure was raised to \$25,000, and the House agreed to that. But at the request of the Senate conferees, who had no comparable provision in their bill, we compromised at \$20,000. This should bring more money into bank deposits and savings and loans from investors with substantial resources, who are reluctant to keep on deposit in any one account more than the amount covered by Federal insurance.

STANDBY POWERS FOR SELECTIVE CREDIT CONTROLS

The most far-reaching provision of the conference bill is the title of the House bill authorizing standby, selective controls over any or all types of credit. This title is taken from a bill I introduced on November 24, H.R. 14954. We added to it in conference a provision agreed to in the Senate to permit the President to institute a system of voluntary credit controls such as were in effect during the Korean war, including a period during that war when we also had compulsory credit controls over consumer credit and real estate credit.

In conference, we felt that the authority for voluntary controls, involving suspension when necessary of the anti-trust laws, gives the President an additional resource to choose from in taking appropriate steps to fight a credit inflation. We do not attempt to dictate what form of credit controls he should seek to impose, if any; the powers are left to his discretion.

TRUSTING THE PRESIDENT WITH BROAD POWERS

The powers conferred upon the President by this legislation cannot solve present inflation problems unless the President chooses to use those powers. It will be up to him. He will have a wide choice of weapons to use in fighting high-interest rates, the mortgage money famine, the curtailment of small business expansion, and the distortion in credit supply.

With the power, of course, goes the responsibility to use the power responsibly. We are willing to trust the President

of the United States with broad powers in the credit field, as we do in so many other fields. But if he refuses to use those powers effectively when the economic situation urgently requires their use, then the political responsibility can be clearly placed—and that, too, is important in a democracy.

But we did not write this bill in order to embarrass the President. We wrote it in order to give him the tools a President should have in order to cope with inflation danger. Undoubtedly there will be pressures upon him to use these powers, or some of them, when he thinks they should not be used. Any man who has been given the responsibility to lead this country as President must have the fortitude to resist pressures he deems are not in the public interest; he must also have the courage to use his great powers when the public interest requires, even when the exercise of Presidential power in the public interest is sometimes unpopular. The burdens of the Presidency are many, including the necessity of sometimes doing unpopular things.

But I think the people of the United States would firmly support this President, or any President, in taking courageous steps to stop an inflationary spiral gripping this country, and in getting funds into the housing area where this step is desperately needed, even if that means temporarily curtailing some unnecessary credit expenditures by business or consumers.

WHAT ARE THE RIGHT PRIORITIES IN USE OF CREDIT?

We are blessed with a dynamic, expanding economy which, at the present time, is expanding much more actively in some directions than in others. The question confronting our society is: in what direction do we now need more expansion than in others? Rich as we are, we cannot afford to indulge every economic wish. Should we use the weight of Government to revive the housing industry? It is dying for lack of credit. Should we use the weight of Government to assure expansion of our educational system, our public facilities and equipment, our attack on environmental hazards, and for many other purposes essential to the survival of our way of life? Periodically, in periods of tight money, the things we are obligated as a Government to accomplish are defeated by diversion of capital and resources to less essential purposes.

On November 24, when I first introduced the bill which is now incorporated into this legislation to provide standby authority to the President and the Federal Reserve Board to impose selective controls over any or all forms of credit, I had no idea that this proposal would so quickly find its way into a bill presented to both Houses for a final vote, although I said I would try to have it considered with the legislation then pending to extend regulation Q. I believe it is the first time credit controls of this far-reaching nature have been brought before Congress. The authority to control consumer and real estate credit was first given to Government in World War II by Executive order of President Roosevelt under wartime powers. In 1950, Congress wrote similar powers into the De-

fense Production Act, after the start of the Korean war. In 1951, Congress repealed that power, and we have never had it available since then. In 1966, the House Committee on Banking and Currency accepted an amendment to the Defense Production Act sponsored by Congressman REUSS and I to restore standby authority for consumer and real estate credit. It was defeated on the House floor. Now we are voting on a bill which extends similar authority not only over consumer and real estate credit but over all forms of credit. On Wednesday, the House upheld this proposal. In conference yesterday, the Senate Conferees agreed to this idea, along with the proposal the Senate had passed suspending the antitrust laws to permit voluntary agreements by the credit industry to ration credit.

The House conferees from the majority side were willing to accept this Senate provision when the Senate conferees agreed at the same time to accept our proposal for broad powers to regulate credit. We did not instruct or order the President on which form of credit controls or regulation he should use—we give him the power to use both types, or either, or none at all.

BACKGROUND OF CREDIT CONTROL TITLE OF BILL

Following, Mr. Speaker, is the press release issued on November 24 on the introduction of the bill which became title II of this measure dealing with standby credit controls.

As will be noted, there is no compulsion on the President to act. But there is an expectation that, as President, he will weigh carefully and with an objective mind the need for using these powers when the necessity arises.

The news release referred to follows:

MRS. SULLIVAN INTRODUCES BILL FOR STANDBY POWERS TO REGULATE ALL FORMS OF CREDIT, INCLUDING BUSINESS CREDIT

Within hours after Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy was quoted as believing standby controls over consumer credit "may be necessary", Congresswoman Leonor K. Sullivan (D-Mo.) today introduced a bill to authorize the President to order the regulation not only of consumer credit terms but of all business credit, too, including so-called commercial paper.

The regulatory powers could be exercised only after the President made a finding that they were needed "to prevent or control inflation generated by the extension of credit in an excessive volume." The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System would administer the controls, at the President's direction, deciding the maximum amount of loans, minimum down payments, maturity periods, and the rates which can be charged.

"Secretary Kennedy's statement in the papers this morning that standby credit controls 'may be necessary' had nothing to do with my decision to introduce the bill," Mrs. Sullivan declared. "But it is interesting to me that he recognizes now the possible need for such legislation. I tried to get him to endorse the idea during hearings of the Banking and Currency Committee months ago, but he would not do so at that time. My new bill has been in preparation for many weeks, and was finally delivered to me by the Office of the House Legislative Counsel on Friday afternoon, so it was my intention to introduce it today in any event."

Congresswoman Sullivan, a ranking Member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and Chairman of its Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, has tried for three years

to get standby consumer credit controls enacted into law. An amendment agreed to in the Banking Committee in 1966 to restore such powers to the Defense Production Act of 1950 was defeated in the House Floor.

She revived the effort in 1967 in the original version of the bill which became the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968, which includes the Truth in Lending Act, but the consumer credit controls provision was dropped in Committee for lack of support at that time.

During hearings of the Banking Committee in June of this year on the increase in the prime rate, Mrs. Sullivan again brought up the possible need for standby controls over rates and terms of consumer credit transactions, and also raised the question of a need for regulatory powers over the terms of business credit. She pointed out then that so-called commercial paper, issued by banks and finance companies to raise short-term funds from corporations and big investors, was not subject to Federal regulation of any type.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin conceded at those hearings that commercial paper could be inflationary and contribute to the increase in interest rates generally. He said the possibility of Federal regulation of such credit should be studied.

Under the Sullivan bill introduced today, the President could authorize the Federal Reserve to "regulate and control any or all extensions of credit, for such periods as the President directed. Among other things the Board could:

- (1) require registration or licensing of credit grantors;
- (2) prescribe the maximum amount of credit which could be extended in connection with any loan, purchase, or other extension of credit;
- (3) prescribe maximum maturity, minimum periodic payments, and maximum periods between payments;
- (4) set rates;
- (5) obtain injunctions;
- (6) institute actions for both civil and criminal penalties for violations. Maximum penalties would be \$1,000 fine and 1 year in jail.

The bill is entitled the "Credit Control Act."

Congresswoman Sullivan declared: "A predominant part of the Administration's fight against inflation seems to be devoted to the effort to tighten availability of credit, through higher and higher interest rates. This effort has had the effect of pricing moderate cost housing, small business, and state and local agencies, out of the market for credit. It has not stopped inflation.

"Rather than continue to ration credit by price alone, I think the American people would be glad to have the burden of fighting inflation spread more evenly across all elements of the economy, by requiring reasonable restrictions on those forms of credit which are most inflationary. Obviously, there is far greater demand for credit than funds available, and under those circumstances, the big corporations which can afford to pay whatever rate is charged are getting all of the credit they need, while the home buyer, and the small businessman, and governmental subdivisions are out in the cold.

"Selective credit controls, which this bill would authorize, could be utilized to channel credit into those activities which best serve the national interest, rather than, as at present, those which return the highest profit. I am sure everyone in the home building industry will welcome this approach, and so will every citizen whose living costs have risen so sharply because of the high cost of borrowing money."

Mrs. Sullivan said she will try to have her bill considered either as part of other legislation now before the Banking Commit-

tee dealing with interest rates paid by banks and savings and loans to depositors, or as a separate measure.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I find it rather strange that our minority friends are now embracing the conference report on S. 2577 as if it were their bill. This is our Democratic bill. No one will be misled by the vote on the conference report on this legislation. One need only look at the conference report to see who signed the report. It will be noted that the Democrats from both bodies signed the report, but no House Republicans did. This should make the facts evident and the play by our minority friends obvious.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if this conference report is approved without a roll-call vote, I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to it as I was 2 days ago when it originally passed the House.

This legislation provides untrammelled power to the President to delegate to the Federal Reserve Board, a private financial institution, life and death control over the credit of this Nation and its citizens.

This without even the declaration of an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of power of which dictators are made.

It is provided, for instance, that "transactions or persons or classes of either to be registered or licensed."

Literally interpreted, this means that it would be illegal for one person to make a loan or extend credit to another unless he or she was licensed or registered.

It is also provided that the Federal Reserve Board would have the authority to "prescribe the maximum rate of interest, maximum maturity, minimum periodic payment, maximum period between payments, and any other specification or limitation of the terms and conditions of any extension of credit."

These are only two of a long list of the most drastic restrictions conceivable.

Mr. Speaker, had this legislation provided that the President "upon the declaration of an emergency" could proceed to invoke such controls upon the people of this nation I would have been constrained to support it. No such condition is imposed.

As I said in debate on this measure 2 days ago, "this is unconditional power. No President should seek and should refuse if granted to him."

I realize that this country is in financial trouble. Through the years I have warned of the consequences that would flow from the wild spending in which this Government has indulged. I have warned, too, that a financial breakdown would unquestionably result in unholy delegated powers being vested in the Executive of this huge Central Government.

Here is another warning, written into the law of the land, for all to see.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 4, answered "present" 2, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

YEAS—360

Abernethy	Erlenborn	McDonald,
Adair	Esch	Mich.
Adams	Eshleman	McEwen
Addabbo	Evans, Colo.	McFall
Albert	Evins, Tenn.	McKneally
Anderson,	Farbstein	McMillan
Calif.	Fascell	Macdonald,
Anderson, Ill.	Feighan	Mass.
Andrews,	Findley	Madden
N. Dak.	Fish	Mahon
Annunzio	Flood	Mailliard
Arends	Flowers	Mann
Ashley	Flynt	Marsh
Aspinall	Foley	Mathias
Ayres	Ford, Gerald R.	Matsunaga
Barrett	Ford,	May
Beall, Md.	William D.	Mayne
Belcher	Foreman	Meeds
Bell, Calif.	Fountain	Melcher
Bennett	Fraser	Meskill
Betts	Frelinghuysen	Michel
Bevill	Frey	Mikva
Blaggi	Friedel	Miller, Ohio
Blester	Fulton, Pa.	Mills
Bingham	Fuqua	Minish
Blackburn	Galifianakis	Mink
Blanton	Garmatz	Minshall
Blatnik	Gaydos	Mize
Boggs	Gettys	Mizell
Boland	Gialmo	Mollohan
Bow	Gibbons	Monagan
Brademas	Gilbert	Moorhead
Brasco	Goldwater	Morgan
Bray	Gonzalez	Morton
Brinkley	Goodling	Mosher
Brooks	Gray	Murphy, Ill.
Broomfield	Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.
Brotzman	Griffin	Myers
Brown, Calif.	Grover	Natcher
Brown, Mich.	Gubser	Nedzi
Brown, Ohio	Gude	Nelsen
Broyhill, N.C.	Hagan	Nichols
Broyhill, Va.	Haley	Nix
Buchanan	Halpern	Obey
Burke, Fla.	Hamilton	O'Hara
Burke, Mass.	Hammer-	O'Konski
Burleson, Tex.	schmidt	Olsen
Burlison, Mo.	Hanley	O'Neal, Ga.
Burton, Calif.	Hanna	O'Neill, Mass.
Bush	Hansen, Idaho	Ottinger
Button	Hansen, Wash.	Passman
Byrne, Pa.	Harrington	Patman
Byrnes, Wis.	Harsha	Patten
Cabell	Harvey	Perkins
Caffery	Hathaway	Pettis
Carter	Hawkins	Phillbin
Casey	Hechler, W. Va.	Pickle
Chamberlain	Heckler, Mass.	Pike
Chappell	Helstoski	Pirnie
Clancy	Henderson	Podell
Clausen,	Hogan	Poff
Don H.	Holifield	Pollock
Clawson, Del.	Horton	Preyer, N.C.
Cleveland	Hosmer	Price, Ill.
Cohelan	Howard	Pryor, Ark.
Collins	Hull	Purcell
Colmer	Hungate	Quie
Conable	Hunt	Quillen
Conte	Hutchinson	Rallsback
Corbett	Ichord	Randall
Coughlin	Jacobs	Reid, Ill.
Cramer	Jarman	Reuss
Crane	Johnson, Calif.	Rhodes
Culver	Johnson, Pa.	Riegler
Daddario	Jonas	Rivers
Daniel, Va.	Jones, Ala.	Roberts
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, N.C.	Robison
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Tenn.	Rodino
Davis, Wis.	Karth	Roe
de la Garza	Kastenmeier	Rogers, Colo.
Delaney	Kazen	Rogers, Fla.
Dellenback	Kee	Rooney, N.Y.
Denney	Keith	Rooney, Pa.
Dennis	King	Rosenthal
Dent	Koch	Roth
Derwinski	Kuykendall	Roudebush
Devine	Kyl	Roybal
Dickinson	Kyros	Ruppe
Dingell	Landrum	Ruth
Donohue	Langen	Ryan
Dorn	Leggett	St. Onge
Dowdy	Lennon	Sandman
Downing	Lloyd	Satterfield
Dulski	Long, Md.	Saylor
Duncan	Lujan	Schadeberg
Dwyer	McClory	Scherie
Edmondson	McCloskey	Schueier
Edwards, Ala.	McClure	Schwebel
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Schwengel
Eilberg	McDade	Scott

Sebelius	Talcott	White
Shipley	Taylor	Whitehurst
Shriver	Teague, Calif.	Widnall
Sikes	Teague, Tex.	Wiggins
Skubitz	Thompson, Ga.	Williams
Slack	Thompson, N.J.	Wilson, Bob
Smith, Calif.	Thomson, Wis.	Wilson,
Smith, Iowa	Tiernan	Charles H.
Smith, N.Y.	Udall	Winn
Snyder	Ullman	Wold
Springer	Utt	Wolf
Stafford	Van Deerin	Wright
Staggers	Vander Jagt	Wyatt
Stanton	Vanik	Wylder
Steed	Vigorito	Wylie
Steizer, Ariz.	Waggonner	Wyman
Steiger, Wis.	Waldie	Yates
Stokes	Wampler	Yatron
Stratton	Watson	Young
Stubblefield	Watts	Zablocki
Stuckey	Weicker	Zion
Symington	Whalen	Zwach
Taft	Whalley	

NAYS—4

Camp	Price, Tex.
Gross	Rarick

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Collier	Cowger
---------	--------

NOT VOTING—67

Abbitt	Eckhardt	MacGregor
Alexander	Edwards, Calif.	Martin
Anderson,	Fallon	Miller, Calif.
Tenn.	Fisher	Montgomery
Andrews, Ala.	Fulton, Tenn.	Morse
Ashbrook	Gallagher	Moss
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Pelly
Berry	Griffiths	Pepper
Bolling	Hall	Poage
Brock	Hastings	Powell
Burton, Utah	Hays	Pucinski
Cahill	Hébert	Rees
Carey	Hicks	Reid, N.Y.
Cederberg	Kirwan	Reifel
Celler	Kleppe	Rostenkowski
Chisholm	Kluczynski	St Germain
Clark	Landgrebe	Sisk
Clay	Latta	Stephens
Conyers	Lipscomb	Sullivan
Corman	Long, La.	Tunney
Cunningham	Lowenstein	Watkins
Dawson	Lukens	Whitten
Diggs	McCarthy	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Moss with Mr. Lipscomb.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Rees with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Conyers with Mr. McCarthy.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Landgrebe.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Hastings.
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Morse.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hall.
 Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Fisher with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Reid of New York.
 Mr. Whitten with Mr. Reifel.
 Mr. Clay with Mr. Tunney.
 Mr. Lowenstein with Mrs. Chisholm.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Cunningham.
 Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Lukens.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Latta.
 Mr. Baring with Mr. Kleppe.
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Eckhart with Mr. Pelly.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Martin.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Hicks with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Kirwan.
 Mr. Corman with Mrs. Sullivan.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Montgomery.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Rostenkowski.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Sisk.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Miller of California.

Mr. BRAY and Mr. BROWN of Michigan changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to and to include extraneous material.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3016, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. PERKINS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3016) entitled "An act 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":

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-778)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3016) 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

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

That this Act may be cited as the "Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969".

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964 AND RELATED PROVISIONS

EXTENSION OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. (a) Section 161 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (redesignated section 171 by section 201 of this Act) is amended (1) by striking out "for which he is responsible", and (2) by striking out "three" and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

(b) Sections 245, 321, 408, 615, and 835 of such Act are each amended by striking out "three" and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

(c) Section 523 of such Act is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "four".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 102. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2,195,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$2,295,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless expressly in limitation of the provisions of this section, of the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for the next fiscal year, the Director shall for each such fiscal year reserve and make available not less than \$328,900,000 for the purpose of local initiative programs authorized under section 221 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and the remainder of such amounts shall be allocated, subject to

the provisions of section 616 of such Act, in such a manner that of such remaining amounts so appropriated for each fiscal year—

(1) \$890,300,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out parts A and B of title I (relating to work and training programs);

(2) \$46,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part D of title I (relating to special impact programs);

(3) \$20,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part E of title I (relating to special work and career development programs);

(4) \$811,300,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out title II, of which \$398,000,000 shall be for the Project Headstart program described in section 222(a)(1), \$90,000,000 shall be for the Follow Through program described in section 222(a)(2), \$58,000,000 shall be for the Legal Services program described in section 222(a)(3), \$80,000,000 shall be for the Comprehensive Health Services program described in section 222(a)(4), \$62,500,000 shall be for the Emergency Food and Medical Services program described in section 222(a)(5), \$15,000,000 shall be for the Family Planning program described in section 222(a)(6), and \$8,800,000 shall be for the Senior Opportunities and Services program described in section 222(a)(7);

(5) \$12,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part A of title III (relating to rural loans);

(6) \$34,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out part B of title III (relating to assistance for migrant and seasonal farmworkers);

(7) \$16,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out title VI (relating to administration and coordination); and

(8) \$37,000,000 shall be for the purpose of carrying out title VIII (relating to VISTA).

If the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section for any fiscal year are not sufficient to allocate the full amounts specified for each of the purposes set forth in clauses (1) through (8) of this subsection, then the amounts specified in each such clause shall be prorated to determine the allocations required for each such purpose.

(c) In addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, there are further authorized to be appropriated the following:

(1) \$14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to be used for the Special Impact programs described in part D of title I;

(2) \$34,700,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to be used for the Special Work and Career Development programs described in part E of title I;

(3) \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to be used for the Project Headstart program described in section 222(a)(1);

(4) \$32,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to be used for the Legal Services program described in section 222(a)(3);

(5) \$80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to be used for the Comprehensive Health Services program described in section 222(a)(4);

(6) \$112,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to be used for the Emergency Food and Medical Services program described in section 222(a)(5);

(7) \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to be used for the Family Planning program described in section 222(a)(6);

(8) \$3,200,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to be used for the Senior Opportunities and Services program described in section 222(a)(7);

(9) \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, to be used for the program of assistance for migrant and seasonal farmworkers described in part B of title III; and

(10) \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1971, to be used for Day Care projects described in part B of title V.

PARTICIPATION OF CHILDREN IN HEADSTART PROJECTS

SEC. 103. Paragraph (1) of section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "Pursuant to such regulations as the Director may prescribe, persons who are not members of low-income families may be permitted to receive services in projects assisted under this paragraph. A family which is not low income shall be required to make payment, or have payment made in its behalf, in whole or in part for such services where the family's income is, or becomes through employment or otherwise, such as to make such payment appropriate."

AMENDMENTS WITH RESPECT TO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

SEC. 104. (a) Section 222(a)(3) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "counseling, education, and other appropriate services" and inserting in lieu thereof "legal counseling, education in legal matters, and other appropriate legal services".

(b) Section 222(a)(3) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Members of the Armed Forces, and members of their immediate families, shall be eligible to obtain legal services under such programs in cases of extreme hardship (determined in accordance with regulations of the Director issued after consultation with the Secretary of Defense): *Provided*, That nothing in this sentence shall be so construed as to require the Director to expand or enlarge existing programs or to initiate new programs in order to carry out the provisions of this sentence unless and until the Secretary of Defense assumes the cost of such services and has reached agreement with the Director on reimbursement for all such additional costs as may be incurred in carrying out the provisions of this sentence."

EMERGENCY FOOD AND MEDICAL SERVICES

SEC. 105. Section 222(a)(5) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(5) A program to be known as 'Emergency Food and Medical Services' designed to provide on an emergency basis, directly or by delegation of authority pursuant to the provisions of title VI of this Act, financial assistance for the provision of such medical supplies and services, nutritional foodstuffs, and related services, as may be necessary to counteract conditions of starvation or malnutrition among the poor. Such assistance may be provided by way of supplement to such other assistance as may be extended under the provisions of other Federal programs, and may be used to extend and broaden such programs to serve economically disadvantaged individuals and families where such services are not now provided and without regard to the requirements of such laws for local or State administration or financial participation. In extending such assistance, the Director may make grants to community action agencies or local public or private nonprofit organizations or agencies to carry out the purposes of this paragraph. The Director is authorized to carry out the functions under this paragraph through the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in a manner that will insure the availability of such medical supplies and services, nutritional foodstuffs, and related services through a community action agency where feasible, or other agencies or organizations if no such agency exists or is able to administer programs to provide such foodstuffs, medical services, and supplies to needy individuals and families."

NEW SPECIAL EMPHASIS PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 106. Section 222(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by add-

ing at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(8) An 'Alcoholic Counseling and Recovery' program designed to discover and treat the disease of alcoholism. Such program should be community based, serve the objective of the maintenance of the family structure as well as the recovery of the individual alcoholic, encourage the use of neighborhood facilities and the services of recovered alcoholics as counselors, and emphasize the reentry of the alcoholic into society rather than the institutionalization of the alcoholic. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve and make available not less than \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and not less than \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, for the purpose of carrying out this program.

"(9) A 'Drug Rehabilitation' program designed to discover the causes of drug abuse and addiction, to treat narcotic and drug addiction and the dependence associated with drug abuse, and to rehabilitate the drug abuser and drug addict. Such program should deal with the abuse or addiction resulting from the use of narcotic drugs such as heroin, opium, and cocaine, stimulants such as amphetamines, depressants, marijuana, hallucinogens, and tranquilizers. Such program should be community based, serve the objective of the maintenance of the family structure as well as the recovery of the individual drug abuser or addict, encourage the use of neighborhood facilities and the services of recovered drug abusers and addicts as counselors, and emphasize the reentry of the drug abuser and addict into society rather than his institutionalization. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for programs authorized under this title, the Director shall reserve and make available not less than \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and not less than \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, for the purpose of carrying out this program."

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT REGARDING TIME OF APPROPRIATIONS OBLIGATION

SEC. 107. (a) Section 242 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Funds to cover the costs of the proposed contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be obligated from the appropriation which is current at the time the plan is submitted to the Governor."

(b) All obligations under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 which have been heretofore recorded substantially as provided in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section are hereby confirmed and ratified.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL LOAN PROGRAM

SEC. 108. Section 302(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "such families, and" and inserting "such families, or".

APPLICABILITY TO TRUST TERRITORY

SEC. 109. Section 609(1) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and title II" and inserting ", title II, title III-A, and title IV".

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE INCREASED FLEXIBILITY IN USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 110. Section 616 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by—

(1) inserting after the phrase "10 per centum" the first time it appears in such section, the following: "for fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1970, and not to exceed 15 per centum for fiscal years ending thereafter;" and

(2) striking out "but no such transfer shall result in increasing the amounts otherwise available for any program or activity by more than 10 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "but no such transfer shall result in increasing the amounts other-

wise available for any program or activity by—

"(1) more than 100 per centum in the case of any program or activity for which the amounts otherwise available are \$10,000,000 or less; or

"(2) more than 35 per centum in the case of any program or activity for which the amounts otherwise available exceed \$10,000,000".

ADEQUATE LEADTIME

SEC. 111. (a) Part A of title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"ADVANCE FUNDING

"SEC. 622. For the purpose of affording adequate notice of funding, available under this Act, appropriations for grants, contracts, or other payments under this Act are authorized to be included in the appropriation Act for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which they are available for obligation."

(b) In order to effect a transition to the advance funding method of timing appropriation action, the amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply notwithstanding that its initial application will result in the enactment in the same year (whether in the same appropriation Act or otherwise) of two separate appropriations, one for the then current fiscal year and one for the succeeding fiscal year.

CREDITING SERVICE OF A VISTA VOLUNTEER

SEC. 112. (a) Section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) strike out "and" at the end of clause (5);

(B) strike out the period at the end of clause (6) and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) add at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(7) a period of service of a volunteer under part A of title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 only if he later becomes subject to this subchapter."

(2) in subsection (j)—

(A) after "1956," in the first sentence, insert "the period of an individual's services as a volunteer under part A of title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,";

(B) before "volunteer or volunteer leader" in the second sentence, insert "volunteer under part A of title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 or as a"; and

(3) before the period at the end of the last sentence, insert a comma and the following: "and the period of an individual's service as a volunteer under part A of title VIII of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is the period between enrollment as a volunteer and termination of that service by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity or by death or resignation".

(b) Section 833 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by—

(1) striking out in subsection (a) "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 8332 of title 5 of the United States Code, and subsections (b) and (c) of this section"; and

(2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Any period of service of a volunteer under part A of this title shall be credited in connection with subsequent employment in the same manner as a like period of civilian employment by the United States Government—

"(1) for the purposes of section 852(a) (1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1092(a)(1)), and every other Act establishing a retirement system for civilian employees of any United States Government agency; and

"(2) except as otherwise determined by the President, for the purposes of determining seniority, reduction in force, and layoff

rights, leave entitlement, and other rights and privileges based upon length of service under the laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, the Foreign Service Act of 1946, and every other Act establishing or governing terms and conditions of service of civilian employees of the United States Government: *Provided*, That service of a volunteer shall not be credited toward completion of any probationary or trial period or completion of any service requirement for career appointment."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be effective as to all former volunteers employed by the United States Government on or after the effective date of this Act.

USE OF CLOSED JOB CORPS CENTERS FOR SPECIAL YOUTH PROGRAMS

SEC. 113. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall establish procedures and make arrangements which are designed to assure that facilities and equipment at Job Corps centers which are being discontinued will, where feasible, be made available for use by State or Federal agencies and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations with satisfactory arrangements for utilizing such facilities and equipment for conducting programs, especially those providing opportunities for low-income disadvantaged youth, including, without limitation—

- (1) special remedial programs;
- (2) summer youth programs;
- (3) exemplary vocational preparation and training programs;
- (4) cultural enrichment programs, including music, the arts, and the humanities;
- (5) training programs designed to improve the qualifications of educational personnel, including instructors in vocational educational programs; and
- (6) youth conservation work and other conservation programs.

(b) To achieve the objectives of this section, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall consult with, elicit the cooperation of, and utilize the services of the Administrator of the General Services Administration, and the Secretaries of Agriculture, of the Interior, and of Labor.

PROVISION WITH RESPECT TO DIRECTOR'S AUTHORITY TO DELEGATE FUNCTIONS

SEC. 114. The authority of section 620(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall not apply to the Legal Services program authorized under section 222(a)(3) of such Act. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall not delegate the program authorized under such section 222(a)(3) to any other existing Federal agency.

AMENDMENT WITH RESPECT TO WITHHOLDING CERTAIN FEDERAL TAXES BY ANTIPOVERTY AGENCIES

SEC. 115. Upon notice from the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that any person otherwise entitled to receive a payment made pursuant to a grant, contract, agreement, loan or other assistance made or entered into under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is delinquent in paying or depositing (1) the taxes imposed on such person under chapters 21 and 23 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, or (2) the taxes deducted and withheld by such person under chapters 21 and 24 of such Code, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall suspend such portion of such payment due to such person, which, if possible, is sufficient to satisfy such delinquency, and shall not make or enter into any new grant, contract, agreement, loan or other assistance under such Act with such person until the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate has notified him that such person is no longer delinquent in paying or depositing such tax or the Director of the Office of Economic Op-

portunity determines that adequate provision has been made for such payment. In order to effectuate the purpose of this section on a reasonable basis the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall consult on a quarterly basis.

TITLE II—SPECIAL WORK AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 201. Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating part E as part F, by renumbering section 161 (as amended by this Act) as section 171, and by inserting after part D the following new part:

"PART E—SPECIAL WORK AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 161. The Congress finds that the 'Mainstream' program aimed primarily at the chronically unemployed and the 'New Careers' program providing jobs for the unemployed and low-income persons leading to broader career opportunities are uniquely effective; that, in addition to providing persons assisted with jobs, the key to their economic independence, these programs are of advantage to the community at large in that they are directed at community beautification and betterment and the improvement of health, education, welfare, public safety, and other public services; and that, while these programs are important and necessary components of comprehensive work and training programs, there is a need to encourage imaginative and innovative use of these programs, to enlarge the authority to operate them, and to increase the resources available for them.

"SPECIAL PROGRAMS

"SEC. 162. (a) The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to stimulate and support efforts to provide the unemployed with jobs and the low-income worker with greater career opportunity. Programs authorized under this section shall include the following:

"(1) A special program to be known as 'Mainstream' which involves work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, physical condition, obsolete or inadequate skills, declining economic conditions, other causes of a lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to other services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands, the rehabilitation of housing, the improvement of public facilities, and the improvement and expansion of health, education, day care, and recreation services;

"(2) A special program to be known as 'New Careers' which will provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields of public service, including without limitation health, education, welfare, recreation, day care, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for on-the-job training, promotion, and advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of pro-

viding job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement.

"(b) The Director is authorized to provide financial and other assistance to insure the provision of supportive and follow-up services to supplement programs under this part including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in these programs and in employment.

"ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

"SEC. 163. The Director shall prescribe regulations to assure that programs under this part have adequate internal administrative controls, accounting requirements, personnel standards, evaluation procedures, availability of in-service training and technical assistance programs, and other policies as may be necessary to promote the effective use of funds.

"SPECIAL CONDITIONS

"SEC. 164. (a) The Director shall not provide financial assistance for any program under this part unless he determines, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, that—

"(1) no participant will be employed on projects involving political parties, or the construction, operation, or maintenance of so much of any facility as is used or to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(2) the program will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed;

"(3) the rates of pay for time spent in work-training and education, and other conditions of employment, will be appropriate and reasonable in the light of such factors as the type of work, geographical region, and proficiency of the participant; and

"(4) the program will, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the occupational development and upward mobility of individual participants.

"(b) For programs which provide work and training related to physical improvements, preference shall be given to those improvements which will be substantially used by low-income persons and families or which will contribute substantially to amenities or facilities in urban or rural areas having high concentrations or proportions of low-income persons and families.

"(c) Programs approved under this part shall, to the maximum extent feasible, contribute to the elimination of artificial barriers to employment and occupational advancement.

"(d) Projects under this part shall provide for maximum feasible use of resources under other Federal programs for work and training and the resources of the private sector.

"PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

"SEC. 165. (a) Participants in programs under this part must be unemployed or low-income persons. The Director, in consultation with the Commissioner of Social Security, shall establish criteria for low income, taking into consideration family size, urban-rural and farm-nonfarm differences, and other relevant factors. Any individual shall be deemed to be from a low-income family if the family receives cash welfare payments.

"(b) Participants must be permanent residents of the United States or of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(c) Participants shall not be deemed Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of law relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, leave,

unemployment compensation, and Federal employment benefits.

"EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF ASSISTANCE"

"SEC. 166. The Director shall establish criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance among the States. In developing those criteria, he shall consider, among other relevant factors, the ratios of population, unemployment, and family income levels. Of the sums appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year for programs authorized under this part not more than 12½ per centum shall be used within any one State.

"LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL ASSISTANCE"

"SEC. 167. Programs assisted under this part shall be subject to the provisions of section 131 of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

CARL D. PERKINS,
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
JOHN BRADEMANS,
JAMES G. O'HARA,
HUGH L. CAREY,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
PATSY T. MINK,
JAMES H. SCHEUER,
LLOYD MEEDS,
W. L. CLAY,
LOUIS STOKES,
O. R. REID,
MARVIN L. ESCH,
ALPHONZO BELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GAYLORD NELSON,
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
EDWARD KENNEDY,
WALTER MONDALE,
ALAN CRANSTON,
HAROLD E. HUGHES,
JACOB K. JAVITS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3016) 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, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a new text. The conference report recommends a substitute text for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for minor technical and clarifying differences, this statement describes the actions of the conferees insofar as they recommend changes in the House amendment.

PROVISIONS WITH RESPECT TO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

The Senate bill provided that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated as additional amounts for carrying out legal services programs during fiscal year 1971 may be used to pay lawyers who are disbarred or suspended from the practice of law. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The Senate recedes.

The Senate bill prohibited the Director from delegating his authority to carry on legal services programs to other Federal agencies. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. This provision of the Senate bill is retained in the conference substitute.

The Senate bill provided that, in the case of legal services programs, the Governor's veto would apply to any "portion of any contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other

assistance" and that the power to override that veto would be a nondelegable power of the President. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The Senate recedes.

The House amendment, unlike the Senate bill, limited the types of "counseling, education, and other appropriate services" which could be provided under legal services programs to "legal counseling, education in legal matters, and other appropriate legal services". The Senate recedes.

The House amendment contained a provision, which had no counterpart in the Senate bill, which provided that members of the Armed Forces and their families would be eligible to obtain legal services under legal services programs in cases of extreme hardship (determined in accordance with the Director's regulations issued after consulting with the Secretary of Defense). It provided that the costs of providing these services would be reimbursed by that Secretary. The agreement reached in conference retains the provisions of the House amendment in this regard except that it deletes the provision for reimbursement of costs by the Secretary of Defense and inserts in lieu thereof a statement that nothing in this new provision will be construed to require the Director to expand or enlarge existing programs in order to carry out this new directive unless the Secretary of Defense assumes the costs of these services and has reached an agreement with the Director on reimbursement for all such additional costs as may be incurred in carrying out the new provision. The conferees recognize that servicemen, qualifying under legal services guidelines, are presently eligible for such services and are receiving help and representation. No inference is to be drawn that such assistance is to be curtailed or eliminated. It is the understanding of the managers on the part of the House that the Department of Defense is considering developing its own programs to provide these legal services. The inclusion of this new provision is not intended to supplant this effort but rather to offer an alternative which it is hoped the Department will consider.

HEADSTART AND FOLLOW THROUGH

The Senate bill continued in effect the present provisions of law under which Project Headstart programs and Follow Through programs are carried on. In contrast the House amendment repealed the provisions of present law which authorize the Director to carry on Project Headstart and Follow Through programs, and substituted therefor, in a new title IX, provisions for special comprehensive preschool programs and programs providing for intensive Follow Through education for primary school children. The conference agreement adopts the organizational approach of the Senate bill in this regard, so that Project Headstart and Follow Through programs will be carried on, as they are today, under section 222(a) (1) and (2).

The Senate bill amended the existing provision of law relating to Project Headstart programs to provide that under regulations which the Director could prescribe, children who are not members of low-income families could be permitted to receive the benefits of the Head Start program. It provided that a family which is not of low income could be required to pay for these services. The House amendment did not contain this provision. The substitute agreed to in conference adopts this provision but requires, rather than permits, families which are not of low income to pay, or that payments be made on their behalf, for these services.

Headstart regulations presently permit as much as 10% of an individual class to exceed the poverty level with respect to income. The managers on the part of the House, feel that participation in programs carried on under this Act by persons who are not of low income makes a positive con-

tribution to such programs, but feel that the costs of their participation should be provided other than through OEO funds. The managers wish to make clear that the programs are to continue to have a poverty focus and that the very poor children are to have a distinct preference. Participation of higher income children should not be permitted where it might deprive low-income persons of the benefits of these programs. Where their participation is permitted their families should be required to make appropriate payments on account of the benefits they receive or payment should be made on their behalf. This view of the conferees is consistent with the position taken by the Congress with respect to other programs authorized under the Act, such as the comprehensive health services program, that while the very poor should have preference, access to program benefits need not always be limited solely to those below the established "poverty" line.

NARCOTICS AND DRUGS

The Senate bill provided for a new special program to be called a "drug rehabilitation program" and also provided a new special program for Alcoholic Counseling and Recovery. The House amendment provided a somewhat similar program to be called a "Narcotic Addict Recovery Program," but contained no provision comparable to that in the Senate bill relating to the Alcoholic Counseling and Recovery program. The Senate bill reserved \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1970 and \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1971 for the Alcoholic Counseling and Recovery program, and reserved \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 1970, and \$15,000,000 for fiscal year 1971, for the Drug Rehabilitation program. The conference substitute adopts these provisions of the Senate bill, but it should be noted that the reservations of funds for these programs which are retained in the conference substitute are made subject to the prior reservation of funds for local initiative programs carried on by community action agencies.

SPECIAL WORK AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The House amendment added a new part E to title I of the Act which provided a new authorization for special "Mainstream" programs involving work activities directed at the needs of chronically unemployed poor, and a special "New Careers" program to provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to new career opportunities. The House bill authorized the appropriation of \$110,000,000 for this purpose for fiscal year 1970 and such amounts as may be necessary for the fiscal year 1971. The Senate bill contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute adopts the substance of this provision of the House amendment. However, it deleted the separate authorization of appropriations, and in lieu thereof added to the general section dealing with authorization of appropriations in the amount of \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970 and the first fiscal year 1971. The managers on the part of the House are fully aware that the Director has delegated to the Secretary of Labor authority to carry on programs similar to those provided for in this new part. The conferees agreed that those existing programs could continue to be carried particularly, but not exclusively, in connection with the concentrated employment programs, and that the scope of their activities not be reduced by reason of the enactment of this additional provision. It had been the plan of most of the House Managers that the Director would be directed to retain, rather than delegate, this new authority.

They did not insist, however, that he do so; but they do insist that these programs and other manpower and job programs be carried on as originally conceived and designed by the Congress, that there be no reduction in their magnitude, that recent

limitations on eligibility (such as those dealing with older workers) be removed, that the "New Careers" program retain real substance and not be limited to public service activities, that substantive efforts such as those going on at the University of Minnesota be encouraged to improve and continue. In short, the managers on the part of the House will insist that the policies and purposes enunciated by the Congress be adhered to. It is their expectation that under this part special emphasis will be placed on single purpose programs, that programs of limited size and scope will be carried out, especially in rural areas, and that the rural poverty areas will receive an equitable share of the assistance being provided. The Director and/or his delegate administrator of this part will be expected to report to the committee on the policies and progress of these programs bi-annually beginning six months after the enactment of this Act. The Managers on the part of the House reemphasize and redirect the attention of the Secretary of Labor to the language on page 7 of the House Report (91-684) dealing with manpower programs.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND MEDICAL SERVICES

The House amendment contained a provision, which had no counterpart in the Senate bill, which added a new title X to the Act under which the Director would carry out intensive programs to eliminate hunger and malnutrition. The amendment also repealed the authority in the existing law which provides for an emergency food and medical service program as a special emphasis program to be carried out under section 222(a). The amendment authorized the appropriation of \$92,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970 and such amounts as may be necessary for fiscal year 1971 for carrying out this new program. The conference substitute does not contain all of the provisions of the House amendment, but instead substitutes for the existing authority in section 222(a) for carrying out emergency food and medical services the substantive language contained in the House provision, with a minor amendment to assure that the services will be provided only on an emergency basis. The substitute also deletes the requirement in the House amendment that particular emphasis be given to programs which serve the elderly and the extremely young. The conferees wish to emphasize their desire that the Director should encourage the employment of elderly persons as regular, part time, and short-term staff in programs carried on under this paragraph.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL LOAN PROGRAM

The House amendment made an amendment to the provisions of the Act governing the rural loan program. This provision, which had no counterpart in the Senate bill, is retained in the conference report. The managers on the part of the House expect that, with the adoption of this amendment, the Farmers Home Administration will consider applications for loans under this Part to elderly people for the purpose of making repairs and improvements to their homes.

APPLICABILITY TO THE TRUST TERRITORY

The House amendment contained a provision, which did not appear in the Senate bill, to ensure that the benefits of titles III-A and IV of the Act are available in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. The Senate recedes.

ADVANCE FUNDING

The Senate bill provided that appropriations for grants, contracts, or other payments under the Act are authorized to be included in the appropriation Act for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which they are available for obligation. This provision authorizing advance funding had no counter-

part in the House amendment. The advance funding provision is retained in the conference substitute.

TIME OF OBLIGATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate bill provided that funds to cover a contract, agreement, grant, loan, or other assistance shall be treated as obligated at the time the plan is approved by the Office of Economic Opportunity and submitted to the Governor for consideration as required by section 242 of the Act, and also ratifies past practices of the Office of Economic Opportunity which is in accord with this provision. While the House amendment did not contain this provision, the House committee in its report recognized the problem and approved the practice, and the managers on the part of the House agree that it should be included in the conference substitute.

CREDITING SERVICE OF A VISTA VOLUNTEER

The Senate bill provided that service as a VISTA volunteer would be credited as if it were Federal service for purposes of determining retirement benefits under Federal law. The House amendment did not contain this provision. The House recedes.

AUDIT REQUIREMENT

The Senate bill provided that the Comptroller General shall have access "for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records that are pertinent to the financial assistance received by any agency under this title". The House amendment did not contain this provision. The Senate recedes.

USE OF CLOSED JOB CORPS CENTERS FOR SPECIAL YOUTH PROGRAMS

The Senate bill provided that facilities and equipment of the closed Job Corps centers will, where feasible, be made available for use by State or Federal agencies and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for conducting programs, especially programs providing opportunities for low-income disadvantaged youth. The House amendment did not contain this provision. The House recedes.

AMENDMENT WITH RESPECT TO WITHHOLDING CERTAIN FEDERAL TAXES BY ANTIPOVERTY AGENCIES

The Senate bill provided that, upon receipt of assistance under the Act, the recipient must set aside a portion of the amount received sufficient to satisfy expected liability under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act. It also provided that, upon notice from the Secretary of the Treasury, when any person otherwise entitled to receive funds under the Act is delinquent in paying these taxes, or in depositing withheld income or social security taxes, the Director must suspend payments and provide no further assistance, until the Secretary of the Treasury notifies him that the recipient is no longer delinquent or that adequate provision for payment has been made. The House amendment did not contain this provision. The conference substitute makes major changes in this provision. It does not include the requirement that recipients of assistance under the Act must set aside the amount necessary to satisfy its expected liabilities for taxes under the Acts referred to above. It also provides that when a delinquency occurs the Office of Economic Opportunity, instead of suspending all further assistance, will suspend only so much of the assistance as may be necessary to satisfy the delinquency. Further, it provides that new assistance may be given when the Director determines that adequate provision has been made for paying any delinquency which is outstanding. The conference substitute includes a further provision which states that, in order to effectuate the purposes of the

section on a reasonable basis, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity must consult on a quarterly basis.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate bill provided authorizations of appropriations for the fiscal year 1970 of \$2,048,000,000. The House amendment in contrast authorized the appropriation for fiscal year 1970 of \$2,343,000,000, of which \$1,563,000,000 was authorized for carrying on programs for which the House did not make separate authorization of appropriations. The bill agreed to in conference authorizes the appropriation of \$2,195,500,000 for the fiscal year 1970.

For the fiscal year 1971, the House amendment authorized the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary. The Senate bill authorized the appropriation for that year of \$2,148,000,000, but, in addition, authorized the appropriation of the following:

- (1) \$14,000,000 for Special Impact programs under part D of title I,
- (2) \$240,000,000 for Project Headstart programs,
- (3) \$32,000,000 for Legal Services programs,
- (4) \$80,000,000 for Comprehensive Health Services programs,
- (5) \$150,000,000 for Emergency Food and Medical Services programs,
- (6) \$3,200,000 for the Senior Opportunities and Services programs,
- (7) \$15,000,000 for assistance for migrant and seasonal farm workers under part B of title III, and
- (8) \$50,000,000 for Day Care projects under part B of title V.

The conference substitute authorizes \$2,295,500,000 for the fiscal year 1971 and authorizes the additional amounts which were authorized by the Senate bill with the following exceptions: (1) an additional authorization of \$15,000,000 for family planning programs; (2) the additional amount for Headstart is reduced to \$180,000,000; (3) the additional amount for Emergency Food and Medical Services is reduced to \$112,500,000.

ALLOCATIONS

The House amendment did not provide allocations to specific programs of amounts appropriated, except to the extent the separate authorizations contained in the House amendment for special work and career development programs, special preschool and Follow Through programs, and intensive programs to eliminate hunger and malnutrition constituted a separate allocation of appropriations.

The Senate bill in contrast provided special allocations for a number of the programs carried on under the Act. These were the following:

- (1) \$890,300,000 for work and training programs under title I.
- (2) \$46,000,000 for special impact programs under part D of title I.
- (3) \$1,012,700,000 for community action programs under title II, of which \$338,000,000 would be for Project Headstart programs, \$60,000,000 for Follow Through programs, \$58,000,000 for legal services programs, \$80,000,000 for comprehensive health services programs, \$25,000,000 for emergency food and medical services programs, \$15,000,000 for family planning programs, and \$8,800,000 for senior opportunities and services programs.
- (4) \$12,000,000 for rural loan programs,
- (5) \$34,000,000 for migrant and seasonal farm worker programs,
- (6) \$16,000,000 for administration and coordination under title VI,
- (7) \$37,000,000 for carrying out VISTA.

The conference substitute adopts the plan of the Senate bill with a major change. As adopted by the conferees, \$328,900,000 must

be reserved and made available for each of the fiscal years for local initiative programs carried on under section 221 of the Act, and only the remainder of the appropriations for each such year would be allocated in the prescribed manner. The amount so reserved is not subject to transfer under Section 616 of the Act. The allocations described above are retained in the conference substitute, except that a new allocation of \$20,000,000 is made for carrying out the new part E of the Act. It should be noted that the provisions of the Senate bill requiring pro rata reductions in allocations where appropriations are insufficient to make such allocations in full are retained in the conference substitute, but, of course, the funds reserved for local initiative programs would not be subject to such reductions. It should also be noted in considering these allocations that the conference substitute retains the provisions of the Senate bill which require the Director to reserve and make available not less than \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970 and not less than \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971 for carrying out the new Alcoholic Counseling and Recovery program and to reserve and make available not less than \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and not less than \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year 1971 for carrying out the new Drug Rehabilitation program.

TRANSFERS

Section 616 of the Act authorizes 10 percent of the amount appropriated or allocated from any appropriation for carrying out any program or activity under the Act to be transferred and used for carrying out any other program or activity under the Act, but no such transfer can result in increasing the amount otherwise available for any program or activity by more than 10 percent. The Senate bill amended this provision to permit the transfer of 15 percent of the amount appropriated or allocated for a program or activity for the fiscal year 1970 and 20 percent thereafter. It also deleted the provision which limits the amount which may be transferred to any program or activity. The conference substitute modified the Senate language to provide that no more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated or allocated for one program or activity may be transferred to another program or activity during fiscal 1970 and no more than 15 percent may be so transferred thereafter. With respect to the limitations on the transfers resulting in increases in the amounts available for any program or activity, the conferees agree that for activities or programs for which \$10,000,000 or less is available a maximum of 100 percent could be added. For any program or activity for which more than \$10,000,000 was available no more than 35 percent may be added.

It should be noted that in at least two respects the agreement of the conferees underscores the overwhelming determination by the House of Representatives on Friday the twelfth of December that title II and the programs authorized thereunder are and must remain Community Action Programs. The elimination of the Murphy amendment relating to the governor's veto power over legal services programs and the provision of a special reservation of funds for local initiative programs underscore the intention of the conferees that the community action program was, and is intended to be, a program locally designed and locally administered. The managers on the part of the House encourage the Director of OEO to explore, along the lines previously mentioned in the House committee report, the opportunities for increased State involvement in poverty programs. It must be quite clear, however, that State domination over program planning, conception, or administration is not intended. Any changes in policy or reg-

ulation that would establish a preference for State rather than local determination and local control of community action programs will be inconsistent with the intention of the Congress.

CARL D. PERKINS,
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
JOHN BRADEMAS,
JAMES G. O'HARA,
HUGH L. CAREY,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
WILLIAM D. FORD,
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
PATSY T. MINK,
JAMES SCHEUER,
FLOYD MEEDS,
W. H. CLAY,
LOUIS STOKES,
OGDEN R. REID,
JOHN DELLENBACK,
MARVIN L. ESCH,
ALPHONZO BELL,
WILLIAM A. STEIGER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15209, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15209) making supplemental appropriations 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 Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, WHITTEN, ROONEY of New York, BOLAND, FLOOD, and STEED, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Messrs. BOW, JONAS, CEDERBERG, and RHODES.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 15209, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970, UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report on H.R. 15209, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 13111, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1970, UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report on H.R. 13111, 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.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(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 tomorrow, if he is able to give us that now.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we will not ask to go over, so we will meet at 12 o'clock tomorrow.

We have outstanding, as the gentleman knows, conference reports on three appropriation bills—for foreign aid, for Labor-HEW, and the supplemental—and on the following bills:

Economic Opportunity Act amendments, Export Control, and Environmental Quality as well as the tax bill. Of course, we know we will not get the tax bill tomorrow, but we will take up as many as possible, hopefully all of these six conference reports, the three appropriation ones and the other three tomorrow, if they are ready tomorrow.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

RESEARCH NEEDED ON MARIHUANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIAMMO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently urged the establishment of a commission to determine the character or marihuana and the effect of its use in order to provide a firm factual basis upon which to found decisions as to its regulation.

I have said that the facts are not completely known and this is true insofar as ultimate conclusions are concerned. However, there are a few undisputable facts and I should like to set them out here.

Up to the present there has been little research performed relating to the effect marihuana—dihydrocannabinol—has on human users and, in turn, the users' impact on our society. Much of the completed work suffers due to methodology. Further, the completed research and other available data has not been adequately pulled together or evaluated.

The active drug compound found in the various forms of marihuana is dihydrocannabinol. The quantity of dihydrocannabinol present varies with the form of marihuana as grown in different areas of

the world. Thus, the pharmacological and psychological action varies with the type of marihuana that the individual uses. As with any drug the dose-response differs with each individual user. Thus there is a different response to American marihuana, Mexican marihuana, Indian marihuana, Vietnamese marihuana, Turkish marihuana, or hashish, in the individual user. Also, within the past few years dihydrocannabinol and some of its active isomers have been successfully synthesized so the problem has been further compounded.

The administration has not moved as fast as it should in taking constructive steps regarding drug abuse. The administration's Control of Dangerous Substances Act of 1969 calls for the delegation of authority to the Department of Justice to classify drugs and to conduct drug research. True, Justice does not have the primary authority to conduct drug research but the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Public Health Service and its component units already have the statutory delegation to conduct drug research including marihuana—dihydrocannabinol. Justice's proposed legislative authority would be concurrent with existing Department of Health, Education, and Welfare authority. The National Institute of Mental Health of Public Health Service's Health Services and Mental Health Administration—HSMHA—has a Narcotic Addiction and Drug Abuse Addiction Division. The President's Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence in its recent report, "Challenging Our Youth," stated:

We recommend that the National Institute of Health, working with selected universities, greatly expand research on the physical and psychological effects of marijuana use.

The National Institutes of Health—NIH—is another component of the Public Health Service other than HSMHA of which the National Institute of Mental Health is an integral part. It is obvious that the present legislative authority is more than adequate to conduct extensive marihuana—dihydrocannabinol—research but what is needed are the necessary ingredients of leadership, direction and funding.

In the recent past we have attempted to discover or create nonaddictive drugs. We were told about the nonaddictive wonders of meperidine—Demerol—vis-à-vis morphine only to discover it, too, was addictive. Later eminent scientists informed the world that other compounds such as phenazocine and pentazocine were nonaddictive. Again with adequate use phenazocine and pentazocine were proven to be addictive—producers of drug dependence. Twenty years ago Food and Drug Administration officials told us that the artificial sweeteners, dulcin, and P-4000, were harmful but that the artificial sweeteners, cyclamate and saccharin were considered safe for food and drug use. Did we know better at that time?

But one thing that was clear—there was inadequate research and knowledge available at that time to make a reliable judgment—for within the past months the Food and Drug Administration and

other governmental and scientific bodies decided that cyclamates are, in fact, potentially harmful to the user. It is probable that many of these compounds could have been determined to be harmful originally if their sponsors and responsible individuals had performed the necessary research. However, it appears that they, too, were committed to their statements of safety, nontoxicity or nonaddiction to become involved in needed research of the drug's effect on humans.

In the past the terms, "potential analgesic," "narcotic," and "addicting" were equated. The term "narcotic" now has more than scientific significance but our professional scientific spokesman before the Congress does not adequately make this distinction. The American Medical Association, National Academy of Science-National Research Council, and World Health Organization have adopted the general term "drug dependence" with an appropriate modifier designating a specific type, to cover all kinds of drug abuse. We should be aware that individuals may become dependent upon a wide variety of chemical substances that produce central nervous system effects ranging from stimulation to depression. What must be determined is the drug's potential for inducing dependence in certain individuals. Some individuals are more likely than others to abuse or overuse the drug of use and, under certain conditions may develop a dependence. It is in this context that we must act now to conduct research, evaluate the research and reach legal conclusions as to the drug, dihydrocannabinol—more commonly used and referred to as marihuana.

In 1960 the authorities arrested 1,700 youths on the grounds of possession and/or use of potent analgesic drugs and/or marihuana. Last year, 1968, 33,000 youths, including 6,000 girls, were arrested for this reason—an increase of nearly 2,000 times in less than 10 years. At present, one out of four major crimes—felonies—are committed by youths under 18 years of age—another large increase of youth participation.

Thus we need to know, if it is possible, just what is the relationship of the increase in drug abuse and use by youth to the increase in crime due to youth.

Basically, this means, therefore, that we must have a scientific basis in reaching conclusions about the effect of marihuana. It is to this end that my bill, H.R. 14981, is directed since it would create a commission for this very purpose. With this commission and with the studies made under its aegis, we would expect to have the knowledge which would enable us to deal intelligently with this drug as in contrast with the emotional, uninformed, and contradictory action that we find today.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS IN A LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE, NOVEMBER 11

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I thought you would be interested in the questions and

answers brought out in a recent Labor News Conference, on November 11. For that reason I am taking the liberty of presenting them to you. They are as follows:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

A top union officer today called for multinational agreements to curb the export of jobs and import of products that are having a growing adverse effect on both U.S. workers and industries.

"Soft goods, ceramics, plate glass and steel" are among the industries hard hit by U.S. owned plants along the Mexican border and "in other low-wage countries, particularly in the Far East," said Howard D. Samuel, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO. Samuel appeared on Labor News Conference an AFL-CIO produced public affairs interview broadcast Tuesday at 7:35 p.m. (EST), on the Mutual Broadcasting System.

He said that some 200 such plants have been built just south of the Mexican border in the last few years, where wages range as low as "30 cents an hour" for the 20,000 workers they employ. He said that in addition to substandard wages, tax breaks granted by the Mexican government and U.S. "tariff benefits" encourage manufacturers to set up foreign assembly plants.

"Now 'assembly' is a fairly broad word," Samuel stressed, pointing out that it includes "putting together all the components of a television set or a radio . . . or most of the operations in making a shirt, or suit, or a ladies' garment." But, he noted, Mexican consumers get no "benefit out of the manufacturing operations that are being set up there," for "even when things are made within its borders (by U.S. companies), they have to be shipped out."

Samuel said that U.S. textile and apparel imports are "growing 70% a year" in general, and as much as 400% to 500% on some items, but that American consumers gain no advantage in either quality or price. He pointed out that "garments coming from European countries, where the wage levels are considerably lower than wage levels in the United States, are sold for the same or higher prices than American-made garments of the same quality."

"The beneficiary is not the consumer, it is the retailer," he declared, and the retailer "is doing very well, indeed."

Samuel was questioned by Lloyd Schwartz, Washington bureau chief for the Fairchild Publications, and Neil Gilbride, labor correspondent for the Associated Press.

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE

(Mutual Broadcasting System, program 29, series 9, November 11, 1969.)

Subject: Mexico's Border Industrialization. Guest: Howard D. Samuel, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

Reporters: Neil Gilbride, labor correspondent, Associated Press; Lloyd Schwartz, Washington bureau chief, Fairchild Publications.

Moderator: Frank Harden.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The following time is presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System.

HARDEN. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL-CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Howard D. Samuel, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

A major problem for U.S. workers has been created by policies of both the U.S. and Mexican governments that have encouraged a large number of U.S. companies to set up

plants just south of the Mexican border. Goods produced at shamefully low wages flow into the United States to compete with products made under U.S. labor standards and at U.S. wages. The AFL-CIO is convinced that non-union plants, evasion of Mexican laws and cheap labor production for the high-priced U.S. market, build neither friendship between the two nations, nor economic development on the Mexican side of the border. Here to question Mr. Samuel about the border-jumping problem which is symptomatic of a broader, international problem, and what organized labor believes can and must be done to meet it, are Lloyd Schwartz, Washington bureau chief for the Fairchild Publications, and Neil Gilbride, labor correspondent for the Associated Press. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Mr. Schwartz, I believe you have the first question?

SCHWARTZ. Mr. Samuel, the Mexican border problem seems to be symptomatic of an even broader issue—growing import competition. Just how serious is this, and what are its dimensions?

SAMUEL. Well, the competition of imports is very serious, and has been growing more serious in the past few years.

It has affected a number of industries, particularly those in the soft goods. It has also affected such industries as ceramics, plate glass, steel.

These imports come not only from Mexico—with the impetus of the Mexican Border Industrialization Program—but also, from many other countries, particularly, the low-wage countries of the Far East.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Samuel, can you put some kind of money figure on that—how large it is—the imports and, perhaps, how many jobs it may be costing American workers?

SAMUEL. I would not know that for all industries, and I am not even sure that those figures are readily available. We know that in Mexico, for example, in the last few years, about 200 plants have been erected under the industrialization program.

Workers there are getting 30 cents an hour—and there are approximately 20,000 of those workers.

Now, I can't say that there have been 20,000 jobs lost. It is not a one-for-one relationship. But, we know that many thousands of jobs have been lost. In some cases, we have been able to trace them directly—on nearly a one-to-one-basis.

GILBRIDE. How does the Mexican border program work?

SAMUEL. The Mexican Government put it into operation about five years ago.

They offer tax benefits. And, the United States offers a tariff benefit. These apply to a company that goes down there and only assembles goods, rather than produces them.

Now, "assembly" is a fairly broad word. It would include, for example, putting together all the components of a television set or a radio set.

It would also mean most of the operations and making a shirt, or suit, or ladies' garment.

The products must then be sent back to the United States—they cannot be sold in Mexico. So, the Mexican consumer does not get any benefit out of the manufacturing operations that are being set up.

GILBRIDE. What's the theory behind them not being sold in Mexico?

SAMUEL. Well, Mexico has a very closed border. It is not even a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades—GATT. Mexico has very restrictive import policies—it permits practically nothing to be imported.

So even, as in this case, when things are made within its borders, they have to be shipped out.

GILBRIDE. Is this making of products at cheap wages and sending them back here, exclusive to Mexico?

SCHWARTZ. This particular policy is, and,

of course, it depends a good deal on the fact that Mexico is along our border. This offers a tremendous advantage to companies. Shipping costs are negligible.

SCHWARTZ. Mr. Samuel, traditionally, organized labor has been free-trade-oriented, and opposed to trade barriers. Now we find them sort of in the protectionist corner. Does this make you uncomfortable, or, is there justification in the economics aspects—the loss of jobs, for example?

SAMUEL. Well, I think that some of the old bromides of the 30's really can't be maintained in our current world-wide economy.

I don't think the term "protectionist," for example, really has much meaning any more, and, I am not sure that the term "free trade" has much meaning any more.

Really, we have to look at imports—international trade—as a major part of our economy. And, we have to apply to it the same kind of planning and programming that we apply to practically every other part of our economy.

SCHWARTZ. Are you willing to accept some voluntary restrictions by other countries—restrictions geared to the growth of our Gross National Product, for example?

SAMUEL. Well, what we are asking for, for example, in our own industry—apparel manufacturing—is voluntary agreements on a multi-national basis. In other words, all countries participating.

These agreements would recognize the growth of our own population and our own consumption. But, they would add an element of regulation to the increasing level of imports, which are at the present time, increasing without any regulation.

SCHWARTZ. Is there any possibility for developing and adopting international labor standards, so that there wouldn't be this disparity in wage scales?

SAMUEL. Number one, I am not sure that there is really much possibility of developing international labor standards. And number two, even if you had them, you wouldn't really get rid of the disparity.

In Korea, for example, the average wage in our industry is 8c an hour. Now, how can you establish minimum wage standards in Korea that would be reasonable in the Korean economy—which would not still maintain a tremendous differential between Korea and the United States?

In other words, you could double and triple the wage in Korea, and it would still be a fraction of what we pay in the United States. So, international wage standards would be good for the people who would benefit from them—the working people—but they would not solve the international trade problems.

GILBRIDE. Well, Mr. Samuel, how can you possibly hope to combat this low-wage competition without, what I think you would call, "protectionist"—that is, I suppose, high tariffs on imports—and quotas?

SAMUEL. Well, as I suggested before, we hope to achieve, in our industry, agreements among all nations, regulating imports among all nations. Incidentally, this would not only regulate imports to the United States. For example, Japan, which has a higher living standard and higher costs than Korea, would also have some kind of regulation to protect it against overwhelming imports from Korea, or the Philippines, or India, which have even lower standards than Japan.

In other words, all nations would be bound by these ties, which would add an element of planning and programming to imports for all countries. Without this, the country with the highest standards of living—which is the United States—is the target of imports from all over the world.

As a result, our imports are climbing, on a generalized basis, at something like 70 percent a year—in apparel and textiles—and on

some individual items, as much as four to five hundred percent a year.

Now, this rate of increase is too much for us to support.

We can support a rate of increase which is more moderate. But, we cannot support a rate of increase which is not regulated at all.

GILBRIDE. What is this 70 percent a year gain in imports doing to the industry in the United States and to the workers in that industry?

SAMUEL. Well, as far as textiles and apparel are concerned, we believe that in the last four to five years, we have lost, probably 200 thousand jobs in our industry, largely due to the import factor.

Imports have been particularly harsh in the textile area. But, they are also climbing now in various items of apparel. For example, the knitted sweater industry in this country is almost out of business. Gloves have been very hard hit. Shirts are coming in in tremendous numbers. So are slacks.

Almost every item has been hit to some extent.

GILBRIDE. Well, this certainly seems to be very tough on that industry and the workers in it in this country. Does anybody benefit? Does the average American consumer benefit, through lower prices for imported goods—those made in Japan, or Formosa, or somewhere else?

SAMUEL. Not generally, on a quality basis. We have found—and of course, I can't speak for every garment that is brought into this country, because many manufacturers and many countries are involved—we have found that in many cases, the garment brought here from another country is made under somewhat inferior standards, because the labor is relatively inexperienced and low-paid. There is not much incentive for craftsmanship.

But, even more important, generally, the retail store is benefitting from a much higher mark-up. For example, garments coming from European countries, where the wage levels are considerably lower than wage levels in the United States, are sold for the same, or higher prices than American-made garments of the same quality.

The beneficiary is not the consumer, it is the retailer. He is doing very well, indeed.

SCHWARTZ. Mr. Samuel, isn't this low-wage competition just as severe a problem for business as it is for labor? And if so, what is business doing about it? Are they co-operating with labor on this? Is it a joint effort?

SAMUEL. There is no question about the effects on industry. There are limits of course, to joint efforts. But, the textile and apparel industries are working very hard—and generally, in the same direction that the labor movement in those industries is working—that is, to achieve multi-national agreements.

SCHWARTZ. What happens if you don't get these agreements—if Congress does not pass quota laws? What happens to the industry and the jobs?

SAMUEL. I think the industry will probably change radically. It won't disappear, but it will change so radically that the present state of the industry will disappear. It will take some other form. I am not sure what it will be.

I don't think incidentally, that the projections you suggest will happen. I think that if we cannot achieve multi-national agreements on a voluntary basis, Congress will pass a law. There is no question in my mind that some action will be taken.

SCHWARTZ. Is there any evidence that this industry is uneconomic and perhaps just cannot compete, and therefore, is expendable?

SAMUEL. No. As a matter of fact, just the opposite.

There are several reasons why it is useful to have imports. One obvious advantage is that in some industries there isn't much competition among companies and prices rise

immoderately. Imports have a leveling effect on prices in those cases. But, this is not true of textiles and apparel, which are among the most competitive industries in the nation. Prices there, generally speaking, have been below—until at least the very last few months—far below the rate of increase prices of other types of products manufactured in this country.

Secondly, imports can be justified, because they bring in some unusual products that are not made here. Again, this is not true in textiles and apparel. There are foreign designers, it is true, who have unusual design ideas. But, they are immediately hired by American firms.

Our firms can make the same kind of dashing, modern suit that a French firm makes, obviously. There is no special skill involved in that.

Thirdly, there may be some degree of foreign efficiency. That isn't particularly true either, in apparel, because in both cases, the capital requirements are very modest—the sewing machines, cutting tables, cutting machines. Neither foreign nor American firms have any special efficiencies, as far as manufacturing is concerned.

So really, the only benefit that the international trade in apparel and textiles has is that the foreign countries have much lower wage rates.

This is one area where we can't compete. And I don't think this country wants us to compete.

Now, the danger to us is very specific. These industries—apparel and textiles—employ about 2½ million people. It's the largest manufacturing employment of any industry in the country. Many of these employees are women—many are members of minority groups.

Generally, the industry has moderate skill requirements. So, if there is a more severe decline in employment, or a threat of unemployment in our industry, the people who are going to be hurt are Negroes, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans, particularly. They are going to be women. Many of them really don't have great access to other industries—don't have very many skills. I think this is exactly what this nation does not need at the present time.

We are spending a great deal of money, through our poverty programs, manpower training welfare, and so forth to try to make sure that these people—women and members of minority groups—become a part of the labor market. If we continue to allow major imports in these areas, it is going to have just the opposite effect.

GILBRIDE. I take it, Mr. Samuel, that you have discussed this problem with United States government officials, such as, I suppose, the State Department. What kind of answers do you get from these people on this question?

SAMUEL. Well, the Administration, as you probably know, has committed itself to the effort to reach multi-national agreements with other countries. This starts at the White House.

The major job of bringing about these agreements has been entrusted to Secretary Stans, of the Commerce Department. Secretary Stans is in full agreement with these goals. The industry, and labor in apparel and textiles, are working very closely with the Secretary.

The Labor Department also has a certain amount of input and is involved in this.

I would say, in all candor, that in these matters, the State Department is always likely to bring up the rear.

GILBRIDE. Why is this? Do they want to maintain friendly relations—is that the basic reason?

SAMUEL. I think the State Department is still motivated by the Cordell Hull kind of international trade theory, which was valid back in the 1930's. I think it is less aware

of the economic problems that face our country, and really is inspired, almost entirely, by a desire to have smooth and easy relations with other countries.

And, I think it overlooks economic problems at its own doorstep.

GILBRIDE. Well, in trying to get some kind of agreement with another country—what would be the motivation for instance, for Japan to agree to such a thing, if they suddenly found a good market here for their goods?

SAMUEL. Well, Japan, to a certain extent, will serve its own self interests, to a certain extent.

Japan, as I mentioned before, is now beginning to suffer from the pressures of imports from even lower-wage countries. Japan is not a particularly high-wage country, by the way. There, you have something around 35¢ or 45¢ an hour.

But, as I said, Korea is at 8¢—and some other countries are at 10¢ and 15¢. And they are beginning to threaten Japan.

So, if a world-wide agreement is worked out, Japan can also look forward to a good deal more stability.

However, I would point out that Japan, like most countries—except the United States—when it comes to industries such as these, which are vulnerable to international trade—most countries are much, much more—if I may use the word—"protectionist" than we are. It is only the United States that has relatively open doors. The other countries, perhaps learning by our example, have not done this. What we are trying to do, really, is open all doors, including those to countries like Mexico and Japan, which don't permit imports of apparel to some moderate level of imports.

SCHWARTZ. Mr. Samuel, men's and boy's clothing prices are continuing to rise. Apparently, there is another round yet to come. Won't this aggravate the competitive pinch and give foreign made merchandise even greater appeal and advantage in the U.S. market?

SAMUEL. Well, there is a question of fact here. There has been some rise, which was long overdue. And I must say, I represent the union in the men's clothing industry, and the industry does not need me to defend its pricing policies.

But, the fact is, we know that for a long time, the men's apparel, and I think a major segment of the ladies' apparel industry also, lagged behind the price levels of most consumer goods. In the last few months or year, some of those price levels have been forced up. They simply couldn't manage without at least some kind of price increase.

I suppose it would have some effect in our struggle against imports. But, no pattern has appeared as yet. As a matter of fact, the prices of some imports are going up also.

SCHWARTZ. Do you see any sign that manufacturers in your industry and others are prepared to become more competitive by producing lower-priced merchandise or perhaps lower-quality goods?

SAMUEL. I read, in a publication called the Daily News Record, that some manufacturers are looking forward—perhaps, next season—to opening up lower-priced lines—yes.

GILBRIDE. Are some of them, Mr. Samuel, tempted to take their own operations overseas—I think, we call those "runaway companies"?

SAMUEL. Yes. A great many are tempted. Those under contract with the Amalgamated cannot, because they are bound by a union contract that requires that all their production be made under union conditions—Amalgamated's union conditions.

Some non-union companies have taken their production abroad. And some, of course, are now moving into the Mexican border area, which we discussed earlier.

GILBRIDE. Does the United States government seem to encourage this kind of thing, in any way?

SAMUEL. Generally, I think the policy of the United States government is not to encourage it. It is not against the law, however.

There is nothing to prevent a company that does not have a union contract, for example, to, in effect, runaway.

I consider this a very crude form of export of jobs.

I don't think there is any possible benefit to America, when a country closes a plant here and opens it up across the Mexican border, or in Hong Kong, or in Jamaica.

That simply means, we have lost "X number of jobs," and those countries have gained them—at a much lower wage level.

SCHWARTZ. Mr. Samuel, the State Department and the Administration take the position that boycotts of imports are unwise because they interfere with foreign policy. Do you agree with this? Or, is your union waging boycotts or planning to wage some against import competition?

SAMUEL. Yes—the Amalgamated has, Mr. Schwartz. We have instituted several demonstrations—not boycotts. We have done it in New York; we have done it in Chicago, and Los Angeles, and are planning several in other cities. We've done this for several purposes.

First of all, to help concentrate our educational efforts in a single area—to dramatize our policies. And we have received of course, a certain amount of public attention.

We also want to put a little extra bit of pressure on the various agencies of our government—agencies which have the responsibility for carrying out Administration policy, in trying to achieve multi-national agreements.

We are trying to show our government, and the country with which they are bargaining, that there is real feeling and real concern in this country about this issue.

GILBRIDE. Mr. Samuel, isn't there a federal program to help American workers who are displaced by imports?

SAMUEL. There is a section of the Tariff Act which does provide adjustment assistance. I think that until recently—and I have just seen an early article and haven't read the whole thing yet—there had never been a case approved.

The Act is so rigid that it has never been able to be applied. It has been, in effect, simply non-functioning.

GILBRIDE. Well, has no one ever been helped?

SAMUEL. Oh, there have been many applications. All have been turned down. The law is such that, in effect, an industry would have to be wiped out—and some direct connection established between the fact that it was wiped out by imports.

At any rate the rules are so rigid that it has been non-functional.

SCHWARTZ. Mr. Samuel, would you agree that industry generally has been lax in developing export markets? It is claimed that there are large markets for the taking, but that industry has shown little interest in getting into them.

SAMUEL. Well, I can't tell you about all industries. I suppose it is true that in some areas, some industries could be more aggressive.

In our industry, it really isn't easy. In the first place, as I indicated before, an awful lot of countries in this world do not permit imports. We are the only ones that really have that wide open door. That is one of the reasons everybody is victimizing us.

You can't export garments to Japan, for example—nothing.

You cannot export any garments to Mexico.

These are two of the great violators of our borders, as far as imports are concerned. And this is true of many other countries. So, you can be just the most aggressive manufacturer, Mr. Schwartz, but there are many borders that you simply can't cross.

SCHWARTZ. Why doesn't this country insist

on a proportional treatment for our own merchandise?

SAMUEL. Well, that is exactly what we are trying to accomplish with the multi-national agreements—that is exactly what we are trying to accomplish.

GILBRIDE. I think, Mr. Samuel, that many people are under the impression that we do have some kind of quota system to limit imports. Is that true in just some industries?

SAMUEL. Yes—it is true, in some instances. I should have mentioned it before, Mr. Gilbride. It is true that we do have the precedent of a multi-national agreement in cotton. The problem is, as soon as the agreement was signed, because it did not include woolen apparel, or textiles, or synthetics, or man-made apparel and textiles, much of the imports began to flow into those areas.

So, what we are, in effect, asking our government is to close the loophole.

We now have an agreement that is working reasonably well in cotton. Now we have to expand it to embrace these other two major areas of textiles and apparel.

SCHWARTZ. Mr. Samuel, would improved industrial technology, for example, help close this competitive gap? How about higher productivity per man-hour?

SAMUEL. Well, in our industry, productivity is pretty well assured, because it is almost entirely piecework. In other words, the worker earns more the faster he works—obviously, under very strict controls, to avoid exploitation. But the fact is, productivity is built in—incentives are built in.

As far as improvements in technology, it is very difficult—in apparel, the least.

Basically, we have not found a way of avoiding two hands and a sewing machine.

In textiles, there has been a tremendous increase in technology. And, I think that will continue.

HARDEN. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE guest was Howard D. Samuel, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO. Representing the press were Neil Gilbride, labor correspondent for the Associated Press, and Lloyd Schwartz, Washington bureau chief for the Fairchild Publications. This is your moderator Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE is a public affairs production of the AFL-CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Broadcasting System.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The preceding program time was presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System. The opinions expressed are solely those of the participants.

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN THE 91ST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION (1969)

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. **HOLIFIELD**) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **HOLIFIELD.** Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have directed the preparation of a summary of the activities and accomplishments of the Joint Committee during the first session of the 91st Congress.

The Joint Committee has completed its 23d year of carrying out its legislative and "watchdog" responsibilities of the U.S. atomic energy program. As a charter member of the Joint Committee, I look back with pride at the developments of atomic energy in the past 2

decades. We have seen our defenses strengthened and we have seen the peaceful atom come of age.

This summary report shows, I believe, that the Congress and the Joint Committee have again contributed significantly to the continued leadership of the United States in the peaceful and military applications of atomic energy. The functioning of the committee clearly demonstrates the ability of the Congress to deal effectively in the oversight of this great energy source which portends so much for the future.

I wish to thank all the members of the committee for their close cooperation in the committee's work.

Additionally, at this time, I believe it is worthwhile to provide a general outline, at least as I see it today, of the tentative scope and magnitude of the Joint Committee review of atomic energy matters to take place in the forthcoming second session of the 91st Congress.

As in previous years the committee plans to give priority attention to the fiscal year 1971 authorizing legislation. Hearings on the authorization bill normally begin shortly after it is submitted by the administration.

The Joint Committee plans to schedule public hearings during the week of January 26, 1970, in continuation of its study of the environmental effects resulting from the siting and operation of nuclear, hydro, and fossil fueled electric powerplants. We plan to receive testimony from representatives of State governments, environmental groups, private industry, and the public at large. Testimony was received last fall from Federal agencies having responsibility in this field. The final record, which will result from these hearings will constitute an up-to-date compendium on all effluents from electric powerplants.

It is expected that the initial executive hearing of the Joint Committee will be its annual briefing by CIA on intelligence matters with particular reference to the nuclear capabilities of Communist China and the U.S.S.R.

Also the committee plans to receive an executive briefing early in the session from the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency on progress and proposed plans relating to the strategic arms limitation talks—SALT—now going on in Helsinki.

Other topics which will probably be considered by the Joint Committee include:

First, a review of the AEC's breeder reactor program. Frankly, as I have already stated in the public record, I am not satisfied with progress in this vitally important endeavor. The committee has noted that this is the highest priority program in the AEC's civilian nuclear power program. The Joint Committee during its review of the 1971 AEC budget, will stress the importance of vigorous pursuit of goals which have been established by the AEC and approved by this committee.

Second, continuing close scrutiny of the matter of the ownership and operation of the AEC's gaseous diffusion plants which supply the enriched fuel needed by the rapidly expanding nuclear power industry. We expect to consider

this matter primarily in the context of the committee's review of the AEC's proposed fiscal year 1971 budget request although certain aspects, such as prices for enriching services and antitrust considerations, may be treated separately.

Third, the so-called practical value legislation, which would have the effect of requiring all, or virtually all, applications for a license to construct a nuclear powerplant to undergo a precensuring antitrust review by the AEC in consultation with the Department of Justice, will also be examined. Affected Federal agencies have already testified on the bills relating to this matter. Next year during our deliberations we plan to hear from representatives of private industry and members of the public.

Commercial Plowshare services legislation, which has already been subject to extensive hearings, will also probably receive legislative consideration.

The committee also plans to review the U.S.-controlled thermonuclear research program, particularly in light of the recent advances in this field made by the United States and the Soviet Union.

In the military field the committee will look carefully into the matter of the need for advanced nuclear-powered submarines to keep pace with the ever-increasing efforts by the Soviet Union in this field.

The committee also expects to analyze the impact of fund reductions on the so-called four safeguards which were instituted at the time of the signing of the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963 to insure that our national security would not be endangered as a result of compliance with the terms of this treaty.

There are numerous items of proposed legislation now pending before the committee. Executive agency comments on all of these bills have been solicited. Comments on some of the measures have been received; as to others we are still awaiting the views of affected or interested agencies. Depending upon the comments received from these agencies, and depending also on the committee's overall schedule, a number of these bills will be scheduled for hearings during the coming year with a view to committee action thereon during the second session of the 91st Congress.

Consideration may be given to holding hearings on the development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry.

In the world today atomic energy, which was virtually unknown three decades ago, touches almost every facet of life in America from the missiles that defend us to the civilian power production so vitally needed to take care of our burgeoning population. The impact of the atom ranges from the moon where the nuclear generator, SNAP-27, powers experiments placed there by the Apollo 12 astronauts, to the research and development aimed at placing a small nuclear battery near the heart to permit life to continue which might otherwise be snuffed out.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Joint Committee's summary report of its activities and accomplishments during the first session of the 91st Congress in the RECORD:

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY IN
THE 91ST CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, 1969

FOREWORD

It has been the practice of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy at the close of each session of the Congress to submit for the information of the Congress, the Executive Branch and the public a report of its activities. (The report for the second session of the 90th Congress was printed in the Congressional Record of October 11, 1968, S-12585.)

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was organized on August 2, 1946. It consists of nine members from the Senate and nine members from the House of Representatives. No more than five from each body can be members of the same political party. The chairmanship alternates between the Senate and the House of Representatives with each Congress.

Present membership is: Chet Hollifield, California, Chairman; John O. Pastore, Rhode Island, Vice-Chairman; Melvin Price, Illinois; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; John Young, Texas; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma; Craig Hosmer, California; John B. Anderson, Illinois; William M. McCulloch, Ohio; Catherine May, Washington; Richard B. Russell, Georgia; Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico; Albert Gore, Tennessee; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; George D. Alken, Vermont; Wallace F. Bennett, Utah; Carl T. Curtis, Nebraska; Norris Cotton, New Hampshire.

Congressman William H. Bates of Massachusetts, a most esteemed and valued member of the Committee since January 19, 1959 died on June 22. Representative Catherine May of Washington was appointed on July 24, 1969 to fill the vacancy created by his death.

The Joint Committee is one of the few committees established by statute, rather than by rule of each House and is unique in several respects. For example, it is the only Joint Committee of the Congress with legislative functions, including the receipt and reporting of legislative proposals. The committee is also charged by law with legislative responsibility as "watchdog" of the U.S. atomic energy program. As part of its responsibilities, the committee follows closely the classified activities of the executive agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission and the Departments of Defense and State, concerning the peaceful and military applications of atomic energy.

In all these activities, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, representing the Congress and the public, seeks to assure the implementation of the following statutory policy expressed in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954:

"The development, use, and control of atomic energy shall be directed so as to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare, subject at all times to the paramount objective of making the maximum contribution to the common defense and security * * *"

During the 91st Congress, first session, the Joint Committee met on a total of 52 different occasions, 38 of which were public and 14 of which were executive meetings.

A total of 17 publications consisting of hearings, reports, and committee prints were published or are in the process of being printed by the Joint Committee in its first session of the 91st Congress. These publications include testimony taken in executive session with classified material deleted before printing.

A list of the publications follows: (1969 (91st Cong., first sess.):

AEC Authorizing Legislation, Fiscal Year 1970:

Part 1: Hearings April 17 and 18.

Part 2: Hearings April 24 and 25.
Part 3: Hearings April 29 and 30.
AEC Report (H. Rept. 91-315; S. Rept. 91-244): June 17 and 18, 1969.
AEC Omnibus Legislation 1969:
Hearings: September 12, 1969.
Report (H. Rept. 91-691; S. Rept. 91-553): November 24, 1969.

Atomic Energy Legislation through the 91st Congress, 1st session: Committee print, December 1969 (available when printed).

Current Membership of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Committee Print, February.

Environmental Effects of Producing Electric Power: Hearings October 28, 29, 30, and 31, November 4, 5, 6, and 7, 1969 (Available when printed).

Future Ownership of Gaseous Diffusion Plants: Hearings July 8 and 9, August 5, 7, and 8, 1969.

LaCrosse Boiling Water Reactor Project: Hearing May 4, 1967.

Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program: Hearing April 23, 1969.

Nuclear Explosion Services for Industrial Applications: Hearings May 8, 9, and July 17, 1969.

Preliminary Antitrust Review of Nuclear Powerplants: Hearings November 18, 19 and 20.

Radiation Standards for Uranium Mining: Hearings March 17 and 18.

Selected Materials Concerning the Future Ownership of AEC's Gaseous Diffusion Plants: Committee Print, June.

Selected Materials on Environmental Effects of Producing Electric Power: Committee Print, August.

I. LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. Atomic Energy Commission Fiscal Year 1970 Authorization Act (Public Law 91-44): The review by the Joint Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission's request for authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1970 was delayed until the incoming Nixon Administration had submitted its budget. The Johnson Administration budget submission was made January 15 and the Nixon revised budget was submitted April 15. The Joint Committee convened its hearings on the AEC request on April 17 to consider the proposed authorization bill (H.R. 10130, S. 1884) and held 14 sessions during the succeeding 8 weeks. Two hearings, to consider the nuclear weapons and naval propulsion programs, were held in executive session because a review of classified data was involved. The record of the public hearings was published in three volumes entitled "AEC Authorizing Legislation, Fiscal Year 1970." A declassified record of the hearing on naval reactors was published under the title "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program—1969."

Following its deliberations on the proposed measures, the Joint Committee voted to file "clean bills." On June 16, Representatives Hollifield, Price and Hosmer introduced H.R. 12167 and Senator Pastore introduced S. 2416. These measures were favorably reported on June 17 (H. Rept. 91-315) and June 18 (S. Rept. 91-244) respectively.

The reported authorization bill, which recommended an increase in authorization of appropriations of \$6,232 million over the Administration's revised request, passed the House without amendment on June 24. The Senate passed the bill on June 26 after amending it by reducing the total authorization to the level of the Administration's request. On July 1, the House acceded to the amendment and passed the bill as amended by the Senate. On July 11 the President signed the Act into law (Public Law 91-44). The law authorizes appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for fiscal year 1970 in the amount of \$2,448,052,000 as follows:

Operating expenses.....	\$1,967,050,000
Plant and capital equipment	481,002,000
Total authorization....	2,448,052,000

Among the highlights of the Joint Committee report, which accompanied the authorization bill, were the following:

The committee expressed its continuing concern about the *Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program* and restored to that program \$4 million which had been cut during the Administration's budget review process. The committee set out the facts as to advance by the Soviet Union in the improvement of their submarine capability and urged support of a vigorous research and development effort to assure technological superiority in the face of Soviet numerical supremacy. The committee also expressed strong support for a nuclear surface warship development and construction program.

In the field of *reactor development and technology*, the committee increased requested funds by \$7.3 million for *civilian power reactors* and \$3.0 million for the *co-operative power reactor demonstration program*. The former evidenced the Committee's support of alternate reactor concepts—high temperature gas-cooled reactor (HTGR), gas-cooled fast reactor (GCFR), and molten salt reactor (MSR)—while the latter indicated the view of the committee that the project definition phase of the liquid metal fast breeder reactor (LMFBR) program should proceed with the necessary involvement of several participants employing various approaches.

The Plowshare program received the largest monetary boost from the committee with the addition of \$10.5 million to the requested funds. The committee made clear its dissatisfaction with the funding level of this program over the past five years. In the view of the committee the promise for domestic commercial applications and the international obligations embodied in the Nonproliferation Treaty demand substantially increased financial support. The committee believes the potential of this technology for improving natural gas and other mineral resources reserves cannot be realized without an efficient and adequately funded research and development program.

B. Legislation requiring preclearing review of competitive and environmental effects of nuclear power plants (S. 212, H.R. 8289, H.R. 9647, S. 1883, S. 2768): On November 18-20, the Joint Committee held hearings on legislation (S. 212, H.R. 8289, H.R. 9647, S. 1883, and S. 2768) relating to the preclearing review of nuclear powerplants from the standpoint of their competitive and environmental effects. The principal bills involved are commonly referred to as "Practical Value" legislation, inasmuch as they would abolish the present provision under the Atomic Energy Act requiring the preclearing of antitrust review of only those types of nuclear powerplants determined by the AEC to have achieved "practical value." As a result of this legislation, all or virtually all nuclear powerplants would be subject to such preclearing review.

The first phase of hearings featured testimony by representatives of Government agencies with an interest in the legislation. Testimony was received from officials of the Departments of Justice and the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Office of Science and Technology. At the conclusion of the hearings on November 20, it was announced that due to the heavy floor schedule in both Houses of Congress and the end-of-the-session workload of the Joint Committee, the committee would not be able to hear the testimony of private industry, special interest groups, and the general public on

these measures prior to the close of this session of Congress. It is expected that such hearings will be scheduled relatively early in the next session of Congress.

The record of the first phase of these hearings is being prepared for publication and distribution to the public prior to scheduling the second phase of the hearings. The printed record will appear under the title "Preliminary Antitrust Review of Nuclear Powerplants."

C. Legislation to authorize industrial plowshare services (H.R. 477, S. 1885, H.R. 10288): On May 8 and 9 and July 17 the Joint Committee held hearings on H.R. 477, S. 1885, and H.R. 10288, bills which would authorize the AEC to make peaceful nuclear explosion services available on a commercial basis, both domestically and abroad, as various applications of nuclear explosive devices for peaceful purposes achieve commercial feasibility. H.R. 477 was introduced on January 3, 1969, by Representative Hosmer for himself and Representatives Hollifield, Price of Illinois, Aspinall, Young, Bates, Anderson of Illinois, and McCulloch. S. 1885, an identical bill, was introduced on April 18, 1969 by Senator Pastore, for himself and Senators Anderson and Bennett. A third bill, also identical, was introduced on April 21, 1969 by Representative Edmondson.

During the May 8 and 9 hearings, the Joint Committee heard testimony on this legislation by representatives of Government agencies with interests and responsibilities in connection with domestic and foreign plowshare applications. Witnesses who testified represented the AEC, the Departments of the Interior, State, and Health, Education and Welfare, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. All generally supported enactment of the legislation.

Subsequently, on July 17, the committee heard the views of non-Government witnesses who expressed an interest in testifying on the legislation. Representatives of the Atomic Industrial Forum, the International Nuclear Corp., the OER Geonuclear Corp. and El Paso Natural Gas Co. testified in support of the legislation.

The record of these hearings was published in December 1969 under the title "Nuclear Explosion Services for Industrial Applications." It is expected that the Joint Committee will convene during the second session of the 91st Congress to consider reporting this legislation, possibly with certain modifications suggested on the basis of the committee's extensive hearings. Hearings on similar legislation in the 90th Congress, on which no final action was taken by the committee, were published in 1968 under the title, "Commercial Plowshare Services."

D. 1969 Omnibus Legislation: On September 12, the Joint Committee held a hearing to consider a number of bills to amend various provisions of the Atomic Energy Act. Those bills were:

H.R. 9644 and H.R. 9648 introduced by Chairman Hollifield (by request) on March 27 and their companions S. 1879 and S. 1882 introduced by Vice Chairman Pastore (by request) on April 18;

S. 1878 introduced by Senator Pastore on April 18; and

H.R. 12697 introduced on July 9 by Chairman Hollifield (by request) for himself and Representative Price of Illinois.

The committee met in executive sessions on September 12 and November 18 on these measures and voted to file "clean bills." H.R. 14925 was introduced on November 20 by Chairman Hollifield (for himself, Representative Price of Illinois, and Representative Hosmer) and S. 3169 was introduced on November 21 by Vice Chairman Pastore. On November 24, the committee voted to report those bills and reports (H. Rept. 91-691 and S. Rept. 91-553) were filed on that date. The

bill passed the Senate without amendment on December 1. The House approved the bill on December 15.

The bill fundamentally accomplishes four amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, plus technical amendments to assure consistency and clarity in the Act. The principal amendments would:

1. Extend for an additional 5-year period (to September 1, 1974) the authority of the AEC to compel licensing of patents found "affected with the public interest" in accordance with applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act.

2. Increase, from five to ten years, the maximum term of imprisonment for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear materials and related offenses.

3. Remove from four sections of the Act, pertaining to penalties for crimes committed with intent to injure the United States or to secure an advantage to a foreign nation, the authority to impose the death penalty and the language which restricts the imposition of imprisonment for life to those cases where in the jury so recommends. Such restrictive language has been found by the U.S. Supreme Court to be unconstitutional in both the Federal Kidnaping Act and the Federal Bank Robbery Act.

4. Provide authority for the AEC to impose civil monetary penalties for violation of the licensing provisions of the Atomic Energy Act or any rule, regulation, order or license issued thereunder. The amount of the penalty is limited to \$5,000 for any single violation and \$25,000 for all violations occurring within any period of 30 consecutive days.

II. AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

A. Civil: Under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, proposed agreements for cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy between the United States and other nations must be submitted to the Joint Committee and a period of thirty days must elapse while Congress is in session before such agreements become effective. In accordance with such procedures, five civil agreements, with the approval of the President were submitted to the committee by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission during 1969.

Two of the submitted agreements were for research activities only. One effected amendments to the existing agreement with Iran and the other superseded the agreement with Portugal. The remaining agreements included power production activities as well as research functions. Of these, the agreement with Venezuela was to be amended while the agreements with Argentina and Austria were superseded. All of the new agreements reflected the updated provisions for private ownership of special nuclear materials provided in the 1964 legislation as well as application of safeguards inspection procedures by the International Atomic Energy Agency (I.A.E.A.) to assure that material is not diverted to other than peaceful purposes.

In addition, the U.S.-I.A.W.A. bilateral agreement for Application of Safeguards to U.S. Reactor Facilities was extended by mutual agreement, for a six month period to expire on January 31, 1970. That program assists the International Agency in developing and improving its safeguards competence.

B. Military: Under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, proposed agreements for cooperation with another nation or with a regional defense organization involving development, utilization and control of atomic energy for military purposes in the interest of mutual defense and security, are required to be submitted to the Joint Committee for a period of sixty days while Congress is in session before becoming effective.

On March 10 the committee held hearings in executive session on an amendment to the Agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom for Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes of July 3, 1958.

The amendment which would provide for the transfer of nuclear fuel for the United Kingdom's submarine program prior to December 31, 1979 was submitted to the Congress just prior to adjournment in November 1968.

The representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and the State Department agreed to make arrangements with the U.K. to insure that the negotiating record with the U.K. indicates that the uses that may be made by the U.K. of the materials to be furnished by the U.S. are clearly understood. This has been accomplished.

The 60 days ended March 13, 1969 and the amendment became effective on March 28, 1969.

III. INFORMATIONAL HEARINGS

A. Environmental Effects of Producing Electric Power: On October 28, 29, 30 and 31 and November 4, 5, 6 and 7, the Joint Committee held Phase I of its public hearings on the environmental effects of producing electric power from all types of electric powerplants. During this phase testimony was received from the Federal agencies and organizations having responsibility in these matters, namely: Science Advisor to the President, the Federal Power Commission, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Radiation Council, and the Department of Agriculture.

Information was received with respect to the policies of the Executive Departments on matters of air and water pollution, thermal effects, adequacy of radiation criteria and standards and related matters. The Joint Committee print of this hearing record, entitled "Environmental Effects of Producing Electrical Power, Part I," will be published in early January 1970, will contain a compendium of information on chemical effluents, thermal discharges, and radioactive liquid and gaseous releases from conventional and nuclear powerplants, which is without parallel.

Phase II of these hearings is scheduled to be conducted early in 1970 and will afford an opportunity for representatives of State governments, private industry, environmental groups, and the public-at-large to present testimony furnishing their own views as well as commenting upon those already presented by the Government agencies during Phase I of the hearings.

B. Radiation Standards for Uranium Mining: On March 17 and 18 the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation held hearings on the subject of radiation standards for uranium mining. The committee looked into the requirements that the uranium mining industries would be expected to meet, the epidemiological studies forming the basis for the radiation standards, and the reasons for delay in Federal Radiation Council action toward arriving at a standard. Subsequent to these hearings the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare appointed a special review committee to perform a continuing review of the situation regarding uranium mining standards. In addition, the Secretary of Labor, after meeting with representatives of uranium mining companies, developed a revised guideline for the processing of "variation requests."

C. Future Ownership of the AEC's Gaseous Diffusion Plants: During extended hearings which began on July 8 and 9 and continued

on August 5, 7 and 8, the Joint Committee considered the question of future ownership and operation of the AEC's uranium enrichment facilities. These plants are presently the only available means for the provision of uranium enrichment services required by the rapidly expanding U.S. private nuclear power industry, and constitute the one significant link in the nuclear fuel cycle remaining under Government ownership and operation. The production facilities, which are located at Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and Portsmouth, Ohio, represent a Government investment of approximately \$2.3 billion.

Witnesses who testified during these hearings represented the Atomic Energy Commission, the General Accounting Office, American Public Power Association, Atomic Industrial Forum, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Consolidated Enrichment Corporation, Edison Electric Institute, National Coal Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. Mr. Philip Sporn, testifying on his own behalf, also appeared as a witness. The record of these hearings was published in December under the title "Future Ownership of the AEC's Gaseous Diffusion Plants."

Testimony during these hearings indicated a diversity of views as to whether the plants should be transferred to private purchasers, a government corporation, or some other form of ownership, or should remain within the AEC. There were also varying views as to the timing of any such transfer.

Subsequent to the hearings and after consultation between White House officials and members of the Joint Committee, President Nixon announced on November 10 that he was requesting the AEC to continue to operate the enrichment plants, but under a separate Directorate within AEC. The President expressed the view that the Federal Government's responsibility for uranium enrichment should eventually be ended; however, AEC operation of the enrichment facilities should continue until such time as "various national interests" would best be served by the sale of the facilities to the private sector. In the interim, the President said, the AEC is to "carry on the AEC's businesslike management of plant operations and establish separate accounts fully reflecting commercial criteria for financial accounting."

On November 10, shortly after the President's announcement the Chairman of the Joint Committee issued a statement in which he generally applauded the President's plan to retain the plants under Government ownership until the day arrives—"assuming the day does arrive," he added—that they can be sold to industry "under circumstances that fully protect the public interest. . . ." Chairman Holifield expressed disappointment that the Presidential announcement set forth no specific plans to fund needed improvements to the enrichment plants. In this regard, Representative Holifield said:

"President Nixon has not yet faced up to the urgent need for starting construction for plant improvements needed to provide the additional enrichment capacity to fuel the nuclear plants which will come on line in the late 1970's.

"Reliance on present enrichment service sales without a definite commitment on the part of the Administration to support an appropriation of at least \$130 million in the fiscal 1971 budget introduces an element of uncertainty which I fear will affect new acquisition of nuclear plants by electric utilities. If the Administration decides it cannot make such a budgetary commitment in the near future, I think it should advocate a self-funding Government corporation, so

that assurance of funding can be arranged without further delay."¹

In light of the Presidential announcement, the AEC is now reexamining its enrichment service charges to determine whether any change in pricing policies is required as a result of the proposed new operating procedures. In view of the potentially critical importance of this matter to the entire nuclear industry, the Chairman of the Committee has requested that the AEC submit the results of its review to the Committee immediately upon completion, and keep the Committee fully and currently informed of all significant interim developments in this connection.

D. The Antiballistic Missile Program: On March 4, the Joint Committee held two hearings in executive session on ABM. Representatives of the Department of Defense and of the Atomic Energy Commission presented testimony concerning aspects of the U.S. ballistic missile defense program including concept, capability, reliability, vulnerability, and command and control functions.

In early 1968 the Joint Committee announced that it had asked the General Accounting Office to maintain a surveillance of the actions being taken in connection with the proposed ABM system. The Committee has requested the GAO to continue such a review and analysis of this important program.

On August 6, 1969 the Senate defeated by a vote of 51-49 an antideployment amendment concerning the SAFEGUARD ABM system, and on December 8 the House voted to appropriate funds for initial deployment.

E. Safeguards Under Limited Test Ban Treaty: The Joint Committee has continued to maintain a careful scrutiny of the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission activities in support of the four safeguards established in connection with the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

In 1963 during the debate on the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty the Senate was assured by the Executive Department that our national security would not be jeopardized if the Treaty were signed because four "safeguards" were being instituted to insure that the United States would not be taken by surprise if the terms of the Treaty were violated. These safeguards are:

(1) the conduct of a comprehensive, aggressive underground nuclear weapons testing program;

(2) the maintenance of modern nuclear weapons laboratories;

(3) the maintenance of the necessary personnel and facilities to resume atmospheric testing on short notice in the event of an abrogation of the Treaty by the Soviet Union; and

(4) the improvement of our capability to monitor the terms of the Treaty, to detect violations and to maintain our knowledge of Sino-Soviet nuclear activities.

During the AEC FY 1970 authorization hearings on April 17, the Chairman of the AEC stated:

"The fiscal year 1970 estimate for the off-continent test readiness program will permit maintenance of essential elements of the current readiness capability while we embark on certain new activities related to the attainment of the goals of the new national nuclear test readiness plan."

On October 30, the Chairman of the Joint Committee was informed by letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense that because

¹The full texts of the President's, AEC and the Joint Committee's November 10 announcements are printed on pages H 11161-H 11163, November 19, 1969 Congressional Record.

of budget restrictions the Joint Task Force charged with maintaining atmospheric test readiness would be disbanded, although a small planning office would be attached to the Washington Headquarters of the Defense Atomic Support Agency.

The Joint Committee is concerned that safeguard provisions adopted in 1963 are being eroded. In the event that the Treaty is abrogated the United States may find itself in the same difficult position it was in 1961 when the USSR broke the "informal" moratorium on nuclear testing in the atmosphere. In this connection the Chairman of the Joint Committee requested the Chairman of the AEC to provide certain classified information which the committee will evaluate prior to proceeding further.

F. Naval Reactor Program: On April 23, the Joint Committee held hearings in executive session on the naval nuclear propulsion program. At these hearings three extremely important issues were discussed: (1) the rapidly expanding Soviet naval threat, (2) the need for a vigorous nuclear submarine development and construction program, and (3) the need for upgrading our nuclear powered surface naval striking forces.

It is clear from Admiral Rickover's testimony and the testimony of other Department of Defense, Navy and Central Intelligence Agency officials to various committees of Congress that the Soviet Union is embarked on a program which reveals a singular awareness of the importance of seapower and an unmistakable resolve to become the most powerful maritime force in the world.

The Joint Committee concluded its hearings on this matter by reaffirming in the Foreword to these hearings that the Congress must take the initiative to insure that the new warships we build for our first line naval striking force will have nuclear propulsion, and to insure that the program for improving and building nuclear submarines is aggressively pursued. The hearings entitled "Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program—1969" were published in June 1969.

G. Food Irradiation: During FY 1970 authorization hearings on April 17, testimony showed that the AEC had asked the Bureau of the Budget to include in the AEC FY 1970 budget request a total of \$1,450,000 for the two food irradiation programs, \$700,000 in Eulogy and Medicine program, and \$750,000 in Isotopes Development Program. Subsequently when the proposed AEC budget was submitted to the Congress, the entire \$1,450,000 had been deleted and the AEC's food irradiation program was eliminated.

The Joint Committee, in its report on the authorization bill, recommended that \$750,000 be restored to the budget for the purpose of conducting the Division of Isotopes Development's low dose radiation preservation studies. While no appropriations were approved for this program for FY '70, both Houses did indicate in their respective reports, that the program should be continued by using other available program funds.

The Joint Committee believes that this program has the potential for achieving far-reaching benefits and expects to continue to support work in this field.

H. Confirmation Hearings: The Senate Section of the Joint Committee met in public session on May 22 to consider the nomination of Theos J. Thompson to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1971. The Senate confirmed the nomination on May 26. Theos Thompson replaced Gerald F. Tape.

On August 7, the Senate Section of the Joint Committee met in public session to consider the nomination of Clarence E. Larson to be a member of the Atomic Energy

Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 1974. The Senate confirmed the nomination on August 8. This position was held by Francesco Costagliola whose term expired on June 30, 1969.

IV. CLASSIFIED ACTIVITIES

A. NATO: The Joint Committee continues to follow closely developments in NATO particularly the plans and programs promulgated by NATO's Nuclear Planning Group for possible response to aggression from the East.

An associated matter of concern to the Committee is the protection of classified information in NATO. In the past several years there have been significant security leaks in NATO. The most recent incident involving apparent compromise of classified information was revealed to the public by the arrest last August of a French national employed by NATO. He was charged with a "grave breach of security."

B. Intelligence Briefings: Representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission have presented briefings to the Committee on intelligence matters with particular reference to Communist China and the USSR.

C. Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT): On November 17 the United States and the Soviet Union began talks on strategic arms limitation in Helsinki, Finland. In connection with these talks, the Chairman of the Joint Committee has exchanged correspondence with the Secretary of State and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Committee believes that these discussions bear significantly on U.S. national security and expects to follow very closely developments in this vitally important area.

D. AEC Rocky Flats Plant Fire: On May 11, a major fire occurred at the Rocky Flats Plant of the AEC. The plant, which is 21 miles northwest of Denver, Colorado, produces plutonium parts for nuclear weapons. The facility is operated for the AEC by the Dow Chemical Company. The fire, which caused an estimated \$45 million damage, occurred in Building 776-777. Several million more dollars will be required to recycle the plutonium involved in the fire and for decontamination of the building. Very little of the plutonium in the fire will not be recoverable for reconversion from the oxide to metal.

The Joint Committee sent a staff representative to the scene to provide the Committee with a first hand report on this matter. Subsequently the Joint Committee strongly urged the AEC to re-evaluate practices and procedures at Rocky Flats and other AEC installations with particular reference to improving fire prevention and fire protection.

V. OTHER ACTIVITIES

A. IAEA: A representative of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy participated in the 13th General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which began September 23. The Conference representatives stressed the importance of developing effective world-wide safeguard inspection procedures to insure that nuclear material is not diverted from peaceful purposes to nuclear weapons development. It is expected that Euratom and IAEA will be discussing in detail ways and means of working out mutually acceptable inspection procedures to implement Article III of the NPT following the signature by West Germany of the Treaty.

B. Nuclear Test, Amchitka, Alaska: Congressman Chet Holifield, Chairman of the Joint Committee, was present at the control point on the island of Amchitka, Alaska, when a nuclear device of about one megaton

was detonated underground on Thursday, October 2. Preceding the test, despite the assurances of the Atomic Energy Commission and its consultants that the test would be safely conducted, there were numerous groups and individuals both in and out of Alaska who opposed the test because of fear of possible aftershock and tsunami problems as well as concern for possible effects on the ecology.

In a statement on the Floor of the House (Congressional Record of October 6, 1969, p. 28714) upon his return, Mr. Holifield reported, "... the test was successful in every phase ... the explosion's register on the Richter scale was exactly as predicted ... There was no release of fission products to the atmosphere ... There was no deleterious effect upon the ecology that could be traced to that event ... The particular test on Amchitka Island has been watched closely by the Joint Committee since it was proposed some 3 years ago. We have been aware of every state of its development. We have approved the program as being essential to the national security."

C. National Accelerator Laboratory: The President's FY '70 budget requested \$96 million for construction for the National Accelerator Laboratory and the 200 BeV accelerator now under construction at Batavia, Illinois. This sum was reduced to \$64 million by the House and increased to \$70 million by a House-Senate Conference. A study made earlier in the year by the AEC had indicated that to keep construction on schedule and to produce a first proton beam by July 1972 would require a minimum of \$89 million for FY 1970 construction funds. It was estimated that funding below \$89 million, for example, at the \$50-60 million level would result in a one year delay and an increase in costs of \$30 million above the estimated total of \$250 million.

A major concern of the Joint Committee is that the scientific experts now assembled to design and supervise construction of the accelerator will become discouraged and seek employment elsewhere; thus, the 200 BeV could be delayed further. Should this happen, the United States would remain in second place in the field of experimental high energy physics, behind the Soviet Union which now has a 76 BeV accelerator at Serpukhov. At present the largest U.S. accelerator operates at about 33 BeV.

D. Nuclear Power on the Moon: The Apollo-12 astronauts left on the Moon four experiments, a central data processor and a radio system for data transmission. This Apollo Lunar Surface Experiment Package (ALSEP) is powered by a nuclear generator which uses the heat of decay of plutonium 238. The heat is applied to one side of a series of thermoelectric devices which generate electricity directly. This nuclear electrical generator, which has no moving parts, is the Space Nuclear Auxiliary Power System. It is the sole source of power for ALSEP.

The experiments, which are expected to record data for at least a year, are a passive seismic experiment, a lunar surface magnetometer, a solar wind spectrometer, and suprathreshold ion detector. The SNAP-27 generator should be functioning normally significantly longer than a year. A complete description of the moon experiments powered by the SNAP-327 nuclear power supply was placed in the Congressional Record of December 8, page 37746, by Chairman Holifield.

Two other nuclear electrical generators are also powering systems in space. The SNAP-19 is providing most of the power for the Nimbus weather satellite and the SNAP-3 navigational satellite, launched in 1961, is still operating.

E. Medical Advances: The Joint Committee has for several years encouraged the clin-

ical research program of Dr. George C. Cotzias and his colleagues at the AEC's Brookhaven National Laboratory in the use of L-dopa for the clinical treatment of neurological diseases, with primary emphasis on Parkinson's disease. L-dopa also significantly helps miners with chronic manganese poisoning. The latest use has been against another neurological disease—dystonia musculorum deformans—which seriously affects children by twisting its victim's limbs and sometimes by making them writhe uncontrollably from head to foot.

Dr. Cotzias was awarded the Albert Lasker award in November 1969 for having developed the protocol which demonstrated the effectiveness of large daily doses of L-dopa in the treatment of Parkinson's disease. Dr. Cotzias' efforts were described by the New England Journal of Medicine as "the most important contribution to medical therapy of a neurological disease in the past 50 years."

TRIBUTE TO HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

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

Mr. PERKINS, Mr. Speaker, on June 3 of this year our distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS), as chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, initiated what I believe are monumental hearings on legislation to encourage States to improve their workmen's compensation laws and to assure adequate coverage and benefits to employees injured in the mining industry. The specific legislation under consideration at that time was H.R. 11476.

Mr. DANIELS, as chairman of that subcommittee, diligently covered the field of workman's compensation law in intensive hearings throughout the month of June, concluding on July 15. It was largely due to the work of that subcommittee, under his leadership, that the benefit payment provisions to miners suffering from black lung disease and to the widows of miners who have died due to this disease were incorporated in the provisions of the Federal coal mine health and safety legislation which this Congress has just cleared and sent to the President for signature.

Mr. DANIELS' subcommittee, in executive session and in many meetings with staff and experts in the field, worked on all aspects of the problem of providing benefits to miners and their families where the miner, because of his exposure to coal dust, was no longer able to support his family. It is a great credit to his ability as a legislator, as a lawyer, and as a person sensitive to the needs of a group of citizens of this country who have long been ignored that title IV of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 will soon be law. I would not want the first session of the 91st Congress to conclude without having made these observations. The monumental forward step taken in assuring healthy and safe working conditions in mines may have obscured the equally monumental legislative accomplishment that is represented by the final clearance

by the House and Senate of title IV of this act.

CONTROVERSIAL MRS. MITCHELL

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for a while the gaucheries of Mrs. John Mitchell were good for a laugh.

But when she sees fit to ridicule Swahili, the lingua franca of much of Africa, a language which an increasing number of young black Americans are studying, it is time for some one to say: Enough.

Apparently, the Attorney General is amused by it all. Then, perhaps the President should politely but firmly ask Mrs. Mitchell to mind her manners.

The following article appeared in the Washington Post for Tuesday, December 16:

MARTHA MITCHELL SPEAKS UP (By Dorothy McCardle)

Attorney General John N. Mitchell's popularity has slipped to second place at the Justice Department when it comes to mail and requests for speeches.

"The Justice Department mail is overwhelming for my wife these days," he said last night. "Everybody writes to her."

"I used to get a lot of requests for speeches, too. Not any more. They all want my wife."

The Mitchells returned to the Washington party scene after a holiday in Florida, which followed Mrs. Mitchell's controversial statements on television and to the press. She caused a sensation when she called peace demonstrators "liberal Communists."

The Mitchells were among the 70 guests entertained at the George Town Club by Robert Keith Gray, former Secretary to the Cabinet in the Eisenhower Administration. Former First Lady Mamie Eisenhower came down from Gettysburg for the party, which was given in honor of Secretary of Defense and Mrs. Melvin R. Laird.

Martha Mitchell, who has been variously reported as under "house arrest" and "gag rule" by her husband, was beaming, and he was beaming proudly her way. Both were full of fun and laughter over all the talk she has stirred up.

"Gag Martha?" quipped Mitchell. "That would be impossible."

Will she make these speeches?

"Yes, indeed, just as soon as she learns to speak Swahili," he quipped.

In fact, she is ready for plenty more interviews, her husband said, "so long as they are conducted in Swahili."

"Want to hear some Swahili?" quipped Martha Mitchell, and she squeaked her tongue in and out as everybody laughed.

She was wearing a beige evening gown, heavily encrusted in brilliants, by Harvey Beren. She said a waiter had spilled ice cream down her back first time she wore it in New York.

"I always try to create a little fun wherever I go," she said. "The one trouble about Florida was that there weren't any Washington newspapers with all those stories about me."

The Attorney General said he had enjoyed comedian Bob Hope's comments about his wife at the White House Sunday night.

The Attorney General never stopped smiling until talk turned to his own job.

"I've got a terrible job," he said. "But it's

a job that needs to be done, and I'm here to try to do it for the President."

Mr. Speaker, it is of course possible that Dorothy McCardle's account was inaccurate or unfair. If so, then a public correction and apology should be made.

Do I make too much of the incident? A brilliant writer, Nicholas von Hoffman, writing in today's Washington Post, suggests that I do not. As Mr. von Hoffman points out, the Attorney General and his wife, who are reported very fearful of revolutionary activity in this country, ought to reflect on whether their behavior could be contributing to the very thing they fear.

Mr. von Hoffman might have reminded his readers of another high society lady who reportedly said: "If they have no bread, let them eat cake."

I call attention particularly to the penultimate paragraph of Mr. von Hoffman's article:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 1, 1969]

REVOLUTION

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

It is impossible to date a mood, a psychological era. But if the beginning are lost it is retrospectively obvious that some time in the middle years of this decade we began to feel differently about ourselves. We began to relish and cultivate a sense of doom and revenge; we spoke of the Fire Next Time and we liked the feelings the thought of fear induced in us; we spoke of Armageddon and Apocalypse like people who wanted what the rest of mankind dreads.

We ascended the helix of violence, crime, confrontation, counter-confrontation, riot, arson and assassination as though we were going through a sexual experience. We enjoyed it. We proclaimed ourselves the sick society with a necrophilic delight in the pathology of pathology. After each act of bloodletting we were not content with seeing it on the TV screen; we had commissions to dredge it up again, show us the killing in new lights and use the analysis of the latest acts of savagery as grounds to predict yet more. Our violence commissions and their reports never lead to legislation—their function is to soothsaying the doom we delight in hearing prognosticated.

In the last months new elements have become discernible in the mood. The first is suspicion. There are now millions of people who believe their phones are being tapped. Congressmen, senators, high government and business officials presume it in their belief that the government is increasingly in the hands of spies and blackmailers. In the most unlikely and exalted places there is talk of repression and concentration camps.

The second is the talk of revolution. Six or seven years ago only paranoid reactionaries gabbled about revolution. For everybody else the subject was laughable. Now the word is used everywhere and all the time, and not merely as metaphor or hyperbole as in the Dodge Rebellion or the Sexual Revolution.

People say the word again and again, meaning they expect in some vague, indefinite, but not too far future time, a violent, political upheaval will come to pass. The word is tossed around thoughtlessly but with the connotation that it will solve our problems, take care of everything, make us well. If you try to pin people down as to how this last and most awful political act is going to make anything better, you don't get answers; you get emotional expectations. Their words in reply suggest that a great welling up and solidifying of masses of peo-

ple will provide a purging, a burning and a purification of the great, collective, social soul. They talk like people drained of energy who see the revolution as a dynamo of massive, undifferentiated human force which recharges and revives them.

Such talk centers among the rich and the near rich. It began among the young but it's spread to the parents and the grandparents so you can hear dowager millionairesses drop casual remarks about the revolution.

The prevalence of revolutionary talk has sprung up in two or three years. Maybe it's simply a fashion and, like bell-bottom trousers, people will tire of it, but that's not certain. We don't know much about revolutions, but what we do know makes it impossible to shrug off the conversations as having no consequence.

It has been observed that no government or master class has ever been overthrown from below. They've committed suicide. (We're speaking of true revolutions, not putsches, coup d'etats or CIA palace takeovers.) The rulers, the rich, the people with presumably the most stake in the status quo lose faith in themselves and belief in the goodness and worthwhileness of both their duties and their heritage.

The revolutionary talk isn't coming primarily from blacks or white factory workers or Mexican farm labor but from the top, from people with money and people with means to broadcast their ideas and convince others. It is this fact that makes it highly unlikely that, the Constitution aside, the government will indulge in the wholesale political repressions that are forever being predicted. The government isn't going to put its own children in jail. Black Panthers, of course, are a totally different question.

This rage for revolution, so common in the western world, derives from feelings and beliefs that are often admirable and courageous. When you see a Sarah Lawrence or a Yale boy working on a production line to start a revolutionary cadre, it's hard not to salute them for their selflessness, but their altruism doesn't make what they're doing less reckless or badly thought out.

"We know to our sorrow that freedom has been better preserved where no revolution ever broke out, no matter how outrageous the circumstances of the powers that be, and that there exist more civil liberties even in countries where the revolution was defeated than in those where the revolutions have been victorious," writes Hannah Arendt in one of the few good books on the subject (*On Revolution*, Viking Press, N.Y., 1965, \$1.65).

But people with the revolutionary rage in them take freedom and civil liberties for granted in their justifiable anguish over such questions as racism, war and poverty. What they forget is that there is no reason to think pulling down the formal, governmental structure of the country can solve these problems while there is every reason to believe a revolution will add new ones.

The great problem a revolution would bring with it would be the establishing of any other kind of government that the American people could accept as legitimate. It doesn't matter how much good can be said for it; the fact is that every revolutionary government goes through the tortures of the damned trying to achieve the legitimation and acceptance which bring stability and the possibility of going forward with any kind of social or economic program.

The legitimation of the American government is the Constitution, a document which we revere with considerably greater and realer piety than we do our various religions. We do it not only because it actually is an amaz-

ing political creation but because it is nearly 200 years old, and we believe in it in a sense that is more than patriotic, more than governmental. It cannot be replaced by something better because we believe in it, our Constitution, nobody else's, and it is this which gives the system legitimate authority, stability and therefore the possibility of quiet and humane improvement and perfection.

One of the most alarming aspects of the kind of talk we're getting now is a discrediting attack on the Constitution's authority. Arendt puts it this way, "Revolutions always appear to succeed with amazing ease in their initial stage, and the reason is that the men who make them first only pick up the power of a regime in plain disintegration; they are consequences but never the causes of the downfall of political authority. . . . The loss of authority in the powers-that-be, which indeed precedes all revolutions, is actually a secret to no one, since its manifestations are open and tangible, though not necessarily spectacular; but its symptoms, general dissatisfactions, widespread malaise, and contempt for those in power, are difficult to pin down since their meaning is never unequivocal."

That's where we are now. The Constitution, our stabilizer, our continuity, our guarantee of freedom for those who have it and our promise for those who don't, is suffering authority drainage. But as Miss Arendt says, the picture is equivocal. The revolutionary enrages bring the final and binding laws into contempt, but so does the Attorney General who is reported smiling while his wife runs off at the mouth at parties making tasteless, racist imitations of somebody speaking Swahili.

If you think you're a revolutionary, know what you're getting all of us into, and if you're not, don't talk like one.

THE FUTURE OF MICRONESIA

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in the course of two special orders, my able colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY), and I discussed the situation in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, now known as Micronesia. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL) also contributed to the discussion. I refer to pages 39858 to 39866 of the RECORD.

During the colloquy between the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) and myself, some difference of opinion emerged as to the degree to which the United States may proceed on its own, without the approval of the U.N. Trusteeship Council and the Security Council, to make arrangements for the self-determination of the Micronesians to which we are committed. My friend and colleague suggested that, because Micronesia is characterized as a "strategic trust territory" under the U.N. Charter, the United States has wider latitude in this regard than was true of the other states administering trust territories. I must record my disagreement.

A strategic trust territory is different from others mainly in that the administering authority may establish bases and station forces there, and in that the Security Council, rather than the General

Assembly, is the U.N. body which has jurisdiction.

Of the 11 original trust agreements, nine have been terminated after a process of self-determination under procedures approved by the appropriate U.N. bodies. I have never before heard it suggested that the procedure in this regard would be any different for a strategic trust territory.

In order that the Members of Congress and other readers of the RECORD may be reminded of the degree to which our administration and the ultimate disposition of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is subject to the United Nations Charter and U.N. procedures, I insert herewith the text of the trusteeship agreement and the relevant articles of the U.N. Charter:

TRUSTEESHIP FOR FORMER JAPANESE MANDATED ISLANDS—AGREEMENT APPROVED BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS APRIL 2, 1947

Approved by the President of the United States of America July 18, 1947, Pursuant to Authority Granted by Joint Resolution of the Congress of the United States of America July 18, 1947

Entered into Force July 18, 1947

PREAMBLE

Whereas Article 75 of the Charter of the United Nations¹ provides for the establishment of an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent agreements; and

Whereas under Article 77 of the said Charter the trusteeship system may be applied to territories now held under mandate; and

Whereas on 17 December 1920 the Council of the League of Nations confirmed a mandate for the former German islands north of the equator to Japan, to be administered in accordance with Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations; and

Whereas Japan, as a result of the Second World War, has ceased to exercise any authority in these islands;

Now, THEREFORE, the Security Council of the United Nations, having satisfied itself that the relevant articles of the Charter have been complied with, hereby resolves to approve the following terms of trusteeship for the Pacific Islands formerly under mandate to Japan.

ARTICLE 1

The Territory of the Pacific Islands, consisting of the islands formerly held by Japan under mandate in accordance with Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, is hereby designated as a strategic area and placed under the trusteeship system established in the Charter of the United Nations. The Territory of the Pacific Islands is hereinafter referred to as the trust territory.

ARTICLE 2

The United States of America is designated as the administering authority of the trust territory.

ARTICLE 3

The administering authority shall have full power of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory subject to the provisions of this agreement, and may apply to the trust territory, subject to any modifications which the administering authority may consider desirable, such of the laws of

¹ Treaty Series 993, 59 Stat. 1031.

the United States as it may deem appropriate to local conditions and requirements.

ARTICLE 4

The administering authority, in discharging the obligations of trusteeship in the trust territory, shall act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and the provisions of this agreement, and shall, as specified in Article 83 (2) of the Charter, apply the objectives of the international trusteeship system, as set forth in Article 76 of the Charter, to the people of the trust territory.

ARTICLE 5

In discharging its obligations under Article 76(a) and Article 84, of the Charter, the administering authority shall ensure that the trust territory shall play its part, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the administering authority shall be entitled:

1. to establish naval, military and air bases and to erect fortifications in the trust territory;
2. to station and employ armed forces in the territory; and
3. to make use of volunteer forces, facilities and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations towards the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority, as well as for the local defense and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

ARTICLE 6

In discharging its obligations under Article 76(b) of the Charter, the administering authority shall:

1. foster the development of such political institutions as are suited to the trust territory and shall promote the development of the inhabitants of the trust territory toward self-government or independence, as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned; and to this end shall give to the inhabitants of the trust territory a progressively increasing share in the administrative services in the territory; shall develop their participation in government; shall give due recognition to the customs of the inhabitants in providing a system of law for the territory; and shall take other appropriate measures toward these ends;
2. promote the economic advancement and self-sufficiency of the inhabitants, and to this end shall regulate the use of natural resources; encourage the development of fisheries, agriculture, and industries; protect the inhabitants against the loss of their lands and resources; and improve the means of transportation and communication;
3. promote the social advancement of the inhabitants, and to this end shall protect the rights and fundamental freedoms of all elements of the population without discrimination; protect the health of the inhabitants; control the traffic in arms and ammunition, opium and other dangerous drugs, and alcohol and other spirituous beverages; and institute such other regulations as may be necessary to protect the inhabitants against social abuses; and
4. promote the educational advancement of the inhabitants, and to this end shall take steps toward the establishment of a general system of elementary education; facilitate the vocational and cultural advancement of the population; and shall encourage qualified students to pursue higher education, including training on the professional level.

ARTICLE 7

In discharging its obligations under Article 76(c), of the Charter, the administering authority shall guarantee to the inhabitants of the trust territory freedom of conscience,

and, subject only to the requirements of public order and security, freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly; freedom of worship, and of religious teaching; and freedom of migration and movement.

ARTICLE 8

1. In discharging its obligations under Article 76(d) of the Charter, as defined by Article 83(2) of the Charter, the administering authority, subject to the requirements of security, and the obligation to promote the advancement of the inhabitants, shall accord to nationals of each Member of the United Nations and to companies and associations organized in conformity with the laws of such Member, treatment in the trust territory no less favourable than that accorded therein to nationals, companies and associations of any other United Nation except the administering authority.

2. The administering authority shall ensure equal treatment to the Members of the United Nations and their nationals in the administration of justice.

3. Nothing in this Article shall be so construed as to accord traffic rights to aircraft flying into and out of the trust territory. Such rights shall be subject to agreement between the administering authority and the state whose nationality such aircraft possesses.

4. The administering authority may negotiate and conclude commercial and other treaties and agreements with Members of the United Nations and other states, designed to attain for the inhabitants of the trust territory treatment by the Members of the United Nations and other states no less favourable than that granted by them to the nationals of other states. The Security Council may recommend, or invite other organs of the United Nations to consider and recommend, what rights the inhabitants of the trust territory should acquire in consideration of the rights obtained by Members of the United Nations in the trust territory.

ARTICLE 9

The administering authority shall be entitled to constitute the trust territory into a customs, fiscal, or administrative union or federation with other territories under United States jurisdiction and to establish common services between such territories and the trust territory where such measures are not inconsistent with the basic objectives of the International Trusteeship System and with the terms of this agreement.

ARTICLE 10

The administering authority, acting under the provisions of Article 3 of this agreement, may accept membership in any regional advisory commission, regional authority, or technical organization, or other voluntary association of states, may co-operate with specialized international bodies, public or private, and may engage in other forms of international co-operation.

ARTICLE 11

1. The administering authority shall take the necessary steps to provide the status of citizenship of the trust territory for the inhabitants of the trust territory.

2. The administering authority shall afford diplomatic and consular protection to inhabitants of the trust territory when outside the territorial limits of the trust territory or of the territory of the administering authority.

ARTICLE 12

The administering authority shall enact such legislation as may be necessary to place the provisions of this agreement in effect in the trust territory.

ARTICLE 13

The provisions of Articles 87 and 88 of the Charter shall be applicable to the trust ter-

ritory, provided that the administering authority may determine the extent of their applicability to any areas which may from time to time be specified by it as closed for security reasons.

ARTICLE 14

The administering authority undertakes to apply in the trust territory the provisions of any international conventions and recommendations which may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of the trust territory and which would be conducive to the achievement of the basic objectives of Article 6 of this agreement.

ARTICLE 15

The terms of the present agreement shall not be altered, amended or terminated without the consent of the administering authority.

ARTICLE 16

The present agreement shall come into force when approved by the Security Council of the United Nations and by the Government of the United States after due constitutional process.²

Certified corrected true copy.
For the Security Council Affairs Department.

D. PROTITCH,
Director in Charge of Security Council
Affairs Department.

CHAPTER XII—INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM

ARTICLE 75

The United Nations shall establish under its authority an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent individual agreements. These territories are hereinafter referred to as trust territories.

ARTICLE 76

The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the Purposes of the United Nations laid down in Article 1 of the present Charter, shall be:

a. to further international peace and security;

b. to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories, and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement;

c. to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and

d. to ensure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of Article 80.

ARTICLE 77

1. The trusteeship system shall apply to such territories in the following categories as may be placed thereunder by means of trusteeship agreements:

- territories now held under mandate;
- territories which may be detached from

² Approved by the Security Council of the United Nations, Apr. 2, 1947; and by the Government of the United States of America, July 18, 1947.

enemy states as a result of the Second World War; and

c. territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration.

2. It will be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which territories in the foregoing categories will be brought under the trusteeship system and upon what terms.

ARTICLE 78

The trusteeship system shall not apply to territories which have become Members of the United Nations, relationship among which shall be based on respect for the principle of sovereign equality.

ARTICLE 79

The terms of trusteeship for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system, including any alteration or amendment, shall be agreed upon by the states directly concerned, including the mandatory power in the case of territories held under mandate by a Member of the United Nations, and shall be approved as provided for in Articles 83 and 85.

ARTICLE 80

1. Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements, made under Articles 77, 79, and 81, placing each territory under the trusteeship system, and until such agreements have been concluded, nothing in this Chapter shall be construed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties.

2. Paragraph 1 of this Article shall not be interpreted as giving grounds for delay or postponement of the negotiation and conclusion of agreements for placing mandated and other territories under the trusteeship system as provided for in Article 77.

ARTICLE 81

The trusteeship agreement shall in each case include the terms under which the trust territory will be administered and designate the authority which will exercise the administration of the trust territory. Such authority, hereinafter called the administering authority, may be one or more states or the Organization itself.

ARTICLE 82

There may be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies, without prejudice to any special agreement or agreements made under Article 43.

ARTICLE 83

1. All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council.

2. The basic objectives set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area.

3. The Security Council shall, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship agreements and without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social, and educational matters in the strategic areas.

ARTICLE 84

It shall be the duty of the administering authority to ensure that the trust territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the administering authority may make use of volunteer forces, facilities, and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the

obligations towards the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority, as well as for local defense and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

ARTICLE 85

1. The functions of the United Nations with regard to trusteeship agreements for all areas not designated as strategic, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the General Assembly.

2. The Trusteeship Council, operating under the authority of the General Assembly, shall assist the General Assembly in carrying out these functions.

CHAPTER XIII—THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL COMPOSITION

Article 86

1. The Trusteeship Council shall consist of the following Members of the United Nations:

a. those Members administering trust territories;

b. such of those Members mentioned by name in Article 23 as are not administering trust territories; and

c. as many other Members elected for three-year terms by the General Assembly as may be necessary to ensure that the total number of members of the Trusteeship Council is equally divided between those Members of the United Nations which administer trust territories and those which do not.

2. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall designate one specially qualified person to represent it therein.

FUNCTIONS AND POWERS

Article 87

The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions, may:

a. consider reports submitted by the administering authority;

b. accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering authority;

c. provide for periodic visits to the respective trust territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority; and

d. take these and other actions in conformity with the terms of the trusteeship agreements.

Article 88

The Trusteeship Council shall formulate a questionnaire on the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of each trust territory, and the administering authority for each trust territory within the competence of the General Assembly shall make an annual report to the General Assembly upon the basis of such questionnaire.

VOTING

Article 89

1. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Trusteeship Council shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

PROCEDURE

Article 90

1. The Trusteeship Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

2. The Trusteeship Council shall meet as required in accordance with its rules, which shall include provision for the convening of meetings on the request of a majority of its members.

Article 91

The Trusteeship Council shall, when appropriate, avail itself of the assistance of the

Economic and Social Council and of the specialized agencies in regard to matters with which they are respectively concerned.

WHO IS TO BLAME

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

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Post carried a letter to the editor from my friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. This letter is particularly significant because it describes accurately and impartially some of the reasons for this year's disgraceful delay in the appropriation process.

While the administration has blamed the Congress for much of this delay, and vice versa, Chairman MAHON stated correctly that the blame for this extraordinary delay must be shared by all those responsible for recommending amounts and appropriating them. The chairman also points out that one of the key reasons for delay in this process is the requirement that "enactment of authorization bills must precede appropriations."

The efforts of our colleagues on the various authorizing committees are worthy of our praise, for these committees are examining more programs—most of which are extremely complex—than ever before. This close scrutiny of our programs is vital if we in the Congress are to fulfill our responsibility to the taxpayers of this Nation. There comes a time, however, when we must stop scrutinizing and start funding.

In order to expedite passage of appropriation bills, my colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) has introduced House Resolution 557, which provides that after the beginning of each fiscal year appropriation bills may be considered even though their authorizations have not been enacted into law. As a cosponsor of this measure, I want to emphasize that this resolution is not intended in any way to dilute the powers or duties of the authorizing committees.

The Committee on Rules is now considering proposals to change the dates of the fiscal year. I strongly support such proposals. It is obvious that the present July 1 to June 30 fiscal year—a relic from the days when Congress was in session for only a few months each year—is no longer adequate for our complex federal system.

As we conclude this session of Congress under threat of a special session, the time has come for us to seriously contemplate changing the fiscal year and changing the rules under which appropriation bills are considered. Only by making these and other changes can we supply the people of this Nation with the modern, efficient, economical Government which they will need in the 1970's and beyond.

In order to clarify this situation and to make it clear what we must do to remedy it, I wish to include at this point in the RECORD the letter of Chair-

man MAHON to the editor of the Washington Post:

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS CHAIRMAN'S REVIEW

Your editorial of Dec. 11, "The Money Bills for Christmas," makes sharp reference to the delays in enactment of the appropriation bills, apportioning the blame among the administration and both houses of Congress. But the record will clearly show that the House Committee on Appropriations has not been the major stumbling block.

I agree with much of your editorial, but I must say that, in my judgment, it is not quite on the qualitative par of your editorial of Oct. 31, "Appropriations Logjam," which I thought was so perceptive and well balanced that I inserted it in the Congressional Record.

Even allowing for some extenuating circumstances—which you do—I would agree that neither the administration nor the House or Senate has done acceptably well in regard to processing the money business this year.

Next year, many of the delays inherent in setting up a new administration will not beset the executive team. This will be of inestimable value to Congress. Moreover, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, working in cooperation with the leadership on both sides of the aisle, we have definite plans for doing a much more expeditious job.

Your editorial of Dec. 11 departs in a significant and, to me, disappointing way from the underlying assessment that blame for late appropriations can be shared generally by all those responsible for their processing. You say that much of the blame for this logjam belongs on the House side, the House leaders allowing "the managers of the money bills to amble along at their own pace instead of fixing a date for the reporting of each bill." I include a statement of the Majority Leader made on the floor of the House on Oct. 29, 1969:

"Mr. Albert . . . Further, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Mahon). Every year he has come in with a schedule or agenda of bills from his committee. He has followed it, I believe, as religiously as any committee in the House has been able to follow an agenda, and he has done an outstanding job. He has been thwarted time and time again by the lack of authorizations and by matters beyond his control . . ."

I would be deeply grateful if you would print for your readers the following facts which seem the most pertinent, since they involve the six regular appropriation bills still pending in Congress. You point out that "enactment of authorization bills must precede appropriations."

Taking the bills one by one, here is the record:

1. *Defense.* The underlying authorization bill passed the Senate Sept. 18; the House Oct. 3; cleared Congress Nov. 6; signed into law Nov. 19.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the appropriation bill Dec. 3; the House passed it Dec. 8. Now in Senate.

2. *Military Construction.* Authorization bill passed House Aug. 5; the Senate Nov. 11; cleared Congress Nov. 21; signed into law Dec. 5.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the appropriation bill Nov. 12; passed House Nov. 13; passed Senate Dec. 8. Now in conference.

3. *Foreign Assistance.* Authorization bill passed House Nov. 20; on Senate floor today (Dec. 12).

The Committee on Appropriations reported the appropriation bill on Dec. 8; the House passed it Dec. 9. Now in Senate.

4. *District of Columbia.* The D.C. revenue authorization bill passed the House Aug. 11;

the Senate Oct. 13; cleared Congress Oct. 30; signed into law Oct. 31.

The Committee on Appropriations reported the appropriation bill Nov. 20; the House passed it Nov. 24; the Senate passed it Dec. 11. It is now in conference.

5. *Labor-HEW.* Despite absence of enacted authorization bills for the antipoverty program and several other programs normally funded in this bill, the Committee on Appropriations reported this bill on July 24 and the House passed it on July 31. It is now in the Senate.

6. *Transportation.* When we reported this bill on Nov. 13 and passed it on Nov. 18, it was necessary to adopt a rule making it in order despite the lack of enacted authorization bills for the urban mass transportation and traffic and highway safety programs.

This bill is still pending in the Senate.

In closing, let me commend you for your generally fair and well intentioned statements on what is perhaps the most important single business of the Congress.

GEORGE MAHON,

Chairman, House Committee on
Appropriations.

WASHINGTON.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PASSMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 15149) making appropriations for foreign assistance for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-779)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15149) "making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 9, 11, 14, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, and 42.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 12, 20, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, and 41, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$353,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$166,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$81,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$105,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$13,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13; and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "American schools and hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program): For assistance authorized by section 214(d), \$3,000,000 for the University of North Africa, Tangier, Morocco; \$1,000,000 for the Vocational School for the Underprivileged in Israel, and \$500,000 for the Merkaz Lechinuch Ichud, Israel, in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$395,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$255,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$300,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "\$37,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$51,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$404,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in

disagreement amendments numbered 6, 8, and 31.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to appropriations to two of the institutions on page 3 of the bill),
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JEFFERY COHELAN (except as to No. 25),
CLARENCE D. LONG,
JOHN J. McFALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
SILVIO O. CONTE (except as to No. 25),
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr.,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GALE W. MCGEE,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOSEPH M. MONTROYA,
HIRAM L. FONG,
NORRIS COTTON,
JAMES B. PEARSON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15149) making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT ACTIVITIES

Funds appropriated to the President Economic Assistance

Amendment No. 1.—*Technical assistance:* Appropriates \$353,250,000 for technical assistance instead of \$313,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$396,870,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount will be distributed as indicated in amendments numbers 2, 3, and 4 below.

Amendment No. 2.—Appropriates \$166,750,000 for Worldwide technical assistance instead of \$150,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$183,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3.—Appropriates \$81,500,000 for Alliance for Progress technical assistance instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$90,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4.—Appropriates \$105,000,000 for Multilateral organization technical assistance instead of \$88,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$122,620,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5.—Provides that not less than \$13,000,000 shall be available only for the U.N. Children's Fund instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 7.—Restores limitation proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate to preclude transfers between the three different technical assistance appropriations contained in amendments 2, 3, and 4 above.

Amendment No. 8.—*American schools and hospitals abroad:* Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will

offer a motion to appropriate \$26,050,000 instead of \$24,050,000 as proposed by the House and \$24,550,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$1,500,000 above the Senate bill is the result of action taken on amendments 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 below.

In connection with this program the Committee of Conference agrees that if A.I.D. finds that any institution contained in these amendments is an institution that has received funds under this bill under another name, it shall not be eligible to receive the funds provided by this appropriation. In addition, the Committee of Conference is agreed that funds provided for the various unbudgeted institutions shall be of a "one-shot" nature and the Appropriations Committees will not consider providing funds for any institutions unless there is a budget estimate submitted by the Executive requesting funds for such institutions.

Amendment No. 9.—Appropriates \$3,000,000 for the Weizmann Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10.—Appropriates \$1,400,000 for Merkaz Lechinuch Ichud as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11.—Appropriates \$5,000,000 for Hadassah (expansion of medical facilities in Israel) as proposed by the House instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12.—Appropriates \$1,200,000 for Beth Yaacov Avat Girl's School, \$800,000 for the Educational Center of Galilee, and \$500,000 for a hospital in Chemke, Nigeria, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13.—*American schools and hospitals abroad (special foreign currency program)*: Appropriates \$4,500,000 in excess foreign currencies for the following institutions, \$3,000,000 for the University of North Africa, Morocco; \$1,000,000 for the Vocational School for the Underprivileged; and \$500,000 for the Merkaz Lechinuch Ichud as proposed by the Senate. The Committee of Conference deleted local currency funds for the Weizmann Institute and for Hadassah in view of its action on Amendments 9 and 11.

Amendment No. 14.—*Prototype desalting plant*: Appropriates \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House to finance planning, design and specifications only. No part of the recommended appropriation is to be used for construction until the proposed project has been reviewed by the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Amendment No. 15.—*Supporting assistance*: Appropriates \$395,000,000 instead of \$300,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$414,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16.—*Contingency fund*: Appropriates \$12,500,000 instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17.—*Alliance for Progress, development loans*: Appropriates \$255,000,000 instead of \$200,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$337,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18.—*Development loans*: Appropriates \$300,000,000 instead of \$265,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$350,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19.—*Overseas Private Investment Corporation, reserves*: Appropriates \$37,500,000 instead of \$75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20.—*Overseas Private Investment Corporation, capital*: Appropriates funds (estimated to be \$20,000,000 in fiscal year 1970) as proposed by the Senate for use as a revolving loan fund to make dollar loans for high priority development projects in the developing countries.

Amendment No. 21.—*Administrative expenses, A.I.D.*: Appropriates \$51,000,000 in-

stead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$51,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22.—*Administrative expenses, State*: Appropriates \$3,700,000 instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,730,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Military Assistance

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, 25 and 26.—*Military Assistance*: Insert appropriate section numbers; appropriate \$404,500,000 instead of \$454,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$350,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore language deleted by the Senate earmarking \$54,500,000 for the Republic of China.

General Provisions

Amendment No. 27.—Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate prohibiting the furnishing of economic assistance to any country which furnishes economic assistance to Communist China.

Amendment No. 28.—Makes available not more than \$9,000,000 for research under Sec. 205(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29.—Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate regarding the withholding of economic assistance to any underdeveloped country which purchases sophisticated weapons systems.

Amendment No. 30.—Conforms section number.

Amendment No. 31.—Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to restore the language proposed by the House with an amendment conforming certain section numbers in this bill to appropriate section numbers in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969.

TITLE II—FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

Amendment No. 32.—Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate providing funds for expenses of foreign military credit sales.

TITLE III—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE (OTHER)

Amendment No. 33.—Conforms title number.

Peace Corps

Amendment No. 34.—Appropriates \$98,450,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$95,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Department of the Army—Civil Functions

Ryukyu Islands, Army, Administration

Amendment No. 35.—Appropriates \$18,790,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 36.—Makes available for administrative and information expenses \$3,151,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,100,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 37.—Conforms title number.

Amendment No. 38.—Makes available \$3,427,413,000 for program activity as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,537,343,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39.—Makes available \$2,420,000,000 for equipment and service loans as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,972,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40.—Makes available \$5,548,000 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,280,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 41.—Conforms title number.

Amendment No. 42.—Deletes language proposed by the Senate prohibiting expenditure of appropriated funds in excess of those au-

thorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1970.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
JOHN J. ROONEY (except as to appropriations to two of the institutions on page 3 of the bill),
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
JEFFERY COHELAN, (except as to No. 25),
CLARENCE D. LONG,
JOHN J. MCFALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
GARNER E. SHRIVER,
SILVIO O. CONTE (except as to No. 25),
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr.,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. O'HARA), for an indefinite period beginning the week of December 15, on account of illness.

Mr. CORMAN, for Friday, December 19, 1969, on account of official business.

Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. SIKES), for December 19 and 20, 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:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS); to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOGAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia); to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MONAGAN, for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee); to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS to extend his remarks prior to passage of the conference report on H.R. 15091, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PETTIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WATSON in two instances.

Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. MCCLORY.

Mr. TAFT in four instances.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in two instances.
 Mr. BOB WILSON.
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
 Mr. REID of New York in two instances.
 Mr. McKNEALLY.
 Mr. DELLENBACK.
 Mr. GROVER.
 Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
 Mr. CONTE.
 Mr. SCHNEEBELI.
 Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. STUCKEY.
 Mr. WOLFF.
 Mr. ST. ONGE in two instances.
 Mr. MATSUNAGA in four instances.
 Mr. LONG of Maryland in six instances.
 Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania in eight instances.
 Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in 10 instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. MIKVA in six instances.
 Mr. SCHEUER.
 Mr. NICHOLS.
 Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
 Mr. RYAN in five instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
 Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
 Mr. FISHER in four instances.
 Mr. JACOBS.
 Mr. RIVERS in three instances.
 Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. MARSH in three instances.
 Mr. ROONEY of New York in three instances.
 Mrs. GRIFFITHS.
 Mr. PATTEN.
 Mr. CONYERS in six instances.
 Mr. OTTINGER.
 Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI.
 Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia.
 Mr. MATSUNAGA in six instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2543. An act to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of horses which are "sored", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 740. An act to establish the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 54. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that

committee did on December 18, 1969, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14916. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, December 20, 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:

1424. A communication from the President of the United States relative to the appropriations for fiscal year 1970 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and the Office of Economic Opportunity (H. Doc. No. 91-206); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1425. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on U.S. assistance programs in Ethiopia; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1426. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of real and personal property of the Department of Defense as of June 30, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1427. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing); transmitting notification of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air Force Reserve, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1428. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (International Affairs); transmitting the index of the legislation enacted during 1969 by the Legislature of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1429. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the effectiveness and administration of the comprehensive health services program under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Chicago, Ill., Office of Economic Opportunity; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1430. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting the annual report of the Department of Defense relative to its disposition of foreign excess personal property located in areas outside of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for fiscal year 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 404(d) of title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1431. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a code system for the identification of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Marketing of Federal obligations participation certificates (16th rept.) (Rept. No. 91-772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Government rejected consumer items (17th rept.) (Rept. No. 91-773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Procurement of 2.75-inch aircraft rocket launchers (Rept. No. 91-774). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Accident and injury data (Rept. No. 91-775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 11832. A bill to provide for the establishment of an international quarantine station and to permit the entry therein of animals from any other country and the subsequent movement of such animals into other parts of the United States for purposes of improving livestock breeds, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EVINS: Select Committee on Small Business. Report on the position and problems of small business in procurements financed by the Agency for International Development (Rept. No. 91-777). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on S. 3016 (Rept. No. 91-778). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 15149 (Rept. No. 91-779). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 15355. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize assistance to small business concerns in financing structural, operational, or other changes to meet standards required by Federal law or State law enacted in conformity therewith; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FEIGHAN (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MESKILL, and Mr. DENNIS):

H.R. 15356. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry of certain nonimmigrants into the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. HALEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. BURKE of Florida, and Mr. CHAPPELL):

H.R. 15357. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in Florida; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GIAIMO (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. McDADE, Mr. PATTEN, and Mr. REIFEL):

H.R. 15358. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 15359. A bill to prohibit certain uses

of the names of members of the Armed Forces who have died as a result of combat actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 15360. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Minimum Wage Act to provide an exemption from the overtime provisions of that act for certain motor carrier employees whose hours of service are subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DENT, Mr. BRADEMANS, Mr. CAREY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. MINK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. ESCH):

H.R. 15361. A bill to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MEEDS (for himself and Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HICKS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. PELY, Mrs. MAY, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H.R. 15362. A bill to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 15363. A bill to create an Office of Defense Review; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 15364. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to alleviate freight car shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 15365. A bill to provide that Federal Assistance to a State or local government or agency for rehabilitation or renovation of housing and for enforcement of local or State housing codes under the urban renewal program, the public housing program, or the model cities program, or under any other program involving the provision by State or local governments of housing or related facilities, shall be made available only on condition that the recipient submit and carry out an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15366. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 15367. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to detect and treat incidents of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 15368. A bill to require labeling of certain packages transported in interstate commerce containing alligator hides or products made therefrom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 15369. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the reduction in disability insurance benefits which is presently required in the case of an individual receiving workmen's compensation

benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, Mr. FISHER, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. RIVERS):

H.R. 15370. A bill to prohibit public officials from operating dual school systems, and from requiring racial balance in school systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 15371. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to alleviate freight car shortages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 15372. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROWN of California (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 15373. A bill to provide for the establishment of not less than seven regional law enforcement academies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 15374. A bill to amend section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, concerning approval by the Attorney General of the title to lands acquired for or on behalf of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN (for himself, Mr. REUSS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CAREY, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. HATHAWAY):

H.R. 15375. A bill to establish a Commission to study and investigate incidents of alleged mistreatment or other misconduct directed against citizens of South Vietnam by U.S. troops operating in Mylai 4 Hamlet, Quang Nai Province on or about March 1968; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. STANTON, and Mr. WIDNALL):

H.R. 15376. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. REES, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. ROYBAL):

H.R. 15377. A bill to establish a national program to provide income supplements to every family in need thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 15378. A bill to establish a joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho (for himself and Mr. McCLURE):

H.R. 15379. A bill to amend the Military Personnel and Civilian Employees' Claim Act of 1964 to permit the settlement of claims for personal property loss suffered by members of the uniformed services occupying off-base quarters if such loss is attributable to a major disaster; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 15380. A bill to exempt FHA and VA mortgages and loans from the interest and usury laws of the District of Columbia, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 15381. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 with respect to the taxation of regulated investment companies; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 15382. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 15383. A bill to provide for orderly trade in bicycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15384. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to increase the exemption from duty to \$300 in the case of residents of the United States returning from South America, Central America, the Caribbean, and certain other areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 15385. A bill to establish a Joint Committee on Environmental Quality; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 15386. A bill to authorize the U.S. Commissioner of Education to establish educational programs to encourage understanding of policies and support of activities designed to enhance environmental quality and maintain ecological balance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 15387. A bill to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes of violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15388. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for correction of inequities respecting losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.J. Res. 1037. Joint resolution to amend Middle East Resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.J. Res. 1038. 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. HARRINGTON:

H.J. Res. 1039. 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.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 or rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15389. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Mitidieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 15390. A bill for the relief of George W. Sharman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 15391. A bill for the relief of James E. Porter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

359. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Danville, Va., relative to activities of the American Electric Power Co., which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.