HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, May 12, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Reginald R. Gunn, vicar, St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Douglas, Ga., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, creator of all men and sustainer of all life, who hast set us in the midst of a changing and perplexing world, we ask Your divine blessing and the spirit of wisdom upon the Members of this Congress, to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of Government, that, by Thy guidance, their actions may be honorable, just, and well pleasing in Thy sight. Direct and prosper all their consultations that peace, happiness, truth, and justice may be established in our land. Save us from all violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil. Defend our liberties and fashion into one truly united people all those who dwell in these United States, that there may be justice and peace, both at home and in the world. All this we ask in the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9477. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.

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

H.R. 5554. An act to provide a special milk program for the children;

H.R. 12858. An act to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States;

H.R. 13816. An act to improve and clarify certain laws affecting the Coast Guard; and

H.R. 14810. An act to amend section 602(3) and section 608c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to authorize production research under marketing agreement and order programs.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 2 to the bill H.R. 10105 entitled: "An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate receded from its amendment No. 3 and agreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 4 to the bill H.R. 10106 entitled: "An act to revise the definition of a 'child' for purposes of veterans' benefits provided by title 38, United States Code, to recognize an adopted child as a dependent from the date of issuance of an interlocutory decree."

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

S. 774. An act to authorize the mortgaging of tribal lands on the Fort Berthold Reservation for certain purposes;

S. 2162. An act to provide for special packaging to protect children from serious personal injury or serious illness resulting from handling, using, or ingesting household substances, and for other purposes; and

S. 2991. An act to extend the act establishing Federal agricultural services to Guam.

THE LATE HONORABLE LLOYD THURSTON

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Lloyd Thurston, who served with great distinction in this body for seven terms, passed away in the veterans' hospital in Des Moines, Iowa, this weekend and was buried in his hometown of Osceola on Sunday.

Mr. Thurston's contributions to the Nation were many. During the Spanish-American War he enlisted in 1898 as a private in Company 1 of the 51st regiment of the Iowa Volunteer Infantry. He served with this company during the Philippine insurrection and was honorably discharged in 1899. He was a captain in the National Guard of Iowa from 1902 to 1906.

He was prosecuting attorney of Clarke County from 1906 to 1910.

During the First World War he served with the rank of captain in Company C of the 26th Battalion. Then followed a distinguished political career which saw him serve as a member of the State senate for 4 years. He was elected to the 69th and to the six succeeding Congresses. Since that time he practiced law in his home county, Clarke County, Iowa.

Perhaps with all of these impressive commendations it might still be said that Lloyd Thurston's great contributions were as a fine Christian gentleman, a wonderful neighbor, and a friend who did serve his community up to the time of his final illness.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL) in expressing sorrow in the death of one of Iowa's foremost citizens, the Honorable Lloyd Thurston.

Mr. Thurston served his country well, both as a Member of the House of Representatives for 14 years and as a member of the Armed Forces. He was a veteran of the Spanish-American War and returned to duty in World War I.

As a Member of Congress, he was a dedicated, hard-working public servant who served his district, State, and Nation capably and with distinction.

Mrs. Gross joins me in extending heartfelt sympathy to his widow, Louella, and in expressing regrets that we could not be present for the final rites on Sunday, May 10.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of my colleagues join me in sending condolences and sincere best wishes to Louella Thurston who survives her husband.

REV. REGINALD R. GUNN

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

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a special pleasure for me to welcome the Reverend Reginald R. Gunn, vicar of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church in Douglas, Ga., to the House of Representatives, I want to thank Reverend Gunn for his inspiring words to us today.

Reverend Gunn was born and raised in the State of Georgia. He was graduated from the University of Georgia in 1962 with majors in philosophy and religion. He attended Seabury-Western Theological Seminary in Evanston, Ill., where he was graduated in 1965. Reverend Gunn served as chaplain at the University of Minnesota Hospitals in Minneapolis during the summer of 1963.

We are happy and proud that he returned to Georgia where he was ordained by the Right Reverend Albert R. Stuart, bishop of Georgia in May 1965. Reverend Gunn became vicar of Trinity Church in Cochran, St. Peter's in Eastman, and St. Luke's in Hawkinsville. He is presently vicar of St. Andrew's.

In addition to his service to the church we are all proud of Reverend Gunn's service to his community. He has served on the welfare director's board in Bleckley County since 1967. He is a group therapist at Coffee County Alcoholic and Drug Treatment Center.

Reverend Gunn is married to the former Mary Lee Ackerman of Atlanta. They have two childlren, Richard Stuart and Heather Luise.

HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3778) to change the name of the Kaysinger Bluff Dam and Reservoir, Osage River Basin, Mo., to the Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir, Mo.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3778

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Kaysinger Bluff Dam and Reservoir, Osage River Basin, Missouri, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved September 3, 1954 (Public Law 83-780), shall hereafter be known as the Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such project is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such project under and by the name of "Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir".

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives has before it legislation to rename the Kaysinger Bluff Dam and Reservoir located in Missouri, after one of our State's most honored citizens, Harry S. Truman. I hope that this body will see fit to give this "unusual" action a resounding vote of approval. I use the word "unusual," for to my knowledge at least, it is not the custom to so honor our illustrious former Presidents while they are still among the living.

It goes without saying that President Harry S. Truman, was not a "usual" man. He was in fact, the very symbol of the American eagle which clutches in one claw the olive branches and in the other a sheaf of arrows.

Most recently, I served as the cochairman of a special event designed to pay tribute to the former President on the eve of his 86th birthday. It was a play, produced in Kansas City, entitled "Give 'Em Hell Harry." This drama offered in vivid detail the turbulent years of the "Fair Deal" and permitted us to relive once again the momentous decisions and actions which were to make the "man from Missouri," a legend in his own time.

Kaysinger Bluff Dam and Reservoir, is located not too far from Independence, Mo., where the former President and his wife Bess, now reside. I can think of no more fitting way to honor one of Missouri's favorite sons, and senior statesmen than by renaming this body of water, surrounded by the land he loved, the Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir.

I commend this legislation to you.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be one of nine members of the Missouri delegation who joined in H.R. 17378 to change the name of the Kaysinger Bluff Dam and Reservoir, Osage River Basin, Mo., to the Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir, Mo.

This dam and reservoir will be the largest in either Missouri or Kansas. The choice to rename this large reservoir for the 32d President of the United States is a suitable one. There are many reasons this is true. As one of the foremost reasons, Mr. Truman is a Missourian first, last, and always. He was born in Lamar, Mo., spent his youth and young manhood in Grandview, Mo., and most of the remainder of his life in Independence, Mo.

This great reservoir will be situated just about equidistant between Lamar and Independence, northeast of Lamar and southeast of Independence. Antoher reason to rename this reservoir is that Mr. Truman has always demonstrated an interest in parks and recreational areas. Back in days when he was a judge of the County Court of Jackson County, Missouri in 1932, he authorized planning for parks and lakes much of which has been carried into completion after he left the court to become a U.S. Senator.

As I remarked in my eulogy on the floor of this House on the eve of Mr. Truman's birthday, Thursday afternoon, May 7, many things have been named for Mr. Truman in Jackson County and in Missouri. A huge sports complex now under construction will be named after Mr. Truman. Then in Independence, there is the Truman High School. It has been repeatedly suggested that the new international airport to serve the Kansas City area be named for Mr. Truman.

As a member of the county court of Jackson County, Mo., early in 1949, after Mr. Truman had been elected President in his own right, in November 1948 it was my privilege to offer a resolution which resulted in an order of that court that 15th Street in Kansas City, Mo., and Van Horn Road in Jackson County, Mo., both be renamed Truman Road. Today this road, carrying his name, is one of the principal east-west thoroughfares or arteries of traffic, in the Kansas City-Independence area.

Back in those days I knew of Mr. Truman's reluctance to have engineering projects, schools or boulevards named after him. It is my opinion he prefers today that nothing more be renamed in his honor during his lifetime. However, there is ample precedent for naming a great engineering project after a living President. In 1930 the giant dam on the Colorado River was named for President Herbert Hoover while he was still in the White House, due to his efforts when he was Secretary of Commerce, which led to the building of that important project.

My only regret is that the House of Representatives did not act either ahead of the Senate, or at least on the same day of the Senate action in this renaming of Truman Reservoir. In order to expedite action the dean of our Missouri delegation, Mr. BOLLING, today asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 3778, passed by the Senate on Thursday, May 7.

For my part I would have preferred to have introduced my own separate bill. I mention this because it is my privilege and honor to represent in the House of Representatives the city of Independence, in which the man of Independence makes his home. Moreover, in a rather unique situation it is also my privilege to represent the entire area in which the Kaysinger Reservoir, now being renamed the Truman Reservoir, is located. Finally, at the extreme south end of our district is Barton County. The county seat of that county is Lamar, Mo., which is the birthplace of Mr. Truman.

But after conferring with the dean of our delegation, Mr. BOLLING, we all agreed it was only fair that participation in this bill to rename Kaysinger as the Truman Reservoir should be shared by all members of the Missouri delegation. Every single member of our Missouri delegation loves the former President, and it was for this reason that it was considered appropriate that the entire delegation join in one single bill, which was H.R. 17378.

Truman Reservoir is an appropriate name. Mr. Truman deserves the honor of this major outdoor improvement being named after him. It will be a memorial which thousands upon thousands of Missourians and others will visit for recreation and pleasure in the years to come. It is a privilege to represent Mr. Truman in the Congress. It is an equally enjoyable privilege to join in renaming Kaysinger the Truman Reservoir.

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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members, including the gentleman now speaking, be allowed to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; when is it proposed to call up the bill?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. GROSS. When is it proposed to call up the bill?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am awaiting instructions. I thought we were

going to call the bill up either Thursday or Friday.

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

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

There was no objection.

SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS, POLICEMEN, AND FIREMEN

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings whereby the bill (H.R. 17138) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1968, and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, was read a third time and passed and laid on the table be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the engrossed bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the engrossed bill as follows:

H.R. 17138

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act Amendments of 1970".

SEC. 102. Section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–823) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 101. The annual rate of basic compensation of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the following schedule of rates:

SALARY SCHEDULE

Salary class and title	Service step						Longevity step		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	A	B	C
Class 1:									
Subclass (a)	$8,500	$8,755	$9,180	$9,605	$10,285	$10,965	$11,390	$11,815	$12,240
Fire private.									
Police private.									
Subclass (b)	9,095	9,350	9,775	10,200	10,880	11,560	11,985	12,410	12,835
Private assigned as:									
Technician.									
Plainclothesman.									
Station clerk.									
Motorcycle officer.									
Horsemounted officer.									
Class 2:									
Subclass (a)	9,775	10,340	10,905	11,470			12,035	12,600	13,165
Fire inspector.									
Subclass (b)	10,370	10,935	11,500	12,065			12,630	13,195	13,760
Fire inspector assigned as:									
Technician.									
Class 3	10,625	11,155	11,685	12,215			12,745	13,275	13,805
Assistant marine engineer.									
Assistant pilot.									
Detective.									
Class 4:									
Subclass (a)	11,475	12,050	12,625	13,200			13,775	14,350	14,925
Fire sergeant.									
Police sergeant.									
Subclass (b)	11,900	12,495	13,090	13,685			14,280	14,875	15,470
Detective sergeant.									
Subclass (c)	12,070	12,645	13,220	13,795			14,370	14,945	15,520
Police sergeant assigned as—									
Motorcycle officer.									
Horse mounted officer.									
Class 5	13,300	13,965	14,630	15,295			15,960	16,625	
Fire lieutenant.									
Police lieutenant.									
Class 6	14,550	15,280	16,010	16,740			17,470	18,200	
Marine engineer.									
Pilot.									
Class 7	15,800	16,590	17,380	18,170			18,960	19,750	
Captain.									
Class 8	18,500	19,425	20,350	21,275			22,200	23,125	
Battalion fire chief.									
Police inspector.									
Class 9	21,500	22,575	23,650	24,725			25,800	26,875	
Deputy fire chief.									
Deputy chief of police.									
Class 10	23,800	24,990	26,480	27,370			29,750	29,750	
Assistant chief of police.									
Assistant fire chief.									
Commanding officer of the White House Police.									
Commanding officer of the U.S. Park Police.									
Class 11	28,500	29,925	31,350	32,775					
Fire chief.									
Chief of police.									

SEC. 103. The rates of basic compensation of officers and members to whom the amendments made by section 102 of this title apply shall be adjusted as follows: Each officer and member receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this title at one of the scheduled service or longevity rates of a salary class or subclass in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled service or longevity step in effect on and after the effective date of this title, except that:

(1) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was assigned as technician I or plainclothesman in subclass (b) of salary class 1 or as technician II, station clerk, or motorcycle officer in subclass (c) of salary class 1 shall on the effective date of this title, be assigned as and receive basic compensation as technician, plainsclothesman, station clerk or motorcycle officer in subclass (b) of salary class 1 at the service step or longevity step in subclass (b) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(2) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was serving as a fire inspector assigned as technician I or technician II in subclass (b) or (c) of salary class 2 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed and receive basic compensation as fire inspector assigned as technician in subclass (b) of salary class 2 at the service step or longevity step in subclass (b) corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(3) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title

was serving in subclass (b) of salary class 9 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 10 at the service step or longevity step corresponding to that service step or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(4) The Fire Chief and Chief of Police who immediately prior to the effective date of this title were serving in salary class 10 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 11 and each shall be placed at the respective service step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

(5) Each officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force and United States Park Police force who is performing the duty of a dog handler on or after the effective date of this title shall receive in addition to his basic compensation an additional $595 per annum, except that if a police private is classed as technician in subclass (b) of salary class 1 in the salary schedule in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Fireman's Salary Act of 1958 solely on account of his duties as dog handler, such police private shall not be entitled to the additional compensation authorized by this paragraph.

SEC. 104. Section 303(c) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–829(c)) is amended by deleting ", (b), or (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "or (b)".

SEC. 105. The first sentence of section 304 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–830) is amended to read as follows: "Any officer or member who is promoted or transferred to a higher salary class or subclass of a higher salary class shall receive basic compensation at the lowest scheduled rate of such higher salary class or subclass which exceeds his existing rate of compensation by not less than one step increase of the next higher step of the salary class or subclass from which he is promoted or transferred."

SEC. 106. Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 401(a) of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–832(a)) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Not more than three succesive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in salary classes 1 through 4, and not more than two successive longevity step increases may be granted to any officer or member in salary classes 5 through 9.

"(3) In the case of the officers or members serving in salary classes other than salary class 1, each longevity step increase shall be equal to one step increase of the salary class or subclass of a salary class in which the officer or member is serving."

SEC. 107. (a) Each officer and member in active service on the effective date of this title to whom section 103 of this title and the amendment made by section 102 of this title apply, who is receiving basic compensation at one of the scheduled service or longevity steps of a salary class or subclass other than subclass (a) or (b) of salary class 1, and whose latest promotion has been subsequent to January 5, 1963, and prior to the effective date of this title shall (1) be placed in the service or longevity step of his salary class or subclass which provides a salary not less than the amount he would have received as a result of sections 102, 103, and 105 of this title had such promotion occurred on or after the effective date of this title, and (2) receive the appropriate scheduled rate of basic compensation for such step in the salary class or subclass in which he is serving.

(b) The rate of basic compensation received by any officer or member under the provisions of section 103 of this title and the amendment made by section 102 of this title shall not be reduced by reason of the enactment of this section.

(c) Any officer or member who receives additional compensation as a result of the enactment of this section shall be credited with any active service he has rendered in the service or longevity step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title for subsequent advancement purposes under the provisions of section 303 or section 401, as the case may be, of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–829, sec. 4–832).

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other law, individuals retired from active service prior to the effective date of this title and entitled to receive a pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the provisions of section 12 of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act shall not be entitled to receive an increase in their pension relief allowance or retirement compensation by reason of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 108. All retired officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force who at any time prior to October 1, 1956, held the rank of Assistant Superintendent shall be held and considered for the purpose of computing retirement benefits payable on and after the effective date of this title to have retired in the rank of Assistant Chief.

SEC. 109. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the Executive Protection Service who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this title for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter 8 of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period bginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this title by an officer or member who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, services in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 110. (a) Paragraph 3 of section 102 of the Act of November 13, 1966 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–823d–1(3)), is amended by inserting after "5" the following: ", 6, or".

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective only with respect to pay periods beginning on or after the effective date of this title.

SEC. 111. For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the provisions of chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code (relating to Government employees group life insurance), all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 112. This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1970.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN POLICE MATTERS

SEC. 201. Paragraph (5) of section 1 of the Act of February 28, 1901 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–122), is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The trial board shall be the exclusive body to receive, hear, and determine complaints against officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force."

SEC. 202. (a) The uniform of officers and members of the United States Park Police force, the Executive Protective Service, the Capitol Police, and the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall bear a distinctive patch showing the flag of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior in the case of the United States Park Police force, the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the Executive Protective Service, the Capitol Police Board in the case of the Capitol Police, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia in the case of the Metropolitan Police force shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(c) This section shall take effect one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this title.

SEC. 203. All laws of the United States in force on the date of enactment of this title in which reference is made to the White House Police force are amended by substituting "Executive Protective Service" for each such reference.

SEC. 204. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside", approved July 25, 1956 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–132a) is amended—

(A) by inserting immediately after "(a)" the following: "except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section,";

(B) by striking out ", except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section," in the second sentence;

(C) by striking out "twelve" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-five"; and

(D) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) For the purpose of this Act, the Chief of Police of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Chief of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, as the case may be, may in individual cases waive the requirement that an officer or member reside within the Washington, District of Columbia, metropolitan district."

TITLE III—SALARY INCREASE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970".

SEC. 302. The District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1501) is amended by striking the salary schedules contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	9
Class 1:									
Superintendent of schools	$35,000								
Class 2:									
Group A, Deputy superintendent	31,000								
Group B, Associate superintendent	29,000								
Class 3:									
Assistant superintendent	22,190	$22,720	$23,250	$23,780	$24,310	$24,840	$25,370	$25,900	$26,430
Class 4	19,480	19,940	20,400	20,860	21,320	21,780	22,240	22,700	23,160
Director, curriculum.									
Director, staff development.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	17,600	18,040	184,80	18,920	19,360	19,800	20,240	20,680	21,120
Group B, master's degree	18,380	18,820	19,260	19,700	20,140	20,580	21,020	21,460	21,900
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	18,770	19,210	19,650	20,090	20,530	20,970	21,410	21,850	22,290
Group D, doctor's degree	19,160	19,600	20,040	20,480	20,920	21,360	21,800	22,240	22,680
Chief examiner.									
Executive assistants to associate superintendents.									
Director of food services.									
Director, industrial and adult education.									
Executive assistant to Deputy superintendent.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level IV, principal	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level III, principal	17,345	17,770	18,195	18,620	19,045	19,470	19,895	20,320	20,745
Level II, principal	16,830	17,255	17,680	18,105	18,530	18,955	19,380	19,805	20,230
Level I, principal	16,315	16,740	17,165	17,590	18,015	18,440	18,865	19,290	19,715
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	18,250	18,675	19,100	19,525	19,950	20,375	20,800	21,225	21,650
Level IV, principal	18,250	18,675	19,100	19,525	19,950	20,375	20,800	21,225	21,650
Level III, principal	17,735	18,160	18,585	19,010	19,435	19,860	20,285	20,710	21,135
Level II, principal	17,220	17,645	18,070	18,495	18,920	19,345	19,770	20,195	20,620
Level I, principal	16,705	17,130	17,555	17,980	18,405	18,830	19,255	19,680	20,105
Group D, doctors' degree	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level IV, principal	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level III, principal	18,125	18,550	18,975	19,400	19,825	20,250	20,675	21,100	21,525
Level II, principal	17,610	18,035	18,460	18,885	19,310	19,735	20,160	20,585	21,010
Level I, principal	17,095	17,520	17,945	18,370	18,795	19,220	19,645	20,070	20,495
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent of pupil personnel services.									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education evening and summer school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	16,205	16,595	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	16,595	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325	19,715
Group D, doctor's degree	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325	19,715	20,105
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audicvisual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	14,800	15,175	15,550	15,925	16,300	16,675	17,050	17,425	17,800
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,190	15,565	15,940	16,315	16,690	17,065	17,440	17,815	18,190
Group D, doctor's degree	15,580	15,955	16,330	16,705	17,080	17,455	17,830	18,205	18,580
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	13,880	14,240	14,600	14,960	15,320	15,680	16,040	16,400	16,760
Group B, master's degree	14,660	15,020	15,380	15,740	16,100	16,460	16,820	17,180	17,540
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,050	15,410	15,770	16,130	16,490	16,850	17,210	17,570	17,930
Group D, doctor's degree	15,440	15,800	16,160	16,520	16,880	17,240	17,600	17,960	18,320
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	14,095	14,445	14,795	15,145	15,495	15,845	16,195	16,545	16,895
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,485	14,835	15,185	15,535	15,885	16,235	16,585	16,935	17,285
Group D, doctor's degree	14,875	15,225	15,575	15,925	16,275	16,625	16,975	17,325	17,675
Assistant director, audiovisual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									

Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	$13,670	$14,005	$14,340	$14,675	$15,010	$15,345	$15,680	$16,015	$16,350
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,060	14,395	14,730	15,065	15,400	15,735	16,070	16,405	16,740
Group D, doctor's degree	14,450	14,785	15,120	15,445	15,790	16,125	16,460	16,795	17,130
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	13,200	13,525	13,850	14,175	14,500	14,825	15,150	15,475	15,800
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,590	13,915	14,240	14,565	14,890	15,215	15,540	15,865	16,190
Group D, doctor's degree	13,980	14,305	14,630	14,955	15,280	15,605	15,930	16,255	16,580
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	12,080	12,456	12,850	13,235	13,620	14,005	14,390	14,775	15,160
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,470	12,855	13,240	13,625	14,010	14,395	14,780	15,165	15,550
Group D, doctor's degree	12,860	13,245	13,630	14,015	14,400	14,785	15,170	15,555	15,940
Psychiatric social worker.									

Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Longevity step Y
Class 14:														
Group A, bachelor's degree	$9,250	$9,660	$10,070	$10,480	$10,890	$11,300	$11,710	$12,120	$12,530	$12,940	$13,350	$13,760	$14,170	----------
Group B, master's degree	10,030	10,440	10,850	11,260	11,670	12,080	12,490	12,900	13,310	13,720	14,130	14,540	14,950	----------
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,420	10,830	11,240	11,650	12,060	12,470	12,880	13,290	13,700	14,110	14,520	14,930	15,340	----------
Group D, doctor's degree	10,810	11,220	11,630	12,040	12,450	12,860	13,270	13,680	14,090	14,500	14,910	15,320	15,730	----------
Coordinator of practical nursing.														
Census supervisor.														
Class 15:														
Group A, bachelor's degree	7,800	8,115	8,430	8,745	9,060	9,375	9,760	10,145	10,530	10,915	11,300	11,685	12,070	$13,000
Group A–1, bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours	8,190	8,505	8,820	9,135	9,450	9,765	10,150	10,535	10,920	11,305	11,690	12,075	12,460	13,800
Group B, master's degree	8,580	8,965	9,350	9,735	10,120	10,505	10,990	11,475	11,960	12,445	12,930	13,415	13,900	15,200
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,970	9,355	9,740	10,125	10,510	10,895	11,380	11,865	12,350	12,835	13,320	13,805	14,290	15,600
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree	9,360	9,745	10,130	10,515	10,900	11,285	11,770	12,255	12,740	13,225	13,710	14,195	14,680	16,100
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.														
Attendance officer.														
Child labor inspectors.														
Counselor, placement.														
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.														
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.														
Research assistant.														
School social worker.														
Speech correctionist.														
School psychologist.														

(2) Section 2(c)(2) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1511(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The terms 'plus fifteen credit hours' and 'plus thirty credit hours' mean the equivalent of not less than fifteen graduate semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree or thirty graduate semester hours beyond the master's degree as the case may be in academic, vocational, or professional courses, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board, except that in the case of a shop teacher in the vocational education program the fifteen or thirty semester hours need not be graduate semester hours. Graduate credit hours beyond thirty which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing such thirty credit hours. The term 'plus sixty credit hours' means the equivalent of not less than sixty graduate semester hours in academic, vocational, or professional courses beyond a master's degree, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board, except that in the case of a shop teacher in the vocational education program the sixty semester hours need not be graduate semester hours. Graduate credit hours beyond thirty which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing such sixty credit hours."

(3) Section 3 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1512) is amended by—

(A) striking out "For" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), for";

(B) inserting immediately after "position" each time it appears "or salary class"; and

(C) by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(b) The Board of Education may place in a permanent status any fully qualified employee in salary class 15 having three or more years of satisfactory service, including service in an educational system or institution of recognized standing outside the District of Columbia, as determined by the Board, at any time beginning one year after the commencement of the probationary period of such employee. Any employee appointed to permanent status under this subsection shall be considered an employee of the Board on permanent tenure."

(4) Section 4 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1521) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Any employee of the Board of Education in group A of salary class 15 who possesses a bachelor's degree plus fifteen credit hours shall be transferred in accordance with section 10(a) and (b) to group A–1 of salary class 15."

(5) Section 5 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1522) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Whenever a teacher or school officer is changed to a lower salary class or to a lower level in the same salary class as in the case of school principals in the public school system, the Superintendent of Schools is authorized to fix the rate of compensation at a rate provided for in the salary class or level to which the employee is changed which does not exceed his existing rate of compensation, except that if his existing rate falls between two service steps provided in such lower salary class or level he shall receive the higher of such rates; if he is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum rate provided in such lower salary class or level in which he is to be placed, he will retain his existing rate of compensation and receive one-half of any future increases granted his new salary class or level until such time as his rate of basic compensation is no longer in excess of the maximum rate provided in such lower salary class or level. This subsection shall not apply if such reduction to a lower salary class or level is (1) for personal cause, (2) at the request of such teacher or school officer, (3) as a condition of a previous temporary promotion to a higher grade, or (4) because of a reduction in force brought about by lack of funds or curtailment of work."

(6) Section 6(a)(1) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1531(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) On July 1 of each year, following the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each permanent employee in salary class 15 who is on service step 13 and has completed 15 years of creditable service shall be assigned to longevity step Y. Each permanent employee in salary class 15 who is in longevity step X, on such effective date, shall be assigned to longevity step Y. In determining years of creditable service in salary classes 3 through 15 for placement on service steps, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the placement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned or who are brought under this Act in accordance with the provisions of this section."

(7) Section 6(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1531(b)) is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "On July 1 of each year, following the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each permanent employee who has not reached the highest service step for his group, or, if his salary class has no group, the highest service step for such salary

class, shall advance one such service step until he reaches the highest service step for such group or salary class. However, the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement following any school year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer."

(8) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 10 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1535 (a) and (b)), respectively, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) On and after the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each promotion to group A–1, group B, group C, or group D within a salary class shall become effective—

"(1) on the date of the regular Board meeting of the twelfth month prior to the date of approval of promotion by the Board, or

"(2) on the effective date of the master's degree or doctor's degree or on the completion of thirty or sixty credit hours beyond the master's degree or on the completion of fifteen credit hours beyond the bachelor's degree, as the case may be,

whichever is later.

"(b) Any employee in a position in a salary class in the salary schedules in section 1 of this Act who is promoted to group A–1, group B, group C, or group D of such salary class shall be placed in the same numerical service step in his new group which he would have occupied in the group from which he was promoted."

(9) Section 13(a) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Board is authorized to conduct as part of its public school system the following: summer school programs, extended school year programs, adult education programs, and Americanization schools. The pay for teachers, officers, and other education employees in the summer school programs, adult education school programs, and veterans' summer high school centers shall be as follows:

Classification	Per period		
	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Summer school (regular):			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools; counselor, elementary and secondary schools; librarian, elementary and secondary schools; school social worker; speech correctionist; school psychologist	$6.86	$7.61	$8.42
Psychiatric social worker	8.02	8.92	9.86
Clinical psychologist	8.35	9.29	10.28
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary school	9.69	10.77	11.92
Supervising director	10.02	11.15	12.33
Principal, elementary and secondary schools	10.69	11.89	13.15
Veterans' summer school centers:			
Teacher	6.86	7.61	8.42
Adult education schools:			
Teacher	7.54	8.38	9.27
Assistant principal	10.66	11.85	13.11
Principal	11.76	13.07	14.46

(10) Section 13(d)(2) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(d)(2)) is amended by striking out "monthly" and inserting in lieu thereof "semimonthly".

(11) Section 14 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1543) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. On July 1, 1970, each employee assigned to salary class 15 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in twenty or twenty-four semimonthly installments, at the discretion of such employee, in accordance with existing law. All other employees covered by the provisions of this Act shall have their annual salaries paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments in accordance with existing law. Annual salaries for employees paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments means calendar year for purposes of this section."

SEC. 303. The increase provided in this title for the position of Superintendent of Schools under salary class 1 of the salary schedule shall be effective only with respect to individuals employed in that position on or after the date of the enactment of this title.

SEC. 304. (a) The third paragraph under the paragraph beginnning with the side heading "FOR ALLOWANCE TO PRINCIPALS:" under the center heading "PUBLIC SCHOOLS." in the first section of the Act of May 26, 1908, entitled "An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and nine, and for other purposes" (D.C. Code, sec. 31–609) is amended by striking out ": *Provided*, That the salaries of other teachers shall begin when they enter upon their duties." and inserting in lieu thereof ". However, effective July 1, 1970, the salaries of employees in salary class 15 and such other employees who were paid on a ten-month basis immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, whose services commence with the opening of school and who shall perform their duties, shall begin on the first day of September and shall be paid in twenty semimonthly installments, except that employees in salary class 15 may elect to be paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments. The first payment shall be made on the first day of October, or as near that date as practicable; and the second payment shall be made fifteen days thereafter or as near that date as practicable. Subsequent payments shall be on the first and sixteenth days of the month or as near those date as practicable. The salaries of other employees in salary class 15 shall begin when they enter upon their duties."

(b) The fourth paragraph under the paragraph beginning with the side heading "FOR ALLOWANCE TO PRINCIPALS:" under the center heading "PUBLIC SCHOOLS." in the first section of such Act of May 26, 1908 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–630), is amended to read as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1970, the following rules for division of time and computation of pay for services rendered are established: Compensations of all employees in salary class 15 and such other employees who were paid on a ten-month basis immediately prior to the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act amendments of 1970 shall be paid in twenty semimonthly installments, except that employees in salary class 15 may elect to be paid in twenty-four semimonthly installments. In making payments for a fractional part of a month, one-fifteenth of an installment shall be the daily rate of pay. For the purpose of computing such compensation and for computing time for services rendered during a fractional part of a semimonthly period in connection with the compensation of such employees, each and every semimonthly period shall be held to consist of fifteen days, without regard to the actual number of days in any semimonthly period thus excluding the 31st day of any calendar months from the computation and treating February as if it actually had thirty days. Any person entering the service of the schools during a thirty-one-day month and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to pay for that month from the date of entry to the 30th day of such month, both days inclusive; and any person entering such service during the month of February and serving until the end thereof shall be entitled to one month's pay, less as many days thereof as there were days elapsed prior to the date of entry. For one day's unauthorized absence on the 31st day of any calendar month one day's pay shall be forfeited."

SEC. 305. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this Act, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this title, for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after January 1, 1970, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by any such employee who dies during such period.

(b) For purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 306. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after January 1, 1970.

TITLE IV—CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM

SEC. 401. The first section of the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949 (D.C. Code, sec. 31–691) is amended by inserting after "for any purpose" the following: "authorized by the Board of Education".

SEC. 402. The Board of Education shall formulate within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, policies, procedures, and rules and regulations governing employee-management relations between the Board of Education and its employees and organizations representing such employees. Such rules and regulations shall include, but shall not be limited to, a clear statement of the rights of employees, procedures with respect to the recognition of labor organizations, determination of appropriate units, consultation and negotiation with labor organizations, approval of agreements, mediation, and impasse resolution, policies and practices regarding consultation with other organizations and associations and individual employees, and standards of conduct for labor organizations. The policies, procedures, and rules and regulations so established by the Board of Education shall be consistent with the provisions of Executive Order 11491, dated October 28, 1969 (relating to labor-management relations in the Federal service); the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; and such other Federal and District of Columbia Government personnel policies as may be required by statute.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE LAWS

SEC. 501. Section 3 of title VI of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1567b(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. IMPOSITION OF TAX.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every resident a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	2% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$20, plus 3% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	$50, plus 4% of excess over $2,000.
Over $3,000 but not over $5,000	$90, plus 5% of excess over $3,000.
Over $5,000 but not over $8,000	$190, plus 6% of excess over $5,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	$370, plus 7% of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $17,000	$650, plus 8% of excess over $12,000.
Over $17,000 but not over $25,000	$1,050, plus 9% of excess over $17,000.
Over $25,000	$1,770, plus 10% of excess over $25,000."

SEC. 502. (a) Paragraph (3) of section 125 of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2602) and paragraph (3) of section 212 of the District of Columbia Use Tax Act (D.C. Code, sec. 47–2702) are each amended by inserting after "wines" the following: "for human consumption other than off the premises where such liquors, beer, or wines are sold".

(b) The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—PAY RATE FOR THE COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD

SEC. 601. (a) Section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1889 (D.C. Code, sec. 39–201), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 7.", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any person serving as the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard shall be paid at a rate equal to the minimum rate of basic pay for GS–15 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code, and shall be subject to the provisions of subchapter IV of chapter 55 of such title.

"(c) Any officer of the Armed Forces of the United States who, while serving on active duty, is detailed to serve as commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard shall, while so detailed, be entitled to receive only the pay to which he is entitled as an officer of the Armed Forces."

(b) The paragraph under the center heading "NATIONAL GUARD" in the first section of the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961 (74 Stat. 25), is amended by striking out "at not to exceed $13,300 per annum".

(c) The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after the date of enactment of this title.

The engrossed 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.

VACATING PROCEEDINGS ON S. 2694, SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS, POLICEMEN, AND FIREMEN

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings whereby the House considered, amended, and passed the bill of the Senate (S. 2694) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 and the District of Columbia Teacher's Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes, be vacated and that further proceedings on that bill be indefinitely postponed.

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

There was no objection.

TO FURTHER AMEND THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 199) to further amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 199

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective April 13, 1970, clause (A) in clause (1) of section 5(c) of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress) is amended by striking out "at least 10 percentum" and inserting in lieu thereof "at least 6 percentum".

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 199 is to correct a typographical error in the recently enacted Public Law 91–230.

On April 1, 1970, the conference report on H.R. 514 was agreed to in the Senate. On April 7, 1970, the conference report was agreed to in the House. The bill was signed into law on April 13, 1970, by the President and is Public Law 91–230. In the conference report on page 41 (H. Rept. 91–937) a change as a result of a Senate amendment was made to the eligibility requirement under Public Law 81–815 which provides for school construction in federally affected areas. The conference report accurately reflected the decision of the conferees with respect to the Senate amendment. However, in printing the Public Law 91–230, on page 37, the 6-percent minimum eligibility was erroneously printed by the Government Printing Office as 10 percent. Indeed, the House and the Senate never intended this change. In fact, the alteration of this figure was not a conference issue.

Senate Joint Resolution 199 would simply correct this typographical error. I would hope that prior to the enactment of this joint resolution the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would acknowledge that Public Law 91–230 contains this typographical error and would continue to administer Public Law 81–815 as if the printed law was 6 percent rather than 10 percent.

The Senate joint resolution 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.

WALTER REUTHER, A LOSS TO THE NATION

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we are going to miss Walter Reuther.

We will miss him this coming summer, when his personal prestige might have avoided the prolonged strike that now threatens the auto industry.

But more importantly than Walter Reuther the labor leader, we will miss Walter Reuther the responsible American citizen. Rejecting the notion that his duty lay merely in fattening his members' pay checks, Mr. Reuther always felt he could best serve his auto workers by working to improve the world in which we all live. He endorsed the 1963 civil rights march when the AFL–CIO did not. He expressed deep reservations about the Vietnam war when it was unfashionable to do so. He was a strong advocate of consumer protection and consumer education. He consistently worked to decrease international tension and slow the arms race, and he recognized that the economic security of his members and the country will depend in the long run on our ability to convert to a peace economy.

While many labor leaders were becoming indistinguishable from management except by their higher incomes, Mr. Reuther never lost sight of the dangers of selling one's soul to the establishment, and that is something we might all think about occasionally.

PROVIDING FOR A CUTOFF OF FUNDS FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN VIETNAM, CAMBODIA, AND LAOS

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

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, last week 17 other Members of the House and I offered a resolution to provide a funds cutoff for military activities in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. In the absence of a declaration of war, or in the absence of other specific congressional authority, it would provide for the safe and orderly withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Vietnam by the end of June 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that today Congressman FRANK HORTON became the 50th cosponsor in the House, and we now have a total of 54 on the list of Congressmen sponsoring this legislation.

The resolution is H. Res. 1000. I hope the people of this country will urge their Congressmen to become cosponsors of this resolution.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

Although confronted with the same financial problems during fiscal year 1969 that plagued public housing agencies throughout the nation, the National Capital Housing Authority continued its search for new ways to provide good housing for the low income residents of the District of Columbia. The Authority made progress in many areas toward increasing both the supply and the utility of public housing. Details of this progress are reported in the authority's annual report, which I transmit herewith.

The effort to provide a sound public housing program requires concerted cooperation and coordination among all levels of government, private enterprise, and the community. Under Mayor Washington's leadership, I anticipate that further important progress will be made toward achieving our goal of decent housing and effective community services for all the residents of our Nation's Capital.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 12, 1970.*

DEDICATION OF THE OMAR N. BRADLEY MUSEUM AT CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on May 8, 1970, it was my pleasure to attend the dedication of the Omar N. Bradley Museum at Carlisle Barracks, Pa., quite incidentally the post of my first military duty.

It was significant that this particular date was chosen for the ceremony because it was also the 25th anniversary of V–E Day. May I say that no man did more to make V–E Day possible than did Gen. Omar N. Bradley. After the general cut the ribbon, officially opening the museum, he made this statement:

> Some years ago I was asked to define what FREEDOM means to me. My answer, which I have had occasion to quote recently was: "Freedom—no other word was ever spoken that has held out greater hope, demanded greater sacrifice, needed more to be nurtured, blessed more its giver, damned more its destroyer, or came closer to being God's will on earth. May Americans ever be its protector."

Mr. Speaker, these eloquent words from a great citizen soldier should be heeded by all. For those who are interested in U.S. military history, a visit to the Gen. Omar N. Bradley Museum would certainly prove worth while.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 994 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 994

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, all points of order against the provisions contained under the following headings are hereby waived: "National Aeronautics and Space Administration" beginning on page 19, line 17 through page 21, line 8; and "National Science Foundation" beginning on page 21, line 18 through page 23, line 14.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 113]

Anderson, Ill.	Cohelan	Green, Oreg.
Anderson, Tenn.	Collins	Gubser
Ashley	Conte	Halpern
Aspinall	Conyers	Harrington
Ayres	Corman	Harvey
Baring	Cramer	Hébert
Biester	Culver	Kee
Bingham	Cunningham	Keith
Blatnik	Daddario	Kirwan
Brademas	Davis, Ga.	Long, La.
Brock	Dawson	Lowenstein
Broomfield	Dickinson	McCarthy
Brown, Calif.	Diggs	McMillan
Buchanan	Dorn	Macdonald, Mass.
Cabell	Dowdy	Mahon
Carey	Edmondson	Mann
Carter	Fallon	Meskill
Celler	Fish	Mollohan
Chisholm	Fisher	Moorhead
Clancy	Ford, William D.	Morse
Clark	Fraser	Morton
Clausen, Don H.	Frelinghuysen	Mosher
Clay	Gallagher	Murphy, N.Y.
	Gray	Ottinger
Pollock	Scheuer	Teague, Tex.
Powell	Schneebeli	Tunney
Reid, Ill.	Slack	Whalen
Reid, N.Y.	Steiger, Wis.	Wilson, Bob
Reifel	Stokes	Wright
Rosenthal	Stratton	Yatron
Ruppe	Taft	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 338 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL RATES TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Subcommittee on Postal Rates may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives points of order on a couple of sections of the independent offices-Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. The waivers are against the provisions under the headings of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the National Science Foundation. These waivers are necessary because the authorization bills are not as yet enacted, although both authorization bills have passed the House.

Does the gentleman from Iowa desire me to yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, will the gentleman yield?

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

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

I wish that the gentleman would rephrase his statement to say that these requests for waivers would have been unnecessary had the legislative committees proceeded with their business in ample time and had the other body acted with less foot-dragging. I do not believe this waiver to be a necessary procedure at all.

It is my understanding that we will get another one of these rules tomorrow in connection with the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation bill requesting waivers of points of order.

If this is going to become the accepted procedure, we might as well throw out the rule book, at least those provisions dealing with orderly procedure of the

House, the rules being that the authorization bills must be passed and signed by the President before the appropriations bills may be considered on the floor of the House.

Let us just throw out that part of the rule book that provides for the passage of the authorizing legislation prior to consideration of the appropriation bills.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman from Iowa makes a good point. This is an unusual procedure. It is an unusual procedure which the Committee on Rules is trying to use in a discriminating and frank fashion, with the cooperation of the legislative committees. I believe—and I know in this case, and I believe in every case, our only reason for making these exceptions—and I certainly hope it will not become the rule, but will continue to be exceptions—is to expedite the business of the House, and to encourage all involved in the legislative process to expedite the legislative process.

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

Mr. BOLLING. I am glad to yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman from Missouri say that this is an unusual procedure, and express the hope that it will not have to be indulged in as a common practice. I wish I could share the gentleman's hope, but we see these waiver procedures being used increasingly and I for one do not like it at all.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that the gentleman from Missouri has adequately explained the resolution, House Resolution 994. It just waives points of order against two sections in the pending appropriation bill so we can proceed and handle that matter on the floor of the House this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 17548, with Mr. ANNUNZIO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we bring you today the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for fiscal 1971.

This bill provides funding for some 20 independent agencies and for the vital and important programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Hearings on the bill continued for more than 2 months and included many witnesses and extended testimony concerning every facet of every program in every agency before our committee.

The hearings covered more than 5,000 pages of testimony and exhibits in four volumes of published hearings.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been thoroughly considered and thoroughly discussed.

Let me at the outset, Mr. Chairman, commend and congratulate all members of the subcommittee.

There are 10 members of our subcommittee—all contributed significantly to this bill.

This bill is a product of the entire subcommittee.

Let me commend, in this connection, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIPLEY), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MARSH), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), and the ranking minority member of the committee, the able and genial gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS), the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MCDADE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON).

All have made significant contributions to the preparation of the bill in bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman permit me also to compliment and commend our three very able and efficient committee clerks—Homer Skarin, Hunter Spillan, and Paul Thomson—they are very valuable and most efficient.

The committee had to set some priorities because of budgetary stringency.

The budget submitted this year is a tight budget—and the reductions provided are not as great as in the past.

We are, of course, cognizant of the demands upon our resources and the budget by the war in Vietnam.

We are also aware of the problem of inflation.

We considered 100 items in this bill—and some 54 items were cut and reduced.

However, we are also aware that the vital functions of Government must be continued and that our cities—large and small—must be assisted in the solution of their problems.

While this bill is a big bill—it is a prudent bill—which responds to the needs of the Nation in these areas.

The Nation's increasing concern over the quality of our life and environment is reflected in this bill.

The Federal Communications Commission is directed in our report on page 5 to "develop sound and effective policies regarding violence and obscenity on television, and to develop the full potential of this medium to enhance the quality of American life."

The Federal Power Commission is urged to be on the alert for possible future power brownouts and blackouts.

The National Science Foundation is urged to proceed with its research into problems of the environment.

The Council on Environmental Quality chaired by Chairman Russell Train is funded in this bill to examine the overall problems of environment and the Federal Government's approach to the solution to these problems—and to recommend policies for protecting and improving the quality of our Nation's environment.

The Appalachian Regional Commission is also concerned with the problem of our environment as evidenced by the reclamation of stripmine areas for park purposes.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has a number of programs concerned with the environment—including urban renewal, open space land grants, rehabilitation of existing homes and model cities, among others.

SUMMARY OF BILL

There are five titles to this bill.

Title I which includes the Independent Offices.

Title II which includes offices in the Executive Office of the President.

Title III. The Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Title IV. Federal Corporations—in this instance the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Title V. General provisions.

As I indicated earlier this is a major appropriations bill and time will not permit a detailed discussion of all items in the bill.

I recommend to all Members the reading of this report, and I commend also the hearings which explain in detail the justification for the budget requests in testimony and exhibits.

For your information at this point I am inserting in the RECORD a summary breakdown by agencies of the amounts recommended in the bill.

The table follows:

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY IN THE BILL

Agency or item	Revised budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with budget estimates
Appalachian Regional Commission	$958,000	$958,000	
Appalachian regional development programs	295,500,000	291,500,000	—$4,000,000
Civil Defense (DOD)	73,800,000	72,000,000	—1,800,000
Civil Defense (HEW)	3,755,000	3,500,000	—255,000
Civil Service Commission	97,222,000	94,203,000	—3,019,000
Commission on Government Procurement	1,800,000	1,500,000	—300,000
Council on Environmental Quality	700,000	650,000	—50,000
Disaster relief	65,000,000	65,000,000	
Federal Communications Commission	24,900,000	24,725,000	—175,000
Federal Power Commission	18,450,000	18,210,000	—240,000
Federal Trade Commission	21,375,000	20,500,000	—875,000
General Services Administration	696,593,500	724,916,300	+28,322,800
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	3,333,000,000	3,197,000,000	—136,000,000
National Aeronautics and Space Council	$560,000	$400,000	—$160,000
National Commission on Consumer Finance	500,000	500,000	
National Science Foundation	513,000,000	497,000,000	—16,000,000
Office of Emergency Preparedness	11,835,000	10,215,000	—1,620,000
Office of Science and Technology	2,175,000	2,000,000	—175,000
Renegotiation Board	4,235,000	4,110,000	—125,000
Securities and Exchange Commission	21,916,000	21,716,000	—200,000
Selective Service System	76,000,000	75,000,000	—1,000,000
Veterans Administration	8,960,528,000	8,960,528,000	
Department of Housing and Urban Development	2,993,021,000	2,929,081,000	—63,940,000
Total	17,216,823,500	17,015,212,300	—201,611,200

By way of overall summary, budget requests totaled $17,216,823,500.

Our committee is recommending $17,015,212,300.

This is a net reduction below the budget request of $201,611,200.

Seventy-five percent of the funds appropriated in this bill are for the three largest agencies funded in the bill—the Veterans' Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

In addition to appropriations for these important agencies—this bill provides funds for regulatory agencies that are charged with being guardians of the public interest.

Agencies funded in this bill provide an umbrella of protection for consumers and citizens.

For example, the Federal Communications Commission regulates and supervises the radio and television industry standards in an effort to insure that these media will be operated in the public interest.

The Federal Trade Commission shields consumers from unfair and deceptive trade practices and fraud in the marketplace.

The Securities and Exchange Commission regulates the sale of stocks and securities in the open market, with full disclosure required in the public interest.

The Federal Power Commission is charged with the responsibility of protecting the public interest and the consumer with its regulation of natural gas and electric utility rates.

This bill also provides funding for the more than 50 programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to aid and assist our cities—large and small—in their programs of growth and progress.

Let me highlight some of the major actions of the committee.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The committee recommends $94,203,000 for the Civil Service Commission.

This includes funds for salaries and expenses of the staff of the Commission—the employee health benefits programs—annuities under special acts—and other programs of the Commission.

The bill contains $700,000 to finance the Federal Labor Relations Council established by Executive Order of the President to mediate and settle labor-management disputes in the Federal Government.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The committee is recommending an appropriation of $24,725,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Communications Commission—a reduction of $175,000 from the budget estimate.

The committee believes there is ample funding provided for the Commission to develop sound and effective policies regarding violence and obscenity on television.

The committee is deeply concerned over the importance of using radio and television in the public interest.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The committee recommends $18,210,000 for salaries and expenses of the Federal Power Commission—a reduction of $240,000 from the budget request of $18,450,000.

The committee also approved funds for a study and evaluation of the systems of the natural gas industry.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The committee recommends an appropriation of $20,500,000 for the work of the important Federal Trade Commission.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends $724,916,300 for all programs of the General Services Administration.

This is a net increase of $28,322,800 over the budget request due primarily to the method of financing new public building projects included in the budget.

The GSA Administrator recommended the reprograming of $82,725,000 for 13 projects previously funded.

The committee recommends $142,024,300 in new appropriations and $48,473,200 to be reprogramed from eight projects previously funded.

Funds are included for six new construction projects in fiscal 1971—and for three superstructures.

These include the FBI Building in the District of Columbia and Federal buildings in Philadelphia and Chicago.

To repeat: The committee has approved reprograming of eight of 13 projects—and approved the funding of other projects which are smaller in amount and for which immediate capability for construction has been demonstrated.

A list of construction projects funded in the bill may be found on page 7 of the report.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding I want to get one thing straight as we go along, and perhaps the gentleman has answered it by referring to the building programs. In looking at the reports accompanying this bill, if I am correct, the amount is $1,152 million above the appropriations for the same general purposes in this present fiscal year. Is that correct?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that this bill is $1,151,966,800 over the 1970 funds that have been appropriated to date. The second supplemental for 1970 has not been taken into consideration, since it has passed the House only last week.

Mr. GROSS. But is the expenditure called for in this bill not $1,151 million-plus above that of last year?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct, as I have explained.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me so I may expand on that?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I think right at this point the record should reflect the fact that if we consider the second supplemental that this House passed last week and add those funds to last year's bill, the increase over last year is not $1 billion as the gentleman from Iowa said, but is $255 million. So we have to compare this bill with the total funds that were made available in 1970. When that comparison is made, you will see that our table in the report does not reflect the action of the House on the supplemental. I ask the Chairman if that is not correct.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Yes, I say to my good friend, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if I may have just a second or two on that I was not saying these figures were accurate. I was merely asking if these statements and figures in the report reflected the true state of affairs. The gentleman has explained the recently approved supplemental should be added to last year's amount, which I accept, but I do not

want the record to show I was saying this was the case.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend.

Mr. Chairman, for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service of GSA the committee is recommending $335,250,000—$8,903,000 below the budget request.

For repair and improvement of public buildings the committee recommends the full budget estimate of $83,280,000.

The backlog in needed repair and maintenance of Federal buildings will continue to grow.

However, the committee recommends that in the next budget GSA develop plans and requests that will begin to reduce this backlog of needed and essential repairs and improvements of federally owned buildings.

The committee recommends $83,346,000 for the Federal Supply Service operated by the General Services Administration.

The GSA operates one of the largest supply systems in the world—providing supplies for both civilian agencies of Government and the Department of Defense.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The budget recommendation for NASA is $3,333,000,000.

The committee recommends $3,197,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1971.

This is a reduction of $136 million below the budget estimate.

The committee recommendation is $403,875,000 below the House authorization and $118,950,000 below the Senate authorization.

We are, therefore, below the House, Senate, and the budget in our recommendation.

The Apollo 11 flight achieved the initial goal of landing men on the moon and returning them safely to earth.

Apollo 12 confirmed our excellence, leadership, and maneuverability in space with a second safe lunar landing and return.

The recent Apollo 13 flight, while not completely successful, confirmed the ability of our great space team—in space and on earth—to overcome terrible obstacles and a critical accident to return our astronauts safely to earth in an improvised and crippled spacecraft.

Following the Apollo 13 accident, our committee held further hearings with Dr. Thomas O. Paine, Administrator of NASA; Dr. Wernher von Braun, Deputy Administrator of NASA; and other officials of the space agency.

It is the view of the committee that the review board which has been appointed will consume considerable time on its study and evaluation of the cause or causes of the Apollo 13 accident.

This obviously will take time—and as we pointed out in our report—the committee wants to give ample time for the study and report on the Apollo 13 problem.

The committee is not reducing NASA's appropriation because of any lack of faith in our astronauts or in the space program—it is the feeling of the committee that there is no compelling reason to proceed with further missions until the review board has reported and appropriate additional safeguards provided.

For research and development for NASA the committee recommends $2,500,000,000, a reduction of $106,100,000 in the budget estimate.

This amount will provide for one Apollo flight in 1971 instead of two flights as originally planned.

The President has recommended initial funding in the 1971 budget for research and program definition for the space shuttle and space station program—also approved by the authorizing committees of the Congress.

Concerning the space station and space shuttle, the funds recommended here will provide for the beginning of research and program definition for this program.

The committee will give further consideration to the funding needs for this program—which represents the major thrust of the space program in the next decade—after program definition has been achieved and a report made to the committee next year.

The committee supports the space shuttle and space station as appropriate programs for the Nation in its next major space effort.

We urge, however, that this program be pursued in a deliberate and precise manner—with proper precautions for safety.

The committee recommends $18,275,000 for construction of facilities—a reduction of $16,325,000 from the budget estimate.

This amount will provide for several important construction projects—but omits certain proposed new laboratories, which the committee believes can be deferred at this time.

For program management the committee recommends $678,725,000—a reduction of $13,575,000 from the amount recommended.

The funding recommended will provide for a viable and ongoing space program.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

For the National Science Foundation the committee recommends $495,000,000—for fiscal 1971—a cut and reduction of $16,000,000 below the budget request.

This is one of the lowest reductions and smallest cuts made in the past several years in the Foundation's budget and is an increase of $57,000,000 over appropriations provided for the current year.

While the budget proposes an overall decrease in science education assistance, the committee has recommended the present level of support of $23,300,000 for the summer institutes program to provide supplementary training for high school science and mathematics teachers.

The committee considers the summer institutes program to be productive, needed and helpful—and of great benefit to science instruction and students throughout the Nation.

In view of the strong emphasis on environmental research and improving the quality of our life and environment, the committee recommends that excellent existing laboratory facilities at Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Oak Ridge, Tenn., be utilized for environmental research.

The committee feels that since these facilities are available, they should be utilized and avoid duplicating facilities.

It is important to point out that some of the programs of the Foundation represent the cutting edge for new knowledge in our society.

The National Science Foundation is considered by many to be the scientific spearhead into the unknown—uncharted—and unchallenged areas of science and research.

The committee commends the important work and mission of the National Science Foundation.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The committee recommends $4,110,000 for the Renegotiation Board which has a constructive record of saving the Government and taxpayers millions of dollars in renegotiated Federal defense-related contracts.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The committee recommends $21,716,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The committee is concerned over the continuing decline in the stock market and urges the SEC to be alert in its administration of the securities laws in the public interest.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The committee recommends $75 million for the Selective Service System—a cut and reduction of $1 million from the budget request.

Draft calls next year are expected to decline.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The largest single appropriation in the bill is $8,960,528,000 for all programs of the Veterans' Administration.

This is the full budget amount—and the largest appropriation in the history of the Veterans' Administration.

The committee has conducted thorough and extensive hearings with officials of the Veterans' Administration.

As a result of these hearings the committee is convinced that the full amount of the budget request is needed to support the vital and important veterans benefit programs including: compensation and pensions; readjustment benefits, including education and training; medical and hospital care, housing insurance and other benefits and assistance provided by law for our veterans.

For compensation and pensions the bill provides the full budget estimate of $5,456,600,000.

The committee recommends the budget estimate of $1,354,500,000 for readjustment benefits—training and education assistance, and vocational rehabilitation.

For veterans' insurance and indemnities the committee recommends an appropriation of $5,100,000 in addition to a transfer of $7,100,000 from unobligated balances.

For medical and hospital care the

committee recommends the full budget estimate of $1,752,200,000.

The House has just approved $22 million in a pending supplemental bill for medical and hospital care—a $7 million increase over the budget recommendation for medical care.

In addition we are recommending $50 million above the original budget submitted for medical care in 1971. A total of $1,752,200,000 is provided for medical care.

In testimony by Dr. Musser, the Chief Medical Officer of the Veterans' Administration, the committee has been assured that excellent and quality medical care can be provided for our veterans with the additional amounts provided.

Other appropriations for VA also recommended include $59,200,000 for medical and prosthetic research—an increase of $1,579,000 over the comparable amount for 1970; $19,100,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses—the budget estimate.

The committee has recommended $59,000,000 in new appropriations for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.

In addition, the committee recommended $80,765,000 in unobligated carryover funds—making a total of $139,765,000 available for hospital construction to the Veterans' Administration next year.

This is the third highest level of funding for veterans hospital construction in the history of the Veterans' Administration.

In addition the committee recommends the full budget request of $7,500,000 for grants for construction of State nursing homes.

Veterans officials estimate that 8,164,000 veterans will receive medical and dental treatment on an outpatient basis next year while another 785,000 will receive treatment in the hospitals.

The number of veterans and their dependents and survivors receiving assistance continues to mount.

It is estimated in 1971 the number of veterans receiving pensions will total 1,071,000 while another 2,073,000 will be receiving disability compensation.

In addition an estimated 1,584,000 survivors of veterans will be receiving compensation.

Concerning readjustment benefits, Public Law 91–219 increases the rates of veterans assistance for programs of vocational rehabilitation, education assistance, and special training allowances by approximately 35 percent under the new law recently passed by Congress.

Under this bill and program it is estimated that in 1971 a total of 1,472,000 post-Korean conflict veterans will be receiving benefits, together with 46,600 children of veterans and 21,000 wives and widows of veterans.

In addition some 24,900 veterans are expected to receive vocational rehabilitation.

In summary, I repeat: This bill carries the highest appropriation for veterans benefits in the history of the Veterans' Administration, in excess of $8,960,000,000, and carried one of the highest levels of veterans' hospital construction in history.

TITLE II: EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

With the problems of pollution accelerating, along with the Nation's concern over the quality of our environment, the committee recommends $650,000 for the new Council on Environmental Quality.

This Council will analyze environmental conditions and trends and provide an overview of the many agencies of Government concerned with the question of pollution and environment.

It will also review and appraise Federal Government programs which have an impact on the environment.

And this Council on Environmental Quality will—as its name indicates—recommend policies to protect and improve the quality of our environment.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

The committee recommends $400,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Council—a reduction of $160,000 from the budget request.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

For the Office of Emergency Preparedness the committee recommends a total of $10,215,000.

The primary purpose of the Office of Emergency Preparedness is to provide for nonmilitary emergency preparedness and to assist in the event of national disasters—cooperating with eight departments and agencies throughout Government.

DISASTER RELIEF

The committee recommends the full budget of $65 million to provide for grants to the States for unforeseen disasters that may arise and to which the President must be responsive.

There were 29 major disasters declared in calendar year 1969, the highest number in history.

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The committee recommends $2 million for the Office of Science and Technology.

The Director of the Office is charged with the responsibility of advising the President on scientific matters and in coordinating and overseeing the development and progress of scientific and technological programs in the various agencies of Government.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The committee recommends $291,500,000 for the programs of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission.

This recommendation includes $175 million requested for the vital and important Appalachian highway and access roads program.

This program is opening the way of industrial development, growth, and progress in Appalachian communities in the 13 States eligible for this assistance.

As a matter of fact, one of the most critical needs of the Appalachian region is access through new highways and roads.

The basic act authorizes construction of 4,300 miles of highways and access roads.

The committee recommends the funding of other Appalachian programs at a level of $116,500,000 which is $4 million below the budget request.

These funds assist in the construction of trade schools, hospitals, health centers, airports, and other needed and essential projects and facilities.

The achievements and beneficial results of these programs can be seen in Appalachian communities as new public facilities set a new tone for progress and provide a new surge of optimism and hope in the several Appalachian States.

This program is now moving forward.

This program is working.

The progress is visible.

And progress builds on progress.

The States, Federal Government, and local communities have joined hands and joined forces in this program to move the Appalachian area ahead in growth and progress.

CIVIL DEFENSE

The committee recommends $72 million for the Office of Civil Defense—including $21,400,000 for grants to States and local civil defense organizations.

The committee is also recommending $3,500,000 to maintain the medical stockpile and the community preparedness activities.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The committee recommends $2,929,081,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The committee is responding to the needs of our cities, large and small.

And we shall continue to honor our commitments to our cities.

In this connection I want to point out that the amounts appropriated in this bill are only the tip of the iceberg of appropriations for programs for our cities.

The special analysis of the budget points out that the total Federal financial commitment to our cities is estimated to be approximately $44 billion for 1971, including all types of loans, grants, guarantees, and other assistance and commitments.

Our recommendations for 1971 provide for further increases in the four major low-income housing programs of HUD: Public housing, rent supplements, homeownership assistance, and rental housing assistance.

These programs form the major thrust of Secretary Romney's concentrated effort to meet the Nation's housing needs through public housing and federally assisted private housing.

The Department estimates that payments required for new commitments in these programs ultimately will require appropriations ranging from a minimum of $11,666,000,000 to a maximum of $19,872,000,000 over the next 40 years.

So, I repeat: We are providing generous funding for housing for the needy—which together with annual contracts for contributions over the years represent a multibillion-dollar housing program. The cost over the next 30 to 40 years is shown in the following table:

COST OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY UNDER SELECTED HOUSING PROGRAM

	Contract authority	Minimum cost	Maximum cost
Approved 1970 and prior:			
235, 30 years	$160,000,000	$2,188,400,000	$4,800,000,000
236, 40 years	155,000,000	2,605,600,000	6,200,000,000
Public housing, 40 years	804,250,000	25,380,300,000	28,757,500,000
Rent supplements, 40 years	122,000,000	3,635,800,000	4,880,000,000
Subtotal	1,241,250,000	33,810,100,000	44,637,500,000
1970 supplemental bill:			
235	35,000,000	503,475,000	1,050,000,000
236	35,000,000	597,380,000	1,400,000,000
Subtotal	70,000,000	1,100,855,000	2,450,000,000
1971 bill:			
235	$130,000,000	$1,870,050,000	$3,900,000,000
236	135,000,000	2,304,180,000	5,400,000,000
Public housing	170,000,000	4,223,800,000	6,800,000,000
Rent supplements	50,000,000	1,953,400,000	2,000,000,000
Subtotal	485,000,000	10,351,430,000	18,100,000,000
Grand total	1,796,250,000	45,262,385,000	65,187,500,000

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

This bill provides $1,770,500,000 for renewal and housing assistance.

This includes $40 million for neighborhood facilities, the amount recommended in the budget; $1 billion for urban renewal including $400 million for conventional urban renewal, $300 million for the neighborhood development programs, $175 million to initiate new conventional urban renewal projects and $125 million for code enforcement, demolition grants and other urban renewal programs.

The bill also provides $35 million for rehabilitation loan funds, and $654,500,000 for annual contributions for low-rent housing, the budget request.

The committee is recommending $7,200,000 for new annual contract authority for college housing—the full amount currently authorized.

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

The committee recommends a total of $291,500,000 for metropolitan development.

This includes $50 million for comprehensive planning grants, a cut and reduction of $10 million below the budget estimate, and $3,500,000 for community development training and urban fellowship grants programs.

Concerning the new community assistance program, testimony indicates there are 15 or 16 prospective developers of new cities.

Only one has reached the point of funding in the current year.

We are recommending $5 million for this program for next year—double the amount appropriated for the current year.

We are recommending $75 million for open space land grants, the budget request.

For basic water and sewer grants we are recommending $150 million, the full budget request.

We recognize the importance of this program.

This program is basic, essential, and needed.

The committee urges this agency to move forward on the funding of this important program.

In a recent year there was a $15 million carryover on appropriations made available for basic water and sewer grants.

I repeat: The committee recommends the full budget request of $150 million for this basic water and sewer grant program.

MODEL CITIES

The committee recommends the full budget amount of $575 million for the model cities program.

This program—keyed to local initiative and local planning—is beginning to move ahead into the 2d and 3d year action stages—and the committee feels that strong support is crucial at this point.

A total of 150 cities are participating in the model cities program at HUD.

URBAN TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH

The committee recommends $30 million for research and development at HUD.

This represents an increase of $5 million over the current year.

Some 200 grants have been made under this program—and the committee is not convinced at this time that the reports made by researchers have been used as effectively as they might have been.

We are more than doubling the amounts provided for this program only a few years ago.

MORTGAGE CREDIT

The committee recommends $168,200,000 in new appropriations and increased annual contract authorizations of $315 million for the mortgage credit programs in fiscal 1971.

For section 235—the homeownership assistance program—the committee recommends $130,000,000 for annual contract authorization.

For section 236—the rental assistance program—the committee recommends $135,000,000, the full budget authorization.

This exhausts the authorization for these programs for fiscal 1971.

We recently provided $10 million each for sections 235 and 236 programs above the budget in a supplemental bill which just passed for the current year.

We have not approved advance funding for these programs for fiscal 1972.

And for rent supplements the committee recommends an increased authorization of $50 million.

In summary the committee has been generous in its funding recommendation for HUD programs for our cities.

Our cities—large and small—are the touchstones of our society—the primary sources of employment—the centers of commerce and industry—the nerve centers of the Nation.

And if our people are to live and work in our cities, the cities themselves must be livable and functional—practical and pleasant.

The funds which we are recommending in this bill for urban renewal, metropolitan development, public housing, mortgage credit, and other programs will go a long way toward advancing these goals.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The committee recommends a limitation of $5,570,000 for administrative expenses of the Home Loan Bank Board.

We also recommend $14,700,000 for nonadministrative expenses to provide for examining and supervising member institutions—and $408,000 for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, we are recommending a total of $17,015,212,300 in appropriations for the several independent agencies and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for 1971.

The three largest items in the bill are for the Veterans' Administration, NASA, and HUD.

We have made only slight reductions and cuts—the lowest cuts in several years—and none in the budget for veterans' programs.

Secretary Romney of HUD has written me as follows:

> It is with great pleasure to learn that our Appropriations Committee mark-up treated us so well. This budget should help us get a good start towards a successful year.

Dr. Musser, Chief Medical Officer of the Veterans' Administration, has testified that with the funds here recommended that the Veterans' Administration can provide "excellent" and also "quality" medical care for our veterans.

I understand that some amendments will be offered to the Veterans' Administration and HUD portions of the bill—and so I wanted the Members to know that the officials of these agencies are indeed pleased with the generous amount of funds recommended.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, this is a major appropriations bill—a well-considered bill—and should be approved.

The members of our committee will be pleased to try to answer any questions that the Members care to ask concerning any details of the bill.

This bill has been well considered.

It is a prudent bill.

I hope that the House will support the committee bill. And, I urge its approval and passage.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, a valued member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding, and I want to commend him for the statement he has made which I think very accurately and succinctly summarizes the agencies and departments of our Government which are funded in this bill.

I believe it is frequently overlooked, as the gentleman has pointed out, that there are more than 20 different departments and agencies which are funded here, and the bill covers in excess of $17 billion, and ranges from our cities to our space program.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that anyone on the committee has worked any harder than the gentleman in the well, and again I certainly want to commend to my colleagues, the bill which the gentleman has brought to the floor of the House.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, for his comments.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to compliment the gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, on the great amount of work he has put into this bill, and the effort that he has expended.

He has conducted many, many days of hearings on the bill, and he has compiled hundreds and hundreds of pages of testimony on one of the most difficult, appropriation bills that we have in the Congress. Mr. Chairman, I know of his concern about carrying on, and going forward with the model cities program.

There is a concern on the part of the Members of Congress as well as a number of mayors and town officials throughout the United States with respect to the model cities program.

There have been some rumors to the effect that some $500 million would be taken out of the model cities program to implement the President's program on integrating schools—the new program that the President has suggested and recommended some months ago.

I know that the chairman of this committee has received a communication from Secretary Romney of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I trust that when we go back into the House he will insert that letter in the RECORD.

I wonder if the chairman would dwell on that question for a moment?

Mr. EVINS. of Tennessee. I am very pleased to inform my friend and say that in substance the letter of the Secretary says that this is a plan recommended from some sources—not from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and a final decision has not been made. But it pointed out that even in the event there is a recommendation of the transfer of some of these funds to some other programs that this would require the approval of the Congress.

Mr. BOLAND. I am delighted to get the chairman's assurance on this. As the letter of the Secretary does say it would be necessary to return to the Committee on Appropriations to obtain committee action for any such transfer of funds. I emphasize here that I would oppose such transfer. I appreciate the chairman's response.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The committee has recommended these funds specifically for the model cities program.

Mr. BOLAND. There is another program about which I am concerned. I know the chairman is concerned as are the members of this subcommittee, that is the homeownership program, the section 235 homeownership program for which this committee has provided $130 million for the fiscal year 1971.

The question I raise with respect to section 235 of the homeownership program is directed to the failure on the part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide many dollars for the rehabilitation of homes.

There are a great number of limited dividend and nonprofit organizations that are in the business of rehabilitation of existing homes. A great number of the limited dividend and nonprofit organizations are also sponsoring new homes under the homeownership program.

In my judgment I do not think the Department of Housing and Urban Development is using enough funds under the section 235 program to permit limited dividend and nonprofit organizations to purchase existing homes and rehabilitate the homes.

I think this is an excellent social program, as well as a sound way of producing rapidly some sound, safe, and decent housing. It provides jobs for people in disadvantaged and ghetto areas, under the Housing Act of 1969 it is permissible for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to use 20 percent of the funds in this program to acquire existing homes and rehabilitate existing homes.

It is the position of the Secretary that this does not add to the total number of units across the Nation. I would hope the Department would look closely at this program of rehabilitation and that it would express its willingness to increase the funding for the purchase of existing homes.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I share the concern of my colleague. It seems to me it is much better to repair houses rather than to tear them all down. So we have a joint interest in this program and I hope that this program will be given emphasis.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the remarks of the chairman and I thank him very much.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. Could the gentleman tell the Committee how much money is in this bill for the space shuttle and space station program; and how that compares with the authorization that we passed the other day?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I would say to my friend we have not damaged the space shuttle and space station effort. We feel that the program definition should be developed this year and we will look closely at this program next year. However, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has flexibility in how he chooses to commit the $2,500,000,000 contained in the bill for research and development.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, what was the cut in the $2.5 billion?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I say to the gentlemen, we did not specifically allocate the reduction of $106,100,000 from research and development. The Administrator has substantial flexibility as to how the reductions will be applied. There is some slippage in the flight schedule, as we indicate in our report, and the space program is in a period of reorientation and adjustment for the future. The $2,500,000,000 in the bill should support a viable program.

Mr. DENNIS. If the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to express my concern as to this particular field, because while it is outside of my expertise, it seems to me that this particular space shuttle-space station program could be of vital importance to us from a military point of view. I would hate to see any other nation get ahead of us in that particular program. So I hope the committee has it firmly in mind that that is a priority matter.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. This Nation is first in space. We have excelled in space and will continue to do so, I will say to my friend. We want to carry on the program properly and safely, and ample funds are provided for that purpose.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This country is also first in debt, too, is it not?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman may have a point.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Forty-seven Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 114]

Anderson, Tenn.	Carter	Dawson
Ayres	Celler	Dickinson
Baring	Chisholm	Diggs
Barrett	Clancy	Dowdy
Berry	Clark	Eckhardt
Bingham	Clay	Edmondson
Blatnik	Cohelan	Eilberg
Boggs	Collins	Fallon
Brademas	Conyers	Fisher
Brock	Corman	Ford, Gerald R.
Broomfield	Cramer	Ford, William D.
Brown, Calif.	Culver	Fraser
Buchanan	Cunningham	Frelinghuysen
	Davis, Ga.	

Gallagher	Macdonald, Mass.	Rodino
Gray	Mahon	Rosenthal
Green, Oreg.	Mathias	Scheuer
Gubser	Meskill	Schneebeli
Halpern	Mollohan	Sikes
Hanna	Morse	Slack
Hansen, Wash.	Morton	Smith, Calif.
Harvey	Mosher	Stokes
Hathaway	Murphy, N.Y.	Stratton
Hébert	Ottinger	Teague, Calif.
Horton	Patman	Teague, Tex.
Hosmer	Philbin	Tiernan
Kee	Podell	Tunney
Keith	Pollock	Whalen
Kirwan	Powell	Wilson, Bob
Leggett	Railsback	Wilson, Charles H.
Long, La.	Rees	Yatron
Lowenstein	Reid, N.Y.	
McCarthy	Reifel	
McMillan		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17548, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 334 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) has made such a detailed explanation of the bill and has covered it so thoroughly that anything I might say would have to be repetitious. I will, therefore, not undertake to discuss all of the programs funded in the bill before you today and will confine my remarks to emphasizing some of the items I believe will be of particular interest to the membership.

But first, a few preliminary remarks might be in order. For example, this is one of the largest single appropriation bills you will be called upon to consider during the session. It provides $17,015,212,300 in new obligational authority for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and 20 separate and independent agencies of the Government.

The amount appropriated in the bill is $201,611,200 less than was requested in the budget. But it is $1,151,966,800 more than was appropriated for the same department and agencies in last year's bill.

The increases over last year include: $310,055,000 for the HUD; $1,255,336,000 for the Veterans' Administration; $57,000,000 for the National Science Administration; and $178,507,300 for the General Services Administration.

Not included in the above totals is the second supplemental for 1970, which passed the House last week. The total amount in that bill applicable to last year is $896,485,700. When you apply this supplemental amount, the bill before you today is only $255,481,000 over the amounts made available in 1970.

There are other, though smaller, increases over last year's appropriation scattered through the bill. They are all identified on a line item basis in the tables appearing on pages 24 through 43 in the committee report which is available for all Members at the Clerk's desk in this Chamber.

I have previously stated that the bill appropriates $201,611,200 less than was requested in the budget and is $255,481,000 above amounts appropriated for 1970 including the supplemental. I have just itemized some of the larger increases over last year, and they alone will add up to more of an increase over last year than I have said the bill contains.

The explanation for this is, of course, found in the fact that scattered through the bill are many decreases below the budget and indeed many decreases below the appropriation levels in last year's bill. Some of the substantial decreases below the budget are: $63,940,000 for HUD; $2,005,000 for the Executive Office of the President; $16,000,000 for NSF; and $136,000,000 for NASA.

Other reductions in smaller amounts are shown in the tables incorporated in the report.

Some of the substantial decreases below last year's bill are: $62,325,500 for the Civil Service Commission; $499,633,000 for NASA; and $96,000,000 in funds appropriated to the President for various functions funded through his office.

After doing all of the balancing off of increases and decreases in specific line items, we come up with the totals first mentioned and which I will repeat here for emphasis:

The bill before you today appropriates $17,015,212,300.

This amount is $201,611,200 below the 1971 budget.

It is $255,481,000 above the sums appropriated for fiscal year 1970, including the supplemental the House passed last week.

In making up this bill the committee considered 100 separate line items, including appropriating items and spending limitations. Reductions are recommended by the committee in 54 of these items. In considering the budget requests for these 20 independent offices and agencies and the Department of HUD, the committee heard testimony from 389 witnesses and their testimony and the interrogations of these witnesses by committee members cover 5,000 pages of hearings which are contained in four separate volumes.

With these preliminaries out of the way, let me now turn to a discussion of some of the more significant items in the bill. First let us consider title III which contains the appropriation for the Department of HUD.

HUD

For this department the bill contains $2,929,081,000 in direct appropriations. It also includes $135,275,000 in the form of limitations on amounts of corporate funds that may be expended by HUD for administrative and nonadministrative expenses.

Some of the better known programs administered by HUD in its mortgaging financing operations are rent supplements, homeownership assistance—section 235—and rental housing assistance—section 236.

You will observe from the bill and the table on pages 39 and 40 of the report that HUD is being granted new contract authority for these programs as follows: Rent supplements, $50,000,000; homeownership assistance, $130,000,000; and rental housing assistance, $135,000,000.

In addition to this new contract authority for the three programs just mentioned, HUD has backdoor spending authority for the public housing program provided under permanent legislation which grants new contract authority for use in 1971 amounting to $170,000,000.

There are some additional facts with respect to the four programs just mentioned which need to be known in order to understand the magnitude of the tax burden being imposed upon the taxpayers of the country by these programs. Let me outline these additional facts for the information of all concerned.

RENT SUPPLEMENTS

The $50,000,000 in new contract authority for rent supplements provided in this bill means that HUD is authorized to enter into new contracts obligating the Government to disburse $50,000,000 a year for 40 years, or a total of $2,000,000,000 under this one item of the bill.

If the rent supplement program should be abandoned at the end of 1971, the cost to the taxpayers for rent supplements will be between $5,589,200,000 as a minimum and $6,880,000,000 as a maximum.

HOMEOWNERSHIP ASSISTANCE—SECTION 235

The $130,000,000 in new contract authority granted in the bill for this program means that HUD is authorized to enter into new homeownership assistance contracts obligating the Government to disburse $130,000,000 a year for 30 years, or a total of $3,900,000,000 under this one item of the bill.

If this program should be abandoned at the end of 1971, the cost to the taxpayers for homeownership assistance will be between $4,561,925,000 as a minimum and $9,750,000,000 as a maximum.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE—SECTION 236

The $135,000,000 in new contract authority granted in the bill for this program means that HUD is authorized to enter into new rental assistance contracts obligating the Government to disburse $135,000,000 a year for 40 years, or a total of $5,400,000,000 under this one item in the bill.

If this program should be abandoned at the end of 1971, the cost to the taxpayers of the rental assistance program will be between $5,507,160,000 as a minimum and $13,000,000,000 as a maximum.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The other low income housing program is known as public housing. It is even more expensive than the programs previously discussed. These contracts also run for 40 years. The bill under consideration today includes $654,500,000 to pay the subsidy for this one year on the 900,000 public housing units now under contract. The sum mentioned is only one year's cost of this program.

HUD has authority under permanent legislation to enter into these contracts and the only role Congress has to play is to pick up the check. The new contract authority for public housing in 1971 amounts to $170,000,000 and when the contracts are signed the taxpayers are

stuck for $170,000,000 a year for 40 years, or a total of $6,800,000,000, by this one action.

If the public housing program should be abandoned at the end of 1971, the cost to the taxpayers under existing contracts would be between $29,604,100,000 as a minimum and $35,557,500,000 as a maximum.

SUMMARY

For the four programs just discussed—if all should be abandoned at the end of 1971—the cost to the taxpayers will be as follows:

	Minimum	Maximum
Rent supplements	$5,589,200,000	$6,880,000,000
Homeownership assistance	4,561,925,000	9,750,000,000
Rental assistance	5,507,160,000	13,000,000,000
Public housing	29,604,100,000	35,557,500,000
Total	45,262,385,000	65,187,500,000

PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM

In addition to the fantastic first cost of this program, which as I have already indicated will be between $29 and $35 billion if no contracts are signed beyond 1971, the program is in deep financial trouble in 469 communities across the country. That number of public housing authorities had operating deficiencies last year and had to dip into reserves to meet operating expenses. Unfortunately some of the LHA's have exhausted their reserves built up over the past years. Notable among those is the one in the District of Columbia. Last year HUD had to advance the National Capital Housing Authority $850,000 to keep it from going bankrupt.

Included in the $654 million provided in this bill is $13 million which HUD estimates it will have to advance to various local housing authorities to cover their deficiencies for 1971. By deficiencies I mean the amounts by which rent collected fail to cover operating expenses—exclusive of debt service which is paid by the U.S. Government by way of subsidy.

The causes for these serious financial difficulties are varied. Some of it is caused by poor management. One housing authority which HUD forced to reorganize by refusing to take over operations made a dramatic turn around after a management service was engaged resulting in the elimination of 100 unnecessary jobs and a generally more efficient operation on a business-like basis.

Another cause is the ever-increasing cost of maintenance, caused partly by inflation but partly also by deterioration, vandalism, and so forth.

It is pertinent to note that in the District of Columbia, where we are constantly being told that the housing shortage is acute, there are 600 public housing units empty right now. Witnesses testified in the hearings that most of these units are vacant because excessive vandalism has made them uninhabitable.

OTHER HUD PROGRAMS

There are a variety of other HUD programs funded in this bill. A mere listing of them will indicate the magnitude of HUD's contributions toward the solving of the problems of the cities:

Urban renewal, $1,000,000,000; model cities, $575,000,000; grants for neighborhood facilities, $40,000,000; rehabilitation loan fund, $35,000,000.

Metropolitan development programs designed to assist States, cities, and towns to improve community planning and environment and to provide necessary services and facilities, $291,500,000.

Urban research and technology, $30,000,000.

Mortgage credit programs—these include rent supplements, homeownership assistance, rental assistance, and public housing which have been discussed heretofore and only totals are included here for information: New appropriations, $168,200,000; new contract authority, $315,000,000.

The programs administered by HUD constitute only a small fraction of the total involvement of the Federal Government in the effort to solve the urban problems of the Nation. The Bureau of the Budget states that the total Federal financial commitment for urban, social, and community development programs will be about $44 billion in 1971.

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

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe the gentleman said there was about $3 billion provided in this bill for housing?

Mr. JONAS. That is for the entire Department of HUD in direct appropriations.

Mr. ZWACH. I have gone through this bill. I am sure the gentleman realizes a major share of the poor housing and low incomes is in countryside America. I cannot find any designation. I wonder how much of this $3 billion will wind up as housing assistance in countryside America.

Mr. JONAS. What does the gentleman mean by "countryside America"?

Mr. ZWACH. I mean rural America, outside the metropolitan areas.

Mr. JONAS. The Farmers Home Administration handles rural housing programs and funds are allocated to FHA by HUD out of the funds appropriated in this bill to HUD.

We do not have any conventional public housing in rural areas, but we do have rural housing programs administered by Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. ZWACH. The FHA appropriation is not in this bill?

Mr. JONAS. The FHA we are talking about is the Farmers Home Administration instead of Federal Housing Administration. The farmer gets its housing money out of funds appropriated in this bill for HUD.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Under the procedure worked out between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Agriculture any request for sewerage or water loans, in communities of less than 5,500 is referred by HUD to the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield further.

Mr. ZWACH. Part of the $3 billion, then, goes for this purpose to FHA, or does it?

Mr. JONAS. There is $150,000,000 in this bill for water and sewer facilities, but that is not housing. The money for rural housing will come out of funds appropriated to HUD.

Mr. ZWACH. I am familiar with that section.

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

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. The problem is in respect to the allotment of the money. Money is allotted for housing development, but there is not an appropriation to the Farmers Home Administration, as the gentleman has said.

Mr. JONAS. That is right. Part of the funds provided for HUD are allocated.

Mr. STEPHENS. They are allocated. We took the ceiling off the amount that could be allocated about 2 years ago. It used to be $300 million, then we made it an insurance program and added approximately $300 million to it.

After that we took the ceiling off of it and Farmers Home gets what the Department of HUD allocates to it.

Mr. JONAS. When I said it was administered by the Farmers Home Administration, I should have added that the Farmers Home Administration administers the farmer's home program, but the funds are allocated out of this appropriation by the Department of HUD.

Mr. ZWACH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is making a most significant and most important point. It should be emphasized to those who think we are not doing enough for the cities in the housing program. If you take all of the contract authority over the history of the program, it is estimated that it could cost $65,189,000,000.

In the legislation before the authorizing committee there is legislation to phase the rent supplement program into other programs, as the gentleman is well aware.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JONAS. I wish to say a word or so about several activities of the General Services Administration. GSA of course is known as the housekeeping agency of the Government. GSA does all of the procurement for the Government except for the Defense Department, manages, maintains, and constructs all public buildings; manages the strategic stockpiles; operates the Archives and Record Service; provides transportation and communications service for all Government agencies; disposes of surplus property by transfer, donation, utilization, and sale; to name a few of the major functions.

These activities are discussed in the committee report and I will only add by

way of summary that the bill provides GSA with new obligational authority for 1971 in the amount of $724,916,300—an increase over the budget of $28,322,800, attributable primarily to the fact that the committee believes GSA should go forward with new or additional funding on 19 public building construction projects. These include six new projects, three major superstructures, and additional funding to complete 10 projects for which additional funds are required.

And now I would like to make passing reference to three GSA programs I feel will be of general interest.

FIGHT ON POLLUTION

In an effort to improve the air we breathe, GSA is engaged in an experiment to test the effectiveness of dual-fuel systems in automobiles. GSA is in a unique position to make this test because currently it operates 97 motor pools around the country.

So far the results have been encouraging. If this record continues to show the feasibility of conversion, GSA will install dual-fuel equipment in all of their cars and 1,200 cars in motor pools will already have been converted by the end of this year.

It costs about $300 to convert a car to a dual-fuel system. The problem is refueling since one tank of natural gas will be sufficient for only about 80 to 90 miles. This indicates it will be more efficient for in-city travel. GSA reports that the conversion cost is low in comparison with benefits derived. In addition to contributing to cleaner air, there is a financial saving since results to date show that, after conversion, the natural gas costs about 40 percent less per mile traveled than gasoline.

GSA has also embarked on another program, pursuant to an agreement with Ford Motor Co., for a motor vehicle emission control test experiment designed to control pollutants in the exhaust of older vehicles now on the road and which contribute measurably to smog in the cities. If this test is successful, millions of automobiles can be tuned to new specifications or equipped with emission control devices.

Thus the Federal Government is setting a rapid pace in the mounting attack on air pollution.

PROPERTY DISPOSAL

GSA has also stepped up its surplus property disposal program. This effort is being made at home and also abroad. It is estimated that this drive will result in sales of excess property valued at $768 million in 1971 as compared with sales of $240 million in 1970. These sales of course are made only of items actually in surplus supply after all agencies of Government are screened to determine they are not needed.

It may interest you to know that the value of 20,202 Federal buildings and installations around the country amounts to $69 billion. This value is based on acquisition cost.

The value of personal property to be screened by GSA in 1971 for transfer, donation, utilization, or sale will be $6 billion.

MOTOR POOL OPERATIONS

I have always had a special interest in the motor pool operation by GSA since I was the author of the legislation which authorized GSA to operate these pools.

It therefore gives me special pleasure to report that the operation of these pools continues to produce substantial savings to the taxpayers. There are now 97 pools in operation in as many localities in the country. GSA identifies savings of $25,910,000 through the operation of these pools for 1969 alone and cumulative savings of $159,595,000 since the enactment of my motor pool bill.

NASA

This bill before you today appropriates $3,197,000 for 1971 operations by NASA.

This is a reduction of $136,000,000 under the funds requested in the budget.

It is $499,633,000 below the sum appropriated last year.

The committee believes that the manned space flight to the moon scheduled for late this year should be postponed until 1971, in order to give adequate time to identify the causes for the recent near disaster to Apollo 13. In addition, this recommendation is based upon a realization of the necessity of stretching out the program to meet the requirements for budgetary restraint.

The bill provides $2,500,000,000 for continued research and development. This is a reduction of $106,100,000 from the budget request. The funds provided will finance one Apollo flight instead of two in 1971.

The bill also includes $18,275,000 for construction. This is a reduction of $16,325,000 from the budget request.

The third item in NASA's budget is called research and program management. The bill provides $678,725,000 for this activity. This is a reduction of $13,575,000 from the amount requested. This is the fund from which operations are financed and the committee feels that the level of operations be retained at current levels, instead of increasing that level.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

This bill includes $8,960,528,000 to finance operations of the Veterans' Administration during 1971. This is the full budget request and is the largest amount ever appropriated for the VA in the history of the Veterans' Administration. Following is a breakout of the various VA programs which will use these funds.

Compensation and pensions, $5,456,600,000: The pension rolls continue to increase and in 1971 a total of 1,071,000 veterans will be receiving pensions and 2,073,000 veterans will be receiving disability compensation. Compensation also will be paid to 1,584,000 survivors of veterans.

Readjustment benefits, $1,354,500,000: In 1971, 1,472,000 post-Korean veterans, 46,600 children of veterans, and 21,000 wives of veterans will qualify for these benefits. In addition, some 24,900 veterans will receive vocational rehabilitation.

Insurance and indemnities, $5,100,000: This is in addition to $7,000,000 to be transferred from unobligated balances in other insurance accounts.

Medical care, $1,752,200,000: In the second supplemental bill approved by the House last week, $22,000,000 was provided for program increases in addition to funds included in the fiscal year 1970 bill. In addition the committee is recommending $50,000,000 as requested in a revised budget estimate.

The committee has been assured by the VA that the sum appropriated in this bill for medical care will provide quality medical care for a projected caseload of 8,164,000 outpatients and dental treatments. An estimated 785,000 patients are expected to receive medical care in VA hospitals during 1971.

Medical and prosthetic research, $59,200,000.

Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses, $19,100,000.

General operating expenses, $239,200,000.

Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities, $59,000,000.

This sum, in addition to other funds available, will provide for total obligations of $120,418,000 in 1971 for hospital construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities. This is an increase of $88,281,000 above the level provided last year.

Grant for construction of State nursing homes, $7,500,000: Matching funds are provided by the States where these homes are built.

Grant to the Republic of the Philippines, $2,000,000.

Payment of participation sales deficiencies—subsidy on sold mortgages under a program now discontinued—$6,128,000.

Loan guarantee revolving fund, $350,000,000.

As previously stated, this bill provides $8,960,258,000 for veteran programs. This is the largest sum ever appropriated for these purposes in history. It is $1,255,336,000 more than was appropriated for VA programs last year.

Truly it can be said that Congress is living up to every responsibility to provide for the veterans who have worn our country's uniform.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side, and we are ready to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have some requests for time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT).

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

I was privileged to serve on the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations which considered the proposed fiscal year 1971 budget of the Veterans' Administration, which among other independent agencies and HUD, is now before the House for action.

The $8.9 billion in new budget authority recommended by the committee is the full budget amount. It represents the largest appropriation request in the history of the Veterans' Administration.

While it is not an austere budget—as

some have termed it—this budget is by no means unrealistically generous. On the contrary, it reflects the increasing responsibilities of the Veterans' Administration to provide benefits and services for an expanding veteran population which now numbers approximately 27.3 million and is growing as Vietnam era servicemen return to civilian life at the rate of about 85,000 a month.

Before summarizing briefly these responsibilities—most of which are statutory obligations which the Congress has established—may I take this opportunity to commend the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Donald E. Johnson, and his associates in the Veterans' Administration for their very complete but concise budget presentation.

As the Members know, not only is the Administrator serving his first year in office, but so are the other top officials of the VA, including the Deputy Administrator, Fred B. Rhodes, the Associate Deputy Administrator, Rufus H. Wilson; the Chief Benefits Director, Olney B. Owen; the Chief Medical Director, Dr. Mark J. Musser; and the VA's General Counsel, John J. Cocoran.

I think they are to be congratulated for their very thorough grasp of the VA's programs and responsibilities.

It is particularly gratifying that while they appreciate the complexity and comprehensiveness of the benefits and services we in the Congress have structured for our Nation's veterans, their dependents and survivors, they also understand the priority importance of two other "C's" which have always motivated the Congress; compassion and concern for our Nation's veterans, particularly for the ill and service-disabled, and for those veterans and their dependents and survivors in need.

What are the specific benefits and services which this recommended budget will enable the Veterans' Administration to provide?

In brief they are as follows:

$5,456,600,000 for the payment of compensation and pensions. As the Members realize, I am certain, the total number of veterans and survivors on the VA's compensation and pension rolls continues to rise. It is estimated that in fiscal year 1971 approximately 1,071,000 disabled and needy veterans will be receiving pensions. Another 2,073,000 service-disabled veterans will be receiving disability compensation. And an estimated 1,584,000 survivors of veterans will be receiving service-connected death compensation payments.

The recent action of the Congress which increased VA education and training assistance allowances for veterans and eligible sons, daughters, widows, and wives of veterans who died or are permanently and totally disabled as the result of service attests to our appreciation of the value to our Nation as well as to those benefited of GI bill and other education programs.

The committee recommends approval of the full budget estimate of $1,354,500,000 for veterans readjustment benefits. These funds will enable the Veterans' Administration to pay the congressionally authorized, increased educational assistance allowances to an estimated 1,472,000 post-Korean and Vietnam era veterans in fiscal year 1971; to an estimated 24,900 disabled veterans expected to receive vocational rehabilitation training; to 46,600 eligible sons and daughters, and to 21,000 eligible widows and wives.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the Members' time to review every item in the recommended fiscal year 1971 budget for the Veterans' Administration. The committee, after thorough questioning of VA officials during our hearings on this budget, and only after careful examination and study of the proposed budget submitted by the President on behalf of the Veterans' Administration, is satisfied that the funds requested for such important veterans benefits and services as insurance and indemnities, home loan guarantees, construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities, medical and prosthetic research, and general administrative and operating expenses are reasonable and necessary.

I would point out to the Members that while general administrative and operating expenses would appear to cover routine, unglamorous activities, in fact one of the most exciting, unique, and rewarding programs in the history of the Veterans' Administration is included under this heading.

I refer, of course, to the VA's innovative and most successful "Outreach" program through which more than 1,200,000 American servicemen in Vietnam have been given first-time-in-history battlefield briefing by VA representatives on their veteran benefits.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman did the subcommittee put one penny in the bill for the outreach program?

Mr. TALCOTT. There is no specific money in the bill for the outreach program, not any additional amount.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. If I understand the appropriation, there is not one single, solitary dime in the bill for the outreach program.

Mr. TALCOTT. There is money for the outreach program. These services are being provided through the military budget as well as through the Veterans' Administration budget.

There is also the companion program being conducted by the county Veterans' Administration service offices.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman well knows that we have had a contact program for years, but we have a new outreach program that we just enacted into law. We asked for $11 million and there is not one single, solitary cent in the bill for that program.

Mr. TALCOTT. I am under the impression that there is some money in the bill that can be and is used for this purpose.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. There is not in a line item that identifies the money for this specific purpose. But they have $329 million for general operating expenses, which is $18 million more than was provided last year and it is out of this money that the project in question is to be financed.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. We all know that VA can transfer money. Veterans' Administration has had to transfer money for equipment and money for other things has been transferred into the hospital program.

Sure, as the gentleman on the other side has just said, you can take money from one place and put it in another place. But there is not one single, solitary cent in this bill for the new outreach program.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has been talking of general operating expenses. The general operating expense appropriation is generally available for all salaries and expenses of VA programs except the medical program.

The VA presently has contact offices in major cities throughout the United States. It is proposed to expand this program further.

The number of offices were cut back some time ago because they had too many. About 3 years ago they started to establish telephone service in many cities where free toll service is provided for calls to VA regional offices. A veteran just picks up the phone to call the Veterans' Administration.

There was no budget estimate for this so-called outreach program as submitted to the committee. VA has had contact offices and telephone service for some time.

I think if the Veterans' Administration wanted to fund it, they would and could use some of their money in expanding the contact program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is correct. There is not a line item of any funds for outreach because there is no budget request for this program to provide more contact service and free telephone service and additional toll service in the cities through the VA contact offices.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. While we are on this particular point, the gentleman from Tennessee mentioned, I think, and I think it ought to be noted, that we increased the bill by $18 million over last year for general operating expenses. So far as the item of the outreach program, it would be funded in any event out of that fund.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further comment?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think the Veterans' Administration has done a good

job on contact, when they put the contact service over into Vietnam and when they are going to put them in South Korea and when they are going to put them into Germany.

But our committee went to conference with the other body this year and we passed a bill, H.R. 11959 which the President signed, and out in California the President deplored the fact that more veterans were not taking advantage of the veterans' programs.

We put in this outreach program and there is not one dime in this bill for it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I believe this bill was passed subsequent to the submission of the budget and there is presently no request for expanding the contact services.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is very true. But I would not expect this Congress to be a rubber stamp for everything the Bureau of the Budget does. I would expect the Congress to be independent and to do what is right for the veterans.

I commend the Veterans' Administration for what they have done. I do not necessarily agree with the outreach program. But do not come in here and tell us that you have done a lot on the outreach program when you have done nothing.

Mr. TALCOTT. According to my information, if the gentleman will permit me to say, there are more than 1,500,000 servicemen who have received predischarge veteran benefits briefing at separation points, while nearly 280,000 ill and disabled servicemen in stateside military hospitals have been given indepth, personalized bedside counseling on their veteran benefits, particularly disability compensation, hospital and medical care and vocational rehabilitation training.

These totals, of course, do not include the hundreds of thousands of veterans interviewed and helped by representatives at U.S. Veterans Assistance Centers throughout the country, nor the 85,000 veterans each month who receive a personalized letter from the VA reminding them of their benefits.

I think there is a good effort to counsel veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman is exactly right. So will you tell the President that and not let him come back and criticize us for not having done more?

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, permit me to mention however, with special emphasis on the requested and recommended budget for the Veterans' Administration's hospital and medical care program.

In light of recent comments here in the Congress, by the national news media, and from other quarters, it is appropriate I believe to place the record-high $1,752,000,000 budget requested for this program for fiscal year 1971 in proper perspective.

Contrary to charges that have been made, this record-high budget request, coming as it does on top of the present alltime high budget already appropriated for the VA hospital and medical care program in the current 1970 fiscal year, this request cannot be fairly construed as a belated recognition by this administration or this committee that our ill and disabled veterans have not been receiving quality medical care.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that they have been receiving, are now receiving, and will continue to receive the quality medical care they need and deserve.

And they will do so in increasing numbers.

Under the medical care program, a projected caseload of 8,164,000 outpatient and dental treatments are expected and an estimated 785,000 patients are expected to receive care in VA hospitals.

The construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities in 1971 will be the largest VA construction program since 1950 and the third largest in VA history. A total of $120,418,000 will be obligated for construction in 1971.

There has been a great deal of concern for the medical care program for 1970 and 1971. The second supplemental appropriation bill which passed the House last week included $22 million in additional funds for this program plus funds for the pay raise for medical care personnel.

Much has been said in criticism of VA hospitals over the last year.

Much of this is unwarranted and unjustified—based on partial truths and an effort by one network to arouse controversy. Those few complaints that have merit are a miniscule minority and are being corrected promptly whenever known. However, any system will always be imperfect so long as human beings deal with human beings. The VA medical program is no exception. Abuses can arise in any hospital, or hospital system, in like manner.

The VA hospitals provide medical care that is second to none in the world.

A needy veteran—any needy veteran who is unable to pay for hospital care—need only sign a statement that he is unable to pay for needed medical care, and it is provided—free. Any citizen in any other nation would think this incredible, but it is true.

About two thirds of those cared for in veterans' hospitals are nonservice connected cases. About 8 percent are Vietnam veterans. Of course, veterans with service-connected disability receive priority treatment.

The VA maintains 166 hospitals throughout the country and Puerto Rico. They provide the highest type of medical care of any system in the world.

For 1971 the committee recommends over $1.75 billion for these hospitals. There will be 95,261 operating beds in 1971. VA will care for 785,000 patients during the year, an increase of 4,300 over the current year. Nursing home care is also provided in many communities.

The funds provided for these hospitals has grown every year, and will again in 1971. Any hospital can use more money. There is no limit to what could be provided. Everybody would like to have more money, but in balance, our Nation is good and considerate to our veterans—not only the service connected—but also the nonservice connected veteran who states that he needs but cannot pay for medical care.

Our Nation has been good to veterans in providing many kinds of benefits that total $8.9 billion in 1971—the largest appropriation in VA history.

The appropriations for the VA have increased from $4,946,470,500 in 1962 to $8.960 billion in 1971. Benefits cover not only veterans, but survivors and veterans' dependents. The total for medical care alone increased from $955 million in 1962 to $1,752,200,000 in the last 10 years.

Of 166 VA hospitals, about one-half are adjacent to and operated in close association with university medical schools.

The VA system has participated in the development of and provides all, of the many improved medical services available in our best hospitals today. Hemodialysis units—intensive coronary care units—alcoholic treatment units—epilepsy centers—spinal cord treatment centers—open heart surgery, organ replacement centers, pulmonary emphysema units and labs—prosthetic appliances, to name a few of the high quality services.

These are available without charge to needy veterans—service connected or not. There is one exception that should be corrected, but to date has not been—if a needy veteran has a hospitalization policy he cannot go to a veterans hospital. His insurance policy will not pay for it.

If you have visited any VA hospital you should be impressed and proud of it. Some are older than others—but these are being continually modernized or replaced.

Some are multistoried structures on beautiful sites in cities—others are on the outskirts of towns with spacious grounds. Many have recreational facilities and niceties that private hospitals do not have—but always—these hospitals are available to provide free medical care for needy veterans throughout our land when they cannot afford to pay for it.

I should specially mention the dental care program provided by VA, which has experienced some delays and backlogs during the current year that are now being corrected.

A backlog has developed in the last year due to the rapid discharge of Vietnam veterans. No one objects to these accelerated discharges. However, the military normally would provide necessary medical and dental care before discharging a veteran. However, with the acceleration of discharge they found this could not be done, and have told servicemen to go to the VA rather than delaying their discharge. The discharges have increased from 800,000 to 1 million per year rate.

A backlog of from 40,000 to 45,000—or about 2 months—is expected on June 30 of this year. The increased funding provided in the recent Supplemental is bringing this unexpected backlog under control.

There are some other VA programs that contribute to improved medical care. VA is spending $100 million for training

purposes in VA hospitals in 1971. Its research program—which is additional to medical care funding—is over $59 million next year.

The original budget request for medical care was $1,702,200,000. The President submitted an amended request for an additional $50 million making the total request $1,752,200,000. The committee is deeply concerned about the quality of medical care for our veterans and we questioned the VA officials very intensely in this connection. On page 709 of part 4 of our hearings, in response to questions about the medical program, Dr. Musser informed the committee as follows:

> Yes, sir. In addition to covering the pay increase, the amended budget will provide for activation of three new hospitals, improving of staffing ratios in existing hospitals, establishment of specialized medical services in many locations, allowances for increased usage and cost of drugs, medicine, utilities, et cetera, and a reduction in equipment and maintenance and repair backlogs.
>
> The $50 million includes funds for 3,600 additional average employment which together with the 2,123 increase provided in the original fiscal year 1971 budget should raise our staffing ratio to about 1 to 1 in NP hospitals and 1.60 employees per patient in general hospitals. The $50 million increase is exactly what I requested and was based on our best estimate of a realistic recruitment potential. With these staffing ratios I believe V.A. will provide excellent medical care.

The increase in medical outpatient staff visits are expected to increase from 6,195,000 in 1970 to 6,662,000 in 1971, an increase of 467,000 visits. The patients treated in VA hospitals are expected to increase 4,300 from 780,487 in 1970 to 784,788 in 1971.

The Veterans' Administration in 1971 anticipates adding 5,284 permanent full-time positions to the medical care program, for a total of 127,348 full-time positions. This will provide 1.6 employees to 1 patient in their general medical and surgical hospitals.

Administrator Johnson informed the committee that while an ideal staffing ratio may be somewhat higher, the 1.6 to 1 ratio is the best goal for 1971 "with the limitations in recruitability".

Some feel that the ideal staffing ratio should be 2 to 1. However, it takes a substantial amount of time to recruit and train quality personnel. It just cannot be done in 1 or 2 years.

We feel that quality medical care must be provided for our veterans and we have recommended the full amount requested in the budget to insure that quality medical care is provided.

I believe that the Congress, as well as the President, is determined that America's veterans, especially our returning disabled Vietnam veterans, shall receive the highest quality medical care.

The compassion, the concern, the dedication and skill of the more than 142,000 men and women who staff and carry out the VA's hospital and medical care program are a matter of record. A record, I submit, in which they and we in the Congress can take justified pride.

The budget the committee has recommended, and which the administration requested, will enable VA to add to its distinguished record of quality medical care for America's ill and disabled veterans.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE).

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I think that the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican from North Carolina have done their usual outstanding job in trying to indicate to the Members of this body some of the ramifications of this bill and some of the very technical problems and agreements and disagreements that are contained in the legislative process in bringing this bill to the floor. As an individual Member, I generally support all of the provisions of the bill. It does not agree 100 percent with my philosophy, any more than it does, I suppose, with that of any other member of the subcommittee.

It was of necessity a matter of compromise, and I hope that the bill will be passed.

I did want to take just a few moments to dwell on one aspect of the bill and tell you about some language that appears on line 5 of our report under the account for the Federal Communications Commission. There are roughly 10 sentences that have been added to this lengthy report at my request, and I must say added unanimously in the language of this report as a direction to the Federal Communications Commission, I should like to read them:

> The Committee is concerned that too small a part of the resources of the Federal Communications Commission may be devoted to comprehensive policy planning to attack major problems confronting the Commission and the communications industry. Our attention has been particularly drawn to the need to insure optimum use of the spectrum in the public interest, to develop sound and effective policies regarding violence and obscenity on television, and to develop the full potential of this medium to enhance the quality of American life. The Committee is of the opinion that the funds recommended herein for appropriation will adequately support an increased effort in this regard.

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

Mr. McDADE. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I would like to commend the gentleman for pointing out these facts about the Federal Communications Commission. I think the gentleman will agree that for several years, at least, the subcommittee has been consistently asking the Federal Communications Commission to concern itself with these problems, to concern itself with the problems of the spectrum, and reallocations thereof. For years we have been promised that there would be action in this area. For years we have been told that there were studies being made.

Yet, I believe, for a period of 30 years there has been no reallocation of the spectrum. The time is long past due when this reallocation must take place. There is need in the spectrum for reallocations, particularly for land mobile users, for citizens users, and for various nonbroadcast purposes and nongovernmental usages which business and commerce demand.

Also in the area of the quality of television and problems of violence and obscenity, it seems to me, a great deal must be done.

I agree with the gentleman and I join with the gentleman in expressing concern that the Federal Communications Commission is not doing the job as it should be done, and it must get on with the tremendous job which confronts it and come up with suggestions and answers and recommendations.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut. He has been one who has been consistently interested in this problem. I deeply appreciate his comments.

I think those of us who serve in this body have to recognize a little something of the problem we face. In doing that, if we begin to try to focus in on some of the national concern that is arising over the problems confronting the communications industry, we can begin to put our problems a little bit more in perspective.

The President in his recent message to the Congress on education, pointed out what to me was a tremendously important and, indeed, almost startling statistic. He pointed out that the average student spends more time watching TV than he spends actually in the schools of this Nation. He pointed out that, in getting a high school diploma, the average student spends about 11,000 hours, whereas in the same period of time he will spend something like 16,000 hours watching television.

All of us in this House are and have been concerned about the problems throughout the Nation concerning obscenity. Recently we passed a bill to deal with obscenity as it affects the children of this country and the adults of the United States by proscribing the use of our postal facilities. But think how much more difficulty there is, and think how much more important it is, and think how much more powerful a media television is, and think how it can contribute a positive or negative influence on this problem. We must ask ourselves if we have devoted any kind of sufficient attention to this particular problem.

We have noted too that there have been questions raised about possible censorship either by the networks or by someone else because of a person's political views. Those in the FCC and in this Congress are charged with the responsibility for a real interest in trying to see this problem examined in greater detail.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut pointed out, there is increasing utilization of the spectrum which calls for additional studies to be developed in order to take advantage of what is a tremendously important national resource.

We also have to be aware that we have to get the communications industry, and our delegate agency is supposed to be the FCC, to try to figure out how to get the industry to use the spectrum as a more positive force in this Nation.

In my judgment there has been probably no greater contribution to television programing than the advent of "Sesame Street," which is an effort at

least to begin to present preschooling advantages to the preschool-age children of this Nation and maybe to draw their attention for just a few moments away from the many programs that are dominated by violence and other things that may or may not be producing a generation of children addicted to the most powerful communications media ever developed by mankind.

I do not think it is an acceptable answer either for those of us who serve in this body to find the Bureau of the Budget or people in the Federal Communications Commission pleading poverty when we say they should make an effort to try to find out what is happening in these areas. Estimates that were given to us in the committee are that total revenues directly regulated by the FCC approximate $30 billion. This is just direct regulation. It does not include all the other indirect business related to the communications industry that we do not even begin to regulate or to touch.

I suppose to me the most significant comment that was made about the value of the permission that is given to use the public spectrum was made clear when it was estimated in the hearings by the FCC that if someone wanted to talk about purchasing WCBS–TV in New York City, they would be starting with an opening price of approximately $100 million.

That would be a beginning bargaining price to discuss the purchase of a single television station in the city of New York.

Now, the total indirect impact of this industry on our gross national product really cannot be estimated. I do not believe it is fruitful for us to accept either from the FCC or the Bureau of the Budget or anybody else the position that we do not have enough money to begin to examine questions like how we deal with the problem of violence, or how we deal with the problem of obscenity, or how we deal with the question of the efficient use of this important national asset, the spectrum, for the benefit of all the people who live in this great Nation of ours.

I believe the hearings will show to anybody who might be interested in looking at them—that there are areas of FCC responsibility where there are no standards at all. None has been developed. None is in the planning stage.

I believe it is about time that the FCC began to answer some of the very basic questions I am raising here today and which every member of the subcommittee raised when we had this most important hearing on the FCC budget.

They do not have any policy at all, for example, on the degree to which networks have a right to exercise censorship.

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

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, not only do they not have a policy, but also they really have not even considered the matter of network censorship, or whether or not there ought to be any sort of guideline laid down in a meeting between the FCC and industry as to exactly how the matter should be treated.

They do not have a mechanism for monitoring quality, or indeed even basic decency in TV programs.

Not only do they not have standards, but also they have not tried, so far as the hearings demonstrate, to begin to try to get over to the Hill to answer the questions.

There are no priorities for the allocating of the new portion of the spectrum that is going to become available to this Nation because of increased technology. Nowhere have they begun to decide what might be the optimum use of that spectrum for the benefit of the people of this Nation.

I believe we have to recognize that one of the great events for good or for evil that has happened in this Nation has been the development of a vast communications network centered around the television industry. It can be and ought to be a magnificent use of a public asset, that is, the spectrum, as regulated by our delegated agencies in such fashion that we will not have to ask questions about whether or not it does contribute to the incidence of violence or whether or not it has an impact on the children of this Nation, or whether indeed we are using that national asset to try to get through to and to reach the children in an affirmative way, as I suggest to you that "Sesame Street" is now doing.

I hope the networks will take note and begin to get into this kind of programing, as was recently suggested by the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission in a speech in Los Angeles. They have an enormous responsibility to the people of this Nation in an area like this and I hope we can look forward to some new and better programing.

Mr. Chairman, I should like also to comment on another matter.

As noted in the Appropriations Committee report, the bill includes $291,500,000 for Appalachian regional development programs. This includes $175,000,000 for the highways program.

I concur in this recommendation, but do so only in reliance upon certain assurances which were given in the record during hearings on the bill. The Appalachian Regional Commission has assured the committee that it will be able to reprogram sufficient funds to meet emergency situations which may arise as a result of new outbreaks of the mine fires and subsidences which continually plague certain areas of the country.

In this connection, I include in the RECORD at this point a letter from John B. Waters, Jr., Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, which sets forth these assurances in greater detail:

THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1970.

Hon. JOSEPH M. McDADE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McDADE: This letter is in further response to questions which were raised during the hearings on the Appalachian Regional Commission's 1971 appropriation request with respect to funding mine fire extinguishment and subsidence under Section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

1. Funds appropriated in 1970 and requested for 1971 would surely be available to fight mine fires and to alleviate subsidence problems. While both the 1970 and 1971 requests were predicated on estimates that the funds would be primarily utilized for surface area restoration, they *would* be available for mine fire and subsidence projects if such projects were requested by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and were otherwise permissible by law and regulation.

2. There are at the present time uncommitted funds under Section 205 which would be available for mine fire or subsidence work if the project were to be submitted by any State in the Region.

3. Should, in the future, a State desire to submit mine fire or subsidence projects for approval rather than a surface restoration project, such a mine fire project could be approved by the Commission.

4. In the event of a mine fire or subsidence project of an emergency nature, the Commission could reprogram funds to meet such situations, except that funds provided under contract authority for the Section 201 Highway program would not be available for reprogramming. I believe that we have the necessary resources and authority, and am confident we would use them in such an emergency.

If any further information is needed, I will be pleased to be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. WATERS, Jr.,
Federal Cochairman.

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

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I commend the gentleman on his remarks, and I should like to bring in one item of information on this particular matter.

One of the largest television stations in Los Angeles, KHJ, has voluntarily announced that it will no longer cover these riots and demonstrations which have so much violence in them. They are voluntarily stopping that. It seems to me this is something that could be emulated by other television stations.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, about 3 weeks ago the authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration came before the House. If I remember correctly, that bill called for some $3.6 billion, and it was approved by the House carrying about $3.6 billion. This committee, as I understand it, has reduced the funds for the moon-doggle to about $3.1 billion—and I am dealing now in round figures—or a cut of some $404 million. I commend the committee for making this cut and I wish it was far more, but I wonder what some of the Members are going to do today, especially some of those on the Republican side of the aisle who talk economy yet they walked through the teller line and tied the vote at 53 to 53 defeating Mr. KARTH'S amendment to cut $240 million out of that bill. I wonder if they are going to be here today to offer amendments to put at least $240 million back in. I await with interest this afternoon to see what happens.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a few questions about the money in this

bill for the National Science Foundation, the authorization for which we had before the House only yesterday. I note in the committee hearings, in response to a question by Mr. JONAS, Mr. Sisco responded to the gentleman from North Carolina, by saying:

The unobligated balance of fiscal year 1970 funds available for obligation as of January 1, 1970, was $264 million and the total funds unexpended on that date was $573 million.

The House approved the authorizations yesterday in the neighborhood of $525 million, plus $2 million in foreign currencies. The Appropriation Committee, in my opinion very properly reduced the amount to $495 million.

My question to someone on the committee is how in the world could the National Science Foundation spend $573 million from January 1 to the end of this fiscal year and do it with any degree of responsibility and sanity in the expenditure of public funds?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my good friend that the National Science Foundation makes research grants and contracts with colleges and universities for upgrading science facilities and equipment, and many other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. I know what they do.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Many of these contracts are for 3-year periods. The gentleman has indicated there is an unexpended carryover, but there are commitments and obligations. When you enter into a contract for a 3-year period, you have an obligation, and that is why the Foundation has this large unexpended balance.

Mr. GROSS. But how can they possibly ladle out $573 million? It must take more than an ordinary shovel. It has to be a scoop shovel when they start dishing it out at that rate.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The National Science Foundation, in addition to the grants programs, also operates five research centers of their own. In addition the Mansfield amendment, which in effect says that no appropriation for research shall go to the Department of Defense unless it is defense related, has caused the Department of Defense to transfer to NSF certain of their research functions.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, the Department of Defense is cutting down on research and so is NIH as well as NASA as a result of a cut in funds. So, the unemployed are simply walking across the street and getting a job with this outfit, the National Science Foundation.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we have made a $16 million cut below the budget.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. May I add one comment to those made by the chairman of the subcommittee?

The gentleman from Iowa makes a very good point. The only trouble about it is that the gentleman is talking about outlays and spending of money. We do not deal with that in this bill. We deal in obligational authority. There are estimated to be $234 billion in 1970 and $250 billion in 1971 of unexpended funds in various executive agencies of the Government that has previously been appropriated but unexpended. So, you cannot compare outlays with appropriations.

As the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) said, some of these contracts run for 3 years and there will be incremental expenditures as the obligations become due under those contracts.

Mr. GROSS. I know, but their guidelines are from fiscal year to fiscal year, are they not?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. They get money every fiscal year?

Mr. JONAS. They came in with a budget request of $16 million above this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I do not have to tell my friend from North Carolina—he has been around here too long—that when you start overstuffing these agencies with money, that is when they waste it, hand over fist.

Let me continue with another excerpt from your hearings. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) is speaking now and he says:

The scientists are going to discover the framework for review of contemporary inflation.

It does not say they are going to solve it. This is something new for the National Science Foundation to go into the field of studying, with a special commission, contemporary inflation. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee two questions:

What is the difference between "inflation" and "contemporary inflation"?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend I wish I knew the answer to both of those questions.

Mr. GROSS. So they plan to go into a study of inflation when the Lord knows every agency of this Government is studying inflation and the evils thereof.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if the National Science Foundation could in some way contribute toward solving the problem of inflation and the problems of our cities, they would be making a significant contribution to our country. It is our sincere hope that they may be able to find a solution.

However, at the present time they are unable to process and follow up on only a fraction of the number of applications which they receive in the fields of mathematics, chemistry, biology, and the social sciences.

Mr. GROSS. They use another word for it but I do not recall exactly. It is something like "societale."

Let us look briefly at another subject about which the gentleman from Tennessee was directly involved, and which appears on page 607 of the hearings:

Mr. EVINS. You are launching out on some big, long-range, costly programs.

Here is another one, "Arctic research programs." How much will it cost and what is the timespan?

Dr. JONES. I can't tell you for sure, Mr. Chairman, how long it will last. It will depend a little on the life of the oilfields up in the north.

Mr. EVINS. What is your planning?

Dr. JONES. Ten to 15 years.

Mr. EVINS. How much is the estimated cost?

Dr. JONES. $2 million next year and it will probably expand to a total over the next 10 years of $10 million per year.

In other words, if the "oilfields up in the north" lasted for 100 years we would be expected to spend $10 million or more a year on "arctic research programs."

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend from Iowa that our committee is watching these expenditures very closely. A year or so ago we had testimony that they had actually located some oil in their oceanographic exploration. I asked, "What did you do?" They said they did not want to run the risk of polluting the area and plugged the hole.

So, they have proven they know how to discover oil. Maybe they can find some there to help with the budget problems with which our country is confronted.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa, and I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa to yield to me for one moment.

I would say to the gentleman from Iowa to at least give this subcommittee credit for stopping "mohole".

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say for not stopping mohole?

Mr. JONAS. For stopping mohole.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I certainly do, and I certainly give the committee credit for the cuts it made in programs in this bill that badly needed to be cut even more.

On page 699 of the hearings, Mr. EVINS asked:

Doctor, how many grants were made in the social science field last year?

Dr. HINES. 474.

Mr. EVINS. How many do you estimate for next year?

Dr. HINES. I suspect it will be about the same number.

Mr. EVINS. What was the largest grant?

Dr. HINES. There were a few, about $250,000.

Mr. EVINS. To whom and what for?

Dr. HINES. One was a study on the attitudes of the American people toward violence.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Then Mr. EVINS said:

I can tell you the attitude, they don't like it.

There are already dozens of commissions and committees around here studying environmental attitudes and violence. And still the National Science Foundation goes into this field to the tune of at least $250,000. Where did this grant go? To the University of Michigan which has already obtained millions of dollars in grants through the foreign aid program.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I was hoping the gentleman from Iowa would read the response of Dr. Levin, who said that they are not planning to investigate the attitude of the public toward violence. They know that the public is opposed to violence. What they propose doing is studying the things that make these people engage in violence. And if they can come up with an answer to that that will help us find a way to stop these people from engaging in violence then I think the money will be well spent.

Mr. GROSS. There are 535 Members of Congress who ought to do something about the violence that is rampant in the country.

Mr. JONAS. Yes, but we have not been able to be very successful in our efforts.

Mr. GROSS. How much more expert in that field are these people?

Mr. JONAS. I just do not know. I would just be willing to give them a chance to come up with some answers, and I would applaud them if they can find out what motivation there is that causes people to engage in violence.

Mr. GROSS. People have been engaging in violence for since the beginning of time, have they not?

Mr. JONAS. Not quite as much as they are doing today.

Mr. GROSS. It is inconceivable that with all the money that has been spent on the study of violence and crime through the years there is no worthwhile report gathering dust on some shelf.

I do not know what else there is to finance around here. Is there any rock unturned?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is one of the great Members of the House, one of the great economizers of the House, and one who has done a great deal in this direction. We want to compliment the gentleman for his helpfulness, and for his great capability. We appreciate his ability in being able to screen these expenditures.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, but let me tell him that I am having a page count conducted on the hearings conducted by his committee that were made available only a few days ago. There are either eight or 10 thick volumes of hearings from the gentleman's committee, and from the committee chaired by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) on State, Justice, and the Judiciary, and other agencies.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, I think there were four volumes from this committee that were made available only yesterday or the day before and that is not sufficient time to provide an opportunity to look through these thousands of pages, especially, when the bills are called up immediately after the hearings are released for public consumption. I wish the committee chairmen would make the hearings available a couple of weeks before the bills are called up so that we might do even more with the information that is obtained from those who are spending the money.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield. The gentleman recognizes the monumental task before the committee. We began hearings in early February, and have spent 3 months in examination of the top officials of all these agencies of the Government. We have tried to hold the line and cut out exorbitant expenditures. We want to give you the benefit of these hearings so that all of the information is available to you.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the committee for what it has done. But why not release these hearings, since they are so voluminous—why not release them as they become available—as the hearings on one department agency are completed and so give us a little time to go into them deeper than we do.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We try to get the hearings printed just as soon as possible. The job is so monumental that the Printing Office broke down. We commend the gentleman for his scrutiny, his survey, his review, and his excellent examination of these hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I think at this point it would be worth pointing out that we are committed within the committee, and this has some application to what the gentleman said about the rule that we asked for on this bill—we are committed to completing action on an appropriation bill before the new fiscal year begins.

Mr. GROSS. I am not criticizing the Appropriations Committee for the waiver of points of order on this bill—not at all.

Mr. Chairman, I am only pointing out, in view of the fact that you are conducting these extensive hearings, that there is no way the ordinary Member of Congress can profit therefrom unless the hearings are released sometime in advance of consideration on the House floor.

Mr. JONAS. They only became available recently, and the only way we could have made more time available would have been to delay the consideration of the bill, and we do not want to do that.

Mr. GROSS. No, what I am suggesting to the gentleman is the release of these volumes as they each become available; as they are completed.

Mr. JONAS. That is, instead of waiting to complete all of the hearings?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. That is a very good suggestion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wish that I could support this bill but I cannot and for the reason, among others, that I am convinced the appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration ought to be cut by at least another $1 billion and the National Science Foundation ought to be cut considerably deeper. I could not justify to those I represent in Congress a vote for more explorations of the moon and the funding of more commissions and councils to suggest ways and means of spending more money when the Treasury is already barren.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I am greatly dismayed by the independent offices-Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1971. This legislation represents a glaring example of the lopsided priorities presently prevailing in our Federal budget.

Under the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, the Department of Housing and Urban Development receives $2.929 billion, while the appropriation for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is $3.197 billion. HUD's appropriation represents only 63 percent of its total authorization, while 89 percent of the authorization is to be allocated to NASA. Thus, HUD, a Department charged with responsibility over many of the most pressing and immediate problems of urban America, is to receive $268 million less than NASA, whose programs and goals, while laudable, are hardly of immediate concern or in need of prompt attention. I shall vigorously support amendments to H.R. 17548 to reduce the NASA appropriations and to increase the appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It is more important for us to put Americans in decent housing than to continue to put men on the moon and other planets.

Regarding the housing appropriations, I am particularly disappointed that the bill provides only $1 billion of an authorized $1.7 billion for urban renewal. Secretary Romney himself has pointed out that this coming July 1 there will be a $3 billion backlog of urban renewal project applications from the financially impoverished cities of America. Obviously, more funds are necessary if our cities are to accomplish an effective rebuilding program.

In another instance, the bill provides no funds whatsoever for tenants services despite a $45 million authorization by Congress and a $5 million request from the administration. Funds for water and sewer grants are $350 million under the authorized amount.

Model Cities constitutes one of the most promising programs ever developed to assist blight-ridden urban centers. As originally conceived the program called for a comprehensive approach—a total attack—on the myraid problems which have adversely affected the quality of life in American cities. Unfortunately, due to inadequate funding, model cities has yet to fulfill the great expectations which accompanied its enactment in 1966. The legislation before us continues the practice of underfunding this worthwhile program. Of an authorization for fiscal 1971 of $1.6 billion for model cities, only $575 million is appropriated.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to reverse the priorities es-

tablished in this bill and to give top priority to those programs which attempt to assist our cities and our people toward a better life.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, included in the Department of Housing and Urban Development section of the bill we are considering are fiscal year 1971 proposals for $130,000,000 in contract authority for section 235 of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act and another $115,100,000 for payments on existing contracts for both the 235 and 236 sections of this legislation. Congress reaffirmed the national goal of "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family" in its declaration of policy in the 1968 act. I agree wholeheartedly that the highest priority should be given to decent housing for all Americans. However, I would like to publicly state my opposition to the manner in which the section 235 program is being administered, at least within my congressional district by the FHA regional director in Tampa. Hundreds of reservations have been issued for the speculative production of these homes without, in my opinion, any consideration being given to the status of the various housing markets. Let me read from a letter written last September to give you an example:

> We live in a neighborhood where our existing homes were built two to five years ago and were purchased for $20,000–$26,000. Due to the space program cutbacks at Cape Kennedy, many people are being forced to leave the area and since the start of this 235 development a few weeks ago, potential buyers will not even come to look at the homes in our neighborhood. More and more each day the owners of these homes, most of them insured by FHA and VA, will have no recourse but to leave them and let them be foreclosed. It is hard to understand why the same Federal department would allow one program (Section 235) to destroy the value of a property insured by them under another program.

It is hard for me to understand also. At the time there were, and this is a conservative estimate, some 750 vacant homes in the northern section of Brevard County, Fla., where this homeowner lives. It took me 3 full months of correspondence and meetings with FHA officials before a decision was announced halting the issuance of conditional commitments for the speculative production of new homes until the housing market situation justified additions.

But regardless of the housing market, it seems to me that FHA regional directors have an obligation to all homeowners in an area in that the Federal Government is insuring the greater majority of homes. And it is also my belief that while this particular program is primarily intended to stimulate the production of new or rehabilitated units, its limited application to existing housing should be broadened in that this has proven a successful and useful part of the program. Why should new homes be constructed when vacant, new, or used homes which fit the requirements of this program are in existence?

Another thing about this program amazes me. The maximum subsidy payment to which a low-income homeowner is entitled leaves him with a monthly payment obligation such as he would have under a mortgage with a 1-percent interest rate. The Internal Revenue Service has ruled that families receiving these assistance payments do not have to report them as income, and they are allowed to deduct on their income tax all of the interest and taxes paid on their behalf by the Federal Government.

It is my hope that the Federal Housing Administration will carefully review this program and its various aspects and issue strict guidelines to the Federal Housing Administration regional directors, whose autonomous power, in at least one instance, is doing anything but helping the housing situation in this country.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 17548, a bill making appropriations for sundry independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I am particularly pleased that the committee has provided $6,089,000 in funds for the construction of the new Federal building, West Palm Beach, Fla.

The citizens of Palm Beach County and the city of West Palm Beach have been looking forward to this facility for a long time and I am pleased that we will soon be able to move forward with the construction before the year is out, assuming the Senate concurs with the House provisions for this facility.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, today is a very important day for our city of Wilmington. Important because it represents a giant step forward in the realization of a project of crucial importance to the revitalization of our community.

I want to express my appreciation to the House and especially to the members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the political aisle who have included $9,127,000 for a Federal building in Wilmington.

Several years ago, Wilmington citizens, business, labor, and community leaders, as well as leaders of both political parties banded together to redevelop our largest city. The key link in this multimillion-dollar downtown development program has been this Federal building. Timewise, there is no Federal project that has been on the books longer than the project for the Wilmington Federal building, which was originally authorized in 1959, but was never funded.

As I have indicated, many people, both Republicans and Democrats, have played a key role in this project. There are too many to mention each by name. During my first term of office, however, I worked closely on the project with the late Governor Terry, who took a great interest in its realization. Likewise, a great Delawarean, the late Henry B. duPont devoted his great talent and energies to this matter. In part, due to a request from him, I discussed the project at length with the President at a White House breakfast, as well as with his staff. We in the Washington delegation have also had the strong help and support of Governor Peterson, Mayor Haskell, as well as his predecessor, Mayor Babiarz.

It was a great day for Delaware when the President included funds for this new Federal building as part of his General Services budget. Today is another great day as the project moves closer to reality.

There are many reasons why this facility is of such importance to our community. It will help enable this building to be coordinated with the construction of other private and public buildings in accordance with a general design concept. I believe better service may be provided our citizens through locating all Federal agencies in one centrally located building. It has also been estimated that savings will result because of the high cost of renting office space in the city. And, finally, we believe this step forward will help expedite the many other projects, public and private, now on planning boards or under consideration. In brief, the appropriation of these funds means more than merely a new Federal building. It is a significant step in improving the quality of life in the city of Wilmington.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriation, chaired by the distinguished chairman the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), for their inclusion in the present bill before us today of the sum of $3,716,000 which will get underway much needed construction for a new U.S. court house and Federal office building in the city of Baltimore.

The need for this new building has been well documented by the General Services Administration and the authorization for the building was approved by the Committee on Public Works, of which I have the honor to be chairman. I appreciate the speedy manner in which funds have been provided to begin construction of the Baltimore building so soon after its authorization by the Public Works Committees of the House and Senate.

Baltimore is the largest, most important city in the State of Maryland. It is the seventh largest city in the United States, and is the second most important seaport in foreign trade tonnage on the Atlantic seaboard.

The size and importance of the city of Baltimore make it quite clear that proper facilities should be available for the Federal agencies and Federal courts which are located within the city. It has been apparent for some time that the existing buildings housing the court facilities and agencies that are to be housed in this new building are inadequate. For this reason, the Committee on Public Works, at my request, directed the General Services Administration to survey Federal building needs in Baltimore. That survey is a basis for the authorization for the appropriation we are considering today.

I am delighted with the rapid manner in which both the authorization and initial funding for the Federal building we are considering today has moved.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 17548, the independent offices-HUD appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971. Although the Appropriations Committee did not

fund all of the various HUD programs as much as I would like to have seen, I can endorse the work of this great committee in providing adequate funds to meet the needs for housing our citizens under the various Federal housing programs. In particular, I congratulate the committee for approving all of the contact authorization remaining for the sections 235, homeownership program in the amount of $130 million, and 236, rental housing programs in the amount of $135 million. These two programs have now proved to be the most successful and innovative programs that the Congress has approved in all of the Federal housing programs. They have won the endorsement and vigorous support of many diverse interest groups and is a testament to the Democratic administration which proposed them.

I am pleased that at least $50 million was provided for the rent supplement program, although I would like to have seen the full appropriation of the $100 million authorized. I am disappointed that the section 312 rehabilitation loan program was not funded adequately; only $35 million is provided in this bill, when the needs of cities, such as my own home city of Philadelphia, could probably use the whole appropriated amount. Large cities, such as Philadelphia, find the 312 program an extremely important way of salvaging existing structures in our cities.

The urban renewal program remains one of the most important programs for revitalizing our cities, both large and small. The requests for grants under urban renewal are much greater than the committee has approved in this bill. I would like to have seen a full $1.6 billion appropriated, especially since the neighborhood development program needs additional funds in order that cities might rapidly use the renewal funds more effectively.

The denial of funds for the tenants services programs is the most serious defect in this appropriations bill. Time and again, Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am chairman, has heard testimony that such a program to educate, train, and aid tenants in public housing is a vital necessity if proper management of our local authorities is to be maintained. I do not agree with the committee report which states that these services are being adequately provided by local authorities, churches, fraternal, labor, volunteer, and civil groups. These groups simply do not have the funds to provide the needed services.

I intend to support the amendment to be offered by Mr. STEPHENS of Georgia, and my distinguished colleague the ranking minority member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. WIDNALL, to provide full appropriations for the water and sewer facilities program. The administration requested only $150 million for this very important program. I believe that the need is such that $500 million should be appropriated. I am sorry to see that the administration recommended only $575 million for the Model Cities program, the same amount as was requested in last year's budget. With the administration intent on grabbing Model Cities funds for other purposes, I would have hoped that the committee would have recommended the full authorization of approximately $1.6 billion. I was disappointed that the committee did not recommend a full $11.3 million for fair housing and equal opportunity that the administration requested. The committee recommended only $7 million for this vital program and I would hope that the additional $4.3 million is added to the bill.

I heartily endorse the committee's recommendation of $30 million for urban technology and research. The committee report language states that it is important for Congress that the results of these research programs, particularly Operation Breakthrough, develop more supporting material so that we know more of what Breakthrough is accomplishing.

Mr. Chairman, I am most pleased that the committee has approved the funds needed for the superstructure of the Federal courthouse and office building in Philadelphia. The funds for the substructure had been appropriated several years ago and that portion of the building is well underway. The funds included in this bill, $61.8 million, will allow an orderly continuation of construction for completion of the entire building.

I urge the passage of this appropriation bill.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, during the process of authorizing funds for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, gave detailed consideration to all aspects of the programs conducted by NASA. The Manned Space Flight Subcommittee and the full committee, after receiving testimony from NASA Centers, key industrial contractors, and senior officials of NASA, added additional funds to the Apollo and the space flight operations line items. This was done with the intent of assuring that when Saturn V production is resumed later in the 1970's the leadtime required to build these vehicles will be reduced, and that the expertise and know-how to build such vehicles will not be lost. Funds were also added to provide for additional scientific payloads on the last of the currently scheduled Apollo lunar exploration flights. In the area of space flight operations, funds were added to gain more benefit from the flight of the orbital workshop, now called the Skylab, scheduled for 1972 and which will be utilized in two additional missions in 1973. Funds were also provided to further explore the technology associated with the low-cost shuttle and space station so that the Congress and the Executive will be provided with the information necessary to make decisions in future years as to the pace and direction of our efforts in the shuttle and space station fields. It should be pointed out that the NASA budget request to the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1971 was $535,000,000 more than the bill which came to this Congress. The increases recommended by the Science and Astronautics Committee, under the distinguished leadership of our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), represented a total increase of approximately $298 million over the administration request. The appropriations bill before us today negates, at least in part, the thorough and thoughtful effort given to the NASA programs for fiscal year 1971. However, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) and his committee for their endorsement of a thorough study of the low-cost space shuttle and space station.

The Subcommittee on NASA Oversight, which I am privileged to chair, undertook a study in late 1969 which reviewed the posture of our manned space flight effort and spoke specifically to the question of costs and schedules and the future of manned space flight. This study was published under the title "Manned Space Flight—Present and Future" in January of this year. In the light of the Appropriatons Committee's action with respect to manned space flight, it seems important to me to review the findings of this study.

First, as is well known to the Members of this body, our national space program has been in precipitous decline since the fiscal year 1966. After 1974, the United States will no longer have the capability of lifting manned payload in excess of 60,000 pounds into earth orbit or deep space unless Saturn V production is resumed. It was also a finding of this study that a launch rate of less than two manned vehicles per year could materially increase the risk of mission success in space flight. This study and the subsequent action of the committee also endorses the view of the Appropriations Committee that adequate definition of a low-cost shuttle and space station are of major importance to the future of our national space program. However, the deletion of $106.1 million from the NASA budget, coupled with recommending the postponement of the Apollo 14 flight until next year, can only serve to further weaken our national space effort.

Therefore, it would seem important that this $106.1 million reduction be restored to the NASA budget so that NASA may adequately schedule the lunar exploration flights consistent with changes associated with the Apollo 13 experience and consistent with minimizing risk of mission success, this will allow sufficient flights to exercise launch operations recovery and supporting personnel and facilities in the manned space flight program.

THE NASA BUDGET

The NASA fiscal year 1971 authorization and appropriation request was $3.333 billion. This figure is $522 million below a comparable figure for 1970. NASA's estimated expenditure for fiscal year 1971 is approximately $3.4 billion, which is over $2.5 billion below NASA's peak expenditures in 1966. This reduction in space budget has required major cutbacks and deferrals in the number of programs. NASA's peak employment was 420,000 people, which will have declined by the end of fiscal year 1971 to approximately 144,000 people. It is a tribute to the management of NASA that so much has been achieved in our national space program while forcing expenditures to an ever lower level. We spent $25 million in 8 years to develop the manned space

flight capability that we have today. At the same time we spent over $600 billion on health, education, and welfare programs in the Federal Government. Again, I believe it is a tribute to the NASA and industrial personnel in the space program that they achieved so much within the level of funds that we have provided. The appropriations bill before you is $404 million less than the funds authorized for NASA for fiscal year 1971. The ability to conduct adequate programs in the 1970's could easily be compromised by this major reduction.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The appropriations bill before us today represents a $106.1 million reduction in research and development from the NASA request for fiscal year 1971. NASA has made the decision based on the Apollo 13 experience to schedule the Apollo 14 launch no earlier than December 1970. The reduction of $106.1 million will far exceed the cost of deferral of the Apollo 14 flight from October to December of this year. In fact, the deferred costs are of the order of $10 to $20 million while the remaining $86 to $96 million will have to be absorbed by NASA in current programs. I know the Members of this body are well aware of the drastic reductions that NASA has had to take in the space program to operate within the budget proposed for the next fiscal year. The closing of the Electronics Research Center in Boston, Mass., is well known to everyone. The manned space flight program of NASA will cease to exist after 1974 unless sufficient work is done to initiate adequate programs in that area. Saturn V production has been terminated, the lunar exploration missions have been stretched out and our first orbital workshop, a precursor to a space station in the 1970's, has been most recently delayed by 4 months and previously delayed by over a year and a half. The flight of automated scientific satellites, particularly the applications technology satellites F and G have been deferred and the Viking Mars mission postponed until 1975.

The net effect of this reduction will not be further deferrals and delays but likely the termination of programs in which we have already invested substantial amounts of money. Surely this works against the findings of the President's Space Task Force recommendations made in September of last year to the President. If we are to maintain an adequate national space effort, the recommendations of this report must be heeded.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

As the total cadre of people in industry and within NASA has declined, it has become increasingly important that NASA maintain in-house laboratory test and development personnel, the know-how and capability to meet the problems of current programs and plan and direct future national space effort. The reduction included in this appropriation bill in the research and program management area of $13,575,000 can only serve to weaken NASA's capability to meet the needs in its current and future programs. Approximately 1,950 civil service personnel will be removed from NASA in the reduction in force based on this decreased budget as contained in this bill. A reduction in force, as the Members know, causes, many dislocations within an organization, shifting of people from one job to another is required. Therefore, it is not only a net reduction in total available people, but also a substantial dislocation of people from one job to another within the agency. This can only serve to reduce NASA's capability to cope with problems such as the Apollo 13 accident and to maintain continuity in the complex and difficult programs which they manage.

It is estimated by NASA that at least 20 percent of their total work force will suffer disruptive influences because of the reduction in force procedures. This problem is further aggravated by the fact that NASA will not be able to hire new professional employees during this period of time. It is important that new college graduates be brought into the space program if the vitality and technical expertise of the agency is to be maintained in the years ahead.

The President's 1971 budget includes plans to reduce the NASA end year civil service strength by 800 from the planned end year 1970 strength. Of these, 600 are related to the closing of the Electronics Research Center as a NASA installation, with the balance to be accomplished through personnel attrition. However, a reduction of the magnitude proposed by the Appropriations Committee would require NASA to resort to reduction-in-force — RIF — procedures. The current estimate of total separations of permanent civil service personnel in 1971 is 1,250 spread throughout the year—exclusive of the 800 positions to be abolished at ERC, Headquarters, MSFC, KSC, and MSC. If no replacements whatever were made in 1971 the maximum savings from the 1971 budget level would be only about $4 million.

There are several reasons why we cannot rely on attrition for further 1971 reductions. First, continued reliance in attrition would compound already serious problems. Between July 1967 and June 1971, NASA will have reduced its strength in permanent positions by 1,655 people in 1968, 1,338 in 1959, 798 in 1970 and a planned 800 in 1971, which, exclusive of the adjustments for conversion of service contracts, totals 4,591. Except for the planned 1971 reduction, these reductions have been taken almost entirely by attrition during this period. We have replaced only about 50 percent of our total actual separations. Because of our restricted ability to hire for the past several years and the wide difference between separation rates of occupational groups, a maldistribution of skills exists in the current work force. While the patterns vary somewhat from center to center, the overall agency separation rate of 4.9 percent in 1970 is the cumulative result of separation rates of 3.0 percent for scientists and engineers, 5.0 percent for administrative professionals, 13.7 percent for clerical employees and 3.1 percent for technicians and wage board. It is not expected that this pattern will change significantly in the future.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

The NASA fiscal year 1971 budget proposal for construction of facilities requested the amount of $34.6 million. The bill before us today is $16,325,000 below that proposed level. The effect of the bill is to deny all but 2 of 11 small but significant projects proposed by NASA. In addition, effort devoted to the facility planning and design would be drastically reduced. NASA has reached sufficient maturity in facilities construction so that if these facilities are to be maintained in good working order it is necessary to undertake a reasonable level of rehabilitation and modification to existing plants. It is a shortsighted view if sufficient funds are not provided to maintain the substantial investment this Nation has in the facilities devoted to the space program. In addition to this, certain small but new facilities are required if NASA is to efficiently undertake current and future programs. During hearings on the authorization of funds for NASA for fiscal year 1971 the construction of facilities items received a searching and thorough review. The $34.6 million request of NASA for construction of facilities would be a prudent investment for this Nation, not only in maintenance of facilities but for limited new construction necessary to maintain NASA's technological vitality.

SPACE SHUTTLE

Mr. Chairman, we are all for economy in Government. We all wish to see a maximum return from the investment that the Government makes in any program. This Nation has invested over $38 million in our national space program. It is an investment that is paying dividends at the present time. We have learned much since the fateful days since the launch of the first Sputnik, when we, as a nation, were far behind in pursuing the potential of space.

The Saturn V launch vehicle, the only large payload vehicle available to this Nation, is successfully carrying on lunar exploration missions, but we are nearing the end of the road in manned space flight effort. This Nation will have no manned space flight capability after 1974 with the exception of one or two smaller S–IB vehicles. Between now and 1974 seven vehicles will have flown to the moon and have made outstanding contributions to our scientific knowledge of the earth, the moon, and the solar system.

We will have launched, in 1973, an orbital workshop now called Skylab and will have made visits to Skylab on three missions. All of these things are of major significance. But decisions have not been made on going beyond 1974 in manned space flight. If we are to realize the return on investment in our national space effort from the tremendous investment that has already been made, it is important that we develop a low cost transportation system to space. This will serve not only manned space flight but also automated space flight programs. Such a vehicle will reduce the cost of placing men and equipment in space from $1,000 or more to an estimated cost of less than $100 per pound once the low cost transportation system—called a shuttle—is

developed. The moneys included in the current authorization bill provide for the design of such a low cost transportation system. It is the major element of the total NASA plan in the 1970's which offers promise of a reduced cost in the space program.

The shuttle, in my view, brings together more closely than ever before the manned and unmanned programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It provides not only a means of placing men in orbit at a lower cost but also the means of examining, retrieving, and repairing automated space vehicles in near earth orbit. This same low cost transportation system will be able to take one or more automated spacecraft to orbit at a low cost. It provides the means of resupplying a manned space station planned for development in the late 1970's.

Again such a space station requires a low cost transportation system if man is to be able to utilize and experiment in space on a long-term basis at a reasonable cost. This same low cost shuttle will also reduce the inventory of vehicles necessary in our national space program.

It is likely that in 1977–78, when such a shuttle becomes operational, that only the very small Scout vehicle used for the smaller satellites and the very large Saturn V vehicle required for deep space missions and lifting payloads in excess of 60,000 pounds of weight into orbit, will be required. The shuttle also offers the opportunity for developing a true rescue system in that it is able to be launched quickly and returned intact to its original launch site. This will allow the retrieval of men and equipment from space on short notice. The low cost shuttle is a key element in the total NASA plan to develop space stations, continue lunar exploration and in support of planetary exploration in the late 1970's and early 1980's.

The shuttle also offers promise, once developed, of being an economical vehicle allowing other nations to participate fully in space programs. The cost of such participation will have been brought to a sufficiently low level to allow increased international cooperation in placing satellites in orbit or providing multinational crews and experimenters. With the shuttle in operation it will not always be necessary that an entire compliment of an earth orbital station be manned by highly trained astronauts. Since the vehicle flies much like a commercial aircraft, taking off vertically and landing horizontally, on an air field, it will be possible to take technicians, observers, and scientists to orbit to perform useful work.

The low cost shuttle also is a significant stimulus to our aeronautical research. The shuttle is the marriage of a rocket and aircraft systems. It has elements of both. There is no question that our aeronautics industry will be improved by the development of such a vehicle.

In summary, the low cost space shuttle offers this Nation the opportunity to provide a major cost reduction in operating in near space in the middle and late 1970's. It supports both automated and manned space flight and reduces the inventory of rockets and spacecraft models that will be necessary in future space effort. It provides the beginning of a true space rescue capability and is a key element in planned future programs of NASA. It provides a new avenue for international cooperation in space and acts as a stimulant to the development of our aeronautics industry.

The funds included in this bill for fiscal year 1971 provide sufficient money to detail requirements for a space shuttle. This is the information the administration and the Congress needs to make decisions for a commitment for the final development of a low cost shuttle.

Therefore, I must commend the members of the Committee on Appropriations for their strong endorsement of studies for a space shuttle and space station which as the words of the report on the bill before us today stated:

> The Committee supports the Space Shuttle and Station as the nation's next step in space.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, this bill before us, H.R. 17548, is certainly and necessarily expansive and complex including, as it does, requested appropriations for some 20 independent executive agencies and the vitally important Department of Housing and Urban Development. Surely the esteemed chairman and his associate members of the Appropriations Committee deserve the gratitude of the House and the country for their diligent and painstaking efforts to prepare and present a prudent and reasonable measure for our determination.

I know that the entire bill will be given the most thorough examination by all Members, but I most earnestly hope that your most concentrated and sympathetic attention and consideration will be granted to the provisions of title III of the bill, containing the appropriations recommended for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, because I very deeply feel it is imperatively urgent for this House to insure that the Department's wholesome programs for model cities, basic water and sewer facilities, urban planning, urban renewal, and related activities be adequately funded for full operation.

There is no question that the origin and continuation of the model cities programs throughout the country, as in my own home city of Worcester, Mass., have become increasingly important in the promotion of local and national unity and they effectively and wholesomely serve to give material assistance, hope, and encouragement to the less fortunate among us.

It is quite clear, Mr. Chairman, to all of us, I am sure, from our own experience and contacts with city and State officials that, without adequate Federal aid, our communities and our commonwealths throughout the country cannot, by themselves, assume the tremendous financial burdens that the fulfillment of these programs require. Therefore, if anything, the committee-recommended appropriations should be increased, in particular areas, as I hope they definitely will be, for instance, in the recommendation for grants for basic water and sewer facilities, but under no circumstances should any of the items be reduced.

In practically all instances, the committee recommendations constitute a bare minimum of continued operational efficiency, and any reduction action would be tantamount to a contradiction and betrayal of our past words and deeds in this House to help the poor, rehabilitate our cities, expand the opportunities for public, low and middle income housing, encourage home ownership and otherwise make it possible for all of our citizens, of whatever race or color or circumstance, to share in the blessings of our national heritage.

Inherent, or course, in this departmental appropriation is the intent and desire to stimulate the production of housing, which is vitally urgent and desperately needed, by reducing down payments on home mortgages, streamlining Federal Housing Administration programs, eliminating unnecessary and burdensome bureaucratic requirements and establishing more uniform criteria for low and middle income housing construction. If we have any hope at all of ever meeting the accelerating demand, in this inflationary period, for decent housing, it is absolutely essential that we begin now to provide the means to close the rapidly growing gap between supply and demand.

Mr. Chairman, in its overall concept and provisions, this measure is prudent and reasonable and represents a priority national investment designed to improve the quality of life for all Americans, and I hope that, with pertinent amendments, it will reecive the overwhelming approval of the House.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, it is tempting, particularly for the layman including Congressmen, to say, "Away with the space program, who needs it? Whoever needed it?" Tempting, but not wise. The technology derived from our space effort to date may have more relevance to spaceship earth's survival prospects than any single development since the discovery of electricity.

This new technology or spinoff from man's quest into the unknown benefits mankind in three ways; through direct application of space systems, through new products and processes transferred from the general fund of technology developed by the space program, and through a fresh understanding of our environment from the perspective of the space traveler.

Improved weather forecasting, and the potential of weather control or modification, is one of the best known and most appreciated of all direct applications of space systems. Besides forecasting the overall weather picture, perhaps the most dramatic impact of weather satellites is their ability to keep a watch on storms, hurricanes, and threatening weather patterns, and to do this early enough and precisely enough to permit timely warnings.

Hurricane Camille, for example, was first observed and then tracked by satellite. The hurricane's path, force, and extent were predicted early and accurately enough to permit authorities to evacuate some 70,000 people from the gulf coast. The ESSA estimates that without early warning, without tracking, without the

credibility provided by actual satellite pictures and data, 50,000 people might have perished in this devastating storm. On the other side of the coin, in November of 1969 Hurricane Laurie also threatened the gulf coast. Observations and tracking by satellite provided the basis for safely predicting that Laurie would not strike the coast. The savings here from the decision not to evacuate and not to protect property are estimated to have exceeded $3 million.

These are but a few examples; since 1966, in fact, U.S. weather satellites have watched every major storm threatening the Nation. In 1969 alone, 12 Atlantic hurricanes, 10 eastern Pacific hurricanes, and 17 western Pacific typhoons were identified and tracked by satellites. Color television cloud pictures from NASA's experimental Applications Technology Satellite—ATS—in stationary orbit are now being used in near-real time. The Navy uses weather satellite pictures for ice patrols and to schedule antarctic resupply. Airline pilots routinely receive a weather photo of their route.

Since April of last year, a new infrared spectrometer on the weather satellite, Nimbus III, has been measuring the vertical temperature of the atmosphere. It provides every day, electronically, from orbit the equivalent of 10,000 conventional atmospheric soundings by balloon or sounding rocket. Satellites and weather are inherently global systems and the extension of these applications to other nations cannot be overlooked. By using automatic readout systems, every nation in the world can benefit from the automatic picture taking—APT—systems onboard U.S. weather satellites. Over 50 countries already view daily weather patterns over their own territory in this way. These same countries also benefit from cloud picture mosaics, built up from individual weather photos and processed by computer, routinely made available by the U.S. Weather Bureau. And soon, Navsat satellites will provide precise navigation for world shipping, and traffic control for aircraft.

The communications satellites will be able to bring into the remotest corners of earth, knowledge, information and education geared to the economic needs, language and culture of every family. Perhaps one day, using simultaneous translation, a weekly conversation between representatives of all the earth's great philosophers can bring into every home a new awareness of the joint venture we are engaged in, survival, reducing fear and mistrust, and just possibly the barren machinations and weapons systems they generate.

Looking to the future, one of the important new developments of great potential is NASA's Earth Resources Technology Satellite program. The first steps in this program are experimental, aimed at learning what can be monitored from space.

Multispectral photographs and sensor data from Apollo flights and from specially fitted aircraft are providing the initial inputs. By combining the information capabilities of space systems, the data transmission capabilities of satellites, and the high speed data processing and large memory of the computer, these promising first experiments may someday develop into a new global environmental information system geared to human decision processes at every level.

Such a system can have major economic value. Hydrologists can monitor melting snow and ice and make important decisions regarding impounding of water in reservoirs, and its effective release for irrigation; knowing the magnitude of the spring runoff will also make possible effective flood control.

Geologists will be assisted in mineral and petroleum exploration, and their understanding of the internal mechanics of the earth will be improved to make possible prediction of earthquakes and volcanic activity.

Farmers of the world could be told of soil needs, which could ultimately save, according to the Department of Agriculture, a billion or more dollars a year in farming costs in the United States alone, one quarter the current annual cost of the whole space program. It will monitor the oceans as well. It is estimated that the value of the world's fishing catch and mineral royalties will be increased by $2 billion each through satellite ocean surveys. Moreover, they will warn man against the depredations of his fishing and oil industries which disturb the life cycle of the sea, possibly even jeopardizing the orderly process of oceanic photosynthesis from which most of our oxygen is derived.

In the field of communications NASA is presently developing a new type of Comsat called the broadcast satellite. This is a system that can send its signal directly to individual television sets or to a community antenna, bypassing the intervening complex of ground facilities needed by the point to point Comsat. By utilizing the energy of the sun the broadcast satellite can become the primary power source, thus eliminating the high cost ground station previously required. The first of these new satellites, the application technology satellite F, is to be launched in mid-1972. It will be placed over India with low cost receivers to be set up by the Indian Government in some 5,000 villages, thereby enabling educational programs on population control and improvement in agriculture practices to be viewed by hundreds of thousands of people.

Less dramatic and in some cases practically unknown are the derived benefits, which stem from general technological advances generated by the demand for performance and reliability of the manned space program.

To foster technological transfer, and shorten the time gap between the development of new technology and its effective utilization, NASA has created the Biomedical Applications Teams, and the Technology Utilization program.

In the medical field, spray-on electrodes and miniaturized sensing devices have contributed new techniques to health care. Sensors monitor tracheotomy tubes inserted in windpipes to insure that they do not get clogged. Sensors, smaller than the head of a pin, can be inserted into a vein to measure blood pressure without interfering with the patient's circulation. A central control station in a hospital can now continuously measure the pulse, respiration rates, temperature, and blood pressure of many patients simultaneously by utilizing sensors and spray-on electrodes. The development of a sight switch to give astronauts an extra pair of arms has been adapted for use by people suffering from paralysis. With this spinoff item a patient can manipulate a motor-driven wheelchair with only the movement of his eyes.

The lunar gravity simulator has been modified to rehabilitate the physically handicapped.

Sealed capsules of radioactive isotopes, built by Monsanto Research Corp., to supply the heat energy that powers thermoelectric generators for satellites, have already been adapted as energy sources for cardiac pacers. Soon these capsules may power blood pumps to replace failed hearts, which are in advanced stages of development. The advantages are reliability and attention-free operating life.

Laser technology developed originally for defense and space use is being adapted for delicate and precise use in medicine. Aerospace engineers, particularly McDonnell-Douglas personnel, have been working since 1962 with medical research teams to find new ways to use lasers in "knifeless surgery" and as diagnostic tools. Lasers are being evaluated in dermatology, organ repair, amputation, and in microbiological studies.

Industrial spinoff from the space program has produced many dividends. Most familiar of the new advances are handsize television cameras, Teflon, and fire resistant paints, and materials. Industrial spinoff is being used by a number of firms in the St. Louis area. The Angelica Corp. is applying flameproofing techniques learned from NASA to such garments as nurses' and doctors' uniforms. The Killebrew Engineering Co. is developing better welding techniques, based on information developed for NASA. Hussman Refrigerating Co. is improving their products with information from NASA's technology utilization program. Other companies utilizing this transferred technology are: Radcliffe Industries, Modern Engineering Co., Guarantee Electrical Co., Conductron Corp., and the U.S. Paint and Lacquer and Chemical Co.

Now, what of man in space? Recently on Earth Day, I met hundreds of students and academicians who voiced the firm opinion that all investments in space should cease at once in favor of investments on earth. Yet, a curiously dominant thread ran through their prescription for earth: Population control, and the need for government to take a more active part in achieving it. It is clear that those who reject the importance of space technology claim with equal fervor that the effort to keep earth livable cannot possibly succeed unaccompanied by firmly enforced worldwide population management. Man's curiosity concerning the limits of his environment begins as random probing, but can become a directed effort should the current environment prove too confining for his numbers or his spirit.

In the meantime there is another relevance to manned programs difficult to tag with a price. It comes in two perspectives: The earth as seen by man in space, and the man in space as seen from earth. The earth was seen and described on this floor by the first man from the far side of the moon—Frank Borman—as a tiny ball hanging in the black stillness of space, with no sustaining help from the galaxies, entirely dependent on man's own initiative, and, as Borman said, his sense of brotherhood. Not a bad perspective, while cities burn, hungry reach up in Biafra, and bodies float down the Mekong.

The second perspective we saw last week in a space shot that failed. Or did it in all respects? How do we measure failure, and how success? If an aborted effort to land and return men from the moon was failure, we failed indeed. But the world was used to success. Would success in that limited sense have focused the prayers, hopes, and yearnings of men too deep to describe? Or did it take failure to do it? All of us were on that ship, in the LEM, in the command module. And we wanted to come home safe. That tiny struggle in the sky meant more to the watching world than any part of its own anatomy of chaos down here. It succeeded in suggesting that great ventures should be joint ventures. And I would hope that as we look ahead to more Apollo flights, consideration be given to initiatives to incorporate a Soviet experiment if not a scientist-astronaut on one of them or one soon thereafter. The more we link hands in realizing the joint dreams of man, the fewer hands we will have free to fight with, and the less inclination to do so. Great wars cost great sums—hardly compensated by the concomitant reductions in population. What price then may we place on small embraces between great powers? If men on earth should work together to make their planet spaceship more livable, and less likely to blow out a panel, or dissipate its oxygen, maybe that lesson must come from men in space. Heaven knows it has not come from men on earth.

As Teilhard de Chardin holds, "Things rising converge." Perhaps that is true of the hopes of man.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my deep concern about recent reports that the administration is considering diverting the sum of $500 million from the model cities program for other purposes. I strongly oppose such a step because I believe it would be devastating to the hopes of many and to the effort to revive our dying cities.

I am well aware that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development last week asked the House Appropriations Committee to approve the administration's full 1971 budget request for model cities, which was subsequently approved. This act I applaud. However, Secretary Romney pointed out that "no final decision has been made" regarding the diversion of model cities funds. It is reported that the admnistration is still studying the possible transfer of these funds. I do not think Secretary Romney approves the transfer.

I hope these reports are nothing more than a "trial balloon" which can be deflated through my efforts, and through those of other Members. I urge my colleagues in Congress to register their own concern.

I must vigorously protest any diversion of model cities funds. It is somewhat consoling to me that the Appropriations Committee would have to approve such a transfer if it were requested by the administration. But I think that to request this diversion of funds would be reneging on an administration pledge to meet the urgent needs of the cities and model cities.

This pledge exists by virtue of the earmarking in the proposed administration budget for fiscal 1971 of the sum of $575 million to assist local model cities boards in supplementing their existing programs. It is obvious that a cut of $500 million would force model cities to operate at a greatly reduced level. I can easily predict the discouragement, and the strong public frustration, which would result from a severe cutback at exactly the time when this promising program is beginning to take hold. Model cities needs these funds. To allow this crippling blow would surely set back our efforts to eradicate urban blight for years to come.

As we consider the HUD appropriations bill today, I hope this body will consider the urgent need for full funding of model cities.

Since I have been closely involved with the start of a model cities program in Fall River, Mass., in my district, I am keenly aware of the extensive citizen involvement in this program and of the hopes and expectations which rest in model cities.

Fall River, with a population of about 99,000, is not a prosperous city. It suffered a severe economic blow with the loss of a great textile industry in the decades preceding World War II.

Model cities represents a new hope for Fall River. In January 1969, it was chosen as one of 150 American cities which now have model cities programs. The site selected for model cities redevelopment is a 616-acre residential area of depressed housing and underprivileged families. While the area includes about 15 percent of the population, it has an unemployment rate nearly double that of the rest of the city. It has serious problems of inadequate transportation, a shortage of health-care services, a heavy school dropout rate. The testing of schoolchildren revealed that 83 percent needed dental care and that a majority were near the anemia level. These are among the problems which model cities seeks to resolve.

Fall River moved enthusiastically ahead with its model cities planning. This year HUD declared that the sum of $1.9 million had been reserved for Fall River's model cities when its first year action plan had been received and approved, and further that HUD could support plans for major new park and recreation facilities.

Fall River has met its timetables under the program. Its mayor and city council, its citizens, and the deprived residents of the model cities area, have been deeply involved in the program to launch model cities.

Fall River is on the threshold where its planning effort will produce visible results. Is this effort now to be crippled, these hopes shattered?

The President has stated that he does not want to inspire expectations that cannot be fulfilled. To cripple model cities at this time would be devastating to the hopes of many persons in many cities. The provision of adequate housing is another integral part of model cities, and I recall the words of the recent report on national housing goals which the President transmitted on April 1 to the Congress:

> As our population grows, geometry will force us to expand ever farther beyond the crowded centers of our cities. This expansion must be accomplished without leaving the center cities as islands of decay, tenanted mainly by lower income families and stripped of adequate public services by the lack of a sufficient tax base.

I feel that there are other less critical parts of the budget from which these funds could be obtained.

There is little hope for our cities if we retreat from programs whereby we have planted the seeds for urban resurrection. The problems which we postpone today are multiplied many times as we delay; in time, they may well be beyond the possibility of solution.

This is not the time to bury hopes. This is not the time to decimate the expectations placed in model cities, or to deny the continued Federal support to the cities which will make this survival possible.

I urge the provision of full funding for model cities as requested by Secretary Romney. I would hope that further consideration of any diversion of these funds would be dropped by the administration. Should such a request be made, I hope it will be rejected by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. There has been a steady erosion over the past several years of the support that has been appropriated to NASA. This has been based more upon irrelevancies than upon basic fact.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology is particularly sensitive to the reductions in research and development. Advanced research, the least mission-oriented of NASA's operations, has been subject to the exigencies that have occurred in both manned and unmanned space flight programs which demand money. It has been unfortunate, therefore, that advanced research and technology has been forced to contribute to that need through the reprograming process. The fact is that reductions in funding in advanced research and technology will result eventually—and in the not too distant future—in an inability to meet the scientific needs of an ongoing and well-funded program of space exploration. Advanced research provides the seedstock of knowledge on which necessary applied space technologies will sorely depend.

The Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology has responsibility

not only for those scientific investigations contributing to our space program, but also has jurisdiction over the other statutory responsibility of NASA, Aeronautics. The Committee on Science and Astronautics has consistently accepted the subcommittee's recommendations that aeronautical research be bolstered and expanded to meet the Nation's needs, both civilian and military. It has been an uphill fight which has been reasonably successful.

However, I cannot conceive how NASA can accept a reduction of $106 million in research and development for fiscal year 1971 without reflecting that reduction across the board. It is undeniably true that small cuts in research and development funds associated with NASA manned and unmanned space flight programs would be major ones for advanced research and technology. Time and again we have been made aware of rising budget restrictions in our national economy. It seems very illogical to allow those restrictions to debilitate the principal source of our scientific strength in NASA. If I may draw an analogy, it is comparable to the farmer who is forced to eat his seedstock. He can be sure he will have no crop next year. Such is the case here. We have to decide whether we will have a program in space that is continuing and viable. Pressing as present day exigencies are, we must not let them negate the wisdom demonstrated by Congress in years passed in its support of our national space program.

In response to a query, NASA was unable to give us exactly what this effect would be. However, they did indicate that this reduction would require NASA to examine all of its programs with a view toward further delays and terminations. It is evident, therefore, that this is a serious reduction in the NASA program. Further, from what I have said above it is evident that the advanced research and technology programs in NASA have continued to decline over the past several years and that they are not now adequately funding programs in addition to the aeronautics mentioned above. These programs include chemical propulsion, basic research effort, and electronics work which we have encouraged in order to improve safety in aircraft flight, as well as the aeronautical vehicles program which has been so valuable to our country.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The amendment would restore $11,275,000 to the NASA appropriation for research and program management. The cut recommended by the Appropriations Committee would lead to an additional reduction of about 1,000 people beyond the 800 decrease already planned.

There are several important reasons for my objections to the cut:

First. The NASA budget request has already been pared down extensively—this is not a matter of "fat" being trimmed off. It is cutting into the core of an important technological asset of this Nation.

Second. An increasingly acute problem is NASA's inability to employ newly graduated professional employees. This has been getting worse for several years. In 1965, NASA hired 965 graduating college students; in 1969, new hires were down to 253—and, before taking the appropriations cut into account, the number is expected to fall to 180.

One serious impact of this trend is the rising average age of the NASA professional work force: it has been going up at the rate of eight-tenths of a year per year, and the average age at most NASA centers is now in the mid-40's. The inevitable result is a decreasing vitality and choking off of new talent; our national capability can be seriously damaged by this trend.

A third reason is related to the second. The Science and Astronautics Committee has been attempting to alert the House to a problem which can seriously affect the economic well-being and security of our Nation. Our position in aviation and aeronautics is being impaired to a near-tragic degree by the lack of people educated in appropriate research and development.

We have been No. 1 in the world in civil aviation, but we will not stay there if we continue to neglect the means by which we achieved this superiority in the first place: a strong technological capability based on innovative people. This cut will further degrade NASA's capability in aeronautics—at a time when we have been striving to build up our capability. If we seriously damage the basis for our technological strength, we can forget about economic progress to finance all the other things that people want to do.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

The action of the Appropriations Committee contained in this bill was to reduce the construction of facilities item within NASA by approximately 47.5 percent. Further, the report accompanying this bill specifically delineated the areas for which NASA had spent the recommended amounts and then, and I quote "denied the funds requested for other construction projects at this time." Mr. Chairman, this action came after the House Authorizing Committee had approved these construction items as being essential for funding in fiscal year 1971.

For example, if the action of the Appropriations Committee were sustained, the nuclear test stand at the nuclear rocket development station in Nevada would not be funded at all this year. This engine test stand is an essential item in the development of this nuclear rocket but furthermore, this test stand is a major item of equipment, of which the $3.5 million requested in fiscal year 1971 is only the first increment. This increment is needed this year to buy long leadtime items of equipment which will allow the test to be carried out in the proper sequence of development of the nuclear rocket. We have a development program for this rocket which is in proper time phase to meet a use requirement during the latter part of this decade. I may say that already due to reduced funding there has been an increase of approximately $50 million in this total development because of insufficient funding at the right time. This is exactly the sequence that will occur in the event we do not allow NASA to buy the essential long leadtime items needed this year for this test stand. We are faced with a similar circumstance in respect of the 210-foot antenna facility at Goldstone, which was deleted in this bill. In order to carry out the planetary missions which are currently scheduled, NASA must have this additional power available at Goldstone to operate this antenna. The facility could only operate at unacceptable low power levels and NASA would be unable to carry out the missions successfully.

This same situation prevails for the relocation of a transportable facility to be located in Chile in support of the Apollo applications program, Skylab. In view of the long leadtime required for construction overseas, it is essential that funds be authorized this year to support the Skylab which will be launched in 1972.

Also, we are confronted with the deletion of an isotope thermoelectric system laboratory which is absolutely necessary for checking out future unmanned spacecraft in our planetary program. This facility is needed for preliminary checkouts by midcalendar year 1972 and the Polymer Research Laboratory, which is sorely needed at the Ames Research Center in California to consolidate and handle hazardous chemical research work there.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the action of the Committee on Appropriations to reduce funding wherever possible, and I assure all of my colleagues that we have been meticulous in our review of the budget request for these items. We have been particularly sensitive to construction items since NASA has found it necessary to close down some of their existing facilities because of decreased mission requirements.

We feel, however, that the justification presented only covered essential construction in fiscal year 1971. Further, this was the lowest construction budget ever submitted by NASA in the history of the space program.

I am willing in this case to support the restoration of only 50 percent of the reduction imposed by the Appropriations Committee action—under conditions, however, that would allow NASA the freedom of establishing the priorities for expenditures within this area. I am willing to restrict the funds for construction, therefore, only if NASA is then allowed to commence construction on those items having the highest priority in the program and the greatest need in their program. I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he is then willing to compromise the language contained on page 10 of the report accompanying this bill which would allow NASA this freedom. I believe this to be a proven and necessary action in view of the severity of this reduction in construction funds. I, therefore, encourage support of this amendment.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time, and I ask that the Clerk do now read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Government Procurement, $1,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1972: *Provided,* That $1,250,000 of the foregoing amount shall not become available without submission of a program and financial plan by the Commission and approval thereof by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the proviso beginning on line 19, page 5 and extending through line 23 on page 5 on the ground that it is legislation in a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) desire to be heard?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we recognize the point that the gentleman has raised.

We only wanted the Commission to advise us as to how they were to use the funds for this program. We have been assured by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD) and other members of the Commission, members in whom we have great confidence, that they will keep the committee and the Congress informed as they proceed with this new commission.

So, Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe the point of order is appropriate in the interests of consistency with the ruling of the Chair on May 7 in a similar situation, and to maintain the customary distinction between legislative and appropriation matters.

Let me assure the Committee of the Whole and the Committee on Appropriations that the Commission on Government Procurement will submit the required information as promptly as possible. I say this as a member of the Commission and its Vice Chairman.

Unfortunately, the Commission was late in getting started. The enabling legislation was signed by the President on November 26, 1969, but his appointments were not announced until April 3, 1970. The Commission had its first organizational meeting on April 22, and steps are being taken to recruit the staff and develop the plan of work. The Chairman of the Commission, E. Perkins McGuire, has communicated with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, and has assured him, as I am now assuring the Committee, that the desired information will be forthcoming as promptly as possible. I am confident that the Commission will submit to the Appropriations Committee the programatic schedule and the financial plan long before any part of these funds would be expended.

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

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

Mr. HORTON. As the other Member of the House on the Procurement Commission, I would like to concur with the gentleman from California and also to assure my colleagues on the committee that it is my understanding, as it is the understanding of the gentleman from California, that this program will be submitted to the committee and it will be forthcoming as soon as possible.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is correct. I thank the gentleman. We are holding interviews now, and I might say to the committee and the House that we have had some tremendously well-qualified people attracted to this program. They have come to us with great backgrounds in the procurement field. They are very interested. They see an opportunity in this study of our procurement practices and procedures to save the Government a great deal of money. The Commission appointed by the President, the Vice President and the other members that have already been appointed by the Speaker and the statutory member, Mr. Staats, the Comptroller General, have met.

We have appointed an executive board, and the chairman is interviewing people now to put the staff together and to divide up the work that has to be done.

I have tremendous hopes that we will be able to justify the confidence of the House in supporting the study of our procurement practices.

I thank the subcommittee chairman, Mr. EVINS, and the members of the subcommittee for their support and their understanding of the purposes of the Procurement Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for the payment of rental on lease agreements for the accommodation of Federal agencies in buildings and improvements which are to be erected by the lessor for such agencies at an estimated cost of construction in excess of $200,000 or for the payment of the salary of any person who executes such a lease agreement: *Provided,* That the foregoing proviso shall not be applicable to projects for which a prospectus for the lease construction of space has been submitted to the Congress and approval made in the same manner as for the public buildings construction projects pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Thirty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 115]

Addabbo	Dickinson	Meskill
Albert	Diggs	Mollohan
Anderson, Tenn.	Dulski	Morse
	Edmondson	Morton
Ashley	Fallon	Mosher
Ayres	Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.
Baring	Foley	O'Neill, Mass.
Barrett	Ford, William D.	Ottinger
Beall, Md.	Fraser	Railsback
Bingham	Frelinghuysen	Reid, N.Y.
Blatnik	Gray	Reifel
Brademas	Green, Oreg.	St Germain
Brown, Calif.	Gubser	Scheuer
Buchanan	Halpern	Schneebeli
Carter	Hansen, Wash.	Slack
Chisholm	Hébert	Stokes
Clancy	Jones, Ala.	Stratton
Clark	Kee	Thompson, N.J.
Clay	Keith	Tunney
Cohelan	Kirwan	Weicker
Collier	Leggett	Whalen
Collins	Long, La.	Wiggins
Conyers	Lowenstein	Wilson, Bob
Corbett	McCarthy	Yatron
Cramer	McMillan	
Culver	Macdonald, Mass.	
Cunningham	Mahon	
Davis, Ga.		
Dawson		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17548, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 350 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including research, development, operations, services, minor construction, maintenance, repair, and alteration of real and personal property; and purchase, hire, maintenance, and operation of other than administrative aircraft necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $2,500,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FULTON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which consists of several amendments on page 20, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania: On page 20, line 1, strike the amount "$2,500,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$2,537,975,000".

On page 20, line 7, strike the amount "$18,275,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$27,025,000".

On page 20, line 19, strike the amount "$678,725,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "$690,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that his amendments be considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I offer amendments which are on the Clerk's

desk which would restore $58 million to the Independent Office Appropriations Act insofar as it pertains to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget for fiscal year 1971 and ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered in bloc.

If my amendment is adopted the amount to be appropriated in this bill will still be $78 million below the budget request of $3,333 million.

I offer this amendment since in my judgment, as well as in the judgments of my colleagues, the reduction of $136 million to the already reduced NASA appropriation will seriously affect the NASA program for the forthcoming fiscal year. As the Members of the House are well aware, having previously considered the fiscal year 1971 NASA authorization bill, the budget submitted by NASA had already been trimmed by the Bureau of the Budget by some $1.2 billion below that recommended by the President's Space Task Group.

Mr. Chairman, if the Committee will check into my amendments, Members will find I am restoring $58 million of the cut proposed by the Appropriations Committee of $136 million in the NASA budget. The reason is that the NASA budget is only 19 percent of the total of $17.2 billion included in this bill, but NASA has taken 65 percent of the total cut. This is too big a cut for our space program.

A substantial reduction in the space budget for fiscal year 1971 was deemed necessary by the Administration in a time of rising inflation and urgent domestic needs. Even though the $3.333 billion fiscal year 1971 budget is $522 million below the comparable figure for 1970, and expenditures in fiscal year 1971 will be more than $2.5 billion below the Nation's peak for space in 1966, a balanced space program is envisioned for the next decade.

The final fiscal year 1971 budget was the result of months of effort on the part of NASA designed to arrive at a sound starting point for the post-Apollo era. The President's Space Task Group—STGG—developed near- and long-term options for future space flight. Considering the current economic climate and technological capabilities, NASA and the STG recommended a budget level to implement the recommended course of action—a solid approach to space exploration, but without the pitfalls of a crash program.

NASA submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a fiscal year 1971 budget request of $4.497 billion. This was ultimately reduced, in view of competing demands within the Government, to $3.333 billion. The substantial reductions to NASA's original request had the following impact: Cancellation of Apollo 20 and stretchout of the remaining Apollo schedule; phasedown of the major Apollo test and production sites at Mississippi and Michoud; slipping of Skylab's first Saturn workshop by 4 months, suspension of follow-on Saturn V production; suspension of lunar flights during operation with Skylab; deferral of applications technology satellites F and G; slipping of Viking Mars mission to 1975, and the planned closing of the Electronics Research Center, which will now be taken over by the Department of Transportation.

While NASA has received substantial cuts from its initial request, the agency still feels that the current level of $3.333 billion does support the STG recommended plan, but at a somewhat reduced pace. It is to NASA's credit that it was able to put together the essential elements of the STG's recommendation under such severe budgetary constraints. A further reduction of $136 million as recommended by this bill may seriously affect NASA's ability to move forward with a sound program for the next decade. In view of all the prior history of cuts already made during the budgetary process, any further cuts would undoubtedly require NASA to examine all of its future programs for possible delays or terminations. In view of these cuts and NASA's record of accomplishments, I would support a recommended level of funding at or slightly below the budget request.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I feel that we must take some action to restore part of the funds cut from the fiscal year 1971 budget as reflected in the bill now before us. It appears that certain things that have been cut are essential to the success of NASA's activities for the fiscal year 1971.

In the research and development area NASA requested $2,606,100,000. The House Appropriations Committee recommendation would reduce this amount to $2,500,000,000, a reduction of $106.1 million. In reviewing the impact of this cut it is my considered judgment that this action taken will seriously impair the Apollo program.

The reduction of $106.1 million in R. & D. was recommended in the context of a recommendation that Apollo launches during fiscal year 1971 be reduced from two to one. I believe this reduction to one launch per year is wasteful of personnel and installations and costs more in the long run.

Such a reduction in Apollo launches from two to one in fiscal year 1971 by shifting the Apollo 14 launch to early calendar year 1971 and delaying Apollo 15 until after fiscal year 1971 would not result in significant cost savings to NASA during fiscal year 1971. All of the hardware for Apollo 14, with the exception of the components to be modified because of the Apollo 13 accident, is at Cape Kennedy undergoing prelaunch checkout processing. The hardware for Apollo 15 has been completely fabricated and is either in test or storage preparatory to shipment to Cape Kennedy.

Consequently, the savings to be realized would only amount to from $10 to $20 million. These savings would only be realized from fuels and other consumables; overtime at the launch site; repair pad damage; mission special documentation; and deployment of recovery forces. As a result the other $86 million to $96 million would have to be absorbed by cutting or terminating other programs.

Therefore, I am recommending that the research and development program contained in H.R. 17548 be increased by $37,975,000.

The reason is this. While the NASA Review Board on Apollo 13 has not yet finished its review, it is apparent there are going to have to be extensive modifications to Apollo 14 and Apollo 15.

After some little research and study I have come to the figure of $30 million for those modifications and $7,975,000 for other supporting costs incident to these modifications.

We must make sure our astronauts are safe. We, therefore, should have the money in advance for changing over Apollo 14 and Apollo 15.

In addition to that, Members will see in construction of facilities I have increased the amount by $8,750,000. The committee itself has made a 50-percent cut, and mine is taking it back not even halfway.

In the area of construction of facilities, NASA had requested $34,600,000. The Appropriations Committee recommendation is that this amount be reduced by $16,325,000 which would eliminate 10 of the 14 projects recommended.

I think I should call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the total construction requirement costs by NASA for fiscal year 1971 exceeded $100,000,000. The administration has done an excellent job of cutting this program down to bare minimums. Only those projects considered urgent and well justified were included in the agency's request.

I have carefully reviewed those projects proposed for deletion by the Appropriations Committee. I consider it essential five of the projects should be restored in total and one in part. My reasoning for this is as follows:

The Polymer Research Laboratory at the Ames Research Center at a cost of $1,525,000 is an urgent requirement in order for research on aircraft safety. The project is necessary to move forward in materials research related to nonflammable castings for aircraft cabins, to reduce potential hazards, toxic fumes, and so forth, in existing aircraft.

The Calibration Laboratory at Houston, which was deleted by the Appropriations Committee at a cost of $900,000, is an absolutely essential project to provide facilities for accurate calibration of all instruments necessary for spacecraft testing. This is another project involving the safety of our astronauts.

The Earth Resources Technology Laboratory at Goddard Space Flight Center in the amount of $2,050,000 was deleted by the Appropriations Committee, a really practical program. This is an addition to the existing building which is required to provide space for experimental satellite control, telemetry, data processing and related support functions. The Earth Resources Technology Laboratory is most important in the interest of deriving benefits to mankind. This project should be restored.

I would agree with the committee on one of their reductions.

They have cut $3.5 million from the test stand of NERVA, that is the nuclear space rocket. I believe that can be cut $500,000, so I would restore only $3 million of the $3.5 million cut in that particular field.

At the Nuclear Rocket Development

Station is the first increment of a ground test stand for the NERVA space nuclear power program in the amount of $3,500,000. There is some flexibility in this estimate and I believe that some reduction can be absorbed. Therefore, my amendment would add $3 million to the committee action.

Two other projects, both essential to tracking and data acquisition, in connection with the safety of our astronauts, were deleted by the Appropriations Committee. These are a power plant extension at Goldstone for the 210-foot dish-in the amount of $750,000 and a relocation of a transportable telemetry receiver facility in the amount of $525,000. I recommend strongly these projects should be restored.

The total that would be added to the bill now under consideration for the critically needed construction of facilities amounts to $8,750,000.

One further point is this: On the Apollos 14 and 15, we have to modify the oxygen tanks, because we found that the teflon used as wire coverings in those tanks has caused a short, and the valves and the fittings probably have to be taken out of the tanks and modified. I feel that should be done thoroughly, because it is a matter of astronauts' safety. There is where most of my amendment would be applied—$37 million.

I want to finish by saying that the Space Administration itself has taken one of the biggest cuts of any of the agencies so far this year, and compared to previous years it is down by billions of dollars. It is $2.5 billion below our 1966 space program.

The research and program management appropriation on page 10 of the committee report provides for the costs of operating and maintaining our field centers throughout NASA. The House Committee on Appropriations has recommended that the administration's request be reduced by $13,575,000 to $678,-725,000 from $692,300,000. The largest portion of the reduction would have to be applied to personnel since over 70 percent of this appropriation goes for personnel compensation and benefits.

To accommodate a reduction of this magnitude would require a reduction in force of 1,300 employees. This cut in people would be in addition to the 800 positions already cut by the administration before the request was submitted to Congress. A cut of an additional 1,300 personnel would have serious impact in many areas of our country. It is for these reasons that my amendment would add $11,275,000 making the total $690 million. This would still require a reduction and firing of 200 NASA personnel which would bring the total reduction to 1,000 NASA people when considering the 800 positions already affected by the administration.

The space agency itself had cut 800 employees in its budget as submitted to this Congress. In addition to that, if we take the cut of $13 million plus which the committee is now proposing, taking down the funds further, we will find there will be another 1,300 employees laid off and fired. That means over 2,000 employees in this particular year being fired by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I feel that is hurting the agency.

Finally, I should like to say to the committee, in its report, we who serve on the Committee on Science and Astronautics feel that the scientists and the people in charge of NASA should do the scheduling.

If I may have the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS), I believe it is on page 9 of your report that you recommend there be a deferment of Apollo 14. According to the latest estimate I have had from NASA, the Apollo 14 flight is not going to take place before December 3. Once we get the countdown going from this distance it becomes very hard and very expensive to revise the launch schedule, because we are recruiting people all around the world and deploying recovery forces.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I therefore feel that because of the particular position of the moon, the launch windows, and all that, we in the House should not be trying to specifically set the times of these launchings. Would the gentleman from North Carolina agree with me on that?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we are not telling them when to launch. We are just saying they ought to launch but one manned flight in 1971, any time they want to launch it. We are not cutting down on the number of launches they plan. We just say we do not believe they will be ready to launch in December. We do not believe they ought to launch another this year, because it will take longer than they anticipate to find out what the trouble was.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I should like to ask the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, as well as the chairman, a question. Does this leave NASA open, on its own engineering judgment, to decide the time?

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether this report leaves NASA open to make the decision on its own engineering and scientific research judgment, as to the times of launch? I do not believe that we in the House are setting, nor should we be trying to set the time, and thus take over this engineering function. Is that correct?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from North Carolina answered correctly. The committee is not attempting to say when the flights should be. We do not think there should be a flight before they look into the causes of the accident and recommendations for correction are made.

We have suggested one flight next year, rather than two. We agree that we cannot say when the windows are open or when the weather will be good. We are merely suggesting one flight.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. That has been the position of the Committee on Science and Astronautics as well.

I should like to read the following letter from NASA which is their official position on the impact of the reductions which this bill will leave on their programs:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1970.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: This is in response to your request for our appraisal of the impact of a reduction of $106 million in FY 1971 R&D funding for NASA, as recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations. This reduction was recommended in the context of a suggestion that Apollo launches during FY 1971 be reduced from two to one.

Such a reduction in Apollo launches from two to one in FY 1971 by shifting the Apollo 14 launch to early CY 1971 and delaying Apollo 15 until after FY 1971 would not result in significant cost savings to NASA during FY 1971. All of the hardware for Apollo 14, with the exception of the components to be modified because of the Apollo 13 accident, is at Cape Kennedy undergoing prelaunch checkout processing. The hardware for Apollo 15 has been completely fabricated and is either in test or storage preparatory to shipment to Cape Kennedy.

In view of the status of the hardware and since the operational elements of the Apollo program have already been sized down to a minimum level representing a basic capability, the only effect that would be achieved by this delay in schedule is the deferring of incremental costs associated with the actual launch, e.g., fuels and other consumables; overtime at the launch site, mission operation centers and tracking stations; repair of pad damage; mission peculiar documentations; and deployment of recovery forces. The maximum cost of these activities is estimated to be from $10 to $20 million depending on actual scheduling.

Since the indicated reduction of $106 million far exceeds the cost deferrals that might accrue during FY 1971 from the shift at the Apollo 14 launch date until CY 1971—and a decision has already been made to prepare for a launch of Apollo 14 no earlier than December 3, 1970, in order to utilize effectively the base-line capability and meet launch window requirements—actions would have to be taken to reduce or eliminate activities in Apollo and other NASA programs to accommodate the reduced funding.

NASA's budget for 1971 is over one-half billion dollars less than the current fiscal year—marking the fifth consecutive year of significant budget reductions. The FY 1971 budget level required NASA to take significant actions to reduce all major space activities (except space applications) including: the decision to close the Electronics Research Center (which, as you know, will now be transferred to DOT); the phase-down of the major Apollo test and production sites at Mississippi and Michoud; the suspension of the Saturn V launch vehicle production; the stretchout of the Apollo lunar missions to maximum intervals; the deferral of Skylab; the suspension of lunar flights during operations with Skylab; the deferral of the Applications Technology Satellites F and G; and the deferral of Viking Mars mission to 1975. In view of these actions, addition reductions of the magnitude recommended by the House Appropria-

tions Committee would undoubtedly require NASA to take further actions of program delays or termination.

In summary, a reduction of $106 million in R&D cannot be accommodated by merely adjusting the Apollo launch scheduling; such a reduction would require NASA to examine *all* of its R&D programs with a view toward further delays and terminations.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. LOW,
Deputy Administrator.

Likewise I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the Space Committee's hearings on February 17, 1970, which contains Dr. Thomas Paine's response to my questions:

Mr. FULTON. Then, is there a good balance between NASA's manned programs and unmanned space programs in space exploration? And is this an economical and efficient NASA budget for the Fiscal Year 1971? I would like to take some cuts, maybe $25 million, $50 million. If you would apply those to the program and see what the adjustments would have to be.

What was the original figure of presentation by NASA to the Bureau of the Budget as its optimum and recommended program? And was this done on one set of suppositions or in the alternative? Is your moon exploration worth the cost? I think we have to justify that to the public. And is the planned rate of launch of these programs, which you have given us on sheets 11 and 12, 13 and 14, the optimum rate or is it the most efficient and best rate?

(Material requested for the record follows:)

"The FY 1971 budget request is based on a program which, although forward looking, is very austere. To arrive at this program level required a number of hard choices as outlined in Dr. Paine's testimony including program deferrals, suspension of Saturn V production and closing of the Electronics Research Center. Any further reduction in our funding level for FY 1971 will require a reshaping of the program with some further difficult choices on deferral or deletion of activities important to continuation of a progressive space program in the early 1970's, based on the manner in which such reductions occurred, their timing, and the status of our programs at the time the reductions were being absorbed.

"NASA's original recommendation to the Bureau of the Budget provided for implementation of Program Option II in the Space Task Group Report. The budget authority for FY 1971 requested to implement this option was $4,497.4 million. This recommendation did not represent the upper bound of the programs considered technically achievable, but was considered by NASA to be an optimum balance between technical progress and the government-wide fiscal constraints. A comparison of the budget based on this recommendation and the budget request now before Congress which totals $3,333.0 million is summarized on the attached chart."

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET AUTHORITY REQUESTED AND FINAL ALLOWANCE

[Millions of dollars]

Appropriation and program	NASA request to BOB	Final allowance	Difference from request
Research and development:			
Manned space flight	2,109.2	1,474.2	−635.0
Apollo	1,178.5	956.5	−222.0
Space flight operations	928.2	515.2	−413.0
Advanced missions	2.5	2.5	
Space science and applications	893.0	565.7	−327.3
Physics and astronomy	125.0	116.0	−9.0
Lunar and planetary exploration	365.9	144.9	−221.0
Bioscience	16.4	12.9	−3.5
Space applications	219.0	167.0	−52.0
Launch vehicle procurement	166.7	124.9	−41.8
Advanced research and technology	349.0	264.2	−84.8
Basic research	23.0	17.6	−5.4
Space vehicle systems	42.3	30.0	−12.3
Electronics systems	36.4	22.4	−14.0
Human factor systems	33.0	17.9	−15.1
Space power and electric propulsion systems	32.8	30.9	−1.9
Nuclear rockets	60.0	38.0	−22.0
Chemical propulsion	20.4	20.3	−.1
Aeronautical vehicles	101.1	87.1	−14.0
Tracking and data acquisition	318.0	298.0	−20.0
Sustaining university program	26.0		−26.0
Technology utilization	5.0	4.0	−1.0
Total, research and development	3,700.2	2,606.1	−1,094.1
Construction of facilities	90.2	34.6	−55.6
Research and program management	707.0	692.3	−14.7
Total, budget authority (NOA)	4,497.4	3,333.0	−1,164.4

Likewise, here is how Dr. Paine testified on February 17, 1970, at the Science and Astronautics Committee hearings as to how NASA has cut the budget but yet tried to achieve a balanced program:

In order to preserve this balanced program oriented strongly to the future, we have had to make hard choices and take prompt actions to reduce our previously planned programs and our institutional base.

The most significant actions include:

Reducing our broad electronics research programs and closing NASA's new Electronics Research Center in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Suspending, for an indefinite period, production of Saturn V after the original 15 vehicles are completed.

Placing the NASA Mississippi Test Facility in a mothballed status in 1971 after the final Saturn V test in December 1970, unless alternative uses can be found in the next year, and reducing the workforce of the Michoud Assembly Facility in New Orleans to the minimum necessary to support Saturn flights.

Canceling the Apollo 20 lunar mission and suspending production of Lunar and Command and Service Modules related to follow-on Saturn V vehicles.

Delaying the initial AAP flight by about 4 months, to late 1972.

Delaying the Apollo 18 and 19 lunar missions until 1974—after the AAP workshop missions.

Rescheduling the Viking Mars missions from the 1973 launch window to the 1975 opportunity.

Slipping the launch of Applications Technology Satellites F and G by about 12 months.

Canceling the NASA Sustaining University Program.

In taking these actions, we must plan carefully, and implement precisely, so that we retain those skills and programmatic building blocks that will be essential to execute the projects of the coming decades.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend the adoption of my amendment which would add $58 million to the amount contained in H.R. 17548 which is less than one-half of the amount—$136 million—proposed by this bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is a very articulate and knowledgeable Member, but I would remind the gentleman that there is $3.197 billion in this bill for the NASA program.

The bill provides $2.5 billion for research and development. The funds are not specifically earmarked by the various programs within the total. The hardware for Apollo has been largely procured, so funding for this program is declining. An increase is proposed in the Apollo applications program. There are other increases and decreases in the overall program, and the review of the last Apollo 13 flight will take time and probably require some adjustments.

In regard to construction of facilities, we provided for a new facility at Cape Kennedy for electrical utilities maintenance personnel. We also included funds to finish the solar simulator modifications at Jet Propulsion Laboratory, for the rehabilitation and modification of existing facilities, and $2 million for planning and design for future facilities

The committee did not approve the funds requested for several new laboratories. NASA has done well with the existing laboratories it has and we feel these new laboratories can be deferred at this time.

Now, with respect to the third item in the bill, research and program management, the gentleman from Pennsylvania alluded to the reason for the reduction. NASA is closing its Electronics Research Center at Cambridge, Mass., and the whole facility will be operated by the Department of Transportation. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is giving up 600 jobs at that location. NASA plans to have a total of 30,550 jobs in 1971 and we have provided the funds for necessary personnel. NASA spends $7 million each year in overtime. We commend them for spending this money, if it is necessary to make their manned flights safe, but since there is no urgency in speeding up these space shots, is it necessary to use this much overtime? In addition to that, there is close to $4 million which is reimbursable to other agencies for employees assigned to NASA. There are many similar items in the budget.

We think the cuts are reasonable. The

committee gave great consideration to the amount of money needed and made a complete evaluation of it. I believe the committee was unanimous in this respect.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) spoke of the necessity of restoring some of these millions because of the tolerances of tools. I wonder when the gentleman from Pennsylvania will display the same tolerance for the taxpayers of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only about 1 minute to concur in what the gentleman from Tennessee has said.

The committee was unanimous on this cut. We had extensive hearings on it. It reflects the collective judgment of the committee.

I would say to my friend from Pennsylvania that I am surprised that he would seek to increase this item. I personally thought the committee was overly generous when it recommended $3.197 billion for NASA for 1971. There is a substantial body of opinion in the country that feels we are spending more money than the country can afford at this time. I would recommend that he be satisfied with the committee bill because if we get in a big fight over it today the result might well be a cut instead of an increase.

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

Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of this bill that causes me great concern. The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a reduction of $106 million in the funding for NASA's research and development programs. In its report, the committee suggests that this reduction should be absorbed by reducing from two to one the number of lunar missions in fiscal year 1971. There are several reasons why I seriously question the wisdom of this action.

In the first place, in my view, it is a mistake to make decisions in an appropriation bill on a complicated subject like the space flight schedule. Over the years, the complex matter of launch schedules and mission phasing has always been considered very carefully in the hearings and studies of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, with the final decisions left to NASA to determine within broad program guidelines and the available resources.

For example, last fall and winter the staff of our committee conducted an intensive study, which considered in great detail the factors affecting flight rates, both in Apollo and in the programs proposed for the 1970's. This study, entitled "Manned Space Flight; Present and Future," was published on February 12, 1970.

During the consideration of the NASA authorization request, the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, under the leadership of Chairman TEAGUE, examined this matter in great detail, both in hearings in Washington and in hearings and summaries at nearly a dozen locations where work on the space program is in progress throughout the United States. After completion of these very extensive studies, our committee determined that two flights a year to the moon is the proper rate; and this determination was incorporated in the NASA authorization for fiscal year 1971. The House passed this measure on April 23. Let me mention a few of the considerations underlying the determination.

One is safety. Testimony by officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration reflects a concern that a considerable slowing of flight schedules might result in difficulty in maintaining the high degree of motivation and morale that has contributed to success in our manned space flights. They feel that prolonged periods of idleness between flights would not be consistent with the essential efficiency and effectiveness of the worldwide ground-support team.

NASA officials are also concerned that a major slowdown in the program might affect ground crew proficiency and equipment reliability enough to reduce the likelihood of mission success. The razor-sharp alertness and high motivation of the ground crews—so magnificently demonstrated during Apollo 13—cannot be maintained over long periods with such inactivity.

Along with the consideration of ground crew proficiency is the effect of celestial mechanics on the launch schedule. When we plan a mission to a specific site on the lunar surface, we are limited to a certain period in a particular month when we can launch. For some sites of scientific interest there may only be 1 month during a calendar year when a launch can be attempted. These "launch windows," as they are called, are controlled strictly by nature and any schedule adjustment must take them into account.

I think it should also be pointed out that this bill would appropriate an amount $400 million below the authorization passed less than 3 weeks ago and it is also over $800 million below what the President's Space Task Group recommended for fiscal year 1971 and $1.3 billion below what the space agency originally requested from the Bureau of the Budget.

In exploring the moon, with the limited number of Apollo vehicles paid for and available, our committee feels strongly that the program should be carried out at a rate that provides maximum returns in knowledge from the Apollo investment.

From the Apollo 8 mission of December 1968, and the first lunar landing, Apollo 11 last July, four missions were conducted at intervals of about 2 months. Immediately after the successful first mission, this interval was increased to 4 months to make the scientific effort more effective, and the Apollo 12 mission was conducted in November 1969. When it was found that a 4-month interval was still not optimum for scientific analysis, this interval was increased to 6 months and the work forces, materiel flow, contracts and other operations were adjusted to reflect this schedule. NASA has also implemented a plan wherein the trained manufacture and launch teams are being retained only on a very selective basis. A stretchout of the launch rate to one per year would seriously jeopardize this phasing at contractor, subcontractor and vendor plants, as the committee's studies in launch rates points out.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, NASA has been cut deeply in their fiscal year 1971 request. They have an austere program—one designed to provide maximum benefits for the resources invested. I do not think it appropriate for the Appropriations Committee to attempt to restructure launch schedules and program phasing. And because I feel that NASA has been cut enough I would vote for appropriations at the budget request.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for clarification of a question that was previously posed to the chairman of the subcommittee by the gentleman from Pennsylvania concerning the scheduling of Apollo shots.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am seriously concerned about the language that appears in the report of the Appropriations Committee. The scheduling of these Apollo shots or moon shots—we already have the hardware—becomes quite a problem because of the relative location of the moon with reference to the earth, the "window" in which to approach the moon. I believe the scientists call it celestial mechanics.

I know that Congress can regulate many things, but it is almost impossible for Congress to regulate the position of the moon and earth. I wonder if the Appropriations Committee is aware of the hardship they are wishing on NASA and I wonder if the gentleman would agree to this—if the review committee does finish its study of the Apollo 13 shot and they are perfectly convinced that Apollo 14 vehicle is ready in its entirety to be launched, would there be objection on the part of the Appropriations Committee for NASA to take advantage of a favorable season of the year during which to launch?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. In answer to my friend, I believe it was pointed out in the press recently that NASA announced they have moved Apollo 14 from October to December.

We suggest that there not be another flight in 1970. We do not propose to schedule the flight. We do not know when the windows are open or what the weather problem will be.

I will read the language of the report:

> In view of the investigation and study of the Apollo 13 flight and the time required for the evaluation of the problems and recommendations, the Committee recommends that the Apollo 14 flight, tentatively scheduled for October, 1970, be deferred until after the first of the calendar year 1971. This is not meant to limit the number of lunar landings presently recommended by NASA, but to give ample time for the study, report, and correction of the Apollo 13 problems.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the chairman and I think this partially answers my question. The shot about which you are speaking in October is now scheduled for December. This is the same shot, the Apollo 14 shot. Then, the committee has no objection to NASA using its own best judgment and proceeding as soon as there is the surety that the safety problems and so forth have been met?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We expect NASA to use their own best judgment and there is money in here for the flight.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. I thank the gentleman very much for his response.

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

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

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, it was with some dismay that we learned the House Appropriations Committee had reduced the House authorization some $403,000,000 from $3.6 to $3.197 billion. This was $136 million below the President's budget request of $3.333 billion. $373 million was cut in the research and development program, $15.7 million from the constructions facilities program and $14.9 million from the research and management portion.

On the positive side, I applaud the committee for the strongest statement favoring the space shuttle that has been made anywhere when it stated:

> The Committee supports the Space Shuttle and Space Station as the nation's next steps in space, but urges that we pursue a careful and deliberate schedule for safety and position.

I applaud the committee for their foresight in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the cuts proposed by the Appropriations Committee. NASA's budget for 1971 is over a half billion dollars less than the current fiscal year, marking the fifth consecutive year's budget reductions.

The fiscal 1971 budget level required NASA to take significant action to reduce all major space activities, except space applications, including the decision to close the Electronics Research Center, to phase down the major Apollo test productions sites at Mississippi and Michoud, the suspension of Saturn 5 launch vehicle production, the stretching out of the Apollo lunar missions to the maximum intervals, a 4-month delay in the Sky Lab program, the suspension of lunar flights during operations with Sky Lab, the deferral of the applications technological satellites F and G, and the deferral of the Mars mission.

These actions were all required without the additional reduction of $106.1 million in the R. & D. budget as recommended by the Appropriations Committee. The apparent rationale for this reduction is an adjustment of the Apollo schedule and launch of only one moon mission during fiscal 1971.

However, by shifting the Apollo 14 launch to sometime after the beginning of calendar year 1971, and delaying Apollo 15 until after the end of fiscal 1971, no significant cost saving would result. All the hardware for Apollo 14, with the exception of the components to be modified because of the Apollo 13 accident, is at Cape Kennedy undergoing prelaunch checkout processing. The hardware for Apollo 15 has been completely fabricated for shipment to Cape Kennedy.

In view of the status of the hardware and since the operational elements of the Apollo program have already been sized down to a minimum level representing a basic capability, the only effect that would be achieved by this delay is the deferring of incremental cost associated with the actual launch such as fuel and other combustibles, overtime at the launch site, mission operations centers, and tracking centers, repair of pad damage, and deployment of recovery force.

The minimum cost of these activities is estimated from $10 to $20 million depending on the scheduling. The reduction of $106.1 million far exceeds the cost of referral and, therefore, NASA would not be required just to shift the Apollo program but would require to examine all of its R. & D. programs with a view toward further delays and termination.

We are at a minimum point today. Any further reduction is uneconomical and unsafe. The same rationale can be said regarding the research and program management and construction of facilities.

For instance, the reduction in the research and program management of approximately $13.5 million would cause the reduction of about 1,300 employees in addition to the reductions already planned in the 1971 budget. These constant reductions have caused an acute problem in NASA's inability to employ newly graduated professional employees. For instance, NASA hired 965 graduating college students in 1966 and in 1970 the number is estimated at 180.

To carry out the riff required by the Appropriations Committee's actions, NASA would have to make a major realinement in its organizational structure. NASA has been cut to the bone and cannot afford to be cut any further.

The NASA fiscal 1971 construction facilities estimate was a minimum request. During the hearings the question was constantly asked, "Are these essential?" And everything that was not essential was eliminated. The total initial requirements were approximately $350 million submitted by NASA field centers. These construction requirements submitted by NASA are necessary to meet specific program needs to reduce hazards and to improve basic operational facilities and key activities.

For instance, the $2 million Earth Resources and Technological Laboratory at the Goddard Space Flight Center in Maryland is being eliminated. Yet, this new addition is required to provide space for experimental satellite controlled telemetry data processing and related support functions. This requirement is urgent since these functions support the experimental ERTS A and B satellites, the first of which is scheduled for launch in April 1972. The other projects are of the same significance and importance.

Mr. Chairman, the space program has been cut over the last 5 years more than any other program. Under this bill, the space program represents approximately 19 percent of the total money appropriated. Yet of all the agencies, NASA has received approximately 65 percent of the cuts. I do not believe that by these cuts we are making proper use of the facilities, the personnel, and the wonderful team that has been built up. They are operating at a minimum level at best. Let us give this team of Government and industry the support that they have so richly earned.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible to know the right amount of money to place in this bill. I do not know. There is no one on this floor in my judgment who does know. Surely it is right and proper that we place an amount of money in this bill that will keep our country as the No. 1 nation in the space field. That is what our committee tried to do. We talked with the most knowledgeable people in this country insofar as space is concerned and the President appointed a very distinguished panel that recommended nearly $1 billion more than is contained in this bill.

Our committee cut that just about in half, and we placed that money in the bill. Now, the committee, whom I am sure have the same desire that we have to keep our country No. 1 in space, made the decision to cut it another $106 million. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) is attempting to put back approximately half of that. It will be many years before we know what was the right thing to do. I think the money should be put back in.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Texas if it is not true that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON) still would cut the total amount below the recommendation in the President's budget?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Even with the funds in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the amount of money in the bill will be below the recommendation in the President's budget.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it would be $78 million below the President's budget.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no great criticism of the subcommittee. I know that they acted in good faith, but I wonder if they were familiar with some of the cuts that they have made.

Permit me to say that the present bill

is $201,611,000 below the President's recommendation. Of this amount of $201 million, $136 million is taken out of the space program. Sixty-five percent of the cut in the space effort is being asked for in the bill, and the space effort is only about 19 percent of the total of the bill. This was brought out very well by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Some of the things we would like to see returned would be—and I may say that it was said that there were a number of new laboratories. In effect, these are not new laboratories, they are new facilities in the established laboratories. For instance, there is an item for $1,525,000 for the Polymer Research Laboratory in the Ames Research Center. This is in the interest of aeronautics, the testing of paints and other things that are so necessary in making the airplane you fly in safer for you. I think that this is something that we are going to need information on, and we are going to need it very badly as these bigger planes come into being.

The Earth Resources Laboratory—and all of the money has been taken out for it—this is a very important part of the space effort, and it is one that will give us the payoff in the space effort—the immediate payoff.

Going down the line, I notice that the power complex and the new antenna for the 210-foot disc at Goldstone has been knocked out—$750,000 in one place, and $525,000 in another.

These are important because this is one of the great radar complexes that we find so necessary in tracking these stations, and tracking the new work that NASA has done.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is worthy to be noted that this bill does not represent the final word on this subject during this Congress. I anticipate that NASA will attempt to recoup some of these cuts in the Senate. The other body will get a different version, and we will be in conference. If it can be established that we have made too drastic cuts there will have to be some adjustment.

Mr. MILLER of California. I appreciate that this is a possibility. But I will say to the gentleman that he has a responsibility, and I have a responsibility, and I want to exercise and take care of my responsibility and not leave it to the other body.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to my good and congenial friend, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The distinguished gentleman from California is the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and we recognize and respect him immensely for his point of view.

The determination of the proper amount for NASA programs is not a simple matter.

As the gentleman said, the program is being reappraised at this time. Substantial sums are involved. The gentleman from Texas indicated he did not know for sure what the correct amount should be. In evaluating the demands for funds as represented by many programs, our committee approved a total of $3,197,000,000 in support of the space programs in 1971. This should provide for continued and substantial progress while the program is being reappraised. We feel that the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to say, I disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I wonder if the gentleman from Tennessee is sure that he knows the right amount.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. No one can be absolutely sure, as the gentleman knows. We are recommending what we think is a proper amount. It is the considered recommendation of our subcommittee and of our full committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is what we did in our full committee.

Mr. MILLER of California. I understand the gentleman's position, because we made an investigation, and we came to another conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be supported.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I include at this point the material which I have previously referred to:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 21, 1970.

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request I am enclosing statements of our present assessment of the impact of the reductions to the Research and Development, Construction of Facilities, and Research and Program Management FY 1971 requests, as recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations.

If I can provide additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. LOW,
Deputy Administrator.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

The House Committee on Appropriations has recommended an appropriation for R&PM of $678,725,000, a reduction of $13,575,000 from NASA's 1971 budget request. Such a reduction would impact all functional areas of cost covered by this appropriation account, but the largest portion of the reduction would have to be applied to personnel (over $10 million) since over 70% of the R&PM goes for personnel compensation and related costs. We estimate that a reduction of about 1,300 employees in addition to the reductions planned in the 1971 budget would be required.

The President's 1971 budget includes plans to reduce the NASA end year civil service strength by 800 from the planned end year 1970 strength. Of these, 600 are related to the closing of the Electronics Research Center as a NASA installation, with the balance to be accomplished through personnel attrition. However, a reduction of the magnitude proposed by the Appropriations Committee would require NASA to resort to reduction-in-force (RIF) procedures. The current estimate for total separations of permanent civil service personnel in 1971 is 1,250 spread throughout the year (exclusive of the 800 positions to be abolished at ERC, Headquarters, MSFC, KSC and MSC). If *no* replacements whatever were made in 1971 the maximum savings from the 1971 budget level would be only about $4 million.

There are several reasons why we cannot rely on attrition for further 1971 reductions. First, continued reliance in attrition would compound already serious problems. Between July 1967 and June 1971, NASA will have reduced its strength in permanent positions by 1,655 people in 1968, 1,338, in 1969, 798 in 1970 and a planned 800 in 1971, which, exclusive of the adjustments for conversion of service contracts, totals 4,591. Except for the planned 1971 reduction, these reductions have been taken almost entirely by attrition during this period. We have replaced only about 50% of our total actual separations. Because of our restricted ability to hire for the past several years and the wide difference between separation rates of occupational groups, a maldistribution of skills exists in the current work force. While the patterns vary somewhat from center to center, the overall agency separation rate of 4.9 percent in 1970 is the cumulative result of separation rates of 3.0 percent for scientists and engineers, 5.0 percent for administrative professionals, 13.7 percent for clerical employees and 3.1 percent for technicians and wage board. We do not expect that this pattern will change significantly in the future.

An even more acute problem is our inability to employ newly graduated professional employees and the resulting aging of the work force. The average age of NASA employees is increasing at 8/10 of a year each year. While NASA hired 965 graduating college students in 1966, the number dropped to 738 in 1967, 567 in 1968, 253 in 1969 and is estimated to be 180 in 1970. Further reduction of the work force by attrition will eliminate the intake of young college graduates which is so essential to the vitality of an effective technical agency and accelerate the aging of the remaining force.

In carrying out a RIF of the magnitude necessitated by the Appropriations Committee's action, NASA would have to make a major re-alinement in its organizational structure. The planning, implementation and execution of such an organizational re-alinement and the concomitant RIF action would require at least three months to accomplish. We estimate that on the average the Government's liability for severance pay and terminal leave for those employees fired would equal 13 weeks pay for each. Our estimate that it would be necessary to fire 1,300 people is based on these factors and the estimated man year costs for personnel to be separated.

The impact on NASA's workforce would not be limited to the people who ultimately lose their jobs. In carrying out a RIF it can be anticipated that about 3 to 4 times the number of people fired will be subjected to an adverse action. Thus, about 20% of NASA's workforce would suffer the disruptive influence of a RIF procedure.

We cannot say in advance exactly what the effort of such a RIF would be on NASA's ability to carry forward the programs that have been approved. The loss in capability and morale is incalculable; but there is little question that a major blow would be dealt to our in-house capability—the underlying strength of current and future national space and aeronautics activities.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The reduction of $106.1 million in R&D was recommended in the context of a suggestion that Apollo launches during FY 1971 be reduced from two to one.

Such a reduction in Apollo launches from two to one in FY 1971 by shifting the Apollo 14 launch to early CY 1971 and delaying Apollo 15 until after FY 1971 would not result in significant cost savings to NASA during FY 1971. All of the hardware for Apollo 14, with the exception of the components to be modified because of the Apollo 13 accident, is at Cape Kennedy undergoing prelaunch checkout processing. The hardware for Apollo 15 has been completely fabricated and is either in test or storage preparatory to shipment to Cape Kennedy.

In view of the status of the hardware and since the operational elements of the Apollo program have already been sized down to a minimum level representing a basic capability, the only effect that would be achieved by this delay in schedule is the deferring of incremental costs associated with the actual launch, e.g., fuels and other consumables; overtime at the launch site, mission operation centers and tracking stations; repair of pad damage; mission peculiar documentation; and deployment of recovery forces. The maximum cost of these activities is estimated to be from $10 million to $20 million depending on actual scheduling.

A decision has already been made to prepare for a launch of Apollo 14 no earlier than December 3, 1970. This decision was based on the required changes, identified to date, resulting from the Apollo 13 accident.

The proposed reduction of $106.1 million far exceeds the cost deferrals that might accrue during FY 1971 from the shift of the Apollo 14 launch date until CY 1971. Therefore, other actions would have to be taken to reduce or eliminate activities in Apollo and other NASA programs to accommodate the reduced funding.

NASA's budget for 1971 is over one-half billion dollars less than the current fiscal year—marking the fifth consecutive year of significant budget reductions. The FY 1971 budget level required NASA to take significant actions to reduce all major space activities (except space applications) including: the decision to close the Electronics Research Center (which, as you know, will now be transferred to DOT); the phase-down of the major Apollo test and production sites at Mississippi and Michoud; the suspension of the Saturn V launch vehicle production; the stretchout of the Apollo lunar missions to maximum intervals; a four-month delay in the Skylab program; the suspension of lunar flights during operations with Skylab; the deferral of the Applications Technology Satellites F and G; and the deferral of Viking Mars mission to 1975. In view of these actions, a reduction of $106.1 million in R&D, which cannot be accommodated by merely adjusting the Apollo launch scheduling, would require NASA to examine *all* of its R&D programs with a view toward further delays and terminations.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

The NASA FY 1971 Construction of Facilities request was for $34.6 million. House Appropriation Committee action provides a total of $18,275,000, or $16,325,000 below the proposed level.

The NASA FY 1971 Construction of Facilities estimates as submitted, represented a minimum requirement. This request reflected only the most essential items out of requirements totalling more than $350 million submitted by NASA field centers.

The House Appropriations Committee action would deny appropriations at this time for all but two of eleven small but important construction projects proposed by NASA. The action also drastically reduces appropriations for the essential facility planning and design effort. The construction requirements submitted by NASA for FY 1971 are necessary to meet specific programmatic needs, to reduce hazards, or to improve basic operational efficiency in key activities.

The following "briefs" summarize the requirements for each project:

Ames Research Center, California, Polymer Research Laboratory, $1,525,000. New facility is needed as soon as possible to move forward in materials research related to nonflammable castings for aircraft cabins, as well as commercial applications. Facility is also required to reduce potential hazards, toxic fumes, etc., present in existing makeshift quarters.

Goddard Space Flight Center, Maryland, Earth Resources Technology Laboratory, $2,050,000. This addition is required to provide space for experimental satellite control, telemetry, data processing and related support functions. The requirement is urgent since these functions support the experimental ERTS "A" and "B" satellites the first of which is scheduled for launch in April 1972. Subsequently these facilities will be used to provide NASA assistance to the user agency and therefore there will be a continued need for these facilities.

Marshall Space Flight Center, Alabama, Multi-Spectral Photographic Laboratory, $525,000. This is the replacement of an inadequate facility—the continued use of which involves diluted operational effectiveness, as well as the need to make expenditures in repair and improvisation which could better be allocated to a new facility. This facility is in need in FY 1971 to improve Center capability to support the scientific experiments of SKYLAB and future missions. Some of this capability does not now exist and would be expensive to incorporate in the existing facilty.

Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California, Isotope Thermoelectric Systems Applications Laboratory, $1,250,000. This new facility is needed in mid CY 1972 to support technology and the development of new power systems required by planetary spacecraft. New power systems, using radio isotopes, will be required for planned unmanned missions to the outer planets. Development lead times require that this facility by started during FY 1971.

Manned Spacecraft Center, Texas, Calibration Laboratory, $900,000. Spacecraft testing requires frequent and accurate calibration of all instruments. Existing makeshift facilties are inadequate for this purpose.

Goldstone Complex, California, Power Plant Addition, 210' Antenna Facility (Goldstone), $750,000. The new high powered transmitter on the Goldstone, California, 210' antenna requires additional electrical power. Without the added power the new antenna is operable only at unacceptable reduced levels. This project must be provided in FY 1971 to support approved longer range planetary missions in CY 1972.

Western Test Range, California, Alterations to Launch Complex 2, $3,300,000. Beginning with the ITOS–D mission in November 1971, all future Thor stages (first stage of the Delta Launch Vehicle) will be delivered for launching with a standard boat-tail configuration, designed to accept combinations of 3, 6, or 9 solid propellant strap-on boosters for thrust augmentation as required for specific spacecraft weights orbits.

Major changes to the launch complex required to accommodate this new vehicle configuration include: new umbilical tower; service structure platform cutouts to adapt to the muti-solid installation; launch platform plumbing; wiring rearrangements to load propellants from the bottom of new boat-tail; rearrangement and upgrading of the cryogenic system; and launch control consoles and instrumentation.

Nuclear Rocket Development Station, Nevada, Engine/Stage Test Stand No. 2, $3,500,000. This project is for the initial increment of a ground test facility needed to develop and qualify a nuclear rocket stage for flight. In addition, the steam generation capability (for altitude simulation) provided increases the capability of ETS–1. This capability is required in FY 1971 to accommodate the planned long-duration testing of the NERVA engine.

Various Locations, Facility Planning and Design, $5,000,000. The requested $5.0 million for FY 1971 would be reduced to $2.0 million by the proposed action. The initial request was made up of two segments: (1) $3.5 million for regular needs associated with engineering reports, studies, master planning and the development of facility plans and specifications; (2) $1.5 million for continuing planning associated with large complex future facility projects such as those relating to the space shuttle or NERVA Engine/Stage Test Stand No. 2, NRDS, Nevada. The importance of these activities in support of potential future construction of facility requirements is evident. The returns in terms of savings and economy from efforts timely advance planning and design efforts are great. The design lead-time associated with facility projects is long and better planning must be done to insure the ultimate best in design, cost estimating, and scheduling.

Santiago Tracking and Data Acquisition Station, Chile, Relocation of Transportable Tracking Facilities, $525,000. SKYLAB requires a tracking and telemetry facility further south than any of the existing manned space flight tracking stations. The relocation of an existing transportable flight station from Grand Bahama Islands to the Santiago, Chile site (used until now only for unmanned satellites) provides this capability by the most economical means. FY 1971 funding is required to meet SKYLAB schedules.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered en bloc by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FULTON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of California), there were—ayes 24, noes 67.

So the amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed $35,000 of the appropriation "Research and Program Management" in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations or extraordinary expense, to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive.

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

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that $35,000 is a rather substantial entertainment allowance for NASA. I do not know of any other single agency of Government that gets $35,000. On what basis do they get this $35,000? Most of them get $2,500 for wining and dining.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that I think I get the thrust of his suggestion. This is the same amount that has been provided for the past several years. With regard to our tracking stations, we have international commitments and it is necessary to have these scientific consultations.

Mr. GROSS. The $35,000 would not

begin to cover the transportation of people to the various tracking stations around the world.

Is this where they got the money to haul those planeloads of people down to Cape Canaveral last year for one of those moondoggles?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The agency also has scientific consultations frequently with our allies.

Mr. GROSS. I am still curious to know who paid the bill for those planes that went down to Florida with all the junketing Members of Congress; I probably will never find out. I am not going to pursue the subject at this point, but I hope the committee will slice this entertainment allowance down to size next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; maintenance and operation of farms and burial grounds; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowance therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902); and aid to State homes as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 641); $1,752,200,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Army, Navy, and Air Force of the Department of Defense, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EVINS OF TENNESSEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EVINS of Tennessee: On page 26, line 8, strike out "$1,752,200,000" and insert "$1,777,200,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment that has been thoughtfully considered. We have held extensive hearings on all the programs of the Veterans' Administration. As pointed out earlier, in my opening remarks, we have provided the full budget for compensation and pensions, medical care, hospital construction, and all the programs of the Veterans' Administration. This year the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration reach the highest level in its history, $8,960,528,000. In 1970, for medical care alone, we provided a $17.6 million increase above the amended budget. That was over the Nixon budget.

In the second supplemental which the House passed recently we added $7 million above the budget request for a total supplemental of $113.5 million in medical care. In the present bill the administration added a $50 million amendment for medical care.

Our amendment raises the total by $25 million to $1,777,200,000. So we have reached the highest level ever in the medical care program.

We had the testimony of the Chief Medical Officer, Dr. Musser, that the funds requested would provide excellent medical care, quality medical care. With this increase the best of medical care should be assured.

We know that some hospitals are efficiently run, and we know that some are not well run. We urge that the latter be improved.

I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY) who is chairman of the Hospital Subcommittee. He has worked hard on this matter of providing adequate funds for hospitals. I wish also to commend Chairman TEAGUE of the full committee for his concientious effort. Our committee is equally concerned that the best possible medical care for the veterans be provided, and we think we are providing funds for that purpose.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I wish to thank my friend for offering the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) to add $25 million to the item for medical care in the Veterans' Administration's 1971 budget. As I told my colleagues last week when we were successful in getting $4 million in stopgap supplemental funding for the 1970 VA medical care budget, the VA hospital system has some major problems. At the direction of Chairman TEAGUE, a full-scale investigation was undertaken last December in an effort to determine the total dimension of the funding and staffing problems in the VA medical care program. The committee has received a number of complaints from many sources indicating that the VA hospital system was not properly staffed even though most of the needed personnel were available but they could not be employed because of inadequate funds. As a result of the comprehensive questionnaire which was sent to each of the 166 VA hospital directors, we confirmed that practically all of the VA hospitals had inadequate funds and inadequate personnel to care for our hospitalized veterans. Many old and chronically ill veterans who applied for hospitalization were either given outpatient treatment rather than the total care they needed and deserve or else their application for hospitalization was denied altogether and the veteran had to seek treatment elsewhere. Currently the VA is denying approximately 40 percent of veterans' applications for hospitalization. Many veterans in need of community nursing home care could not get this care because VA hospitals lacked the funds to place eligible veterans in this program. Soaring drug costs and increased demand caused a shortage of funds at many hospitals and it was necessary, in some cases, for hospital directors to place an arbitrary limit on the time a veteran outpatient could receive needed medications at VA expense.

Mr. Chairman, our Hospital Subcommittee held hearings just a few weeks ago in Tampa, Fla. We had all of the Florida hospital directors and officers from the major veterans organizations as well as State and county veteran officials as witnesses. The committee learned that Florida VA hospitals have a capacity to operate almost 500 more beds than they are being allowed to operate, yet, the State service officer presented testimony indicating that over 1,000 veterans are on various kinds of waiting lists for treatment. At one of Florida's VA hospitals we found an incredible bed occupancy rate of 99 percent, and this same hospital had one of the lowest staffing ratios of any hospital in the VA system—only 1.1 employees to each patient whereas the average national ratio throughout the VA system approximates 1.5 employees to each patient, and this latter ratio is totally inadequate—it should be at least two employees for each patient in order to deliver effective care. At two other VA hospitals in Florida, it was determined that although they were newly constructed they had not been fully activated due to inadequate funding. It appears that complete activation at these two hospitals may be stretched out over another year to 18 months. At another hospital the orthopedic section has been closed since last November because of the retirement of key personnel and the lack of funds to recruit a replacement.

Mr. Chairman, if the VA medical program around the country is like what we found in Florida, and it appears that it is, there is cause for concern and there is more than ample justification for adding $25 million to the 1971 medical care appropriation in H.R. 17548 for the VA hospital program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, many factors, individuals, and groups played important roles in the result here today, and to all those known and unknown the appreciation of our committee and of the veterans of this country, I am sure. I would be sadly remiss in my duty, however, if I did not specifically express my appreciation as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY), who heads our Subcommittee on Hospitals. He and his colleagues have played a vital role in this entire undertaking and have spent many hours, some of which I fear were tedious. Under his leadership and diligence we have the happy result achieved here today. My special thanks to the subcommittee chairman and to his colleagues on that subcommittee who are the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. BARING), the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD), the

gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT), the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ZWACH), and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. DENNEY.)

Mr. Chairman, my amendment adds $30 million to the 1971 medical care appropriation of the Veterans' Administration hospital system, which is caring for wounded and sick disabled veterans.

My colleagues will recall that just last week I sought and the Appropriations Committee agreed to add a stopgap amount of $4 million for medical care to help the veterans' medical program through the balance of fiscal year 1970.

Mr. Chairman, for over 4 months the Veterans' Affairs Committee has been conducting a comprehensive investigation into the level of funding and staffing of all our VA hospitals. We found the largest hospital system in the world grossly underfunded and understaffed—a situation which has been developing over a number of years—and it was reaching a crisis level at the time our investigation was initiated. The investigation disclosed that:

First, special medical units costing over $20 million were not being used because of inadequate funds to staff them. These were units used for intensive care, coronary care, kidney dialysis, emphysema, alcohol treatment, and other such vital special care units;

Second, VA's entire construction program was deferred in fiscal year 1970, including some new hospitals, major additions to others, several air conditioning and modernization projects where plans were ready to be advertised for construction bids;

Third, an intolerable dental backlog existed involving thousands upon thousands of returning Vietnam veterans who were having to wait from 4 to 8 months to have their teeth fixed because of inadequate funding;

Fourth, drugs for patients on outpatient status were being arbitrarily curtailed and VA mail-order prescriptions were running weeks behind normal schedules because of inadequate funding and staffing;

Fifth, approximately 12,000 hospital beds had been planned for closing in fiscal years 1970 and 1971 mostly due to lack of funds;

Sixth, the VA medical program was being required to absorb over $26 million during 1970 to cover Federal pay raises including $17.5 million for wage board increases for its blue collar employees and other legislation enacted by this Congress and signed by the President for sick and disabled veterans;

Seventh, hospital directors were deferring hiring of medical personnel of all types. Over 4,000 authorized vacancies existed and personnel were available to fill the vacancies but the VA lacked the necessary funds;

Eighth, equipment purchases and maintenance and repair projects at practically all VA hospitals were being canceled or deferred so that these funds could be used for daily operating costs; and

Ninth, the VA medical program was operating at the lowest employment level since June 30, 1966, at the same time it had the highest medical caseload in history.

Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that the 1971 proposed VA medical care budget, which the President revised upward by $50 million as our investigation began to disclose glaring deficiencies, is higher than previous years' budgets, but so are the costs of operating the hospital system because of higher costs and soaring workloads brought on by the Vietnam war. Last year, the Veterans' Administration became responsible for almost 1 million new veterans who came out of the service and their medical care and other benefits are more costly than those of veterans who served in prior wars. The war wounded are more severely disabled because back during World War II and Korea many casualties of the battlefield died there. Today, the rapid treatment given on the battlefield and rapid evacuation to field hospitals saves many lives which would have previously been lost.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about how much higher the 1971 budget is than previous years' budgets. What has not been pointed out is where it is seriously deficient in its ability to provide the kind of medical care our Nation's veterans need and deserve. Here are some of these areas:

First. When the 1971 VA medical care budget was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, it was reviewed and the Bureau reduced it by about $50 million, which is the amount the President restored in making his April 2 announcement. The President said, in part, at that time:

> The Veterans Administration hospital system has been experiencing increasing difficulties in providing a full range of services for the care of sick and disabled veterans—

And that—

> The ability of the VA hospital system to meet future needs has been seriously impaired.

So in submitting an amended figure to his January budget for VA medical care he merely restored funds that the Bureau of the Budget had cut out in the first place—it did not represent a bonanza of extra money. In addition, there is another consideration in this connection. When the Chief Medical Director submitted his recommended budget to the agency head, he asked for over $76,000,000 more for medical care than the amount that was approved by the agency head to be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget.

Second. Even with the appropriation of almost $10 million extra dollars in fiscal year 1970, there will still be an enormous backlog of dental cases pending at the end of this June. The administration has testified that about 40,000 dental cases will still be backlogged, which means that this program will be $3½ million short going into 1971. With the discharge rate of about 1 million veterans per year from the military services, there is every reason to believe that many veterans will have to wait long periods of time to get their teeth fixed because dental care was not available to them while they were in the military service.

Third. The VA hospital system is divided into five geographical regions and each region has a physician and a staff which oversees the activities of the hospital in each region. The regional medical directors report to the Chief Medical Director about conditions and problems within their regions. During 1970, while our committee investigation was in progress which revealed deficiencies of over $99 million, the regional medical directors agreed with the hospital directors that over $69 million were vitally needed and these became known as "approved" deficiencies; however, because of a shortage of funds only about $18 million of these deficiencies were actually funded. This meant that the "approved" deficiencies totaling more than $51 million went unfunded in 1970 representing an underfunding of approximately 74 percent of what the system needed according to the physicians who have a prime responsibility to properly and efficiently operate the VA medical program. The same kind of a situation exists in the 1971 budget—there are many hospital personnel which are needed that cannot be hired because of inadequate funds—there are many items of modern new equipment which are needed which cannot be purchased because of lack of funds—and there are many modernization projects in existing hospitals which cannot proceed because of inadequate funds.

Fourth. The ratio of employees to patients is far below what you find in private sector community hospitals. The last figures available to our committee indicated that most private sector community hospitals had an average staff ratio of 2.72 employees for each patient while the Veterans' Administration has a ratio of about 1.5 employees to each patient in its general medical and surgical hospitals. At many university hospitals operated in connection with medical schools, the ratios are even higher and range from three to four employees for each patient. Even with the $50 million in extra medical funds proposed by the President this ratio will only improve from about 1.5 to about 1.6. This increased ratio has not been brought about entirely by increased funding as the Veterans' Administration has either closed in 1970 or has plans to close in 1971 a total of about 12,000 hospital beds which it has been claimed are not needed; however, there is some serious doubt about this as it appears that because of a shortage of funds many chronically ill veterans who would normally be hospitalized for the total medical care they need are treated on an outpatient basis or their applications are rejected completely and they have to seek treatment elsewhere.

While I am pleased to see this increase, it is wholly inadequate and it means that many hospitalized veterans are not receiving the level of care they deserve and need. Based on testimony which has been given by a number of independent medical experts, it is my opinion that the staffing ratio in most general medical hospitals should be about two employees for each patient.

Throughout the VA system this would require something over 28,000 additional employees and the 166 VA hospital directors reported that about 25,000 of these employees were recruitable at the salary scale which prevailed in December 1969 and since then we have had a 6-percent pay hike which should somewhat improve recruiting problems. The full-time permanent positions in the VA medical program as of June 30, 1966, totaled 128,512. The Administrator testified before our Hospital Subcommittee that with the additional funding they expected a full-time permanent strength at the end of fiscal year 1971 of 127,348 which is still 1,150 positions below the 1966 level at a time when all workload facets of the medical program are considerably higher.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offered is for $30 million which I feel, after 4 months of intensive and searching investigation, is the very minimum amount which must be added to the administration's request for 1971 VA medical care. The figure should be higher, but I realize that we cannot do the entire job in 1 year—but to do less than what I have recommended will break faith with those wounded, sick, and disabled veterans who must reply upon Veterans' Administration hospitals for their medical care.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment has the support of all the major veterans organizations, and I insert at this point in the RECORD the communications of support which they have sent to me:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1970.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reference to the appropriation for the Veterans Administration for fiscal year 1971, as embodied in H.R. 17548, scheduled for consideration and vote by the House today.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is deeply alarmed concerning the deteriorating conditions in Veterans Administration Hospitals caused by inadequate budgets and staff. The study by your Committee of the 166 Veterans Hospitals throughout the nation demonstrated overwhelmingly there are critical shortages which are facing Veterans Hospital Managers on a daily basis.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars through its State Commanders visited one or more of the VA Hospitals in each State of the Union that has a hospital. We called it Project Alarm, and their reports indicate that all observed conditions which must be taken care of this year, or it will be too late.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has always maintained that the question of adequate funds for the VA is basically a matter of national priorities. The Veterans Administration is the single principal agency charged with the responsibility of caring for the nation's wounded and the aftermath of the Vietnam and previous wars. Accordingly, there should be no budgetary or personnel restrictions on the Veterans Administration.

With that in mind, the V.F.W. is extremely pleased with the additional money which was approved by the House last week in the Second Supplemental Bill (H.R. 17399) which has added $22 million to the Veterans Administration appropriation for the rest of this year of 1970. You and your Committee and all others in the Congress who participated in the successful restoration of the $22 million to the 1970 VA appropriation deserve the highest commendation.

Unfortunately, fiscal year 1971 is close at hand. There is much to be done in the long road ahead before the Veterans Administration Hospital System is put back in a condition where everyone will agree that it is providing a quality of medical care second to none. The VA budget for medical care for 1971 is slightly up from last year. The President, in his statement of April 2, 1970 on veterans medical care, has recommended another $50 million for veterans medical care for next year. The $50 million is part of the VA appropriation before the House for consideration today.

Again, the V.F.W. commends the President for taking note of the deteriorating situation which was facing VA Hospitals throughout the nation. He has taken affirmative action by recommending that $50 million be provided in addition to the amount he recommended when he sent his 1971 budget to the Congress early this year.

The V.F.W., however, holds that this is insufficient. There are just too many problems and too many crises which VA Hospital Managers face on a daily basis for them to live within their tight and often inadequate budgets. The VA Hospital Managers are doing an extremely effective job, and the V.F.W. commends all of the dedicated personnel of the VA for doing an excellent job, despite many restrictions and restraints.

A few of the acute problems facing VA Hospitals today which must be resolved in the next few months are as follows:

1. More personnel;

2. Purchasing of new equipment, and making necessary repairs, which have been deferred because of the high cost of personnel, drugs, and medical supplies;

3. Staffing special life-saving medical services, many of which have been idle because of the lack of money to hire personnel;

4. Full implementation of the community nursing home care program for veterans;

5. Denying some veterans much needed hospitalization because it has been more economical to take care of such veterans on an out-patient basis;

6. More money to further reduce the dental backlog for Vietnam veterans;

7. Full scale resumption of the VA construction, renovation, and modernization programs;

8. Additional funds for drugs and prescriptions for veterans with serious health problems, which have reached crisis proportions during this current year; and

9. Forcing the VA to absorb increases in pay for its personnel and the assistance and benefits for needy, sick and disabled veterans, as provided in new laws approved by the 91st Congress.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, therefore, strongly agrees with the amendment which you propose to offer today to the VA Appropriation Bill which will add another $30 million for veterans medical care this coming year.

The V.F.W. commends you and all members of your Committee for the study of the 166 VA Hospitals, which study has produced evidence of deteriorating medical care for veterans, which cannot be ignored or denied.

Approval of the additional $30 million for veterans medical care for next year will be most helpful in the effort to have all Veterans Hospitals provide medical care for veterans which is indeed second to none.

The approval of your amendment to the Appropriation Bill will be deeply appreciated by the more than 1,500,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS W. STOVER,
Director, National Legislative Service.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1971.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

This is to advise that Paralyzed Veterans of America strongly support your amendment adding $30 million to the 1971 medical care appropriation for Veterans' Administration.

WAYNE L. CAPSON,
President.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Cannon House Office Building:

The American Legion strongly supports your proposal to amend H.R. 17548 to increase the FY 1971 budget for VA medical and hospital care. We commend you and your colleagues for your untiring efforts to assure that the Nation's commitment of providing first-class medical and hospital care for its war wounded and disabled is fulfilled.

J. MILTON PATRICK,
American Legion National Commander.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Rayburn House Office Building:

AMVETS strongly support your proposal for amendment to H.R. 17548 calling for increase of 30 million dollars for 1971 medical care appropriation bill for Veterans' Administration. AMVETS do not believe that America's veterans should be deprived of the best medical care available and we wholeheartedly support your amendment.

ROBERT B. GOMULINSKI,
National Commander.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The Veterans of World War I wholeheartedly support your amendment to H.R. 17548 to increase by 30 million dollars the 1971 VA hospital program of the Veterans' Administration.

EDGAR BURKHART,
National Commander.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
May 12, 1970.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TEAGUE: The Disabled American Veterans shares your concern over the deterioration of the VA hospital and medical programs, and we commend you for your efforts to secure increased supplemental appropriations to improve the quality of medical care provided for our nation's sick and disabled veterans.

At a time when the total eligible veteran population is increasing tremendously, when the war in Vietnam is producing casualties at a rate of approximately 100,000 annually, and when the VA Department of Medicine and Surgery is ultimately charged with the care of many of these cases, it seems tragic that budgetary considerations and unrealistic economy measures have forced the Veterans Administration into reductions of patient care facilities.

The DAV recognizes that fiscal and monetary restraint in the domestic economy are necessary to help defeat inflation. We find it hard, however, to accept a level of funding

which is insufficient for the medical care and treatment of those who have suffered disabilities as a result of service in the armed forces of their country.

Like you, Mr. Chairman, we think that these deficiencies should be corrected forthwith; and we strongly support your amendment to H.R. 17548 which will provide an additional $30 million for the Veterans Administration's medical care program in Fiscal Year 1971.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES L. HUBER,
National Director of Legislation.

Mr. Chairman, on April 16, 1970, I advised the Appropriations Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over VA appropriations, of the findings of this committee's 4-month-long investigation in terms of the 1971 funding I felt was needed to insure proper medical care and other services for America's veterans including returning Vietnam veterans who are being discharged at the rate of about 1 million annually. The Appropriations Committee has ignored the recommendations contained in my April 16 communication although they were well documented. I had asked that $32,500,000 be added to the administration's 1971 request for VA medical care. In view of our findings that deficiencies existed far in excess of this amount, I felt that my request was most conservative. My amendment to H.R. 17548 calls for $30 million to be added to the VA medical care appropriation which I feel is the minimum amount I can recommend and keep any degree of faith with America's sick and disabled veterans.

The $30 million which I am requesting would be used for the following purposes:

Equipment	$10,000,000
Dental care	3,000,000
Hospital staffing (1,000 positions)	10,000,000
Resident and intern staffing	3,500,000
Expansion of physician assistant and rehabilitation technician program	2,500,000
Training of additional nurse technicians for specialized medical services (intensive care, kidney dialysis, emphysema units, etc.)	1,000,000
Total	30,000,000

Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert at this point in the RECORD the full text of my April 16, 1970, letter to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., April 16, 1970.

Hon. JOE L. EVINS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices, Housing and Urban Development, Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On March 26, 1970, Public Law 91-219 was approved. Chapter 34 of Title 38 includes a new provision to extend the Veterans Outreach Service Program. The following reference was made to this program as part of the Statement of the Managers in the Conference Report:

"The veterans outreach service program which would be established by this subchapter represents a clear congressional determination that a more extensive and intensive program of veterans benefits counseling, contact and outreach effort is badly needed. Such a program can be of great service, not only to the educationally disadvantaged veteran, but also to any veteran who is unclear about the extent of his entitlement and where his future lies. This subchapter provides clear authority for the use of special telephone tielines to provide outreach services to cities and communities removed from Veterans' Administration offices and contact centers. This subchapter also encourages the expansion of Veterans' Administration contact offices into major communities and population centers where Veterans' Administration offices and services are not readily available or where there are large concentrations of veterans, such as disadvantaged veterans with specialized problems. It is expected that the Veterans' Administration will immediately proceed to survey its contact and outreach facilities and develop plans for expanding these services in line with the provisions of this subchapter. It is expected that Veterans' Administration will develop these plans promptly for submission to appropriate committees of Congress in order that this expanded program may receive appropriate budgetary support in fiscal year 1971 budget.

"The agreed-on conference language eliminated the provisions for a relocation assistance allowance for veterans in need of job assistance. The removal of this provision by the conferees should not be construed to imply a lack of interest on the part of the conferees in job placement assistance for returning veterans. It may be that some of these provisions are appropriate for insertion in general manpower and training legislation. On the other hand, the veterans' employment service is presently operated on a very modest scale and should be supported to the extent necessary to give effective assistance to returning veterans in need of job placement assistance. Additional support of the veterans employment service and identification of the veterans special needs through general manpower and training legislation could greatly improve the prospects for returning servicemen obtaining jobs."

Prior to the passage of this legislation, this Committee conducted an extensive survey on how this outreach program could best be implemented especially to meet the new demands of the returning Vietnam veterans. It was concluded that establishment of 29 new Contact offices in cities of substantial size, which do not now have Veterans Administration service, and the establishment of 74 new special FX telephone systems, which would bring telephone contact with the VA within the reach of millions of veterans without a toll charge, would be the most efficient and economical method of implementing this program. These expanded facilities would cover standard metropolitan statistical population areas of a population exceeding 40 million. I recommend that $11,000,000 be added to General Operating Expenses of the 1971 VA budget to fund this program.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Hospitals on April 14, 1970, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs indicated that despite the request for $9.8 million in Supplemental 1970 funds for free dental care, a backlog of approximately 40,000 cases would still exist as of June 30, 1970. It has been the experience of this Committee that from the time a veteran applies for dental care until he is actually treated ranges from four to six months which is entirely too long a period of time to wait. Accordingly, I recommend that an additional $3,000,000 be added to the 1971 VA Medical Care request to give more timely dental care to our returning Vietnam veterans.

The investigation which this Committee has been conducting indicates that almost all VA hospitals are seriously understaffed. I referred to this matter in some detail in my April 7, 1970 letter to your Committee requesting an increase in the 1970 Supplemental Appropriation. At the end of February 1970, the number of full-time permanent positions in the Medical Care program totaled 120,028. Testimony given yesterday by the Chief Medical Director before the Hospital Subcommittee indicated that even with the $50 million additional funding requested by the President on April 2nd over the original budget submitted to the Congress in January, VA could raise the full-time permanent employment level to only 127,348 which is 1,164 FTP positions below the FTP employment level of the Department of Medicine and Surgery as of June 30, 1966—the employment level roll back date called for in the Revenue and Expenditures & Control Act of 1968. Accordingly I recommend that $9,000,000 be added to the VA Medical Care budget request to provide for approximately 1,000 additional FTP positions which our investigation discloses are recruitable. This will help bring the hospital staffing level up to a more reasonable level to treat an estimated 780,500 veterans in 1971, which is almost 50,000 more than were treated in 1966.

Our investigation has also disclosed that due to lack of funds, in the 1971 budget request, as amended by the President on April 2, 1970, it has been necessary for the Veterans Administration to plan a 10% cut back on its commitments for residents and intern house-staff employees who are directly involved in patient care. Such a cut back would seriously impair the quality of care for our hospitalized veterans. I therefore recommend that $3.5 million be restored to the 1971 Medical Care budget request for this purpose.

Our investigation has also disclosed a need for the expansion of the Veterans Administration Rehabilitation Technician Training Program which deals primarily with veterans who are fitted with prosthetic devices. The high rate of limb loss among returning Vietnam veterans requires an accelerated expansion of this program which is not provided for in the current VA Medical Care budget. It is recommended that $500,000 be added thereto for this purpose.

Both the President and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have decried the current "medical manpower crisis" and have recommended a program to train physician assistants to help augment hospital staffing. The 1971 Medical Care budget for the Veterans Administration for this purpose is totally inadequate and at least $2,000,000 should be added for FY 1971.

A review of the 1971 VA budget request also discloses that a 10% reduction was made in their request in training programs for technicians in the Paramedical and Allied Health Services field. This directly relates to the "massive medical manpower crisis" which the Administration indicates needs most urgent attention. Accordingly, I recommend that the 1971 VA Medical Care budget be increased by $3,000,000 for this purpose. For the same reasons, it is recommended that $1,000,000 be added to the Medical Care budget to expand the training program for Nurse Technicians to staff "Specialized Medical Services" such as coronary care, and other intensive care, hemodialysis, organ replacement, pulmonary emphysema and pulmonary function units.

I also recommend that $250,000 be added to Medical Care in the 1971 VA budget to properly fund the Biomedical Instrumentation Technician Program. Personnel for this specialty are in very short supply and are vitally needed to deliver proper medical care for our seriously sick and disabled veterans.

As you know from my April 7th letter, millions of dollars of equipment and maintenance funds in the Veterans Administration have been diverted to pay staffing and other operating costs over the past few years.

New treatment techniques and procedures which have developed at a rapid rate in the past five to seven years require use of this new equipment to save and prolong lives. Because of inflation and other reasons, the VA has not been able to keep up with the purchase of this new type equipment nor has it been able to properly maintain the physical plants of many of its hospitals so as to insure the best of medical care for America's veterans. In testimony before our Committee on April 14th, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs indicated that an equipment backlog existed of over $49,000,000. While I have already asked that $5,000,000 be added to the 1970 Supplemental for equipment, I believe that another $10,000,000 should be added to the 1971 Medical Care budget to give the most urgently needed relief to this serious backlog.

In summation, I recommend amendments to the 1971 Veterans' Administration budget as follows:

MEDICAL CARE

Equipment	$10,000,000
Dental care	3,000,000
Hospital staffing	9,000,000
Resident and intern house staffing	3,500,000
Expansion of rehabilitation technician training program	500,000
Expansion of physician assistant training program	2,000,000
Restore funds for training of paramedical and allied service program	3,000,000
Expansion of training program for nurse technicians for specialized medical services	1,000,000
Biomedical instrumentation technicians program	250,000
Total	32,250,000

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSE

To implement new "Outreach" provision of Public Law 91-219	11,000,000
Total	43,250,000

I strongly recommend your support of these items which are so urgently needed to provide America's veterans with better medical care and more prompt service on claims which our returning Vietnam veterans are filing with the Veterans Administration.

Sincerely,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am attaching statements by doctors and nurses which we have received:

AMERICAN NURSES' ASSOCIATION STATEMENT TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, APRIL 29, 1970

Here at the Veterans Administration Hospital, the morale of nursing personnel is the lowest in the history of this hospital. The nursing care is terrible. The basic cause is lack of personnel.

At a VA hospital—at one time, this was an excellent hospital in every way. Our main interest was in good patient care and the patients did get the best care. The nurses' and nursing assistants' morale was high. Now with the shortage of nurses and nursing assistants and the increase in the number of doctors the morale couldn't be lower and the patient care poorer.

Morale of the nursing personnel is low because when we leave our ward we feel that there are so many things we should have done but just didn't have the time. We feel that our patients aren't getting the care that they should.

On and on the letters reveal a basic problem, i.e., shortage of adequate staff.

On a recent weekend I was sent from my own unit to act as charge nurse on a urological ward. I was assigned three non-professional GS-3 nursing assistants as my only help. A large percentage of the patients on this ward have in-dwelling bladder catheters which require frequent irrigations to minimize danger of infections and clotting. Many of them also have wound dressings which should be changed frequently. Since GS-3 nursing assistants are not qualified to perform either of these procedures, I was, therefore, solely responsible. In addition, (I was) the only staff member able to pass scheduled medicines every two hours, give intermittent PRN pain medications, transcribe doctors' orders, prepare requisitions, hang intravenous feedings, give IPPB breathing treatments, administer soaks and attempt to evaluate the conditions of patients with whom I was unfamiliar to begin with. Obviously, some patients had to be left with soiled dressings when they asked me to change them, and others did not receive the catheter irrigations they should have. It was not until one patient in particular began moaning in pain that I discovered his catheter was completely occluded with blood clots, and he had to be scheduled for repeat surgery the following morning to evacuate the clots. All of which could have been prevented had I had some nursing or secretarial assistance.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 11, 1970.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Veterans' Affairs Committee, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of a letter which I have received from doctors at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Providence, Rhode Island.

I am sure that you will be interested in the points which they make and know that you will give them careful consideration in your planning for remedial action.

Let me assure you of my appreciation for your efforts to assure first-rate medical care for our veterans, and of my gratitude for what you are doing for Rhode Island veterans in particular.

Yours sincerely,

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
Member of Congress.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
March 5, 1970.

Hon. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN,
House of Representatives,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ST GERMAIN: Enclosed with this letter is a clipping which appeared on page 2 of the February 1 edition of *U.S. Medicine*, a newspaper that is distributed semimonthly to U.S. Government Hospitals throughout the United States and overseas.

We are writing you in support of the position taken by The Honorable Olin Teague, Representative from Texas and Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, and are questioning the accuracy of statements made by the Administrator of the Veterans Administration.

This letter is being written by us as informed and concerned private citizens of Rhode Island who are painfully aware of the constant erosion of the quality of medical care that is being provided for the disabled veterans of all our wars due to a policy of slow financial strangulation, especially evident since March 1969, but which began prior to that date.

Although we cannot speak from experience for other hospitals outside Rhode Island, we believe this malady is common to all V.A. medical facilities from conversations we have had at professional meetings with colleagues from all over the United States.

We do not doubt that the statements made by the Administrator are true in the light of the information available to him. However, it is our firm belief that his opinions are based upon data obtained through the chain of command. It is obvious to any veteran that the Veterans' Administration has at least one of the organizational defects of the armed forces, i.e., inspections are always conducted in a formal atmosphere *with the local commandant present.* Thus, in the services the mess hall always serves meals that would do honor to Escoffier on the day of inspection, and officially, our soldiers are the best fed, best dressed, best treated, best disciplined, most highly motivated and happiest soldiers in the world, and they will make do with what is provided no matter how offensive, inadequate or defective the material provided may be, because good soldiers must always carry on with a stiff upper lip and they must *always* go through channels.

It is also well known that reports which must follow a chain of command are universally favorable because an unfavorable report from an inferior reflects on the competency of his immediate superior and his ability to make do with what is provided.

To refute the Administrator's position we would like to cite the following examples:

1. At present, there is at least $130,000 worth of recently acquired diagnostic and patient care equipment laying idle at the Providence VA Hospital because:

a. Since the personnel freeze and cutback, there is an inadequate number of nurses and technicians to apply and supervise the use of the equipment.

b. All plans for the general intensive care unit and a coronary intensive care unit were shelved in April of 1969 upon Veterans' Administration Central Office orders when the budget freeze was decreed, even though many thousands of man hours and dollars had been poured into planning the projects. The VA Hospital is the only hospital in Rhode Island without federal funds for such projects. Thus, the indigent veteran without prepaid health insurance is denied the recent advances made in medical care, and our already dangerously low nursing and medical personnel is further diluted.

c. The ratio of clinically oriented physician to patient is so critically low that no personnel is available for teaching the use of the monitoring and diagnostic equipment.

2. The implementation of the order to reduce personnel to the June 30, 1965 level has been left to local option. This has led to a policy arrived at without consultation with clinically knowledgeable personnel, which has eventuated in a decimation of the working professional staff because the desired patient to personnel ratio can most easily be achieved with the greatest financial saving by not replacing the most highly skilled persons. One nurse lost will amount to an annual saving of $13,000, whereas one janitor or laborer not replaced will only save $6,000 to $7,000 per annum. This policy leads to clean halls and dirty patients.

Not infrequently we have the potentially hazardous situation of one registered nurse and one nurse's aide working an 8-hour shift and caring for 43 to 45 acutely ill medical or surgical patients. This personnel to patient ratio does not meet federal standards to a Medicare approved *nursing home.*

3. Because of the frustrations which arise from seeing what needs to be done but what cannot be done because of understaffing, physicians and nurses are leaving the V.A. in geometrically increasing numbers. We are now approaching the verge of a downward spiral where more and more people will leave because the disadvantages of Federal Employment far outweigh the advantages.

We have reached the point where dedicated physicians and nurses who would previously forego the financial rewards of private employment can no longer be recruited, because the intangible advantage of practicing the best kind of medicine in an academic en-

vironment free of pecuniary considerations which was once the great attraction of V.A. medicine no longer exists. We are being left gradually with older persons who cannot afford to leave the V.A. for various personal reasons as our sole means of providing continuity of patient care. We predict soon that we will reach a nadir comparable to that which existed when General Omar Bradley was asked to reorganize the V.A. in 1947 after W.W. II.

It would appear that the blandishments of the A.M.A. resisted by all Presidents from Mr. Truman to Mr. Johnson, have finally found a sympathetic soul, and in exchange for A.M.A support in the 1968 elections, Mr. Nixon has assented to the destruction of the V.A. Hospital System by financial strangulation. The A.M.A. has never ceased its campaign to discredit and destroy the V.A. Hospitals; it has only awaited the opportune time.

Are Dr. Knowles, the Regional Medical Programs and the V.A. Hospitals all parts of the same deal?

What is next?

N.I.H.?

Medicare?

We are in full accord with the objective of curtailment of needless spending by all departments in government and think the principle should be applied rigorously to Defense, H.E.W., V.A., State, Transportation, Interior, etc. However, it is our contention that strangulation of the V.A Hospital program is not an economizing measure.

Since the advent of Medicare and Medicaid, many V.A. beds are filled with nursing home type patients which could be placed in such for less than $25.00 per patient day. At the same time, acute medical and surgical veteran patients go to privately endowed federally subsidized hospitals which charge $60–75.00 per day for semi-private accommodations, exclusive of medications, special treatments and physician fees. (It had been demonstrated unequivocally that the same all inclusive care can be provided in V.A. Hospitals for less than $50.00/patient day, even when staffing is relatively adequate.) The reason for this shift in preference of the veteran patients, we believe, has been that they and their families believe that they can no longer receive adequate care in the underfinanced and understaffed V.A. Hospitals.

We have written this letter to inform you of a condition that exists in your state. If you doubt its verity, we invite you to visit the Providence VA Hospital at any time, and after paying your respects to the Director, to interview the medical, surgical and nursing staff *in private* for confirmation. After you are satisfied, we respectfully request you to forward this letter with your endorsement to your colleague in the House who chairs the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

THE AD HOC COMMITTEE,
BOSTON VA HOSPITAL,
Jamaica Plain, Mass., February 21, 1970.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: The House Staff and other interested employees of the Boston Veterans Administration Hospital have prepared a letter and list of demands for reform which we have submitted to our Hospital Director, Dr. Francis B. Carroll.

Enclosed is a copy of that letter and an abstraction which is to serve as a press release.

We appreciate your interest in the V.A. Hospital system and will be glad to assist you in your efforts in any way possible.

Sincerely,

ROBERT C. SAUNDERS, M.D.,
(For the Ad Hoc Committee).

FEBRUARY 17, 1970.

FRANCIS B. CARROLL, M.D.
Hospital Director,
Veterans' Administration Hospital,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: We the undersigned employees of the Boston Veterans Administration Hospital have long felt the health care provided to be inadequate and now realize that the conditions will only deteriorate further unless we insist on major improvements, and refuse to settle for less. The wards are inadequately staffed in nurses, nurses assistants, and ward clerical personnel with many active medical and surgical wards operating with less than one-third the prescribed personnel. The laboratory and x-ray units are hopelessly undermanned, with vacancies that have gone unfilled for months.

It is impossible to render adequate health care to our patients in this situation. We are attempting, futilely, to make up for these deficiencies, and as a result are suffering a breakdown in morale and a sapping of energy which further aggravates the problem.

These conditions have arisen in part as a result of budget cuts and inadequate funding, superimposed on an already unrealistically low operating budget. We *do not* accept the explanation that there is no money available because we know that funds can and should be made available for people's basic health needs. Certainly veterans of our armed services should have "health care second to none", the VAH motto.

In order to remedy some of these deficiencies, the following demands are being made:

1. Doctors have been called all too often to see critically ill patients whose blood pressure and pulse have not been taken at the ordered intervals and found them to have suffered a dramatic change in condition. Frequently complications could have been averted had the doctor been notified of the changes earlier. There is often only one nurse responsible for forty patients, if an emergency situation develops, the other thirty-nine patients may go unseen for an hour or more. To have two emergencies at the same time, a not infrequent occurrence, can only be described as utter, tragic chaos. In the intensive care unit the personnel shortage defeats the purpose of such facilities, with our ICU using only one-half its space and even closing altogether for a few days in December, thus wasting thousands of dollars worth of equipment and space. Therefore, we demand three nurses and three nursing assistants per ward on days and two nurses and two aides on evening and night shifts. An administrative assistant to the head nurse shall be hired in order to free time for nurses to devote to nursing activities. Licensed Practical Nurses are an integral part of most hospital nursing staffs, our hospital fails to attract LPN's because the VAH pay scales are far below community standards; therefore we recommend a review of the policy regarding this practice. We are demanding that ward staffing be raised to minimum standards necessary for patient care.

2. Acutely ill patients are admitted twenty four hours a day even though there is no emergency ward. Rapidly available, comprehensive laboratory tests are indispensable. At the present time only an inadequate minimum of laboratory studies are available after daytime hours, and even during the day; performance and reporting of laboratory test is sporadic and inaccurate due to a lack of personnel. Out of fifty recommended technicians there are 36, a deficiency of thirty per cent. Such a lack of staff results in unnecessary risks to patients, prolonged hospital stays and compromise in diagnosis and treatment. We demand that the Laboratory Service be brought up to full capabilities so that the doctors can do their jobs.

3. At the present time ECG and x-ray written reports are available three to six weeks after being submitted. The result of this delay in essential data is either poor diagnostic evaluation of many seriously ill patients and often delay of appropriate therapy. We demand that steps be taken to insure that all ECG and x-ray written reports are on the wards within 24 hours of submission.

4. As in the laboratory, the x-ray department must provide both around the clock emergency service and the full complement of diagnostic radiology if adequate medical care is to be provided. Presently, the x-ray scheduling is greatly delayed, films are of poor quality and many studies cannot be done due to lack of technicians time. We demand that more x-ray technicians be hired to bring that unit to minimum standards of modern patient care.

5. X-rays are lost or unavailable at the time when they are needed to care for seriously ill patients, due to the current lack of two-thirds of the filing clerks in the x-ray department's file room. We demand that the needed clerks be hired and the positions be upgraded.

6. The hospital's paging system is ineffective. The need for a paging system in an active hospital is beyond question. Innumerable cases of compromise of patient care could be cited. A portable electronic paging system must be made available to all doctors involved in primary care of patients.

7. In this hospital a team of staff physicians evaluate all patients for admission. There is an average of three and one-half doctors who see an average of 60 patients per day. Because of time limitations, the screening of patients is incomplete, and therefore, subject to error. Our demand is for two more admitting physicians, as recommended by the chief of admitting.

8. Many other services have serious deficiencies for similar reasons and therefore we list them here in order to save time and avoid repetition, but they are equal in importance to the above: telephone operators, inhalation therapy, clerical, dietetics, housekeeping and laundry. In fact it is fair to say that every service in the hospital is understaffed, thus contributing to the substandard conditions. All of these areas should be brought to full strength, paid competitively, and properly equipped if this hospital is to meet its responsibility to its patients.

9. Surprisingly, the elevator system in this fourteen story building is one of the leading sources of inefficiency. On an average day, an employee might spend one-half to one hour a day waiting for and riding in elevators. At least maximum use must be made of existing elevators which means that the two manually operated elevators function until 10 P.M. daily, actively carrying passengers.

10. This 920 bed hospital has attempted to provide emergency professional services at night in some vital services with on duty officers taking calls from outside the hospital. The result has been that they are often not available in a practical sense. We demand that all services provide in-hospital night coverage, if they do not already do so, such as radiology, anesthesia, and psychiatry.*

11. The Veterans Administration Hospital System does not provide follow-up out patient care for non-service connected illness The result of this policy is inefficient use of the health care dollar and many cases of unnecessary illness secondary to failure to deliver early treatment. Patients leave the hospital upon recovery from their acute illness with no provision for follow-up care except an uncertain referral to the private physician or a very informal appointment to see the ward physician, which usually fails due to lack of the needed clerical and ancillary personnel. A majority of our patients have chronic diseases where early treatment of minor complications can frequently prevent hospitalizations. We strongly recommend

* This demand to be worked out between the departments involved.

that steps be taken to create a follow-up out patient department.

We submit our demands with the stipulation that steps be taken to satisfy each of them, and that proof of action be shown—not just promises—or we will take further steps. It is clear that all VA Hospitals across the country share the same problem. Our intention is to join forces with interested parties elsewhere to insure the prompt action that is needed to avoid a crisis in the VA system.

Mr. Chairman, there follows copies of press items relating to the VA hospital program:

WASHINGTON.—Patients at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Los Angeles often die unattended in their own filth and critically ill patients have "literally dragged themselves home" just to get away, VA doctors charged today.

Saying they were trying to present their case with "restraint," the two doctors on the staff of the Wadsworth VA Hospital blamed the deaths of many patients on inadequate staffing and facilities.

The doctors, Bernhard A. Votteri and J. Gary Davidson, testified before the Senate Veterans Affairs Subcommittee in behalf of all the resident physicians and interns of the VA Hospital.

Among the problems, the doctors said, was a shortage of nurses that sometimes results in one nurse trying to take care of up to 120 patients at a time.

Also describing the hospital as understaffed, under-equipped and "dirty and filthy" was Sam Bottone, Project Director for the California Nurses Association.

Bottone said, for example, the extended care unit at Wadsworth did not meet the State standards for staffing by nurses.

"If this unit were not a Federal facility, it would not be licensed to operate in California," he said.

Votteri said lack of nurses and equipment had resulted in patients dying of pneumonia resulting from "breathing in their own secretions." Others had bled to death and some simply fell out of bed, he said.

"They have all occurred," he said, "and we have signed statements by attending physicians."

Vottari said veterans also had died because of the lack of special bags costing $45 each that are used for patients who have stopped breathing. Lacking the bags, he said, both nurses and doctors had exposed themselves to "great danger" by rendering mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to patients with tuberculosis and other diseases.

Davidson said the life of one 21-year-old Air Force veteran suffering from encephalitis had been saved by the youth's mother, a former nurse who happened to be visiting him.

The mother, he said, had removed secretions from an opening in his throat to provide air for lungs.

"What would have happened if she had not happened to be there?" asked Chairman Alan Cranston, D-Calif.

"He would have died," the doctor answered simply.

Cranston, in opening the hearings, said such conditions existed at other VA hospitals but that the testimony was intended merely to "focus on one, quite typical VA hospital and its patient care situation."

[From the Washigton (D.C.), Evening Star, Apr. 29, 1970]

VETERANS HOSPITALS ASSAILED IN TESTIMONY BY TWO DOCTORS

(By Judith Randal)

The federal government is risking lawsuits because the care in many Veterans Administration hospitals is not as good as what typical community institutions offer, two young doctors have told the Senate.

In testimony yesterday before the Senate subcommittee on veterans affairs, Drs. Bernhard A. Vottari and J. Gary Davidson told of VA hospital wards where there is only one nurse for 40 patients during the day and 120 patients at night.

They also charged that some VA facilities are so filthy that the means "for preventing the spread of infection can best be described as medieval."

Vottari and Davidson said they were describing the situation at the Wadsworth VA hospital in Los Angeles. But subcommittee chairman Alan Cranston, D-Calif., said that conditions are comparable in VA hospitals in such cities as Philadelphia, New York, Miami, and Boston.

At Wadsworth, the young doctors said, much of the hospital has not been thoroughly cleaned in at least three years and the physician in charge of the orthopedic service mops the floor of the room where casts are applied.

When surgeons recently sought to use the operating room at night for an emergency, they found the water turned off and X-ray equipment that would not work.

In one instance, Vottari said, a mother visiting her Vietnam veteran son was able to save him from drowning in his own secretions after his illness had necessitated a tracheotomy (opening in the windpipe). Otherwise, he surely would have died, as have several others, because of the personnel shortage, Vottari said.

VA Administrator Donald E. Johnson today called the charges totally irresponsible and untrue.

Johnson said that Dr. Charles F. Modica, director of the Los Angeles hospital, had assured him that the ratio of doctors and nurses to patients is higher than ever before.

Modica said he had never received a report of deaths such as described by the two young physicians.

Vottari and Davidson presented notarized statements from other Wadsworth physicians attesting to needless deaths and pictures of the hospital showing dirty dishes and bedpans stacked together on food trays and washrooms doubling as storage closets.

Votari and Davidson said the staff would be fully capable of providing first class care if the government would give them the wherewithal.

They were asked if the $50 million increase in the VA hospital budget sought by the Nixon administration for fiscal 1971 would alleviate the situation. They said most of the rise would be eaten by pay increases and would not be available for improving patient care.

Johnson said today that the Los Angeles hospital received a primary fund allocation for this fiscal year of $43,743,549, $2,257,000 more than the previous year's allotment. He quoted Modica as saying that lack of money had never been a barrier to hiring physicians and nurses.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 17, 1969]

VIETNAM VETERAN SCORES VA DELAYS

(By Stuart Auerbach)

It took only 45 minutes for an evacuation helicopter to fly Max Cleland from Khesanh, where he lost both his legs and his right arm in an accidental grenade explosion, to a hospital in Vietnam where three surgeons treated him immediately.

Then it took him 18 months to persuade doctors at the Veterans Administration Hospital here to fit him with artificial legs because they thought he would never walk again, Cleland told a Senate subcommittee yesterday.

Cleland, 27, who won a Silver Star for gallantry in Vietnam, walked into the hearing room on his new legs.

"There is no doubt in my mind that my rehabilitation time could have been cut in half. To me there was nothing so special in my being a triple amputee. I always assumed I would make it," he said.

"Unfortunately, I did not find that the up-to-date, rapidly applied medical techniques used in saving men on the battlefield had their counterparts in my rehabilitation."

Cleland, a former army captain who served with the First Cavalry Division in Vietnam, charged that the Veterans Administration uses World War II and Korean War methods to rehabilitate Vietnam veterans.

"The Vietnam veteran is aggressive, highly motivated and young. He is not an average patient in any sense," said Cleland, who once worked as a Congressman's aide on Capitol Hill.

"We don't send out emotional pansies to Vietnam. We expect the best treatment and every benefit of the doubt. It's a bit discouraging when we don't get it."

He said he got his legs only after learning that the VA center in New York was more responsive than the hospital here, where rehabilitation activities consisted of carving chess sets or making boxes.

What he really wanted, Cleland said, was to learn how to drive a car specially equipped with hand controls—which he now does.

He also complained that the VA didn't guide him to the best hospital, didn't get him a wheelchair of his own for a year and kept him without pay for two months after he left the Army.

"More effort has to be made, especially by the VA, to insure that the small but select minority of Vietnam returnees in VA hospitals have adequate social, recreational and psychological activities to help them in readjusting to American life," he said.

Aside from the problem of crippling wounds, Cleland said, "is the added psychological weight that it may not have been worth it; that the war may have been a cruel hoax, an American tragedy, that left a small minority of young American males holding the bag."

Earlier at the hearing before the Senate subcommittee on veterans' affairs, Peter L. Lassen charged that the VA is "letting down—or giving up" on crippled Vietnam veterans.

Lassen, 30, who lost the use of both legs in Vietnam, is executive director of Paralyzed Veterans of America.

He said that VA rehabilitation for paraplegic veterans has fallen down and that they are often forced to undergo questionable surgical procedures.

[From the Sunday Oregonian, Dec. 28, 1969]

DOCTORS CHARGE CARE IN VA HOSPITALS HAMPERED BY LACK OF FUNDS

(By Stuart Auerbach)

WASHINGTON.—A doctor who specializes in the care of paraplegics says the Veterans Administration treated patients paralyzed by spinal cord injuries better in 1946 than it does now.

In Miami, young doctors at the VA hospital charge that veterans suffer a "tragic lack of care" there because the hospital is "grossly understaffed."

Psychiatric services at many VA hospitals, once considered very good, "have been falling steadily behind what is available elsewhere in the community," says Dr. Louis Jolyon West, chairman of the Department of Psychiatry at the University of California at Los Angeles, and a VA consultant.

These statements reflect a growing concern in Congress, veterans' organizations and among doctors that the nation's 166 VA hospitals are so underfinanced that the quality of medical care will begin slipping very shortly—if the slide has not already started.

"I don't think we could last over a year" as a top-quality hospital without more money

for staff and innovative new medical programs, says Dr. Arthur J. Klippen, director of the VA hospital in Minneapolis, one of the best in the country.

"There is real danger that the administration and Congress are about to see veterans' hospitals revert to the mediocre status of the 1920s and the 1930s, when tired physicians and political job holders provided the care for the defenders of our country," warns Dr. Stewart Wolf, a professor of medicine at the University of Oklahoma.

While admitting the VA hospitals could use more money, Donald E. Johnson, the Nixon appointee who heads the VA, insists that veterans still receive top quality care—"care second to none."

"They receive good care, compassionate care and good service. The doctors and nurses they have are top flight. We can handle the mission," says Johnson.

Rep. Olin E. Teague, D-Tex., chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, disagrees. He accuses the Nixon administration of reducing the medical care in VA hospitals "to a second class status." He asked for a meeting with President Nixon to discuss the VA hospitals.

BUDGET EXPLAINED

Interviews and congressional testimony indicate that there is little wrong with the VA hospitals that more money wouldn't cure. The budget for VA hospitals is currently $1.9 billion.

Dr. Ernest H. J. Bors, who is about to retire as head of the spinal cord injury center at the VA hospital in Long Beach, Calif., blames lack of people for the deterioration over the past 20 years in the care of paraplegics.

"We don't have the hands to do the job," he says. "It boils down to a matter of the budget."

Dr. Douglas J. Stewart, a second year resident of Miami's VA hospital, says staff shortages there mean that patients with bleeding uclers wait hours to get needed blood transfusions.

"It's a risk," he says. "You are walking a thin line."

He also says that expensive, sophisticated lifesaving equipment bought for the year-old, $22 million hospital sits unused because there are not enough trained staff members available. Only 688 of the 1,020 beds in the hospital are currently open for use.

But Miami isn't in any worse shape than other VA hospitals scattered around the country. It has about 1.56 staff members for each patient—right about at the national average for VA hospitals.

This compares to the average of 2.72 employes for each patient in the nation's community hospitals and three employes per patient in university and teaching hospitals.

Rep. Teague wants to increase the staff-patient ratio to two-to-one. This means adding 28,000 more employes at an annual cost of $240 million.

"If we had a two-to-one ratio, I think we could compete in the quality of medical care with any hospital in the area, even though they have three or four employes for every patient," says Dr. R. H. Kaplan, chief of staff at the VA hospital in Washington, D.C.

The VA hospitals have been hit by a triple financial crunch. The yearly increases in their budgets haven't kept up with either the nation's inflationary trend or the rising cost of medical care—which leads the cost-of-living index.

With 80 per cent of the budget going for salaries, the increases have barely matched four raises that Congress has voted for federal workers, says Oliver E. Meadows, the staff director of the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

VIETNAM EFFECT FIGHT

And, with the cost of medical care in the private sector rising so high, more and more veterans are forced to go to VA hospitals because they can't afford to get treatment on the outside.

Added to all that, the Nixon administration trimmed the budget for hospitals by $70 million this year as part of its fight against inflation.

Congress, however, returned half of that to the VA and indications are that the Bureau of the Budget will allow that money to be spent. VA officials are counting on that money to open $20 million in unused facilities in hospitals across the country.

Surprisingly, the Vietnam war with its 132,000 hospitalized casualties has had little effect on the VA hospitals.

About five per cent of the VA's 800,000 patients last year were Vietnam veterans. The number is growing, though; this year the VA expects to treat more than 60,000 Vietnam veterans.

Many of the Vietnam wounded never get to VA hospitals. They are treated and discharged directly from military hospitals. When casualties are high, however, the military moves patients out to the VA in order to open beds for newly wounded servicemen.

The Vietnam veterans are causing a special problem for the VA. They are young, impatient and demand speedy treatment. Capt. Max Cleland, a Silver Star winner who lost his right arm and both legs in Vietnam, complained that it took him twice as long as it should have to get artificial limbs.

Dr. Bors notes that paraplegics from Vietnam are rehabilitated in about half the time of his other patients.

WAR MOST CRIPPLING

This is important because, as Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., points out, Vietnam is the most crippling war America has fought.

Testimony before Cranston's Senate Veterans Affairs Sub-Committee shows that servicemen are being crippled in Vietnam at twice the rate of the Korean war and three times the rate of World War II.

Started after World War I to care for the war wounds of veterans, the VA hospitals' mission has gradually been increased until today only one-third of their patients suffer from service connected ailments.

Any veteran can be admitted to a VA hospital if he cannot afford medical care elsewhere—with the highest priority going to service-connected cases.

The VA hospitals also play a large part in medical research and training. More than 90 of the hospitals are affiliated with medical schools and half the doctors in the country received some part of their training in VA hospitals.

All this, the experts say, requires money.

Johnson, the VA administrator, says that it appears as if the veterans' hospitals will receive a hefty increase in the 1971 budget, currently in preparation.

"If the funds are low, the quality of medical care goes down," says Dr. Kaplan of Washington's VA hospital. "That affects recruitment. It's a vicious cycle."

[From the Sunday Orgeonian, Dec. 28, 1969]

SPEEDY EVACUATION PROCEDURES MEAN MORE BADLY WOUNDED SOLDIERS LIVE

(By Don Oberdorfer)

WASHINGTON.—On Oct. 31, Pfc. Ronnie Boggress was leading a squad down a trail near Song Be in the Cambodian border region of South Vietnam when he walked into a murderous crossfire from enemy troops hidden in ambush positions on either side. His left leg was blown away, his left arm was shattered and a bullet tore away a large chunk of his left shoulder.

In an earlier war, this 20-year-old soldier would probably have died on the spot. Thanks to the helicopter and to intensive battlefield medicine and to the Army's evacuation procedures, he could grin back at a visitor last week from amid the holiday decorations of Ward 34 of Walter Reed Army Hospital.

The nation is very conscious of the 40,000 Americans killed in action in Vietnam since the decade began, but the fate of the badly-wounded survivors has received less attention. Lately a Senate subcommittee headed by Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., has been digging into the story, and what it has been finding is not calculated to fill anyone with cheer at this or any other season.

MANY U.S. WOUNDED

More than 260,000 men—a quarter of a million—have been wounded in Vietnam, about half of them badly enough to require hospitalization. A substantial number of these—precisely how many is yet undisclosed—have been very severely wounded.

According to Sen. Cranston, the fighting in Vietnam is producing total disability cases at a rate nearly double that of the Korean War and almost triple that of World War II. Out of every 100 veterans receiving compensation for wounds received in action in Vietnam, Cranston says, some 12.4 per cent are totally disabled—compared to 6.7 per cent during the Korean War and 4.4 per cent in World War II.

An Army study of 1,000 men separated from the service for disability because of Vietnam wounds disclosed that 28 per cent were amputees, 25 per cent suffer from paralysis of extremities, and 14 per cent suffer from what is termed "impairment of sense organs." These are much higher percentages than in previous wars. A witness from the Blinded Veterans Association told the Cranston subcommittee that the rate of blindness from the Vietnam War is triple that of World War II.

TREATMENT EXCELLENT

Like Pfc. Boggess, many of these men have received superb medical treatment on the field of battle and excellent medical treatment in an Army hospital such as Walter Reed when they have been evacuated to the U.S.A. In the military hospitals, they are important people—men from the front—but ultimately they are reassigned to the Veterans Administration hospitals for long-term treatment, and that is where the difficulty begins.

The VA hospital system is geared to the older veterans of earlier wars, and it is greatly overburdened by a failure to grow with a growing challenge. Because of congressional action, the VA was forced in 1968 to reduce its personnel back to the 1966 level, when the Vietnam casualties were just beginning to arrive in large numbers. After the congressional cutback was lifted, the Nixon administration continued the ceiling as part of its battle against inflation.

The result, according to the Senate testimony, is that the VA is overworked, understaffed and to a considerable degree behind the times. The wounded veteran of Vietnam combat goes from a helicopter-jet plane era of medicine in the war zone to a Model-T era in the VA hospitals.

Dr. Louis J. West, a member of VA's National Advisory Committee on psychiatry, testified that many mental patients are being kept tranquilized in "chemical cocoons" in VA hospitals because of insufficient professional staff to deal with the real problems. Other witnesses described obsolete equipment and outdated procedures facing Vietnam veterans and others in VA hospitals.

The tragic history of the Vietnam War has been that the nation was willing to wage it, but not to pay for it. In the case of wounded veterans, this is particularly tragic and indefensible.

Whatever one thinks of the merits or demerits of the war, surely the men who are sent to fight are entitled to the best medical care and the best chance for complete recovery and rehabilitation.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support this amendment to add $25 million for much-needed medical care for our veterans in the hospitals throughout the Nation. Likewise, I was proud and honored to be present, to speak, and vote for the funds which the House added last week when we passed the supplemental appropriation bill with $7 million above the President's budget to serve the same purpose in the period between now and July 1, 1970.

Actually, $25 million is not enough to take care of the additional needs of veterans during the fiscal year 1971. When I came to the floor today, I was hoping that the committee would accept a $30 million increase, but I am pleased that there is agreement on the great need for a substantial increase in the appropriation for veterans' hospitals.

NEEDS OF WEST VIRGINIA HOSPITALS

I have talked this question over many times with the able chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, the Honorable OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas, with whom I am honored to serve on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. "TIGER" TEAGUE and I recently completed a videotape for use in West Virginia, during which we reviewed the needs of the four veterans' hospitals in West Virginia. These hospitals are located at Huntington, Clarksburg, Martinsburg, and Beckley, and they will all benefit, not only by the amendment we are considering today, but also by the additional amount appropriated just last week in the supplemental appropriation bill.

STAFF RATIOS OF VA HOSPITALS

Chairman TEAGUE has quite properly pointed out that whereas university hospitals have a staff ratio of over three employees for each patient, and general medical community hospitals and State and local government hospitals have an average staff ratio of 2.72 employees for each patient, the staff ratio in veterans' hospitals is only 1.5 staff for each patient. At Beckley, the staff ratio is 1.55 employees per patient; at Huntington, 1.5, and at Martinsburg, 1.34. At Clarksburg, in order to achieve the optimum staff ratio of two employees per patient, it would be necessary to add 78 full-time permanent positions at an annual cost of $699,000.

All in all, the VA hospitals in West Virginia are approximately 765 positions short of needed staff. These additional positions would cost about $6.7 million annually. I have obtained the following figures indicating that the following unfunded urgent or critical items of equipment or maintenance and repairs are seriously affecting the efficiency of operation and a proper level of patient care:

Huntington	$145,242
Clarksburg	34,837
Beckley	150,215
Total	330,294

In February 1970, the West Virginia hospital directors reported to the Veterans' Affairs Committee that approximately $244,000 had been received to apply against the $1.2 million fund deficiency reported to the committee in December 1969.

BECKLEY VA HOSPITAL

Dr. Henry L. Butler, director of the Beckley VA hospital reported to the Veterans' Affairs Committee in December 1969, that he was approximately $132,000 short of personnel funds and $14,500 short of other hospital operating funds for fiscal year 1970. The Beckley director also advised the committee of a deficiency approximating $88,000 for maintenance and repair projects and equipment acquisitions because these funds were being diverted to pay employees salaries during the 1970 fiscal year. The Beckley hospital director also advised the committee that funds for the community nursing home care program were deficient by almost $11,000. Despite the additional funding it will still be necessary to divert practically all of the 1970 maintenance and repair funds and equipment funds in order to pay salaries at the Beckley hospital.

The staffing ratio at Beckley is 1.55 employees to each patient. In order to achieve the ratio of two employees per patient, approximately 122 additional full-time permanent positions would be needed at an annual cost of about $1 million. The hospital director reported that all but seven of these positions could be filled at the present time if funds were made available by VA Central Office.

CLARKSBURG VA HOSPITAL

After receiving $32,000 in additional funds—$25,000 for staff and $7,000 for community nursing care—Hospital Director Joseph C. Mackney at Clarksburg, stated:

The $25,000 to sustain current year employment is totally inadequate. In December 1969, the hospital director had projected a funding deficiency for salaries of approximately $147,500. The remaining additional funding of $7,000 was earmarked for the community nursing home care program which provides nursing care in private nursing homes at VA expense for veterans who have received maximum hospital care and who now need less expensive care in nursing homes. In December 1969 the Clarksburg hospital director advised the Committee that he was almost $99,000 short of funds for other hospital operating expenses which included such items as drugs, medical and chemical supplies, dental supplies, blood and blood products, and prosthetics such as artificial limbs, eyes and other sensory aids needed for seriously disabled veterans. To make up for this deficit it will be necessary to divert approximately $50,000 from equipment and maintenance and repair funds during FY 1970. In commenting on the receipt of additional funding for FY 1970, the hospital director said, "We are still faced with the minimum deficit in the 4th quarter of FY 1970 of $31,900. As yet we have not determined what we can do to resolve this situation."

HUNTINGTON VA HOSPITAL

After receiving $132,250 in additional fiscal year 1970 funds from VA Central Office, Dr. Lucius L. Powell, director of the Huntington hospital, reported that he was still short of personnel funds in the amount of $270,000 for fiscal year 1970. He indicated that in order to partially make up for this deficit it would be necessary for him to divert more than $103,000 in equipment and maintenance and repair funds in order to pay onduty personnel salaries, and the balance of the deficiency will be made up by not filling vacant positions requiring the hospital to operate at any employment level below fiscal year 1969 even though there had been an increased workload. The hospital director also advised the committee that $10,000 in additional funding had been received to apply toward a $72,000 deficiency in the community nursing home care program and $12,250 had been received to apply against a $74,000 estimated dental care deficiency mostly for Vietnam veterans.

In commenting on the additional funding Dr. Powell stated:

It is our opinion that the total amount allocated this hospital for FY 70 in its Target Allowance, plus the additional allotment of $110,000 received on January 27, 1970, will only enable us to provide our patients with minimal essential requirements. Additional funds and ceiling are urgently required to improve our staffing, particularly in direct patient care areas (i.e. nurses, nursing assistants, physicians, etc.) in order to provide our patients with the care and treatment to which they are entitled. Because of inadequate financial support in the past, this hospital has been unable to accomplish required *essential* maintenance and repair of buildings, grounds and other facilities. As a result, the physical plant has deteriorated markedly during the past few years. In addition, it has been practically impossible (because of budgetary restrictions) to purchase sorely needed additional equipment or to replace equipment that has become obsolete or completely worn out years beyond its normal life expectancy.

In order to achieve the optimum ratio of two employees per patient, approximately 75 additional full-time permanent positions would be needed at an annual cost of about $642,000.

MARTINSBURG VA HOSPITAL

At Martinsburg, Hospital Director Hal Jaffrey reported to the Veterans' Affairs Committee in December 1969 a deficiency of $52,500 to pay salaries for hospital personnel during fiscal year 1970, and a shortage of community nursing home care funds of approximately $21,000. On February 30, the hospital director advised the Veterans' Affairs Committee that $32,472 in additional fiscal year 1970 funding had been received by the Martinsburg hospital for the community nursing home program. In order to make up the $52,000 salary deficiency a number of vacant positions will not be filled during fiscal year 1970.

In order to achieve the optimum ratio of two employees per patient, approximately 490 additional full-time permanent positions would be needed at an annual cost of $4.3 million. According to Hospital Director Jaffrey all of these positions are recruitable at present salary scales at Martinsburg if funds were made available by VA Central Office.

Many individuals and organizations have been helpful in calling attention to the need for additional veterans hospital funds, including the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the State Veterans Bureau. I wish to particularly congratulate the State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, William Smallridge, of Huntington, for his role in highlighting the need for strengthening and improving medical care for veterans. Certainly those who have borne the burden of battle deserve nothing but the best, and I intend to keep on striv-

ing to make sure that West Virginia's veterans who have served their country nobly are not shortchanged in needed medical care in our veterans hospitals.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS). It is my sincere belief that the $25 million proposed by the amendment is urgently needed by the Veterans' Administration hospital system. There can be no doubt that the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program has encountered some acute problems in attempting to fulfill its obligation to provide the best in medical care for every eligible veteran. President Nixon took note of these problems on April 2, 1970, when he recommended an additional $50 million for fiscal year 1971. Past decisions, such as a 1968 law which required the VA to reduce its staff to the mid-1966 level, have seriously impaired the VA hospital system's ability to provide a full range of services for the care of sick and disabled veterans. Several thousand workers in all categories of health services were cut from the payrolls by this law, at a time when VA requirements for this type of personnel were growing steadily. Even more health services personnel will be needed in the immediate future to care for the increasing number of veterans from the Vietnam conflict who need medical care. As the President pointed out, the annual rate of separations has increased from 531,000 in 1965 to 958,000 last year and this rate will climb well above 1 million this year and next.

Currently 7 percent of the patients in VA hospitals and 9 percent of the VA outpatient treatment cases are Vietnam veterans. These percentages will rise. Also, all Vietnam era veterans are entitled to dental care in the year following their separation from service.

This amendment would provide funds in the critical areas of hospital personnel, equipment, and dental care. I strongly urge its adoption.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, the Veterans' Administration finds itself today in the inenviable situation of having a number of expensive pieces of equipment of the life saving variety, or at least life prolonging, which stand idle because funds have had to be diverted for other more pressing needs. If there were no other shortages involved in the VA medical system this alone would warrant the support which I intend to give to the action of the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Mr. TEAGUE, in asking that $30 million be added to this budget for fiscal year 1971.

I know from my own experience in my own State that funds for maintenance of equipment and maintenance of facilities has been diverted in such a fashion as to create a serious problem and every penny additional that we can vote for medical care is going to correct some of these deplorable conditions and to provide a higher standard of care than the veterans today receive.

Admittedly, there is a great shortage of professional and paramedical personnel in the country today. This is attested by the fact that in 1971 we will graduate only 8,500 physicians—only 400 more than the previous year. We will only have 54,000 nurses graduating to meet a shortage which is estimated in the neighborhood of 200,000 if not more.

Salaries of professional personnel and paramedical personnel in hospitals has increased so much that I do not see how anyone on this floor today needs to have the point emphasized but these increases carry over into the public sector and cannot be ignored if the Congress is to meet its responsibilities in providing medical care which use to be described as second to none for our veterans. The pacemaker heart operation was largely developed under VA auspices. The fact that we have a declining rate in the disease of tuberculosis is also due to activities in the Veterans' Administration. These two examples, and many more which could be added, have benefited all mankind and not just the veterans who fought in one of America's wars. But all of these developments cost money and they cost increasing amounts, and we have to meet our responsibilities here today by voting adequate funds for this agency.

One of the life saving programs which is in great demand and use throughout the United States is the so-called kidney machine, more properly known as the hemodialysis program. The Veterans' Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery has more units operating than any other system in the country. Yet this is a very expensive treatment, sometimes running as high as $8,000 to $10,000 a year. Personnel service for this one program for the first 3 months of this year amounted to over $1 million and yet, I am sure, that any of us who had a loved one who needed this sort of care would think whatever the cost involved would have to be met. Those who can afford to do this to the tune of $8,000 to $10,000 a year are a very limited and fortunate group of people. This is just one example of why we should support this amendment today, and which should have the support of the overwhelming majority of this House.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has in recent weeks made a State-by-State survey, station-by-station, of the needs and requirements and general condition of the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program. Each of the 166 stations has been surveyed in depth as to their needs and requirements. If we are to provide something above a minimum type of care to which the veterans of this country are entitled we must provide adequate funding.

I do not think that there is any individual on the floor today, with all due respect to the expertise and knowledge of some of our distinguished colleagues, who has as much detailed information, who has visited personally as many hospitals, who has had as much personal experience in service hospitals, as has the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The record shows that since the gentleman from Texas became chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs he has been in the forefront of enacting constructive and responsible legislation and has never lent his support to any request for funds or other programs which could not be fully documented and supported by facts. His request today for an increase of $30 million in the medical care budget of the Veterans' Administration is in my judgment a minimum, but unless we do at least this much we are, I am sure, in for serious trouble in the VA hospital field. All the veterans organizations are supporting this minimum request and well they should be.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Medicine and Surgery originally requested for this fiscal year which begins next July 1, $1,828,243,000. The President first requested $1,702,200,000, and later requested a supplemental amount of $50 million to make a total budget request of $1,752,200,000. As I have already indicated, this amendment of the gentleman from Texas would increase the budget amount by $30 million, and I know from my own investigation that this is fully warranted. I hope that this amendment may have the overwhelming support of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give my strongest support to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) who is seeking to increase the amount of funds available for medical care in the Veterans' Administration budget for the fiscal year 1971 by $30 million. I must say that I think the gentleman is being a bit on the conservative side. I see stories in the paper about hospital experiences costing over a 4-year period of $57,000 for the treatment of one child and estimates of future hospital costs running as high as $1,000 a day. I hope that we are not playing the game with regard to our veterans of too little and too late. We recently dealt with a case where a young man was paying $350 a day for intensive care after an accident.

The latest per diem cost in VA hospitals on an overall average is $38.59. This involves care in both general hospitals and neuropsychiatric hospitals, and includes the services of physicians. Care in community hospitals far exceeds that rate today for room and board alone. I hope that Members will keep these facts in mind when they consider the need for our VA hospitals.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, in this day of widening foreign responsibilities with the casualties we have already sustained in Vietnam, we cannot afford to economize on the care of veterans who have borne the brunt of battle. I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that the present budget for the Veterans' Administration medical program is the highest in its history. I am also aware, from studying the record, that it is not enough in this day of greatly increased medical costs of higher salaries for professional personnel, paramedical technicians, and for wage board employees. Medical care has increased at nearly twice the rate for other items which make up the cost of living. For example, in 1960 it was 108.1; in 1970 it is 160.1. Unfortunately from a fiscal standpoint we have to run to stand still in the medical field, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I feel dutybound to support

the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, the Veterans' Administration has not been properly funded or staffed for several years and I support completely the amendment which Chairman TEAGUE has offered which would add $30 million to the medical care budget for the Veterans' Administration for the balance of fiscal 1970. Practically every Veterans' Administration hospital has been caught in an impossible squeeze between higher medical and drug costs and rising workloads without receiving proportionally higher funding and staffing allocations. Throughout the VA hospital system there is a vast need for more personnel. At the end of February of this year, the VA medical program was operating with fewer full-time permanent positions than were employed on June 30, 1966—and yet, their medical case load was at record heights.

Mr. Chairman, the staffing ratios in most private sector general community hospitals is about 2.72 employees for each patient while the Veterans' Administration has a ratio of only 1.5 employees for each patient. There is a great deal of dissension growing among the personnel who are working in VA hospitals—especially the nurses—who are vastly overworked. Clerical employees are also of short supply because of personnel ceilings and funding problems and many nurses are being forced to do clerical work in connection with patient charts, and the patients the nurses are trained to care for are not receiving the care which they need. In many VA hospitals where they have ward clerks, they have them for only the day shift. In the evenings and on weekends when they are needed the most—that is when most patients have visitors—they are not available to help direct visitors to patients. Here again the task falls to the nursing service and patients' care suffers. It is not the fault of the many dedicated nurses who are working for the Veterans' Administration—it is the lack of funds to properly staff the hospitals. I know that many hospital directors have for many years been using their equipment and maintenance money to help fund on-duty staff personnel and the result has been that their hospitals have not been able to keep pace with the newest equipment required to provide modern medical care to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that Chairman TEAGUE's amendment will help correct this situation and when it is passed it means that the VA can get started right away with the job rather than waiting. The need is clear and I support the amendment.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I support the very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to add $30 million to the Veterans' Administration medical care appropriation for 1971. As a member of the Hospital Subcommittee, I have seen ample evidence from the information gathered as a result of the 4 month long investigation ordered by Chairman TEAGUE that practically all of the hospitals have serious problems because they have been and still are underfunded and understaffed. I know from personal experience that this situation exists in my home State of South Carolina. As I pointed out last week to my colleagues, the Charleston VA hospital has an intensive care unit which they cannot open because they do not have the funds to hire the staff for it. The Columbia hospital is badly in need of modernization and air conditioning and it does not have enough funds or staff to render a proper level of patient care to those veterans who are either hospitalized there or who receive outpatient care. The demands for care are greater because we are getting about 1 million new veterans each year from the Vietnam war. The cost of medical care is higher and even though the budget requested this year is higher than last year, it is insufficient to meet the essential medical needs of America's veterans. Accordingly, I support Chairman TEAGUE's amendment to H.R. 17548 to add $30 million to the medical care budget of the Veterans' Administration for 1971.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) in support of the committee appropriations for the Veterans' Administration.

This $8,960,528,000 appropriation is the full amount requested in the Federal budget and it is also the largest appropriation in the history of the Veterans' Administration.

While requests for increased appropriations are anathema in our inflationary economy, we must recognize that the high cost of living in our economy is in part due to our involvement in the Vietnam war. Recognizing this, I believe we should also be prepared to care adequately for our returning veterans and for the families of the deceased and disabled.

I would like to share with my colleagues some facts from a recent report submitted to me by my Task Force on Military and Veterans' Affairs and completed under the able guidance of its chairman, Mr. B. A. Nolan, Jr.

This report cited the serious problems existing within the Veterans' Administration medical and hospital program because of inadequate funding and personnel limitations. A major contributing factor to this problem was the personnel ceiling imposed by the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968, enacted during the previous administration which forced the VA to cut back to its June 1966 employment level.

Because of the proximity of the VA hospital in Washington, D.C., to my own district, I would like to point out the problems at that institution as being symptomatic of the deficiencies existing throughout the 165 hospitals in the VA system.

A comparison of staffing ratios between VA hospitals and general community medical facilities in illustrative of the inadequacies. The Washington VA hospital has a staff of 1.48 to each patient while the Washington Hospital Center, only a few hundred yards down the street from the VA hospital, has a staff of 3.3 to each patient. The national staffing ratio average in general medical community and State and local government hospitals is 2.72.

To staff the Washington VA hospital at a minimal acceptable ratio of 2.0 staff to each patient, it has been estimated that the facility, at the present time, would need 14 more physicians, 94 more nurses and nursing attendants, 16 more lab and pharmacy personnel, 64 more medical administrative and supply personnel, three more social workers, two more inhalation therapists, and 10 more maintenance personnel.

Mr. Chairman, this is an example which is symptomatic of the whole Veterans' Administration hospital system. I firmly believe that if we are to support the President's efforts in Southeast Asia then we must be prepared to care for our returning military men. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the request of the administration and the committee to appropriate the full budget request of $8,960,528,000, as well as the proposed amendment which would authorize an additional $25 million for medical care.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I will support H.R. 17548 as amended by the addition of $25 million in funds for the Veterans' Administration medical program.

It was my privilege back about the middle of April this year to visit the Veterans' Administration hospital which is situated in the eastern edge of Kansas City, Mo., and in our congressional district. I was in company with a member of the House Veterans Affairs Hospital Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS). We spent the day with the director of that hospital and with his principal assistant, the associate director, inspecting the facility and the staff of that hospital. We found that they did not have access to enough funding to purchase all the equipment needed, nor have enough funds to hire a sufficient number of doctors, nurses, and other health personnel.

Not only has there been some deterioration in the quality of care in the Veterans' Administration hospital in Kansas City, but also in the nearby Veterans' Administration hospitals on the other side of the Kansas line where our constituents become patients, and about which we are knowledgeable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all of us want to reduce Federal spending just as much as possible. Only yesterday I supported a motion to recommit which would have cut $25 million from programs exceeding the President's budget in the National Science Foundation appropriations. I hope I have never been regarded as a spender. In supporting this increase today, I cannot regard this as reckless spending. Instead, I regard this as simply the faithful discharge of a commitment that Americans have made to our veterans, that they have access to hospital and medical care of the highest quality.

The distinguished chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), is to be commended for the comprehensive investigation which he has initiated into the needs of the Veterans' Administra-

tion medical program. More funds would be justified than just the $25 million because of the steady deterioration of the quality of care in many of our Veterans' Administration hospitals due largely to inadequate staffing. This addition is not extravagant or wasteful spending. Every penny of it is needed and more, too. It is not extravagant because all of it will be used to purchase needed equipment and more adequate staffing. Then, who can say any money spent for high quality care for our American veterans is wasteful? The men who will receive this care are the men who gave of themselves in the defense of their country in one or more of its wars. It is not simply just the better thing to do or the preferable thing to do. Instead, it is imperative that enough funds be made available as soon as possible to assure that all American veterans have access to hospital and medical care of the very highest quality.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly hope that the House will speedily and overwhelmingly approve this pending amendment to increase the medical care appropriations item for the Veterans' Administration hospital system by $30 million.

We have heard the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee testify that his committee has been conducting, for several months, a diligent and comprehensive investigation of the level of funding and staffing within all of our Veterans' Administration hospitals. We have heard his further testimony that the investigation had unfortunately but clearly revealed that the largest hospital system in the most affluent country in the world was grossly underfunded and understaffed, that this situation has been developing over a number of years and it has now reached a critical level that cannot be corrected except through and by the use of the additional funding increase being requested in the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, just a short time ago the officials of the Veterans' Administration hospitals in my own State of Massachusetts unanimously agreed, in testimony, that substantially increased funding for this coming fiscal year was absolutely necessary to provide complete and modern hospital treatment and medical services to Massachusetts veterans, particularly those veterans returning from the Vietnam war. From the additional information and advice presented here today it is obvious that the situation in Massachusetts is similar to that in every other area of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have stated here many times before and I will state it again now, my conviction that the extension of complete and competent hospital and medical treatment and services to our veterans is a vitally important factor in sustaining the high morale of our people, essential for the accomplishment of our own domestic tranquillity and world leadership for peace. This is obviously a matter of special concern to the young people in the Nation today as well as the disabled veterans, and their families, of all wars.

In my judgment, to permit any deterioration in the medical and hospital care of our veterans would be a major disaster to this country. It would specially represent an incredible and intolerable neglect of our disabled Vietnam veterans who are tragically, held to be the most "unwept, unhonored, and unsung" war heroes in all our history. The tragedy of their courageous war service would be compounded by any national betrayal of our moral commitment to them. We can never permit it to come to pass that those Vietnam war veterans who have been the least honored should also be the most neglected.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that adequate appropriations to insure proper, up-to-date hospital treatment and medical care of our veterans should be placed among the very highest priorities of our national budget in order that this country and this Congress shall rightfully fulfill our common moral commitment to care for those who have borne the burden of battle. Let us unanimously approve this amendment, in the national interest, and let us do it quickly without extended delay.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of increased medical care for veterans.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality, in carrying out its functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), including partial support of the Environmental Quality Council and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, $650,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, what difference is there between this Council on Environmental Quality and the Commission on Environment and Technology? How many of these setups are we getting anyway?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, I tried to point out in my earlier remarks that many agencies of the Government have come to the Appropriations Committee and stressed the necessity of the antipollution work and the preservation of the environment. Congress has created this special Council to take on overall look at all the programs so there will not be duplication or overlapping and so there will be more efficient operation. This Council is under the direction of Mr. Russell Train, who has been named by the President. His authority is almost unlimited to oversee all agencies of the Government in the work they are doing in preservation of the environment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman saying this Council on Environmental Quality is going to accomplish this?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. This is what we hope will be accomplished. This is the goal and objective. It is my view there is a great deal of duplication of effort, and this particular commission will have an overview responsibility. This money will go for the staff of this particular Council.

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt that it will take about $650,000 to pay for almost any staff around here nowadays. That is what I fear about the resolution which is coming before the House in the not-distant future; that it will require several hundreds of thousands of dollars on another staff to deal with the environment.

This environment business is getting to be an umbrella, a canopy to cover just about anything you can think of. I hope the Committee will watch carefully to see what happens as a result of this expenditure. You do not put $650,000 together without tapping a great many ordinary taxpayers.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the expressed wishes of the gentleman from Iowa are also the same wishes of the committee in recommending that they do a proper job indeed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, while I have the floor, on the next page—page 21—there is the National Aeronautics and Space Council. What in the world does it do?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The National Aeronautics and Space Council is under the direction of Astronaut Anders. The Vice President is chairman of this Council which advises the President on aeronautical and space activities. At one time we recommended that this Council be consolidated with the Office of Science Technology, but the administration recommended against it. Maybe both the President and the Vice President need a science adviser. I think this Council has written some of the noteworthy speeches the Vice President has made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have had commissions and boards running out of our ears, and now we seem to be going to councils. Everything seems to be a council nowadays—that is "council," not "counsel."

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We have many.

Mr. GROSS. Do they all hire passengers to ride on the gravy train, or what happens?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We have recommended some consolidations, but thus far have been unable to accomplish this.

Mr. GROSS. Incidentally, does the Government supply automobiles for them to drive?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. At the present time they are calling on the GSA motor pool.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I wish to make some calm and con-

structive remarks about the work of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, which has been with us for a long time—in fact it was established during the Eisenhower administration in 1958 under the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of that year. Since 1961, this Council has been located in the Executive Office of the President. So this strategic Council is no Johnny-come-lately in the business of space or bureaucracy, and it is a very lean and highly effective nerve center. The Council advises the President on key decisions involving aeronautics and space activities, and helps resolve interagency differences, helps develop new policies, and coordinates Government and industry action.

It will surprise some to learn the gigantic size of the staff, which numbers less than 25 employees. It is a highly effective, dedicated and hard-working staff of well-trained people. Contrary to some comments which have been made, these are not speechwriters, but they are technicians and policymakers in the fields of space and aeronautics.

I cannot speak too highly of the dedicated leadership of the Executive Secretary of the Council, former astronaut Col. William Anders. I vividly recall one evening I spent with Colonel Anders and his staff at dinner, followed by an extended discussion at the Council offices. These men frequently spend their evening hours and weekends catching up and staying on top of their vital work. I know of no group which is more conscientious in its devotion to duty. I am very sorry to learn that the committee has recommended a slash of 25 percent in the budgeted funds, and hope that the other body will restore this cut because the Council is in a rare position of leadership which cannot only coordinate but also save and eliminate unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the gentleman from Tennessee and his committee for developing an excellent hearing record on the National Aeronautics and Space Council. I should like to call attention to pages 32 to 38 of the hearings. The Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, William Anders, testified the strong support for aeronautics which was being given by the Council. I quote one or two sentences:

> One of the things which I would like to underscore at the outset is the significance of aeronautics, as well as space, in our task and in our national perspective. . . . I think this Nation needs more clearly stated national goals in aeronautics and it would be my attempt to try to help the President formulate these goals.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he does not believe that aeronautics has perhaps been overlooked in the very large expenditure for space. This would further justify strengthening an agency like the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. The gentleman is correct. The Council has a dual role. Not only do they advise as in space matters, but they also advise as in aeronautics and safety in the air. I agree with the gentleman. If we could put a little more emphasis in this area at this time it might be money well spent. We do have a concern in the Federal Aviation Administration for safety, and in the Department of Transportation. This is to advise in the field of aeronautics and safety, as well as space matters.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I appreciate what the gentleman from Tennessee has said. He confirms what Colonel Anders himself told the committee, in the following words:

> I think it has been assumed in the past that the National Aeronautics and Space Council had a parallel interest with NASA with respect to aeronautics. NASA's role has classically been a research and development one. It is my view that you cannot separate aeronautics R. & D. from those things that might sometimes be referred to as aviation. I think this is more than just a semantical point. I think that the R. & D. that NASA does must consider the requirements of the Department of Defense, must consider the requirements of FAA, the airlines, and aviation industry and therefore in building up my staff to address the question of aeronautics, I am trying to find people who are knowledgeable, not just in R. & D., but in operations and in the military aspects of aeronautics. Certainly the environmental factors of aviation that you mentioned, pollution and noise, are very important and we are working with aeronautical specialists, but also in coordination with the President's Council on Environmental Quality and with the Office of Science and Technology.
>
> We would like to address aeronautics across the entire spectrum as our capabilities will permit. That is my long-range plan.

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If I remember correctly, some 2,000 miles of roads are authorized to be improved in Appalachia, and up to this point only about 200 of the 2,000 miles have been improved. The gentleman comes from that area of the country. I should think he would prefer to spend the money on roads in Appalachia, rather than to spend it on this moondoggle, to get a few more rocks and more dust from the moon. We cannot have both, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I would certainly emphasize to the gentleman from Iowa that the developing form of a sound transportation system for the future includes not only highways but also airports and aviation. We desperately need a large regional airport between Charleston and Huntington to open up the economy of the Kanawha and Ohio valleys, plus southern West Virginia, eastern Ohio, and Kentucky. We are also interested in short-takeoff-and-landing planes, which I believe will mean a great deal in helping to develop intercity connections in Appalachia. I do believe the National Aeronautics and Space Council is providing leadership, as the gentleman from Tennessee indicated. Highways are important, but the development of aeronautics and aviation are equally important. Now I agree with the gentleman from Iowa to the extent that we cannot put all our eggs in the space basket, and in fact the space budget this year is the lowest since 1962. But the point I want to make is that under the leadership of Colonel Anders, the National Aeronautics and Space Council is placing increasing emphasis on aeronautics as well as space, and this is of increasing importance in Appalachia.

I would also like to stress that unless America wakes up and starts to place more emphasis on aeronautics, we will lose our preeminence in the entire field of aviation. To retain leadership in the world, we cannot afford to shortchange aeronautics, and I commend the National Aeronautics and Space Council for its valuable work in this field.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COLLEGE HOUSING

For payments authorized by section 1705 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, the unobligated balance of funds appropriated for this purpose in fiscal year 1970 shall remain available until June 30, 1971: *Provided*, That the limitation otherwise applicable to the total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under such section is increased by $7,200,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHERLE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERLE: Page 36, at the end of line 22, strike the period and insert the following: "*And provided further*, that none of the funds appropriated by this act for payments authorized by section 1705 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant or loan to any institution of higher education unless such institution shall be in full compliance with section 504 of Public Law 90–575.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to the one which the House adopted by an overwhelming vote of 329 to 61 in the supplemental appropriation bill passed last year. It simply states that no institution of higher learning shall be eligible for college housing funds from section 1705 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 unless such institution shall be in full compliance with section 504 of the Higher Education Facilities Act as amended by Public Law 90–575.

Members of the House, section 504 is very explicit in its interpretation. It simply states that any person convicted by a court of law or under rules and regulations established by any college or university shall have his student aid automatically cut off. It is that simple, with no more to it than that.

I do not think that it is necessary to research the problems we have had in this country in the last 2 weeks, 2 months, or 2 years. It seems to me that it is less difficult to perform heart surgery than it is to put a little starch into the backbones of some of our school administrators. I heard a tape recording Sunday night by a Kent State student who said that if the administrators would only communicate with the students, this terrible tragedy could possibly have been avoided. I do not know whether or not it could have been. However, on Sunday night I also watched television and saw Robin Fleming of Michigan and

Kingman Brewster of Yale blame the problems of youth and the country on everyone else but themselves. It was almost irrational as far as their view was concerned. I feel this Nation and its educational institutions must survive. As long as the administrators of our colleges and universities are reluctant to enforce the law and to discipline their charges, particularly the radicals and malcontents, then it is the prime responsibility of this body to become involved. We do not need more work. As Members of Congress we have all we need. However, the interests of the taxpayers of this country must be preserved and protected. As far as the objectives of students are concerned who are sincere in their efforts to obtain an education, they must be allowed to attend colleges and universities so that they can compete in our society today.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. All it does is encourage the administrators of our colleges to enforce section 504A which cuts off student aid to those who have no interest in or no business in attending colleges of our great country. As I said a moment ago, it passed last year by a vote of 329 to 61. And, I ask the Members of this House to consider this amendment at this time in that light.

I appreciate the diligent work which has been done by the Subcommittee on Appropriations. They have an amendment in the bill that does nothing more than taking care of Federal employees. It says nothing about the cutting off of student aid. It says nothing about forcing the administrators of our colleges to take any action.

I think, simply, ladies and gentlemen, this amendment will help. Last year, for instance, because of this amendment as contained in section 504(a)(b) of the Higher Educational Facilities Act almost 700 students had their aid cut off because they were convicted in a court of record for willfully idsobeying rules and regulations implemented by the colleges. We did not do it. We did not interfere or intervene. The colleges themselves did this to their own students.

Now, is it asking too much, to let the students of this country continue their educational pursuits, by giving administrators this leverage, if this is what they need? You can call it courage if you want. But for heaven's sakes I think we ought to pass it if we care about the youth of our country. This is the least we can do.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. Chairman, this section of the bill deals with debt service contracts for the building of college dormitories. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has commitments or contracts with universities. The amendment deals with rioting and would impair the advancement of college housing. I do not believe the amendment to which the gentleman has alluded, section 504 of Public Law 90–575 needs further amendment. It is presently public law, there is no need of repeating it. I do not feel there is any need of adding it as a rider to every bill or section of the bill which this body considers.

Mr. Chairman, I would refer the gentleman to section 511 of the bill, which begins at the bottom of page 53 and continues over on page 54.

Mr. Chairman, this language already deals generally with the matter. This proposed language is surplusage and not necessary. For that reason I oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

However, the amendment that was referred to by the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee, does not cover the same subject matter. This refers solely to Federal employees. Students attending colleges are not employees. They are there because of the generosity of the taxpayers and receive Federal aid for an education—not employment.

Mr. Chairman, when we stop and consider the fact that only 1 out of 4 attend college, this means 75 percent do not attend college but pay the bill. I think it is important that these 75 percent have someone to speak for them. This amendment to which the gentleman from Tennessee referred does not cover the same subject and should be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

I believe that the campus riots have reached a stage where this Congress has an obligation to take action and to help stop them. I, certainly, want to do anything that I can. In fact, I would look favorably upon legislation that would freeze all Federal funds allocated to colleges and universities that tolerate riots, vandalism, and violence on their campuses. Why these conditions are permitted on our campuses is more than I can understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHERLE) there were—ayes 24, noes 38.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

For necessary administrative expenses of programs of renewal and housing assistance, not otherwise provided for, $41,000,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question, and I do so for the purpose of seeking information.

Mr. Chairman, on the Operation Breakthrough program, I notice in the report you say that there is no increase. How much money is in here for this Operation Breakthrough, does the gentleman know?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, there is $30 million in the bill for research, including Operation Breakthrough. It is $25 million in the current fiscal year. Next year we are providing a $5 million increase.

In 1954, the Congress provided $125,000 for housing research, in 1962, we provided $375,000, and in 1966, $750,000.

Now we have it up to $30 million, $5 million more than last year. When we reviewed the budget with the Department we received a lot of generalities and a lot of speculation. They have made a lot of press releases about Operation Breakthrough.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there were 200 grants or contracts made to various institutions to come up with ways to improve housing. The resulting reports have all laid on the shelf, and have not been used. We think these studies should be used.

This activity has gone from $125,000 in 1954 to the $30,000,000 recommended in the bill for 1971. We think the funds are adequate and sufficient.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman might be surprised, but I agree with the gentleman. In fact, I think maybe you were over generous with them because, like you, I cannot find out what they are doing. Evidently they have announced one in my district, and I have yet to find out the the details of what they plan to do down there.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. 200 grants have been made, and the committee has not been able to find out what they are doing with them and yet they asked for $55 million more to give away. I think the amount is more than adequate, until they tell us specifically what they are going to use these funds for.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, if I had known the gentleman felt that way I might have offered an amendment to reduce it, because frankly I tell you, Mr. Chairman, I cannot find out what they are planning to do down there. My constituents cannot find out what they are planning to do down there. They have them all wrought up. If you can get anything out of them I would be deeply appreciative.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is one section of the bill where I did not agree with the subcommittee.

As the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, has indicated, the request by the Department of Housing and Urban Development for urban research and technology was $55 million. Of the $55 million requested by the Department, $35 million was for Operation Breakthrough.

The committee in this bill is recommending $30 million or $5 million more than last year.

Operation Breakthrough is the program that was announced by the Department of Housing and Urban Development some time ago. Ten sites have been selected, and I presume one of the sites is in the gentleman's district.

Mr. CASEY. I did not request it.

Mr. BOLAND. You probably did not request it, but I am sure the mayor of your city did. An application for Operation Breakthrough was filed and approved for Houston.

Mr. CASEY. The Republicans are putting it in down there and causing all this trouble.

Mr. BOLAND. I think that most Members who are familiar with the housing problems in America would agree that Urban Technology and Research is not being adequately funded.

The gentleman knows that $35 million of the $55 million requested was for Operation Breakthrough. The sites have been selected and the $35 million for this program is to implement Operation Breakthrough. In my judgment, I think the Operation Breakthrough is being scuttled by not providing adequate funding for the demonstration and evaluation of this new and challenging project.

We are never going to solve the housing problem in America if we do not have adequate research.

We spend billions of dollars on research in many fields of Government activity. Yet, in the area of housing, we are pennywise and pound foolish Research in housing has been, and is, inadequate.

I am sure the Secretary of the Department, Mr. Romney, deeply believes that Operation Breakthrough can help dramatically to meet the housing needs. There is no way in which it can be resolved unless you have demonstrated programs.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. Do you think you are solving the housing problem when you cut the space program? That means you are reducing jobs in the space program and they are trying to put a Breakthrough operation down in the NASA area where people are trying to sell their homes. Do you think that is smart? I do not.

Mr. BOLAND. It is perfectly possible for an Operation Breakthrough demonstration program in that area to come up with some ideas as to what is the best housing in order to meet the deficiencies that exist now in America in housing all over the land. The fact is that the Houston area did consider housing a serious problem for its application to HUD clearly indicates this.

This is a program that the Secretary of the Department sincerely believes can help solve the dire housing needs in America. I am willing to give him that opportunity.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. We have almost tripled the amount since 1969. It is a giveaway program which has not produced much of anything other than reports—over 200 of them.

Mr. BOLAND. Let me respond by saying that it is awfully difficult to answer an argument that uses expressions that appeal to emotion—such as "giveaway program."

But that is simply not so. The fact of the matter is that reputable sponsors were selected from many proposals.

Housing is the most important problem confronting America today, outside of the war in Vietnam. If we do not solve the housing problem, we will not solve the problems in the cities that have given so much unrest and tension.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. I heard mentioned by the gentleman from Tennessee the fact that this program has been going on for years.

Operation Breakthrough started when Secretary Romney took office. That is about 1½ years. I do not know what comparison he is making, and with what other person, who is involved in housing. But this is an entirely new program, originated under this administration. It is going to do some things that will be very helpful for construction and building of homes in America. I do not think your comparison is right.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. In response to the gentleman, I should like to point out that the original authorization for research money for HUD has gone up tremendously in the last few years. It has more than doubled in the last 2 years. Operation Breakthrough is a research program. There has been a fanfare announcement with press releases, but it is still research in housing. They also have over 200 research studies on the shelf which they are not fully utilizing at the present time.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. It may be a good program, but my problem is that I cannot get any information on it. I have a petition from 1,350 families down in my area. Those people say they do not want it because they do not know what is in it. It may be great, but they certainly have done a very poor job in explaining what the project is. I would just as soon they move it out. I do not want to be honored by such a project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS FOR BASIC WATER AND SEWER FACILITIES

For grants authorized by section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 3102), $150,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEPHENS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEPHENS: On page 38, line 18, strike out "$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$500,000,000".

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred two Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, there is authorized to be appropriated by section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 $500 million for the fiscal year 1971. President Nixon in his budget message recommended an appropriation of only $150 million. My amendment is to fund the full $500 million by adding $350 million to the President's recommendation.

We have talked about all kinds of pollution. We continue to talk about air pollution, noise pollution, pesticide pollution, literature, but we have not yet made a real dent in the basic and historic problem, which is water and human waste pollution.

I will give you an example of what the Georgia Water Quality Control Board said, as far as my State is concerned, and you can multiply this by all the States of the Union. In Urban Georgia which is published by the Municipal Association, it is stated that:

250 million gallons of industrial waste and 225 million gallons of raw sewage are being dumped daily into Georgia streams.

Only about 50 percent of Georgia's population is on public sewerage. And, only about one-half of them are connected to systems which provide adequate sewage treatment.

Georgia has 4,202 miles of interstate and intrastate streams. Though only about 800 of these miles can be characterized as severely polluted, virtually all of this pollution is located just below our cities and towns.

These facts are just another way of substantiating that pollution in Georgia is essentially localized and urban created.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to make grants to communities for basic water and sewer facilities. With a limited exception for the small communities faced with critical unemployment problems, these grants pay presently up to 50 percent of the cost of new projects or enlarging and improving existing facilities.

The House in the past has authorized $1,165,000,000 for water and sewer lines for HUD. In the past up to the present we have appropriated only $665 million, which leaves $500 million of authorized appropriations for water and sewer lines unappropriated.

This year the recommendation has been again to underfinance water and sewer appropriation recommendations. I have only asked that we bring it back to what is the full amount of the appropriation.

Every recent application from my district—and I have had many members tell me the same thing—has been turned down. HUD says there are no funds. The Farmers Home Administration says there are no funds. Here is an opportunity to vote some funds.

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

Mr. STEPHENS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

WIDNALL) for cosponsoring this excellent amendment. This is the environment decade, but here, unless we pass the gentleman's amendment, we would be badly shortchanging the very water and sewer lines without which we cannot conquer a dirty environment.

Mr. STEPHENS. That is correct.

Mr. REUSS. There are plenty of spaces to cut this budget and plenty of spaces where by the budget we are actually polluting the environment in the amount of $300 million or more.

I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

We have appropriated $800 million for sewage treatment plants. That is in a different appropriation. This is the location for appropriation of money. It seems to me that it is silly to appropriate money for sewage treatment plants but not have the lines that go into the sewage treatment plants. What we have done is like a cartoon I saw the other day. The vice president of the company told the boss:

"We have put $5,000 into the cure for pollution, and we have put about $200,000 into bragging about what we have done."

That is what we have done. We are putting $650,000 into an Environment Council, which is about a half million dollars, which we could spend on the water and sewer lines.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be supported.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is with reluctance that I oppose the amendment offered by my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Georgia. He is a member of the committee that authorized this program, and knows this subject well.

However, I will say to my friend he has not seemingly taken into account that there are many programs for water grants throughout the Government. HUD has requested $150 million in new money for 1971. They told us recently they have about $43 million uncommitted at this time. For fiscal year 1971, the Economic Development Administration in the Department of Commerce has funds of $73 million, and the Farmers Home Administration, which makes grants for areas under 5,500 population, has $150 million. We appropriated $800 million for the Department of Interior for use in 1970. There are also programs in the Corps of Engineers, the Appalachian Regional Commission, and in other agencies.

We have been quite concerned about this program. Our committee has pushed it and urged it. This is a very popular program with all the Members, and throughout the country. In fiscal year 1969, we gave them $15 million more than was requested. This $15 million was frozen by the Bureau of the Budget.

The best estimates that we have available indicate that $43 million is presently available in the Department and added to the $150 million in the bill provides $193 for this program between now and June 30, 1971. Many cities have not voted the bonds and have not been able to contribute their local share. They are not ready to move. Other projects, totaling about $75 million, have been referred to the Farmers Home Administration.

I called the Department yesterday and asked them to please advise the committee how much money they could efficiently utilize in the grants for basic water and sewer facilities. I have a letter dated yesterday, signed by Under Secretary Richard C. Van Dusen, in which he points out the work in process. He says there is a backlog of 254 full applications which could move, that these are firm projects and that these applications seek funds of $135 million.

Then he says that on the basis of full applications of $135 million, on the measurement of efficient use, "this requires balancing the water and sewer grant program against the demands of other programs." He said further:

On the basis, and considering the overriding need to maintain a sound fiscal posture to combat inflation, we cannot recommend the appropriation to the water and sewer program of more than the $150 million requested in the President's budget.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. STEPHENS. If what they say is true, why is it we are continually told there are no funds, when my applicants come to me and want me to help them?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I, too, have asked for projects and have been told there are no funds.

We have provided increases before and asked them to use more money, but they did not spend the money and it was held in reserve.

I am just giving the gentleman the facts about this very popular program. I like the program and would not be adverse to providing more money for the program. But $150 million is all the Department will support, and what they say they will be permitted to spend.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last three words.

I should like to make it very clear that I support this program. I believe it is one of the best programs we have. We have been fighting for it in the committee.

I remember fussing with Dr. Weaver when he was Secretary because it seemed to me that he was downgrading this program when he refused to spend all the money we had appropriated for it during that year. That was a time when he was putting all the emphasis on model cities.

I do not believe more money than the committee recommends could efficiently be spent next year, but the level of spending could be increased if the preliminary work could be expedited. We have to remember that the cities or municipalities which participate in this program have to sell their bonds. They are finding it exceedingly difficult to move their bonds today at the current high rates of interest they have to pay. They have to get the bond issues adopted by the communities, and then they have to sell the bonds. They have to get their money in hand before they can put up matching funds.

We have been running along at a level of about $150 million a year. One year, as I previously pointed out, our committee put up $165 million for this program, and the administration did not spend it. One year the sum got down to $135 million. It has been ranging between $135 million and $150 million a year.

I do not believe this program ought to be on a prince and pauper basis. We should agree on the level of funding and then we ought to stick to about that level in order that the municipalities will have some idea as to what will be available.

To just suddenly here, after having $150 million in this program last year, come up with $500 million and turn it over to HUD to obligate in one year, is something I do not believe they can do efficiently. I do not believe they are geared up to do it effectively. I believe we will be doing the program an injustice to insist on this amendment for that reason and for another reason.

If this amendment is adopted in the Committee of the Whole today, it will be exceeding the President's budget by $173 million in this one bill.

The committee labored long and hard to try to produce a bill that is satisfactory and which we thought would be satisfactory to all concerned. This bill is more than a billion dollars higher than the bill we adopted last year. The cuts have been lower than previously. I did not hear anybody undertaking, as we read the previous sections of the bill, to reduce model cities and put that money into the water and sewer grants. I did not hear anybody try to transfer urban renewal funds to this program. There is $1 billion in this bill for urban renewal and $575 million for model cities. Maybe some of that money might properly be transferred to this program. I think this program is just as good as any other program in the bill. But I do not think that we should now, after we have passed over all of these other items and cannot make any adjustments adopt an amendment that will add $350 million to the bill the committee labored so long and so hard to perfect. If we do that we will be breaking the budget by $173 million. I do not think we can afford to do that. We have to borrow this money. You are going to drive this budget up, up, and up, and instead of having a surplus next year, you are going to wind up with a tremendous deficit.

I urge the committee to stay with the Committee on Appropriations on this, because we think we have done a good job on this bill. We think it deserves the support of all the Members.

I will be glad to yield to my good friend from Missouri.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, this program is one that has been very close to my heart. I was one of the original sponsors of the program when it passed the House of Representatives, and I have been watching over it ever since. I have been instrumental in offering the raises in authorization that have taken place within the House of Representatives on this program. It concerns me to hear people say they

have not used the money that has been appropriated. How many of you realize how the previous administration and this administration have been discouraging applications? They have been saying, why, we cannot get rid of the money that we have. They had a backlog in the previous administration of almost $4 billion in applications. Then they set out to try to parcel this out into other areas of the Government, to the Farmers Home Administration I believe for one, and several others, in order to try to cut down the backlog so that the figures would not look so bad and the pressure would not be so great. They have done everything they could to try to make it impossible for people to qualify for some of these grants. It is a 50–50 matching fund program. And, I find that the municipalities with which I am acquainted throughout the Nation very strongly want to continue the program with the ability to fund adequately the number of applications that are on hand, and this can be if they are not discouraged by the administration.

I think the only reason that Congress did not vote funds for this program is the lack of information about it and the need that very surely exists. I and the members of my staff have undertaken periodic investigations of the need in the various congressional districts and armed with our findings we have taken the matter up with Members of the House who in the past have never seemed to want to adequately and fully support this program. I just cannot understand why this Congress has been unable to obtain the funds necessary with which to bring the appropriations up to the authorized amount at a time when the Nation is concerned so much with pollution, water pollution, waste disposal, areas of absolute priority as far as this country is concerned. Many who decry efforts to fully fund are not aware of the absolute need.

Mr. Chairman, I know the cost of sewer construction. I know the fact that they have not been able to get help from the Federal Government has meant that many towns have had to carry the entire burden themselves. They have been under State order or under county order to clean up the necessary sewerage disposal problem or else face very severe penalties.

Mr. Chairman, they are desperately in need of the funds. I say this because many of them are bonded up to the hilt. Yet they still have to bond in order to meet the 50–50 matching part of this program. However, the 50 part that the Government can give will make available sufficient funds in order to enable these communities to do the job and to really help clean up pollution in America.

Mr. Chairman, I very strongly urge the Congress meet this critical need.

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

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

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the interest of the gentleman from New Jersey in cosponsoring and in supporting this amendment.

I would like to make one observation that the gentleman from Missouri made to the effect that you cannot take the horse to the water and make him drink. That is not what we are trying to do. We are trying to take the water to the horse.

Mr. WIDNALL. Yes, and have it pure enough to drink.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SANDMAN. As the gentleman from New Jersey knows, the State that he and I come from has made available through a referendum of the people $272 million which is State-matching money for this purpose. I say this in response to the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina. So, in one State in the Union we could absorb almost the entire amount of money sought to be made available under this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Georgia in urging that this Committee support this amendment.

I am a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and I can assure you that the type of testimony that was required to get the authorization indicated that we were far below the needs when we set the authorization. However, we tried to be as realistic as possible. The fact that money has not been flowing from HUD is the fact that money has not been flowing from many of the agencies because of the freeze.

Mr. Chairman, the question of freeze and the question of budget controlling the priorities in the United States, I suggest that the budget cannot establish the priorities of the United States. The Congress has to do that, sitting in committee such as this one. We have to do that. It seems to me, that if this Congress at this time fails to come up with appropriations consistent with the authorizations which were so very tortuously arrived at to provide money for these kinds of programs so basic to our environment, that there has been certainly nothing but rhetoric during the discussions which we have had having to do with environment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it represents a sad state of affairs when we cannot provide this very minute kind of assistance as a start toward the solution of some of these problems.

There are applications which are ready to move, but what is the assurance that there will be funding, which I can assure you is very frustrating to these cities. They have to go through all of the problems of setting up their proposals, going through all the costs of doing the engineering and making the studies to get their systems moving, and then they are told that they have to wait, wait, wait in line, because these programs are not moving in the administration that is supposed to move them. I think they can move these programs without a whole lot of excuse because they have got the ability to do it instead of having our people stand in the wings anxiously wanting to use this money.

The people over there who have been talking about sharing some of the Federal moneys with the local governments, here is a place where you can begin, and make that sharing meaningful. Let us not be put off by the fact that we are going to have a deficit in the budget because we will never have a surplus in the budget anyway. There is going to have to be a deficit to be dealt with. You should know that, and we should know that. We should be ready and willing to deal with that deficit. That is the responsibility of the Congress. I do not believe that you are going to be able to get off the hook by simply saying you want to protect the people because of your concern of the budget. We are going to have to change the priorities around, and we are going to have to make more cuts in some other programs, but certainly not a cut in the priority that exists here.

The gentleman from New Jersey is absolutely one who knows more about this subject than anybody. He has persuaded because of the studies that he has made, and because of the facts that he has presented, the Committee on Banking and Currency. We are the ones who are supposed to come up with a policy decision here. We made that decision. I do not see any reason why the appropriations portion of our responsibility, or the budget portion of the responsibility should negate what has been so well done on behalf of justifying this program.

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

Mr. HANNA. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from California very much on the remarks that he has made. I know the gentleman knows the critical problem we have in San Francisco Bay, and along the coast in California. We have been trying to do the job to satisfy the needs that have presented themselves in this ecological renaissance that is sweeping our States.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman is it not a fact that when the deferrals were made last year in the order of $800 million, the President did not say that this was a cut in the budget, he said it was a deferral, did he not?

Mr. HANNA. Exactly. He said it was a deferral. Only it looks now as though the deferrals are going to go on and on. That is certainly an easy way to cop out on our responsibility.

Mr. LEGGETT. And is it also not a fact that after the $150 million item was put in the budget early this year, that the President sent a message to this Congress stating that he was for a massive $10 billion antipollution effort over the next 5 or 6 years, which would tend then to negate the original budget that they submitted?

Mr. HANNA. I would say that that is exactly correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Let us go back a little bit. As I look

around this Hall I see most of the Members who were here in 1965. In 1965 the House Committee on Banking and Currency brought forth a program which was the result of a national demand that Congress do something to help the communities of this country to meet a very pressing problem. That problem was to do something about their sewer systems and about their waste systems.

At that time, if my memory serves me correctly, people on both sides of the aisle rose and said, "At long last the Federal Government is measuring up to its responsibility. Then they set a program. Part of that program calls for the expenditure this coming fiscal year of the exact amount that is in the amendment offered here by our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) and cosponsored by our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL).

As a result of the Congress having made the commitment to the States, the States went out and told the local communities that you represent, get busy and make your applications; send them to Washington; and the Federal Government will give you half of the money.

That is what you did in 1965 under a prior administration.

In 1970, from coast to coast and from border to border, this country is suddenly realizing what we have done to our country in the last 150 years. The people are demanding that it be cleaned up, and money provided for water supply and sewage treatment.

Helping to clean up our environment will be accomplished by eliminating one of our prime pollution problems—sewage treatment and adequate water supply.

To show you that the Congress is not irresponsible, we also put in another act which we passed; a requirement that this has to be done in cooperation with our sewage disposal plants because it does not do much good to build a collection system and dump raw sewage in the rivers, harbors, or lakes.

You have to treat the sewage before it gets there. Water supply systems and sewage treatment plants have to work together.

I admit to my colleagues that this is a lot of money, but the issue involved here is not dollars and cents. The issue that is involved is survival. It is survival in North Carolina and it is survival in Pennsylvana as well as keeping faith with the American people.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that you first build your treatment plants and your interceptors before you are ready to proceed with building your waterlines?

Mr. SAYLOR. Absolutely not.

Mr. JONAS. All right. Now we are not talking about sewage disposal treatment plants or interceptors. We are talking about this program—only about waterlines that lead to these plants.

Now we are saying that we are going forward with an $800 million program for interceptors and treatment plants and eventually we may need that amount of money to build the waterlines. But not at the same time—or not simultaneously. Therefore, we think this part of the program can well be deferred until we get further along with the interceptors and the treatment plants.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is like saying to the American people that you can grow half an apple. You cannot grow half an apple. You either have a whole apple or you do not have any apple. You have to have both of these together. That is what the Congress said, and everybody around here voted for it at that time. Now the time has come to pay the piper. Now the time has come to keep the faith with the American people. Now is the time to keep the faith with your constituents and your communities who have been thwarted from taking the necessary steps to comply with State laws, Federal laws and filing requests to construct water systems.

You heard the gentleman from New Jersey tell you about both the prior and present administrations' efforts to scatter these various applications among the sundry Federal agencies. They put them everywhere—under the rug—they have done everything to discourage communities. They have gone to people and said, "Do not file your application."

There are enough applications in my State—and that is only one State—to take care of this increase.

We again heard the gentleman from New Jersey say that there are enough applications in his State to take care of this increase. When you multiply that by 50, to take care of the applications now in this country, the trouble is that $800 million in this amendment is hardly enough.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to disabuse the gentleman of that idea because there are only $135 million in firm applications from all over the United States.

Mr. SAYLOR. You adopt this amendment and you will find there will be more than enough applications to take care of all of the money in this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this appears to be an amendment from the Banking and Currency Committee, and I would like to say to the members thereof that there might be some money to spend on some of these projects if you, the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, would stop approving bills to beef up, to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, the capital of so-called international lending institutions. It is reported that you are about to produce still another one that will cost hundreds of millions, if not a couple of billions of dollars.

If you get off that kick, as they say, of taking the money of the taxpayers of this country to beef up international banks so they can dish out 40- and 50-year loans with little or no interest—loans that will never be collected—there might be a little money left in this country to spend on projects of this kind.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to increase grants under this act for basic water and sewer facilities.

Mr. Chairman, there is no single problem in my district more serious than adequate funding for this program. The backlog of applications in my district for water and sewer funds under the HUD program makes it obvious to me that much more is needed if this program is to be a success.

In the past I have supported efforts on this floor—along with a majority of the Congress—to increase funds for sewage treatment plants. I plan to do so again when the 1971 appropriation for this program reaches this floor. But we would only be doing half the job if we acted to provide more adequate funding for sewage treatment plants and then neglected to provide enough funds to build the sewer and water lines which make a sewage treatment plant effective.

I do recognize that the committee has done an excellent job in dealing with the priorities which are posed by this legislation. I do feel, however, that full funding for basic water and sewer facilities must appear at the top of any list of priorities.

It is for these reasons, then, that I fully support the amendment now before this House, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which will increase to $500 million the Federal commitment to local communities for assistance with the costs of constructing basic water and sewer facilities.

This program is one of the most popular of the various Federal programs of aid to local governments, and it is woefully underfunded. I know that this increase will be helpful.

Many communities in my district are faced with the necessity of constructing extensive water and sewer facilities, and in many cases these facilities are urgently needed to abate pollution of lakes and streams. The costs are very great, and the burden presently rests on local governments' principal revenue raiser, the property tax.

I do not wish to be critical of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's administration of this program, because the paucity of funds has combined with great popular demand to put unusual pressures on the program. The agency has been forced to develop intricate and complex formulas to arrive at a method of ranking applications. Some are assisted, but most are left out in the cold.

I am hopeful that Congress will move to expand this helpful program of Federal assistance at least to the extent where all applicant communities can receive a modest share of Federal aid toward the cost of the total project.

I urge the House adopt this amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) to raise from $150 million to $500 million the funds for grants for basic water and sewer facili-

ties authorized by section 702, of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. Presently there is now $500 million of unappropriated authorizations for the water and sewer grant program. This amendment provides full funding for this program.

All of us are well aware of the need to provide funds to make our environment more livable. We all know if our rivers, lakes, and streams are to be safe and sanitary, a greatly increased program of sewage treatment must be begun immediately. HUD's section 702 grant program for water and sewer facilities is necessary if we are to be successful in cleaning up our environment. This is a chance for Congress to act and not merely talk about the pollution problem. The $500 million proposed in this amendment barely covers the backlog of applications for water and sewer grants presently pending in the Washington Office of the Department of Housing Urban Development. Another billion dollars in grant applications are presently pending in the HUD regional offices.

I urge all Members to support this amendment to increase the funds for water and sewer facilities to $500 million.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it is my earnest belief that the House should, and my sincere hope that it will, adopt the amendment to H.R. 17548 presently under consideration, which would appropriate the full amount authorized, $500 million, for basic water and sewer facilities.

I am sure we all recognize, Mr. Chairman, how closely connected this program is to improvement in the quality of our environment. Last year I advocated and supported a successful move to increase greatly—from $315 million to $800 million—the appropriation for sewage treatment plant construction grants. Our objective, then as now, was to halt the deterioration of our Nation's waterways. If we are to progress toward that goal, we must insure that the water and sewer lines leading to the new, improved sewage treatment plants are adequate and sufficient to perform the more demanding tasks they are being assigned.

And, certainly, Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow this added burden to fall on the already sloping shoulders of our towns and cities. In Massachusetts, and I am sure in all the States, the local taxpayers are laboring under almost impossible financial hardship, while municipal governments are sorely strapped for funds merely to cover existing programs and services. Small communities throughout the country, like those bordering on the Blackstone River and other tributaries in my own area, are in genuine need of greater assistance, if more and better water and sewer lines are to be constructed. That is why I have consistently appealed for increases in Federal assistance for these purposes, until these imperative local and national objectives have been achieved.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is at least as large as the $500 million that this amendment would appropriate. We are informed that there is a backlog of approved projects in the Washington Office of HUD which is at least equal to this amount. There is no danger that the money would be spent haphazardly. In fact, members of the committee heard reliable estimates that there is another full $1 billion worth of applications now in various stages of processing in the field offices of HUD. And although these inflationary times tend to make suspect the spending of even one Federal dollar, we should not shirk our responsibility to establish as one of the very first priorities the preservation and protection of our environment.

As I have pointed out in the past, Mr. Chairman, the control and improvement in our environment has become as urgent as life itself, and as nonpartisan as eventual death. Therefore, I would hope that my colleagues from both parties would adopt overwhelmingly this amendment to H.R. 17548.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment being offered to increase the appropriation for water and sewer facilities construction grants from $150 million to the authorized level of $500 million.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is expected to receive 1,000 preliminary applications for water and sewer facilities grants during 1970. If we appropriate only $150 million dollars for this program, some 700 of these applications will have to be denied and vital construction projects delayed. If this amendment is accepted and the full amount authorized is appropriated, then we can move against the backlog of applications and take a major step forward in the struggle against pollution.

The full funding of this program is vital to America's major urban centers—particularly our older cities which are faced with the nearly constant breakdown of water and sewer systems nearly a century old. In Cleveland, Ohio, we have been plagued with massive breakdowns of the city's sewer lines with the result that literally millions upon millions of gallons of untreated sewage have been allowed to flow into the already critically polluted Lake Erie.

In addition, full funding of this program will permit the rapid construction of area-wide sewage line networks which will enable the consolidation of sewage treatment works into more efficient central facilities.

Mr. Chairman, this administration has produced a great deal of rhetoric about the need to stop pollution—it has produced very little action. We need $500 million for this water and sewer construction program, yet this administration has asked for only $150 million. The environmental crisis cannot be solved by empty words; it is our duty today to provide the funds necessary to construct the Nation's needed sewer facilities.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS) which would increase from $150 million to $500 million the appropriation for water and sewer grants. In the past few months, the Nation has been alerted to the grave dangers of pollution. The discussion and dialog culminating in Earth Day on April 22 have alerted everyone to the need for a concerted attack on pollution of all types.

The Interior Department's program for building sewage treatment plants fits in with the pending program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to construct sewer and water lines. This program is of particular value and importance in West Virginia, where we have a backlog of need for these Federal grants for water and sewer lines.

The appropriation of the full amount of the $500 million authorization is a national priority which must be met if we are to march forward in the struggle against pollution. I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS).

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. STEPHENS and Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

FLOOD INSURANCE

For necessary administrative expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carry out the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 572), $5,000,000.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order on this portion of the bill?

The Chair hears none.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOWARD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: On page 42, line 5, after the comma delete "5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$6,050,000".

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, after the concern shown by the House in the last amendment, concern for the plight of so many millions of Americans to the tune of adding $350 million to our appropriation, I would like to state that to do something else for millions of Americans, the House need only concern itself about one three-hundred-fiftieths as much as it did on the last amendment. What this amendment does is add only $1,050,000 to the appropriation for the Federal Insurance Administration to carry out the provisions of flood insurance legislation that has been passed in the last Congress.

The lack of flood insurance has been a problem for small businessmen and individuals for many, many years. A pro-

gram to have the Federal Government assist in this area so that people will be able to afford to buy insurance has been promoted for many years. My colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL), in the 1950's, worked very diligently to get such a program going, and it died in the late fifties. A program for a flood insurance study passed the other body in the 87th Congress with no result in this body. And in the 88th, it passed the other body, with no result. It was not until the 89th Congress that both Houses passed a flood insurance study program. Now we have a program. The only logjam is in Washington, in approving communities so that many millions of businessmen and homeowners may purchase insurance.

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

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman on the amendment he has offered. I understand there is only a half million dollars for administrative purposes.

Mr. HOWARD. Only to the amount the agency said it can effectively use in the coming year.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has pointed out how, despite the fact that the program has been in effect now for well over a year, a very small number of communities have been able to qualify. Is that correct?

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman from Louisiana is correct.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman I am sure is aware of the fact that had communities suffering from the hurricane devastation, such as Hurricane Camille, been under this program, they would have been able to offset losses by flood insurance. Is that correct?

Mr. HOWARD. That is correct. It would have saved the Government many millions of dollars, because the insurance would have covered this, and we would not have had to come up with a Federal Disaster Act and spend money to help these people.

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

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an expenditure. This is an investment. If we want to save millions of dollars for the taxpayer, we can do it by adopting this simple amendment. I hope the amendment will be approved.

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

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey who, along with the other gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SANDMAN), has helped sponsor this amendment.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD), in supporting this amendment to request this increase in the appropriation. I think it is important to point out in this House that the Congress is called upon on many occasions to authorize different projects and, under the schedule of public works, it takes many years for these projects to be authorized and for proper appropriations to be provided. It seems to me in our State of New Jersey only recently—in 1968—as my colleagues from New Jersey know, we had a catastrophic flood which amounted to $130 million in damages. Most of it was noncompensable.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this body to support this particular amendment for added flood insurance funding.

Mr. Chairman, it has taken 36 years to get this program going.

In support of my contention that expanded appropriations be provided for national flood insurance as an interim step in aiding our States and citizens by providing some measure of security in the event of flood damage until comprehensive flood control programs can be properly implemented to enable the insurance companies throughout the country to assume these risks for the individual, I submit the following information on my home State of New Jersey as a graphic illustration of the essential need for this national flood insurance relief.

In view of the fact that New Jersey is now the most urban State in the Nation, with a population in excess of 7 million people, estimated at over 900 persons per square mile, we are the most densely populated State in the Nation. The greatest concentration of our population is in the northeastern quadrant of the State and roughly 80 percent live in the 11 counties which form a rather narrow strip running between New York and Philadelphia. The ever-increasing exodus of people and industry from the urban centers into the suburban and rural areas is creating an ever-counting pressure on our national resources along with enormous competition for the use of our land.

In attempting to establish priorities, it is fully recognized that the order of magnitude of our capital investment requirements literally covers the widest possible elements of the "rebirth" of our State. Of all of these priorities, no matter how we equate or measure our future investment—by whatever standard applied—short of the air we breathe, there is no element more basic or critically essential to the sustenance and life of our people and the economic vitality of our State than the quantity and quality of our water supply. In recognition that total water management in our State evolves around water quality, water supply, flood control, flood insurance, and flood plain zoning, it is important to note that major water supply-flood control studies are intensively being carried out on the Passaic River Basin and the Delaware River Basin. A substantive flood plan delineation program has recently been committed and is underway for the Raritan Basin. Additional flood control studies are being carried out on some of our southern New Jersey rivers.

A flood damage problem of staggering proportions exists today in the Passaic River Basin. The problem has resulted over the years from a complete abuse of this natural resource. The Passaic River has been characterized, as the result of many engineering studies, as one of the filthiest and most unpredictable treacherous rivers in the northeastern part of the Nation. The ever-increasing extreme danger of the flood damage potential of the Passaic River Basin was clearly manifested and exemplified in the catastrophy of substantive proportions that which is considered on the overall magnitude of the problem as being a relatively minor flood—affecting five counties, but particularly severe in the Passaic River Basin, with the attendant loss of a number of lives and enormous property damage costing yet undetermined millions of dollars for rehabilitation—but what price can be affixed to the misery, heartbreak and personal tragedy of the people directly affected. For anyone to dismiss these ravages of nature by labeling them as unavoidable acts of the Almighty would indeed be a travesty and fraud against the people of the flood stricken areas. The national concern now being expressed for the intregity of our environment stems from the confrontation between man's need and capacity to use his environment for economic purposes as well as basic survival of mankind and the need and capacity of the natural resources and the ecosystem to adjust to the changes and consequences.

As a result of the May 1968 flood, Governor Richard J. Hughes, of the State of New Jersey, issued Executive Order No. 43, in part, stating, as follows:

> A request has been made that the President of the United States declare that same area to be a disaster area within the meaning of Public Law 875, which request is presently under consideration.

Governor Hughes in a telegram to President Lyndon B. Johnson stated as follows:

> As Governor, I certify the need for disaster assistance in the State of New Jersey. The northern section of the State, including portions of Bergen, Essex, Middlesex, Morris, Passaic, Somerset and Union Counties have suffered an estimated $150 million in damages from extreme flooding and strong winds. Of this, it is estimated a $133 million loss has been experienced by industry and private home owners. The balance of damage has occurred to roads, bridges and appurtenances thereto; water and sewer systems; mosquito control systems; educational facilities and the collection of debris creating unusual health hazards, including possible infestation of vermin.

The President of the United States, through the Office of Emergency Preparedness, under Public Law 875—disaster relief law—declared this Passaic River Basin area to be a disaster area and made available an immediate appropriation of $3 million to cover emergency repairs and temporary replacement for essential public facilities.

Governor Hughes signed into law Senate bill No. 822 which provided a State appropriation of $5 million to help relieve damages in flood stricken municipalities and counties specifically and particularly for the repair, reconstruction, and replacement of public roads, works, facilities, and structures damaged or destroyed during or as a result of the severe flooding.

The Federal Small Business Administration approved and provided loans in the amount of $1.2 million to accommodate the rehabilitation needs of 191

businesses and homeowners who suffered damages as a result of this flood.

In addition, and most significant to my vigorous support of expanded flood insurance program it is important to note that extensive private property damage was noncompensable under any existing State or Federal flood rehabilitation programs causing considerable economic and personal hardship to the citizens of the flood-stricken area.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New York district, has been conducting indepth engineering studies and evaluation of the Passaic River Basin at considerable public expense for over a 30-year period. In August 1969 the State division of water policy and supply, the State water policy and supply council, and the State department of conservation and economic development formally adopted and declared the comprehensive plan III of the Passaic River Basin flood control-water resources management and development program as prepared under authorization of the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New York district, in conjunction with the New Jersey State Department of Conservation and Economic Development for and on behalf of the State on New Jersey as an integral part of the State's overall water development master plan as the best plan for water resources and flood control management in the interest of the safety, health, and general welfare of the people of the Passaic River Basin region of the State and provided that all future development or redevelopment within the Passaic River Basin region as it relates to the integrity, vitality and the effective implementation of this flood control-water resources management and development program shall be in strict compliance with, and conform to the criteria established by this comprehensive plan.

In his communication on behalf of the State of New Jersey to Col. James W. Barnett, district engineer, New York Corps of Engineers, Gov. Richard J. Hughes stated:

> In view of the seriousness of the problem of the Passaic Valley and the realization that delay in the completion of a comprehensive water management-flood control program as embodied in Plan III will result in increasing hardships to the people of the basin, the State of New Jersey and an escalation of costs, it is requested that every effort be extended to expedite all phases of your work so as to permit authorization of the project and funding by the Congress at the earliest possible date. Continued close cooperation between the Corps of Engineers and all levels of New Jersey government is essential in order that this most vital improvement can be realized.

In view of the great deal of time that will be consumed between the approval and authorization by the Congress and the ultimate funding through an appropriations bill for any public works projects, in view of the additional time-consuming procedures that must be followed after funds become available until the construction of the projects, and in view of the exigencies involved and the severity of the situation relating to the capability of our natural resources in sustaining the ever-increasing growth developing in the river basins throughout the United States, the only protection to the citizen is the flood insurance program.

I believe that the people who live in the areas affected ought to be entitled to equal justice and to have adequate flood insurance protection.

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

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WIDNALL. I should like to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey on this amendment. This is the amount which was asked for by the administration. It is something which can help vastly in an area too long neglected.

With the program underway, developing now, it needs additional funds.

I certainly will support the amendment.

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

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that, as the gentleman said, this is an investment for the future.

As a result of the bad storm in my State, in 1962 President Kennedy declared a state of emergency. Because there was not any flood insurance for the area, there was an appropriation made by this House, and extended to New Jersey, in the amount of $28 million.

This becomes a reality, and flood insurance will be purchasable throughout the land, and such great expenditures will not be necessary.

I should like to join in the remarks of the gentleman in the well, and I support the amendment.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Let us have the facts on this matter. Congress authorized a program of flood insurance. We have a flood insurance program now. The insurance companies provide insurance and the Government guarantees the insurance companies.

These funds are to be used for studies and for surveying and mapping the flood areas.

In 1970, we provided $2.4 million, and this year we recommend $5 million. We have given more than a 100-percent increase over 1970. We have more than doubled the amount provided in last year's bill.

This is not for flood insurance; this is for studies and administrative expenses. We believe the funds recommended in the bill are quite adequate. It is more than double last year.

We ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOWARD) there were—ayes 38, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 994, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed and that I may be permitted to include tables.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE ON STEPHENS AMENDMENT

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks on the Stephens amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

AIRPORT AND AIRWAY DEVELOPMENT AND REVENUE ACTS OF 1970

Mr. STAGGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on

the bill (H.R. 14465) to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, for the imposition of airport and airway user charges, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1074)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14465) to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, for the imposition of airport and airway user charges, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

TITLE I OF THE HOUSE BILL

The managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate as to title I of the House bill and the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 (except section 306 of such amendment which amended the Tariff Act of 1930) having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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 matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

TITLE I—AIRPORT AND AIRWAY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970

PART I—SHORT TITLE, ETC.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970".

SEC. 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY.

The Congress hereby finds and declares—

That the Nation's airport and airway system is inadequate to meet the current and projected growth in aviation.

That substantial expansion and improvement of the airport and airway system is required to meet the demands of interstate commerce, the postal service, and the national defense.

That the annual obligational authority during the period July 1, 1970, through June 30, 1980, for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement of air navigational facilities under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.), should be no less than $250,000,000.

That the obligational authority during the period July 1, 1970, through June 30, 1980, for airport assistance under this title should be $2,500,000,000.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY.

(a) FORMULATION OF POLICY.—Within one year after the date of enactment of this title the Secretary of Transportation shall formulate and recommend to the Congress for approval a national transportation policy. In the formulation of such policy, the Secretary shall take into consideration, among other things—

(1) the coordinated development and improvement of all modes of transportation, together with the priority which shall be assigned to the development and improvement of each mode of transportation; and

(2) the coordination of recommendations made under this title relating to airport and airway development with all other recommendations to the Congress for the development and improvement of our national transportation system.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress on the implementation of the national transportation policy formulated under subsection (a) of this section. Such report shall include the specific actions taken by the Secretary with respect to (1) the coordination of the development and improvement of all modes of transportation, (2) the establishment of priorities with respect to the development and improvement of each mode of transportation, and (3) the coordination of recommendations under this title relating to airport and airway development with all other recommendations to the Congress for the development and improvement of our national transportation system.

SEC. 4. COST ALLOCATIONS STUDY.

The Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study respecting the appropriate method for allocating the cost of the airport and airway system among the various users, and shall identify the cost to the Federal Government that should appropriately be charged to the system and the value to be assigned to any general public benefit, including military, which may be determined to exist. In conducting the study the Secretary shall consult fully with and give careful consideration to the views of the users of the system. The Secretary shall report the results of the study to Congress within two years from the date of enactment of this title.

PART II—AIRPORT AND AIRWAY DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 11. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this part—

(1) "Airport" means any area of land or water which is used; or intended for use, for the landing and takeoff of aircraft, and any appurtenant areas which are used, or intended for use, for airport buildings or other airport facilities or rights-of-way, together with all airport buildings and facilities located thereon.

(2) "Airport development" means (A) any work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing a public airport or portion thereof, including the removal, lowering, relocation, and marking and lighting of airport hazards, and including navigation aids, used by aircraft landing at, or taking off from, a public airport, and including safety equipment required by rule or regulation for certification of the airport under section 612 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, and (B) any acquisition of land or of any interest therein, or of any easement through or other interest in airspace, including land for future airport development, which is necessary to permit any such work or to remove or mitigate or prevent or limit the establishment of, airport hazards.

(3) "Airport hazard" means any structure or object of natural growth located on or in the vicinity of a public airport, or any use of land near such airport, which obstructs the airspace required for the flight of aircraft in landing or taking off at such airport or is otherwise hazardous to such landing or taking off of aircraft.

(4) "Airport master planning" means the development for planning purposes of information and guidance to determine the extent, type, and nature of development needed at a specific airport. It may include the preparation of an airport layout plan and feasibility studies, and the conduct of such other studies, surveys, and planning actions as may be necessary to determine the short-, intermediate-, and long-range aeronautical demands required to be met by a particular airport as a part of a system of airports.

(5) "Airport system planning" means the development for planning purposes of information and guidance to determine the extent, type, nature, location, and timing of airport development needed in a specific area to establish a viable and balanced system of public airports. It includes identification of the specific aeronautical role of each airport within the system, development of estimates of system-wide development costs, and the conduct of such studies, surveys, and other planning actions as may be necessary to determine the short-, intermediate-, and long-range aeronautical demands required to be met by a particular system of airports.

(6) "Landing area" means that area used or intended to be used for the landing, takeoff, or surface maneuvering of aircraft.

(7) "Government aircraft" means aircraft owned and operated by the United States.

(8) "Planning agency" means any planning agency designated by the Secretary which is authorized by the laws of the State or States (including the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam) or political subdivisions concerned to engage in areawide planning for the areas in which assistance under this part is to be used.

(9) "Project" means a project for the accomplishment of airport development, airport master planning, or airport system planning.

(10) "Project costs" means any costs involved in accomplishing a project.

(11) "Public agency" means a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam or any agency of any of them; a municipality or other political subdivision; or a tax-supported organization; or an Indian tribe or pueblo.

(12) "Public airport" means any airport which is used or to be used for public purposes, under the control of a public agency, the landing area of which is publicly owned.

(13) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Transportation.

(14) "Sponsor" means any public agency which, either individually or jointly with one or more other public agencies, submits to the Secretary, in accordance with this part, an application for financial assistance.

(15) "State" means a State of the United States or the District of Columbia.

(16) "Terminal area" means that area used or intended to be used for such facilities as terminal and cargo buildings, gates, hangars, shops, and other service buildings; automobile parking, airport motels, and restaurants, and garages and automobile service facilities used in connection with the airport; and entrance and service roads used by the public within the boundaries of the airport.

(17) "United States share" means that portion of the project costs of projects for airport development approved pursuant to section 16 of this part which is to be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this part.

SEC. 12. NATIONAL AIRPORT SYSTEM PLAN.

(a) FORMULATION OF PLAN.—The Secretary is directed to prepare and publish, within two years after the date of enactment of this part, and thereafter to review and revise as necessary, a national airport system plan for the development of public airports in the United States. The plan shall set forth, for at least a ten-year period, the type and estimated cost of airport development considered by the Secretary to be necessary to provide a system of public airports adequate to anticipate and meet the needs of civil aeronautics, to meet requirements in support of the national defense as determined by the Secretary of Defense, and to meet the special needs of the postal service. The plan shall include all types of airport development eligible for Federal aid under section 14 of this part, and terminal area development considered necessary to provide for the efficient accommodation of persons and goods at public airports, and the conduct of functions in operational support of the airport. Airport development identified by the plan shall not be limited to the requirements of any classes or categories of public airports. In preparing the plan, the Secretary shall consider the needs of all segments of civil aviation.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF OTHER MODES OF TRANSPORTATION.—In formulating and revising the plan, the Secretary shall take into consideration, among other things, the re-

lationship of each airport to the rest of the transportation system in the particular area, to the forecasted technological developments in aeronautics, and to developments forecasted in other modes of intercity transportation.

(c) FEDERAL, STATE, AND OTHER AGENCIES.—In developing the national airport system plan, the Secretary shall to the extent feasible consult with the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Post Office Department, the Department of the Interior regarding conservation and natural resource values, and other Federal agencies, as appropriate; with planning agencies, and airport operators; and with air carriers, aircraft manufacturers, and others in the aviation industry. The Secretary shall provide technical guidance to agencies engaged in the conduct of airport system planning and airport master planning to insure that the national airport system plan reflects the product of interstate, State, and local airport planning.

(d) COOPERATION WITH FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION.—The Secretary shall, to the extent possible, consult, and give consideration to the views and recommendations of the Federal Communications Commission, and shall make all reasonable efforts to cooperate with that Commission for the purpose of eliminating, preventing, or minimizing airport hazards caused by the construction or operation of any radio or television station. In carrying out this section, the Secretary may make any necessary surveys, studies, examinations, and investigations.

(e) CONSULTATION WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Department of Defense shall make military airports and airport facilities available for civil use to the extent feasible. In advising the Secretary of national defense requirements pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary of Defense, shall indicate the extent to which military airports and airport facilities will be available for civil use.

(f) CONSULTATION CONCERNING ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with and consider the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the National Council on Environmental Quality. The recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the National Council on Environmental Quality, with regard to the preservation of environmental quality, shall, to the extent that the Secretary of Transportation determines to be feasible, be incorporated in the national airport system plan.

(g) COOPERATION WITH THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION.—The Secretary shall, to the extent possible, consult, and give consideration to the views and recommendations of the Federal Power Commission, and shall make all reasonable efforts to cooperate with that Commission for the purpose of eliminating, preventing, or minimizing airport hazards caused by the construction or operation of power facilities. In carrying out this section, the Secretary may make any necessary surveys, studies, examinations, and investigations.

(h) AVIATION ADVISORY COMMISSION.—

(1) There is established an Aviation Advisory Commission (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the "Commission"). The Commission shall be composed of nine members appointed by the President from private life as follows:

(A) One person to serve as Chairman of the Commission who is specially qualified to serve as Chairman by virtue of his education, training, or experience.

(B) Eight persons who are specially qualified to serve on such Commission from among representatives of the commercial air carriers, general aviation, aircraft manufacturers, airport sponsors, State aeronautics agencies, and three major organizations concerned with conservation or regional planning.

Not more than five members of the Commission shall be from the same political party. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made, and subject to the same limitations with respect to party affiliations. Five members shall constitute a quorum.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(A) to formulate recommendations concerning the long-range needs of aviation, including but not limited to, future airport requirements and the national airport system plan described in subsection (a) of this section, and recommendations concerning surrounding land uses, ground access, airways, air service, and aircraft compatible with such plan;

(B) to facilitate consideration of other modes of transportation and cooperation with other agencies and community and industry groups as provided in subsections (b) through (g) of this section.

In carrying out its duties under this subsection, the Commission shall establish such task forces as are necessary to include technical representation from the organizations referred to in this subsection, from Federal agencies, and from such other organizations and agencies as the Commission considers appropriate.

(3) Each member of the Commission shall, while serving on the business of the Commission, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from his home or regular place of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(4)(A) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Commission, but no individual so appointed shall receive compensation in excess of the rate authorized for GS–18 by section 5332 of such title.

(B) The Commission is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per diem.

(C) Administrative services shall be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration on a reimbursable basis.

(D) The Commission is authorized to request from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the Government any information and assistance it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this subsection; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information and assistance to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman.

(5) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress, on or before January 1, 1972, a final report containing the recommendations formulated by it under this subsection. The Commission shall cease to exist 60 days after the date of the submission of its final report.

(6) There are authorized to be appropriated from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund such sums, not to exceed $2,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

SEC. 13. PLANNING GRANTS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION TO MAKE GRANTS.—In order to promote the effective location and development of airports and the development of an adequate national airport system plan, the Secretary may make grants of funds to planning agencies for airport system planning, and to public agencies for airport master planning.

(b) AMOUNT AND APPORTIONMENT OF GRANTS.—The award of grants under subsection (a) of this section is subject to the following limitations:

(1) The total funds obligated for grants under this section may not exceed $75,000,000 and the amount obligated in any one fiscal year may not exceed $15,000,000.

(2) No grant under this section may exceed two-thirds of the cost incurred in the accomplishment of the project.

(3) No more than 7.5 per centum of the funds made available under this section in any fiscal year may be allocated for projects within a single State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam. Grants for projects encompassing an area located in two or more States shall be charged to each State in the proportion which the number of square miles the project encompasses in each State bears to the square miles encompassed by the entire project.

(c) REGULATIONS; COORDINATION WITH SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary governing the award and administration of grants authorized by this section. The Secretary and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall develop jointly procedures designed to preclude duplication of their respective planning assistance activities and to ensure that such activities are effectively coordinated.

SEC. 14. AIRPORT AND AIRWAY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—In order to bring about, in conformity with the national airport system plan, the establishment of a nationwide system of public airports adequate to meet the present and future needs of civil aeronautics, the Secretary is authorized to make grants for airport development by grant agreements with sponsors in aggregate amounts not less than the following:

(1) For the purpose of developing in the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, airports served by air carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and airports the primary purpose of which is to serve general aviation and to relieve congestion at airports having a high density of traffic serving other segments of aviation, $250,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1975.

(2) For the purpose of developing in the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, airports serving segments of aviation other than air carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board, $30,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1975.

(b) OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY.—To facilitate orderly long-term planning by sponsors, the Secretary is authorized, effective on the date of enactment of this title, to incur obligations to make grants for airport development from funds made available under this part for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and the succeeding four fiscal years in a total amount not to exceed $840,000,000. No obligation shall be incurred under this subsection for a period of more than three fiscal years and no such obligation shall extend beyond June 30, 1975. The Secretary shall not incur more than one obligation under this subsection with respect to any single project for airport development. Ob-

ligations incurred under this subsection shall not be liquidated in an aggregate amount exceeding $280,000,000 prior to June 30, 1971, an aggregate amount exceeding $560,000,000 prior to June 30, 1972, and an aggregate amount exceeding $840,000,000 prior to June 30, 1973.

(c) AIRWAY FACILITIES.—For the purpose of acquiring, establishing, and improving air navigation facilities under section 307(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the Secretary is authorized, within the limits established in appropriations Acts, to obligate for expenditure not less than $250,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1975.

(d) OTHER EXPENSES.—The balance of the moneys available in the trust fund shall be allocated for the necessary administrative expenses incident to the administration of programs for which funds are to be allocated as set forth in subsections (a) and (b) of this section, and for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and the conduct of other functions under section 307(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, not otherwise provided for in subsection (c) of this section, and for research and development activities under section 312(c) (as it relates to safety in air navigation) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. The initial $50,000,000 of any sums appropriated to the trust fund pursuant to subsection (d) of section 208 of the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970 shall be allocated to such research and development activities.

SEC. 15 DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS; STATE APPORTIONMENT.

(a) APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS.—

(1) As soon as possible after July 1 of each fiscal year for which any amount is authorized to be obligated for the purposes of paragraph (1) of section 14(a) of this part, the amount made available for that year shall be apportioned by the Secretary as follows:

(A) One-third to be distributed as follows:

(i) 97 per centum of such one-third for the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States.

(ii) 3 per centum of such one-third for Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, to be distributed in shares of 35 per centum, 35 per centum, 15 per centum, and 15 per centum, respectively.

(B) One-third to be distributed to sponsors of airports served by air carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board in the same ratio as the number of passengers enplaned at each airport of the sponsor bears to the total number of passengers enplaned at all such airports.

(C) One-third to be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary.

(2) As soon as possible after July 1 of each fiscal year for which any amount is authorized to be obligated for the purposes of paragraph (2) of section 14(a) of this part, the amount made available for that year shall be apportioned by the Secretary as follows:

(A) Seventy-three and one-half per centum for the several States, one-half in the proportion which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, and one-half in the proportion which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States.

(B) One and one-half per centum for Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, to be distributed in shares of 35 per centum, 35 per centum, 15 per centum, and 15 per centum, respectively.

(C) Twenty-five per centum to be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary.

(3) Each amount apportioned to a State under paragraph (1)(A)(i) or (2)(A) of this subsection shall, during the fiscal year for which it was first authorized to be obligated and the fiscal year immediately following, be available only for approved airport development projects located in that State, or sponsored by that State or some public agency thereof but located in an adjoining State. Each amount apportioned to a sponsor of an airport under paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection shall, during the fiscal year for which it was first authorized to be obligated and the two fiscal years immediately following, be available only for approved airport development projects located at airports sponsored by it. Any amount apportioned as described in this paragraph which has not been obligated by grant agreement at the expiration of the period of time for which it was so apportioned shall be added to the discretionary fund established by subsection (b) of this section.

(4) For the purpose of this section, the term "passengers enplaned" shall include United States domestic, territorial, and international revenue passenger enplanements in scheduled and nonscheduled service of air carriers and foreign air carriers in intrastate and interstate commerce as shall be determined by the Secretary pursuant to such regulations as he shall prescribe.

(b) DISCRETIONARY FUND.—(1) The amounts authorized by subsection (a) of this section to be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary shall constitute a discretionary fund.

(2) The discretionary fund shall be available for such approved projects for airport development in the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam as the Secretary considers most appropriate for carrying out the national airport system plan regardless of the location of the projects. In determining the projects for which the fund is to be used, the Secretary shall consider the existing airport facilities in the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, and the need for or lack of development of airport facilities in the several States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. Amounts placed in the discretionary fund pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, including amounts added to the discretionary fund pursuant to paragraph (3) of such subsection (a), may be used only in accordance with the purposes for which originally appropriated.

(c) NOTICE OF APPORTIONMENT; DEFINITION OF TERMS.— Upon making an apportionment as provided in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall inform the executive head of each State, and any public agency which has requested such information, as to the amounts apportioned to each State. As used in this section, the term "population" means the population according to the latest decennial census of the United States and the term "area" includes both land and water.

SEC. 16. SUBMISSION AND APPROVAL OF PROJECTS FOR AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT.

(a) SUBMISSION.—Subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, any public agency, or two or more public agencies acting jointly, may submit to the Secretary a project application, in a form and containing such information, as the Secretary may prescribe, setting forth the airport development proposed to be undertaken. No project application shall propose airport development other than that included in the then current revision of the national airport system plan formulated by the Secretary under this part, and all proposed development shall be in accordance with standards established by the Secretary, including standards for site location, airport layout, grading, drainage, seeding, paving, lighting, and safety of approaches.

(b) PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE POWERS ARE LIMITED BY STATE LAW.—Nothing in this part shall authorize the submission of a project application by any municipality or other public agency which is subject to the law of any State if the submission of the project application by the municipality or other public agency is prohibited by the law of that State.

(c) APPROVAL.—

(1) All airport development projects shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary, which approval may be given only if he is satisfied that—

(A) the project is reasonably consistent with plans (existing at the time of approval of the project) of planning agencies for the development of the area in which the airport is located and will contribute to the accomplishment of the purposes of this part;

(B) sufficient funds are available for that portion of the project costs which are not to be paid by the United States under this part;

(C) the project will be completed without undue delay;

(D) the public agency or public agencies which submitted the project application have legal authority to engage in the airport development as proposed; and

(E) all project sponsorship requirements prescribed by or under the authority of this part have been or will be met.

No airport development project may be approved by the Secretary with respect to any airport unless a public agency holds good title, satisfactory to the Secretary, to the landing area of the airport or the site therefor, or gives assurance satisfactory to the Secretary that good title will be acquired.

(2) No airport development project may be approved by the Secretary which does not include provision for installation of the landing aids specified in subsection (d) of section 17 of this part and determined by him to be required for the safe and efficient use of the airport by aircraft taking into account the category of the airport and the type and volume of traffic utilizing the airport.

(3) No airport development project may be approved by the Secretary unless he is satisfied that fair consideration has been given to the interest of communities in or near which the project may be located.

(4) It is declared to be national policy that airport development projects authorized pursuant to this part shall provide for the protection and enhancement of the natural resources and the quality of environment of the Nation. In implementing this policy, the Secretary shall consult with the Secretaries of the Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare with regard to the effect that any project involving airport location, a major runway extension, or runway location may have on natural resources including, but not limited to, fish and wildlife, natural, scenic, and recreation assets, water and air quality, and other factors affecting the environment, and shall authorize no such project found to have adverse effect unless the Secretary shall render a finding, in writing, following a full and complete review, which shall be a matter of public record, that no feasible and prudent alternative exists and that all possible steps have been taken to minimize such adverse effect.

(d) HEARINGS.—

(1) No airport development project involving the location of an airport, an airport runway, or a runway extension may be approved by the Secretary unless the public agency sponsoring the project certifies to the Secretary that there has been afforded the opportunity for public hearings for the purpose of considering the economic, social, and environmental effects of the airport location and its consistency with the goals and objectives of such urban planning as has been carried out by the community.

(2) When hearings are held under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the project

sponsor shall, when requested by the Secretary, submit a copy of the transcript to the Secretary.

(e) AIR AND WATER QUALITY.—

(1) The Secretary shall not approve any project application for a project involving airport location, a major runway extension, or runway location unless the Governor of the State in which such project may be located certifies in writing to the Secretary that there is reasonable assurance that the project will be located, designed, constructed, and operated so as to comply with applicable air and water quality standards. In any case where such standards have not been approved or where such standards have been promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, certification shall be obtained from the appropriate Secretary. Notice of certification or of refusal to certify shall be provided within sixty days after the project application is received by the Secretary.

(2) The Secretary shall condition approval of any such project application on compliance during construction and operation with applicable air and water quality standards.

(f) AIRPORT SITE SELECTION.—

(1) Whenever the Secretary determines (A) that a metropolitan area comprised of more than one unit of State or local government is in need of an additional airport to adequately meet the air transportation needs of such area, and (B) that an additional airport for such area is consistent with the national airport system plan prepared by the Secretary, he shall notify, in writing, the governing authorities of the area concerned of the need for such additional airport and request such authorities to confer, agree upon a site for the location of such additional airport, and notify the Secretary of their selection. In order to facilitate the selection of a site for an additional airport under the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall exercise such of his authority under this part as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this paragraph. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "metropolitan area" means a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget, subject however to such modifications and extensions as the Secretary may determine to be appropriate for the purposes of this subsection.

(2) In the case of a proposed new airport serving any area, which does not include a metropolitan area, the Secretary shall not approve any airport development project with respect to any proposed airport site not approved by the community or communities in which the airport is proposed to be located.

SEC. 17. UNITED STATES SHARE OF PROJECT COSTS.

(a) GENERAL PROVISION.—Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the United States share payable on account of any approved airport development project submitted under section 16 of this part may not exceed 50 per centum of the allowable project costs.

(b) PROJECTS IN PUBLIC LAND STATES.—In the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands (individual and tribal) exceeding 5 per centum of the total area of all lands therein, the United States share under subsection (a) shall be increased by whichever is the smaller of the following percentages thereof: (1) 25 per centum, or (2) a percentage equal to one-half of the percentage that the area of all such lands in that State is of its total area.

(c) PROJECTS IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.—The United States share payable on account of any approved project for airport development in the Virgin Islands shall be any portion of the allowable project costs of the project, not to exceed 75 per centum, as the Secretary considers appropriate for carrying out the provisions of this part.

(d) LANDING AIDS.—To the extent that the project costs of an approved project for airport development represent the cost of (1) land required for the installation of approach light systems, (2) touchdown zone and centerline runway lighting, or (3) high intensity runway lighting, the United States share shall be not to exceed 82 per centum of the allowable costs thereof.

SEC. 18. PROJECT SPONSORSHIP.

As a condition precedent to his approval of an airport development project under this part, the Secretary shall receive assurances in writing, satisfactory to him, that—

(1) the airport to which the project for airport development relates will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination;

(2) the airport and all facilities thereon or connected therewith will be suitably operated and maintained, with due regard to climatic and flood conditions;

(3) the aerial approaches to the airport will be adequately cleared and protected by removing, lowering, relocating, marking, or lighting or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment or creation of future airport hazards;

(4) appropriate action, including the adoption of zoning laws, has been or will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict the use of land adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal airport operations, including landing and takeoff of aircraft;

(5) all of the facilities of the airport developed with Federal financial assistance and all those usable for landing and takeoff of aircraft will be available to the United States for use by Government aircraft in common with other aircraft at all times without charge, except, if the use by Government aircraft is substantial, a charge may be made for a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities used;

(6) the airport operator or owner will furnish without cost to the Federal Government for use in connection with any air traffic control activities, or weather-reporting and communication activities related to air traffic control, any areas of land or water, or estate therein, or rights in buildings of the sponsor as the Secretary considers necessary or desirable for construction at Federal expense of space or facilities for such purposes;

(7) all project accounts and records will be kept in accordance with a standard system of accounting prescribed by the Secretary after consultation with appropriate public agencies;

(8) the airport operator or owner will maintain a fee and rental structure for the facilities and services being provided the airport users which will make the airport as self-sustaining as possible under the circumstances existing at that particular airport, taking into account such factors as the volume of traffic and economy of collection;

(9) the airport operator or owner will submit to the Secretary such annual or special airport financial and operations reports as the Secretary may reasonably request; and

(10) the airport and all airport records will be available for inspection by any duly authorized agent of the Secretary upon reasonable request.

To insure compliance with this section, the Secretary shall prescribe such project sponsorship requirements, consistent with the the terms of this part, as he considers necessary. Among other steps to insure such compliance the Secretary is authorized to enter into contracts with public agencies, on behalf of the United States. Whenever the Secretary obtains from a sponsor any area of land or water, or estate therein, or rights in buildings of the sponsor and constructs space or facilities thereon at Federal expense, he is authorized to relieve the sponsor from any contractual obligation entered into under this part or the Federal Airport Act to provide free space in airport buildings to the Federal Government to the extent he finds that space no longer required for the purposes set forth in paragraph (6) of this section.

SEC. 19. GRANT AGREEMENTS.

Upon approving a project application for airport development, the Secretary, on behalf of the United States, shall transmit to the sponsor or sponsors of the project application an offer to make a grant for the United States share of allowable project costs. An offer shall be made upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers necessary to meet the requirements of this part and the regulations prescribed thereunder. Each offer shall state a definite amount as the maximum obligation of the United States payable from funds authorized by this part, and shall stipulate the obligations to be assumed by the sponsor or sponsors. If and when an offer is accepted in writing by the sponsor, the offer and acceptance shall comprise an agreement constituting an obligation of the United States and of the sponsor. Thereafter, the amount stated in the accepted offer as the maximum obligation of the United States may not be increased by more than 10 per centum. Unless and until an agreement has been executed, the United States may not pay, nor be obligated to pay, any portion of the costs which have been or may be incurred.

SEC. 20. PROJECT COSTS.

(a) Allowable Project Costs.—Except as provided in section 21 of this part, the United States may not pay, or be obligated to pay, from amounts appropriated to carry out the provisions of this part, any portion of a project cost incurred in carrying out a project for airport development unless the Secretary has first determined that the cost is allowable. A project cost is allowable if—

(1) it was a necessary cost incurred in accomplishing airport development in conformity with approved plans and specifications for an approved airport development project and with the terms and conditions of the grant agreement entered into in connection with the project;

(2) it was incurred subsequent to the execution of the grant agreement with respect to the project, and in connection with airport development accomplished under the project after the execution of the agreement. However, the allowable costs of a project may include any necessary costs of formulating the project (including the costs of field surveys and the preparation of plans and specifications, the acquisition of land or interests therein or easements through or other interests in airspace, and any necessary administrative or other incidental costs incurred by the sponsor specifically in connection with the accomplishment of the project for airport development, which were incurred subsequent to May 13, 1946;

(3) in the opinion of the Secretary it is reasonable in amount, and if the Secretary determines that a project cost is unreasonable in amount, he may allow as an allowable project cost only so much of such project cost as he determines to be reasonable; except that in no event may he allow project costs in excess of the definite amount stated in the grant agreement; and

(4) it has not been included in any project authorized under section 13 of this part.

The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such regulations, including regulations with respect to the auditing of project costs, as he considers necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section.

(b) Costs Not Allowed.—The following are

not allowable project costs: (1) the cost of construction of that part of an airport development project intended for use as a public parking facility for passenger automobiles; or (2) the cost of construction, alteration, or repair of a hangar or of any part of an airport building except such of those buildings or parts of buildings intended to house facilities or activities directly related to the safety of persons at the airport.

SEC. 21. PAYMENTS UNDER GRANT AGREEMENTS.

The Secretary, after consultation with the sponsor with which a grant agreement has been entered into, may determine the times and amounts in which payments shall be made under the terms of a grant agreement for airport development. Payments in an aggregate amount not to exceed 90 per centum of the United States share of the total estimated allowable project costs may be made from time to time in advance of accomplishment of the airport development to which the payments relate, if the sponsor certifies to the Secretary that the aggregate expenditures to be made from the advance payments will not at any time exceed the cost of the airport development work which has been performed up to that time. If the Secretary determines that the aggregate amount of payments made under a grant agreement at any time exceeds the United States share of the total allowable project costs, the United States shall be entitled to recover the excess. If the Secretary finds that the airport development to which the advance payments relate has not been accomplished within a reasonable time or the development is not completed, the United States may recover any part of the advance payment for which the United States received no benefit. Payments under a grant agreement shall be made to the official or depository authorized by law to receive public funds and designated by the sponsor.

SEC. 22. PERFORMANCE OF CONSTRUCTION WORK.

(a) REGULATIONS.—The construction work on any project for airport development approved by the Secretary pursuant to section 16 of this part shall be subject to inspection and approval by the Secretary and in accordance with regulations prescribed by him. Such regulations shall require such cost and progress reporting by the sponsor or sponsors of such project as the Secretary shall deem necessary. No such regulation shall have the effect of altering any contract in connection with any project entered into without actual notice of the regulation.

(b) MINIMUM RATES OF WAGES.—All contracts in excess of $2,000 for work on projects for airport development approved under this part which involve labor shall contain provisions establishing minimum rates of wages, to be predetermined by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276a–5), which contractors shall pay to skilled and unskilled labor, and such minimum rates shall be stated in the invitation for bids and shall be included in proposals or bids for the work.

(c) OTHER PROVISIONS AS TO LABOR.—All contracts for work on projects for airport development approved under this part which involve labor shall contain such provisions as are necessary to insure (1) that no convict labor shall be employed; and (2) that, in the employment of labor (except in executive, administrative, and supervisory positions), preference shall be given, where they are qualified, to individuals who have served as persons in the military service of the United States, as defined in section 101(1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 511(1)), and who have been honorably discharged from such service. However, this preference shall apply only where the individuals are available and qualified to perform the work to which the employment relates.

SEC. 23. USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS.

(a) REQUESTS FOR USE.—Subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, whenever the Secretary determines that use of any lands owned or controlled by the United States is reasonably necessary for carrying out a project for airport development under this part, or for the operation of any public airport, including lands reasonably necessary to meet future development of an airport in accordance with the national airport system plan, he shall file with the head of the department or agency having control of the lands a request that the necessary property interests therein be conveyed to the public agency sponsoring the project in question or owning or controlling the airport. The property interest may consist of the title to, or any other interest in, land or any easement through or other interest in airspace.

(b) MAKING OF CONVEYANCES.—Upon receipt of a request from the Secretary under this section, the head of the department or agency having control of the lands in question shall determine whether the requested conveyance is inconsistent with the needs of the department or agency, and shall notify the Secretary of his determination within a period of four months after receipt of the Secretary's request. If the department or agency head determines that the requested conveyance is not inconsistent with the needs of that department or agency, the department or agency head is hereby authorized and directed, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General of the United States, and without any expense to the United States, to perform any acts and to execute any instruments necessary to make the conveyance requested. A conveyance may be made only on the condition that, at the option of the Secretary, the property interest conveyed shall revert to the United States in the event that the lands in question are not developed for airport purposes or used in a manner consistent with the terms of the conveyance. If only a part of the property interest conveyed is not developed for airport purposes, or used in a manner consistent with the terms of the conveyance, only that particular part shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to the United States.

(c) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN LANDS.—Unless otherwise specifically provided by law, the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not apply with respect to lands owned or controlled by the United States within any national park, national monument, national recreation area, or similar area under the administration of the National Park Service; within any unit of the National Wildlife Refuge System or similar area under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; or within any national forest or Indian reservation.

SEC. 24. REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

On or before the third day of January of each year the Secretary shall make a report to the Congress describing his operations under this part during the preceding fiscal year. The report shall include a detailed statement of the airport development accomplished, the status of each project undertaken, the allocation of appropriations, and an itemized statement of expenditures and receipts.

SEC. 25. FALSE STATEMENTS.

Any officer, agent, or employee of the United States, or any officer, agent, or employee of any public agency, or any person, association, firm, or corporation who, with intent to defraud the United States—

(1) knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report as to the character, quality, quantity, or cost of the material used or to be used, or the quantity or quality of the work performed or to be performed, or the costs thereof, in connection with the submission of plans, maps, specifications, contracts, or estimates of project costs for any project submitted to the Secretary for approval under this part;

(2) knowingly makes any false statement, false representation, or false report or claim for work or materials for any project approved by the Secretary under this part; or

(3) knowingly makes any false statement or false representation in any report required to be made under this part;

shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not to exceed five years or by a fine of not to exceed $10,000, or by both.

SEC. 26. ACCESS TO RECORDS.

(a) RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.—Each recipient of a grant under this part shall keep such records as the Secretary may prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by the recipient of the proceeds of the grant, the total cost of the plan or program in connection with which the grant is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the plan or program supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) AUDIT AND EXAMINATION.—The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to grants received under this part.

(c) AUDIT REPORTS.—In any case in which an independent audit is made of the accounts of a recipient of a grant under this part relating to the disposition of the proceeds of such grant or relating to the plan or program in connection with which the grant was given or used, the recipient shall file a certified copy of such audit with the Comptroller General of the United States not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit was made. On or before January 3 of each year the Comptroller General shall make a report to the Congress describing the results of each audit conducted or reviewed by him under this section during the preceding fiscal year. The Comptroller General shall prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

(d) WITHHOLDING INFORMATION.—Nothing in this section shall authorize the withholding of information by the Secretary of the Comptroller General of the United States, or any officer or employee under the control of either of them, from the duly authorized committees of the Congress.

SEC. 27. GENERAL POWERS.

The Secretary is empowered to perform such acts, to conduct such investigations and public hearings, to issue and amend such orders, and to make and amend such regulations and procedures, pursuant to and consistent with the provisions of this part, as he considers necessary to carry out the provisions of, and to exercise and perform his powers and duties under, this part.

PART III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 51. AMENDMENTS TO FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958.

(a)(1) PROCUREMENT PROCEDURES.—Section 303 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1344) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"NEGOTIATION OF PURCHASES AND CONTRACTS

"(e) The Secretary of Transportation may negotiate without advertising purchases of and contracts for technical or special prop-

erty related to, or in support of, air navigation that he determines to require a substantial initial investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, and for which he determines that formal advertising would be likely to result in additional cost to the Government by reason of duplication of investment or would result in duplication of necessary preparation which would unduly delay the procurement of the property. The Secretary shall, at the beginning of each fiscal year, report to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce of the Senate all transactions negotiated under this subsection during the preceding fiscal year."

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the side heading "Sec. 303. Administration of the Agency" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) Negotiation of purchases and contracts"

(b)(1) AIRPORT CERTIFICATION.—Title VI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1421–1431), relating to safety regulation of civil aeronautics, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"AIRPORT OPERATING CERTIFICATES

"POWER TO ISSUE

"SEC. 612. (a) The Administrator is empowered to issue airport operating certificates to airports serving air carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board and to establish minimum safety standards for the operation of such airports.

"ISSUANCE

"(b) Any person desiring to operate an airport serving air carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board may file with the Administrator an application for an airport operating certificate. If the Administrator finds, after investigation, that such person is properly and adequately equipped and able to conduct a safe operation in accordance with the requirements of this Act and the rules, regulations, and standards prescribed thereunder, he shall issue an airport operating certificate to such person. Each airport operating certificate shall prescribe such terms, conditions, and limitations as are reasonably necessary to assure safety in air transportation, including but not limited to, terms, conditions, and limitations relating to—

"(1) the installation, operation, and maintenance of adequate air navigation facilities; and

"(2) the operation and maintenance of adequate safety equipment, including firefighting and rescue equipment capable of rapid access to any portion of the airport used for the landing, takeoff, or surface maneuvering of aircraft."

(2) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the center heading "TITLE VI—SAFETY REGULATION OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 612. Airport operating certificates.
"(a) Power to issue.
"(b) Issuance.".

(3) PROHIBITIONS.—Section 610(a) of such Act (49 U.S.C. 1430(a)), relating to prohibitions, is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (6);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) For any person to operate an airport serving air carriers certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board without an airport operating certificate, or in violation of the terms of any such certificate."

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (3) of this subsection shall take effect upon the expiration of the two-year period beginning on the date of their enactment.

SEC. 52. REPEAL; CONFORMING AMENDMENTS; SAVING PROVISIONS; AND SEPARABILITY.

(a) REPEAL.—The Federal Airport Act (49 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is repealed as of the close of June 30, 1970.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The first section of the Act of March 18, 1950, relating to Department of the Interior Airports (16 U.S.C. 7a), is amended by striking out "Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof at each such "Secretary of Transportation."

(2) Section 509(c) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended by inserting "Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970;" immediately after "Federal Airport Act;".

(3) Section 208(2) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 3338(2)) is amended by inserting "section 19 of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970;" immediately after "section 12 of the Federal Airport Act;".

(4) The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or by the Federal Airport Act" in section 313(c) and inserting in lieu thereof ", the Federal Airport Act, or the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970"; and

(B) by striking out "Federal Airport Act" in section 1109(e) and inserting in lieu thereof "Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970".

(5) Section 214(c) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 App. U.S.C. 214(c)) is amended by inserting "Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970;" immediately after "Federal Airport Act;".

(6) Section 13(g)(1) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (50 App. U.S.C. 1622(g)(1)) is amended by striking out "Federal Airport Act (60 Stat. 170)" and inserting in lieu thereof "Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970".

(7) Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1267) is amended by striking out "and (h)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(h) the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970; and (i)".

(c) SAVING PROVISIONS.—All orders, determinations, rules, regulations, permits, contracts, certificates, licenses, grants, rights, and privileges which have been issued, made, granted, or allowed to become effective by the President, the Secretary of Transportation, or any court of competent jurisdiction under any provision of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, which are in effect at the time this section takes effect, are continued in effect according to their terms until modified, terminated, superseded, set aside, or repealed by the Secretary of Transportation or by any court of competent jurisdiction, or by operation of law.

(d) SEPARABILITY.—If any provision of this title or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the title and the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected thereby.

And the Senate agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
J. J. PICKLE,
W. L. SPRINGER,
SAM DEVINE,
ALBERT WATSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
VANCE HARTKE,
PHIL HART,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
NORRIS COTTON,
WINSTON PROUTY,
JAMES B. PEARSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

TITLE II OF THE HOUSE BILL

The managers on the part of the House and the managers on the part of the Senate as to title II of the House bill and as to section 306 of the bill as proposed in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 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 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 21, 24, 26, 42, 46, 47, 57, and 74.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 45, 48, 49, 59, 60, 61, 63, 66, 67, 69, and 71, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to section 306 of the bill as proposed in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted in this respect by the Senate amendment, on page 47 of the House engrossed bill, immediately preceding line 1, insert the following new section (as the last section of part III of title I of the bill):

SEC. 53. MAXIMUM CHARGES FOR CERTAIN OVERTIME SERVICES.

(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1451) or any other provisions of law, the maximum amount payable by the owner, operator, or agent of any private aircraft or private vessel for services performed on or after July 1, 1970, upon the request of such owner, operator, or agent, by officers and employees of the Customs Service, by officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, by officers and employees (including an independent contractor performing inspectional services) of the Public Health Service, and by officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture, on a Sunday or holiday, or at any time after 5 o'clock postmeridian or before 8 o'clock antemeridian on a week day, in connection with the arrival in or departure from the United States of such private aircraft or vessel, shall not exceed $25.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no payment shall be required for services described in subsection (a) if such services are performed on a week day and an officer or employee stationed on his regular tour of duty at the place of arrival or departure is available to perform such services.

(c) Amounts payable for services described in subsection (a) shall be collected by the Department or agency providing the services and shall be deposited into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation of that agency charged with the expense of such services.

(d) As used in this section—

(1) the term "private aircraft" means any civilian aircraft not being used to transport persons or property for compensation or hire, and

(2) the term "private vessel" means any civilian vessel not being used (A) to transport persons or property for compensation or hire, or (B) in fishing operations or in processing of fish or fish products.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagree-

ment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment 'nsert the following:

SEC. 203. TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS BY AIR.

(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—Section 4261 (relating to imposition of tax on transportation of persons by air) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4261. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There is hereby imposed upon the amount paid for taxable transportation (as defined in section 4262) of any person which begins after June 30, 1970, a tax equal to 8 percent of the amount so paid. In the case of amounts paid outside of the United States for taxable transportation, the tax imposed by this subsection shall apply only if such transportation begins and ends in the United States.

"(b) SEATS, BERTHS, ETC.—There is hereby imposed upon the amount paid for seating or sleeping accommodations in connection with transportation which begins after June 30, 1970, and with respect to which a tax is imposed by subsection (a), a tax equal to 8 percent of the amount so paid.

"(c) USE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL FACILITIES.—There is hereby imposed a tax of $3 upon any amount paid (whether within or without the United States) for any transportation of any person by air, if such transportation begins in the United States and begins after June 30, 1970. This subsection shall not apply to any transportation all of which is taxable under subsection (a) (determined without regard to sections 4281 and 4282).

"(d) BY WHOM PAID.—Except as provided in section 4263 (a), the taxes imposed by this section shall be paid by the person making the payment subject to the tax.

"(e) REDUCTION, ETC., OF RATES.—Effective with respect to transportation beginning after June 30, 1980—

"(1) the rate of the taxes imposed by subsections (a) and (b) shall be 5 percent, and

"(2) the tax imposed by subsection (c) shall not apply."

(b) DEFINITION OF TAXABLE TRANSPORTATION.—Section 4262 (relating to definition of taxable transportation) is amended—

(1) by striking out "subchapter" in subsections (a) and (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "part";

(2) by striking out "transportation" in subsection (a) (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "transportation by air";

(3) by striking out "in the case of transportation" in subsection (a) (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "in the case of transportation by air";

(4) by striking out "any transportation which" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "any transportation by air which"; and

(5) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) TRANSPORTATION.—For purposes of this part, the term 'transportation' includes layover or waiting time and movement of the aircraft in deadhead service."

(c) REQUIREMENTS WITH RESPECT TO AIRLINE TICKETS AND ADVERTISING.—

(1) Subchapter B of chapter 75 (relating to other offenses) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 7275. PENALTY FOR OFFENSES RELATING TO CERTAIN AIRLINE TICKETS AND ADVERTISING.

"(a) TICKETS.—In the case of transportation by air all of which is taxable transportation (as defined in section 4262), the ticket for such transportation—

"(1) shall show the total of (A) the amount paid for such transportation and (B) the taxes imposed by sections 4261 (a) and (b),

"(2) shall not show separately the amount paid for such transportation nor the amount of such taxes, and

"(3) if the ticket shows amounts paid with respect to any segment of such transportation, shall comply with paragraphs (1) and (2) with respect to such segment as well as with respect to the sum of the segments.

"(b) ADVERTISING.—In the case of transportation by air all of which is taxable transportation (as defined in section 4262) or would be taxable transportation if section 4262 did not include subsection (b) thereof, any advertising made by or on behalf of any person furnishing such transportation (or offering to arrange such transportation) which states the cost of such transportation shall—

"(1) state such cost only as the total of (A) the amount to be paid for such transportation, and (B) the taxes imposed by sections 4261 (a), (b), and (c), and

"(2) shall not state separately the amount to be paid for such transportation nor the amount of such taxes.

"(c) Penalty.—Any person who violates any provision of subsection (a) or (b) is, for each violation, guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $100."

(2) The table of sections for such subchapter B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 7275. Penalty for offenses relating to certain airline tickets and advertising."

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 the following amendments:

Page 52, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "404" and insert: 204

Page 53, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "April 30" and insert: June 30

Page 55, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "transportation" and insert: transportation

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 matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: after June 30, 1970, ; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: after June 30, 1970,; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

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

(4) Subparagraph (M) of section 6416(b) (2) (relating to special cases in which tax payments constitute overpayments) is amended to read as follows:

"(M) in the case of gasoline, used or sold for use in the production of special fuels referred to in section 4041;".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

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

SEC. 206. TAX ON USE OF AIRCRAFT.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

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

the rate of—

"(1) $25, plus

"(2) (A) in the case of an aircraft (other than a turbine engine powered aircraft) having a maximum certificated takeoff weight of more than 2,500 pounds, 2 cents a pound for each pound of the maximum certificated takeoff weight, or (B) in the case of any turbine engine powered aircraft, 3½ cents a pound for each pound of the maximum certificated takeoff weight.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

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

"(e) TERMINATION.—On and after July 1, 1980, the tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not apply.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

Page 60, line 24, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "with respect to" insert: that portion of the tax imposed by section 4491 which is determined under section 4491(a) (2) on

Page 61, line 8, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after "equal to" insert: that portion of

Page 61, line 9, of the Senate engrossed amendments after "such year" insert: which is determined under section 4491(a) (2)

Page 61, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments, after the period insert:

In the case of the year beginning on July 1, 1970, this subsection shall apply only if the person electing to pay the tentative tax establishes what the tentative tax would have been for such year if section 4491 had taken effect on July 1, 1969.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out.

Insert the matter proposed to be inserted.

And on page 65, line 16, of the House engrossed bill before the period insert:

or the amount to which any person is entitled under this section with respect to any period may be treated by such person as an overpayment which may be credited against the tax imposed by section 4491 with respect to such period

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with the following amendments:

Page 63, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "407" and insert: 207

Page 63, line 24, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "March 31," and insert: June 30,

Page 64, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "March 31," and insert: June 30,

Page 65, line 14, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "March 31," and insert: June 30,

Page 67, strike out lines 22, 23, 24, and 25 of the Senate engrossed amendments and insert:

"(3) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT AGAINST INCOME TAX

"For allowance of credit against the income tax imposed by subtitle A for fuel used or resold by the purchaser, see section 39.

Page 70, line 11, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April 1" and insert: July 1

Page 70, line 13, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April 1" and insert: July 1

Page 70, line 16, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April 1" and insert: July 1

Page 70, line 19, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "April 1" and insert: July 1

Page 72, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "March 31" and insert: June 30

Page 73, line 1, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "March 31" and insert: June 30

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: 208.; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: June 30, 1970, and before July 1, 1980,; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: June 30, 1970, and before July 1, 1980; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: June 30, 1970, and before July 1, 1980,; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: June 30, 1970, and before July 1, 1980,; and the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 58:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: June 30, 1970, and before July 1, 1980; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: June 30, 1970; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: ending after June 30, 1970, and beginning before July 1, 1980, and attributable to use after June 30, 1970, and before July 1, 1980; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: 208(b); and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: 208(b)(3); and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: 209.; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Page 75, line 17, of the Senate engrossed amendments strike out "to be assigned" and insert: to be appropriately assigned; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: 210.; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

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

SEC. 211. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by this title shall take effect on July 1, 1970.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The amendments made by sections 203 and 204 shall apply to transportation beginning after June 30, 1970. The amendments made by subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 207 shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1970.

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN C. WATTS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JACKSON E. BETTS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
CLINTON ANDERSON,
ALBERT GORE,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
CARL T. CURTIS,
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 Senate to the bill (H.R. 14465) to provide for the expansion and improvement of the Nation's airport and airway system, for the imposition of airport and airway user charges, 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:

TITLE I

The managers on the part of the House as to title I of the House bill submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to title I of the House bill and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Senate amendment numbered 1 struck out all of title I of the House bill and inserted a substitute text consisting of three titles.

The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to title I of the House bill, with an amendment which is a substitute for both title I of the House bill and Senate amendment numbered 1 (except for section 306 of such amendment which amended the Tariff Act of 1930).

The major differences between title I of the House bill, the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clarifying changes.

TITLE I—AIRPORT AND AIRWAY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1970

Part I—Short title, etc.

Short Title

Section 1 of the House bill provided that the legislation could be cited as the "Aviation Facilities Expansion Act of 1969".

The first section of the Senate amendment provided that the legislation could be cited as the "Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970".

Section 1 of the conference agreement provides that title I may be cited as the "Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970".

Declaration of Policy

Section 2 of the House bill contained findings and declarations by the Congress that the Nation's airport and airway system is inadequate to meet the current and projected growth in aviation; and that substantial expansion and improvement is required to meet the demands of civil aviation, the postal system, and the national defense. This section further declared that the annual expenditure for ten years for improvement of the airway system should not be less than $250,000,000 and that the ten-year expenditure for airport assistance should be $2,500,000,000.

Section 2 of the Senate amendment also set forth findings of the Congress that the Nation's airport and airway system is inadequate to meet current and projected growth in aviation; and that substantial expansion and improvement is required to meet the demands of interstate commerce, the postal service, and the national defense. In addition, this section contained findings that the civil users of air transportation are capable of making a greater contribution to the expansion and improvement of the system through increased user fees, but that revenues obtained from the general taxpayer will continue to be required to pay for the actual use of the system by the United States Government and for the value to the national defense and the general public in having a safe, efficient system in being and fully operational in the event of war or national emergency.

Section 2 of the conference agreement follows the House version except that the broader term "interstate commerce" is substituted for the term "civil aviation" so that the finding and declaration by the Congress reads that substantial expansion and improvement of the airport and airway system is required to meet the demands of interstate commerce, the postal service, and the national defense.

As stated, this legislation refers specifically to the need for the expansion and improvement of the national airport and airway system, in accordance with a national airport system plan, to meet the needs of interstate commerce, the postal service, and the national defense. Because this legislation relates primarily to the development of the national system, it proposes to levy only such user fees as are necessary to meet the Federal responsibility to expand and improve the national airport and airway system.

The managers on the part of the House are aware of the fact that there are needs for expansion and improvement of airport and airway facilities to meet interstate needs outside the national system contemplated by this legislation. In this connection, the managers on the part of the House recognize that many States have created State aeronautical agencies which not only cooperate with the Federal Government in the planning, development, and operation of the national system, but also effectively engage in the planning, development, and operation of needed airport and airway facilities not included in the national airport system, and would encourage the States to continue and expand their activities in this respect.

National Transportation Policy

Section 3 of the House bill required the Secretary of Transportation to formulate and recommend to the Congress for approval a national transportation policy within one year after the enactment of the House bill. The Secretary was required to take into consideration the coordinated development of all modes of transportation and the priority to be assigned to the development of each mode, and the coordination of recommendations relating to airport and airway development with recommendations for the development of the national transportation system. This section also required the Secretary to submit an annual report to the Congress on the implementation of the national transportation policy formulated under this section.

The Senate amendment contained no corresponding provision.

Section 3 of the conference agreement follows the House version.

Cost Allocation Study; Study and Report by the Secretary of Transportation

Section 4 of the House bill required the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study of the appropriate method for allocating the cost of the airport and airway system among the various users, and to identify the cost to the Federal Government that should be charged to the system and the value which should be assigned to any general public benefit, including military. The Secretary was required in the conduct of the study to consult with and give consideration to the views of the users of the system. The Secretary was required to report the results of the study to the Congress within two years after the enactment of the House bill.

Section 101 of the Senate amendment required the Secretary to conduct a study of the appropriateness of the method of allocating and apportioning funds under sections 204 and 205 of the Senate amendment for meeting the needs of the airport and airways system during the five-year period beginning July 1, 1975. The Senate amendment also required the Secretary in the conduct of the study to consult with and give consideration to the views of the users of the system. The Secretary was required to report the results of the study to the Congress not later than February 1, 1975.

Section 4 of the conference agreement follows the House version.

Submission of Schedules Study

Section 102 of the Senate amendment required the Department of Transportation to conduct a study, in cooperation with the Civil Aeronautics Board, to determine the feasibility of requiring a commercial air carrier to submit a schedule of service as a condition precedent to the issuance of any certificate to such carrier by the Board, and authorizing the Board to require such carrier to revise such schedule in order to avoid undue congestion at major airports. The Department was required to complete the study within one year after the enactment of the Senate amendment and submit a report to the Congress.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

This provision of the Senate amendment is omitted from the conference agreement.

Part II—Airport and airway development

Definitions

Section 11 of the House bill and section 201 of the Senate amendment both contained definitions of terms for the purposes of the airport assistance program. Except as noted below, the definitions of both the House bill and the Senate amendment were the same or similar.

Airport development

Section 11(2) of the House bill defined the term "airport development" as any work involved in constructing, improving, or repairing any portion of a public airport, including the removal, relocation, and marking of airport hazards, and including navigation aids used by aircraft operating to or from the airport, and also any acquisition of land (including land for future airport development) or easement in airspace necessary to permit such work or to remove or prevent airport hazards. In addition, the definition contained in the House bill included safety equipment required for airport certification under section 612 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (as added by section 51(b) of the House bill).

Section 201(2) of the Senate amendment contained a similar definition of the same term, with two exceptions. First, it did not include safety equipment required for airport certification as provided by the House bill. Second, unlike the House bill, it did include work involved in the construction, alteration, and repair of airport passenger or freight terminal buildings and other airport administrative buildings.

Section 11(2) of the conference agreement follows the House version.

Application for site approval

Section 201(6) of the Senate amendment defined the term "application for site approval" as a preliminary request by a sponsor for approval of a site selection submitted before any requests for aid.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

The conference agreement omits the definition of this term because it is not used in the language agreed upon by the conferees.

Military aircraft; Government aircraft

Section 11(7) of the House bill defined the term "military aircraft" to include all aircraft owned and operated by the Armed Forces of the United States.

Section 201(8) of the Senate amendment defined the term "Government aircraft" to include all aircraft owned and operated by the United States.

Section 11(7) of the conference agreement follows the Senate version.

Planning agency

Section 11(8) of the House bill defined the term "planning agency" as any planning agency designated by the Secretary of Transportation which is authorized by the laws of the State (including Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam) or political subdivision concerned to engage in areawide planning for the area in which Federal airport aid is to be used.

Section 201(9) of the Senate amendment defined the same term as meaning any State (including Puerto Rico, the Virginia Islands, and Guam) or political subdivision thereof or any other agency authorized by law to engage in airport system planning. The term "airport system planning" was defined by both the House bill and the Senate amendment to mean the development for planning purposes of information to determine the extent, type, location, and timing of airport development needed in a specific area to establish a viable and balanced system of public airports.

Section 11(8) of the conference agreement follows the House version.

Public agency

Section 11(11) of the House bill defined the term "public agency" as a State, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam, or any agency of any of them; a municipality or other political subdivision; or a tax-supported organization; or an Indian tribe or pueblo.

Section 201(12) of the Senate amendment contained a similar definition of the same term except that, under the Senate amendment, the term also included the United States Government or any agency thereof.

Section 11(11) of the conference agreement follows the House version and omits any reference to the United States Government or any agency thereof because, under the agreement reached by the conferees, no United States agency can act as a sponsor of a project for airport development under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970. It was necessary to omit the reference to United States agencies in this definition because the definition of the term "sponsor" uses the term "public agency".

Request for aid

Section 201(14) of the Senate amendment defined the term "request for aid", for the purposes of section 206(d) of the Senate amendment dealing with approval of projects, as the first written request for assistance submitted to the Secretary of Transportation in which the project is outlined in detail in accordance with standardized procedures.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

The conference agreement omits the definition of this term because it is not used in the language agreed upon by the conferees.

National Airport System Plan

Formulation of plan

Section 12(a) of the House bill required the Secretary of Transportation to prepare

and publish, within two years after the enactment of the airport and airway development program under this legislation, a national airport system plan for the development of public airports in the United States, and to review and revise such plan as necessary. The plan was required to follow the mandatory guidelines developed by a National Air System Guidelines Commission and set forth the airport needs for at least a ten-year period.

Section 202(a) of the Senate amendment contained similar provisions with respect to the formulation of a national airport plan, except that the Secretary of Transportation was required to revise the plan at least every two years and the Secretary was not required to follow any mandatory guidelines as provided by the House bill.

Section 12(a) of the conference agreement follows the House version except that the Secretary is not required to follow any mandatory guidelines.

Consultation with Federal, State, and other agencies

Section 12(c) of the House bill required the Secretary of Transportation, in preparing the national airport system plan, to consult with the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Post Office Department, the Department of the Interior regarding conservation and natural resource values, and other Federal agencies, as appropriate; with State agencies designated under section 22 of the House bill; with planning agencies and various representatives of the aviation industry.

Section 202(c) of the Senate amendment contained similar requirements with respect to consultation by the Secretary in the formulation of the national airport system plan, except that there was no specific requirement that he consult with the Department of the Interior concerning conservation and natural resource values and no requirement to consult with specific State agencies designated under the House bill. The Senate amendment did not contain a provision for designated State agencies such as that contained in section 22 of the House bill.

Section 12(c) of the conference agreement follows the House version except that the reference to State agencies designated pursuant to section 22 of the House bill is deleted because that section was omitted from the language agreed upon by the conferees.

Consultation concerning environmental changes

Section 12(f) of the House bill required the Secretary of Transportation to consult with the Secretaries of Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture, and, to the extent the Secretary of Transportation determined to be feasible, to incorporate their recommendations with regard to the preservation of environmental quality in the national airport system plan.

Section 201(f) of the Senate amendment contained similar requirements except that consultation with the National Council on Environmental Quality was required in lieu of consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the recommendations with regard to the preservation of environmental quality were required to be incorporated in the national airport system plan to the maximum degree feasible.

Section 12(f) of the conference agreement combines the provision of the House bill and the provision of the Senate amendment by requiring consultation with the Secretaries of Interior, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture, and with the National Council on Environmental Quality. Their recommendations with regard to the preservation of environmental quality are required to be incorporated in the national airport system plan to the extent that the Secretary of Transportation determines to be feasible.

National Air System Guidelines Commission; Aviation Advisory Commission

Section 12(h) of the House bill created a National Air System Guidelines Commission composed of nine members appointed by the President from private life who were specially qualified by reason of training or experience, including representatives from aviation interests and organizations concerned with conservation or regional planning. The Commission was required to formulate mandatory guidelines for the national airport system plan and for surrounding land uses, ground access, airways, air service, and aircraft compatible with such plan. The guidelines formulated by the Commission were required to be reported to the President and to the Congress not later than January 1, 1971, and the Commission would cease to exist 60 days after its final report. Not to exceed $2 million was authorized to be appropriated from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund to carry out this provision.

Section 301 of the Senate amendment created an Aviation Advisory Commission composed of 15 members appointed by the Secretary of Transportation, including individuals drawn from Federal and State Governments as well as representatives from aviation interests and organizations concerned with conservation and regional planning. The duty of the Commission was to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary of Transportation concerning the long-range needs of aviation, including but not limited to future airport requirements and the national airport system plan. There was no specific termination date for the Commission nor was there any specific limitation on the amount of funds available for its expenses.

Section 12(h) of the conference agreement provides for an Aviation Advisory Commission generally following the structure of the Commission created by the House bill. The name of the Commission is taken from the Senate version and the duty of the Commission is modified so that it no longer is required to formulate mandatory guidelines, but is required to formulate recommendations (which will be advisory only) concerning the long-range needs of aviation, including, but not limited to, future airport requirements and the national airport system plan, and recommendations concerning surrounding land uses, ground access, airways, air service, and aircraft compatible with the national airport system plan. The reporting date for the Commission is changed from January 1, 1971, to January 1, 1972. It will cease to exist 60 days after it files its final report and not more than $2 million is authorized to be appropriated from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund for its expenses.

Planning Grants

Section 13 of the House bill authorized the Secretary of Transportation to make grants of funds to planning agencies for airport system planning and to public agencies for airport master planning. This authority was limited to a maximum of $50 million at the rate of not more than $10 million per year. Not more than 10 percent of the funds made available in any one year could be allocated for projects in a single State.

Section 203 of the Senate amendment contained similar authority except that it was limited to a maximum of $150 million at the rate of not more than $15 million per year. Not more than 5 percent of the funds made available in any one year could be allocated for projects in a single State.

Section 13 of the conference agreement authorizes a maximum of $75 million for planning grants at the rate of not more than $15 million per year. Not more than 7.5 percent of the funds made available in any one year can be allocated for projects in a single State.

Airport and Airway Development Program General authority

Section 14 of the House bill authorized the Secretary of Transportation to make grants (within the limits established in appropriation Acts) for airport development in aggregate amounts not to exceed the following:

(1) For air carrier and reliever airports in the States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, not to exceed $150 million for fiscal year 1970, $180 million for fiscal year 1971, and $240 million for fiscal year 1972.

(2) For general aviation airports in the States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, not to exceed $25 million for each of the fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972.

Section 204(a) of the Senate amendment authorized the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for airport development in aggregate amounts not less than the following:

(1) For air carrier and reliever airports in the States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, not less than $270 million for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1980.

(2) For general aviation airports in the States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, not less than $30 million for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1980.

Section 14(a) of the conference agreement provides for a five-year airport development program and authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for airport development in aggregate amounts not less than the following:

(1) For air carrier and reliever airports in the States, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, not less than $250 million for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1975.

(2) For general aviation airports in the States, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, not less than $30 million for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1975.

Long-term obligational authority

Section 204(b) of the Senate amendment authorized the Secretary of Transportation to incur obligations to make grants, beginning on the date of enactment of the Senate amendment, for the fiscal year 1971 and the succeeding four fiscal years in an aggregate amount not to exceed $1.5 billion. Appropriations were authorized to liquidate obligations incurred as follows: not to exceed $300 million before June 30, 1971; not to exceed an aggregate of $600 million before June 30, 1972; not to exceed an aggregate of $900 million before June 30, 1973; not to exceed an aggregate of $1.2 billion before June 30, 1974; and not to exceed an aggregate of $1.5 billion before June 30, 1975. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the four succeeding fiscal years the Secretary was authorized to make grants for the purposes of this section within the limits established in Appropriation Acts.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

Section 14(b) of the conference agreement provides for a five-year program of obligational authority in an aggregate amount not to exceed $840 million. No obligation can be incurred for a period of more than three fiscal years and no such obligation can extend beyond June 30, 1975. The Secretary of Transportation is prohibited from incurring more than one such obligation with respect to any single project for airport development. Obligations incurred under this authority cannot be liquidated in an aggregate amount exceeding $280 million before June 30, 1971, an aggregate amount exceeding $560 million before June 30, 1972, and an aggregate amount exceeding $840 million before June 30, 1973.

The modified provision reduces the term

and amount of the authority, restricts each obligation to a period of not longer than three years, restricts the number of obligations which can be incurred with respect to a single project, and prohibits the liquidation of the aggregate amount of the authorized obligations before the expiration of the first three years.

Airway facilities

Section 204(c) of the Senate amendment authorized the Secretary of Transportation to obligate for expenditure (within the limits established in appropriation Acts) not less than $250 million for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1980 to acquire, establish, and improve air navigation facilities under section 307(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

Section 14(c) of the conference agreement follows the Senate version except that the program is reduced to five years. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized, within the limits established in appropriation Acts, to obligate for expenditure not less than $250 million for each of the fiscal years 1971 through 1975.

Other expenses; research and development activities

Section 204(d) of the Senate amendment required that the balance of the moneys available in the Airport and Airway Trust Fund be allocated for administrative expenses of the airport program, for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and other functions under section 307(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 not otherwise provided for under the preceding section of the Senate amendment (section 204(c)) relating to airway facilities, and for research and development activities under section 312(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (as it relates to safety in air navigation). The first $50 million appropriated to the trust fund from general revenues was required to be allocated to such research and development activities.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

Section 14(d) of the conference agreement follows the Senate version.

Distribution of Funds; State Appointment

Air carrier and reliever airports

Section 15(a)(1) of the House bill required the Secretary of Transportation to apportion funds made available for air carrier and reliever airports, as soon as possible after July 1 of each year, as follows:

(1) For the several States on the basis of an area-population formula, $48.5 million for the fiscal year 1970, $58.2 million for the fiscal year 1971, and $77.6 million for the fiscal year 1972.

(2) For Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands in shares of 35 percent, 35 percent, 15 percent, and 15 percent, respectively, $1.5 million for the fiscal year 1970, $1.8 million for the fiscal year 1971, and $2.4 million for the fiscal year 1972.

(3) For sponsors of air carrier airports on the basis of the number of enplaned passengers at each airport of the sponsor, $50 million for the fiscal year 1970, $60 million for the fiscal year 1971, and $80 million for the fiscal year 1972.

(4) For distribution at the discretion of the Secretary, $50 million for the fiscal year 1970; $60 million for the fiscal year 1971, and $80 million for the fiscal year 1972.

Section 205(a)(1) of the Senate amendment required the Secretary of Transportation to apportion funds made available for air carrier and reliever airports in any fiscal year as follows:

(1) One-third of the amount available to the several States on the basis of an area-population formula, except that, before such apportionment, 3 percent of such funds would be available for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in shares 40 percent, 40 percent, and 20 percent, respectively.

(2) One-third of the amount available to sponsors of airports in areas designated by the Civil Aeronautics Board as large hubs, medium hubs, or small hubs on the basis of the number of enplaned passengers in each hub.

(3) One-third of the amount available would be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary.

Section 15(a)(1) of the conference agreement is a combination of the House and Senate versions and requires the Secretary to apportion funds made available for air carrier and reliever airports in any fiscal year, as soon as possible after July 1 of each such year, as follows:

(1) One-third of the amount made available to be distributed as follows:

(A) 97 percent of such one-third for the several States on the basis of an area-population formula.

(B) 3 percent of such one-third for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands in shares of 35 percent, 35 percent, 15 percent, and 15 percent, respectively.

(2) One-third of the amount made available for sponsors of air carrier airports on the basis of the number of enplaned passengers at each airport of the sponsor.

(3) One-third of the amount made available to be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation.

It was the intent of the committee of conference that an airport sponsor will be eligible for an apportionment under this section if the airport involved serves a point on the route of an air carrier certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board. This would include the case of an airport with respect to which the air carrier certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board is authorized to suspend its scheduled service temporarily on the condition that such service is furnished by an air taxi operator, which is an air carrier exempt from certification by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

General aviation airports

Section 15(a)(2) of the House bill required the Secretary of Transportation to apportion funds made available for general aviation airports, as soon as possible after July 1 of each year, as follows:

(1) $18.375 million for the several States on the basis of an area-population formula.

(2) $375 thousand for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands in shares of 35 percent, 35 percent, 15 percent, and 15 percent, respectively.

(3) $6.25 million for distribution at the discretion of the Secretary.

If the amounts available for apportionment for any year were less than the amounts stated above, the House bill required that such lesser amounts be apportioned in accordance with the ratios indicated by the stated amounts.

Section 205(a)(2) of the Senate amendment required the Secretary of Transportation to apportion funds made available for general aviation airports for any fiscal year as follows:

(1) Seventy-three and one-half percent of the amount made available for the several States on the basis of an area-population formula.

(2) One and one-half percent of the amount made available for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in shares of 40 percent, 40 percent, and 20 percent, respectively.

(3) Twenty-five percent of the amount made available to be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary.

Section 15(a)(2) of the conference agreement is a combination of the House and Senate versions and requires the Secretary of Transportation to apportion funds made available for general aviation airports in any fiscal year, as soon as possible after July 1 of each such year, as follows:

(1) Seventy-three and one-half percent of the amount made available for the several States on the basis of an area-population formula.

(2) One and one-half percent of the amount made available for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands in shares of 35 percent, 35 percent, 15 percent, and 15 percent, respectively.

(3) Twenty-five percent of the amount made available to be distributed at the discretion of the Secretary.

In exercising his authority with respect to the distribution of discretionary funds under section 15 of the conference agreement, the committee of conference feels that the Secretary of Transportation should give particular consideration to the requirements of smaller airports and, to the extent feasible, make every attempt to meet such requirements.

Availability of apportioned funds

Section 15(a)(4) of the House bill provided that amounts apportioned to a State for air carrier and reliever airports and for general aviation airports under the area-population formula would remain available for approved airport development projects in that State, or sponsored by that State but located in an adjoining State, for a period of two fiscal years. Thereafter, any amount remaining unobligated would be added to the discretionary fund established under section 15(b) of the House bill. Each amount apportioned to an airport sponsor would remain available for approved airport development projects at airports sponsored by it for a period of three fiscal years. Thereafter, any amount remaining unobligated would be added to the discretionary fund established under section 15(b) of the House bill.

Section 205(a)(3) of the Senate amendment provided that amounts apportioned to a State would remain available for obligation by that State for a period of three fiscal years and, thereafter, any amount remaining unobligated would be added to the discretionary fund.

Section 205(a)(4) of the Senate amendment provided that each hub area be credited with its apportionment each year and, to the extent that credit exceeded the total payments from such apportionment to airport sponsors in that hub area in the current year, the excess would remain to the credit of that hub area for the two succeeding years. If the Secretary approved a project for airport development in that hub area within the three-year period described, the accumulated amount remaining to the credit of that hub area would be available to the sponsor of the approved project as a grant for such project. If no project was approved in such three-year period, the amount credited to that hub area would be added to the discretionary fund.

Section 15(a)(3) of the conference agreement is a combination of the House and Senate versions and provides that amounts apportioned to a State for air carrier and reliever airports and for general aviation airports under the area-population formula will remain available for approved airport development projects in that State, or sponsored by that State but located in an adjoining State, for a period of two fiscal years. Thereafter, any amount remaining unobligated by grant agreement will be added to the discretionary fund. Each amount apportioned to an airport sponsor will remain available for approved projects at airports sponsored by it for a period of three fiscal years. Thereafter, any amount remaining unobligated by grant agreement will be added to the discretionary fund.

Enplaned passengers

Section 15(a)(5) of the House bill required the Civil Aeronautics Board to compile sta-

tistical information concerning the numbers of enplaned passengers for the purpose of the airport sponsor apportionment required under section 15(a)(1)(C) of the House bill.

The last paragraph of section 205(a) of the Senate amendment required the Secretary of Transportation to determine the numbers of enplaned passengers pursuant to regulations prescribed by him for the purpose of the hub apportionment required under section 205(a)(1)(B) of the Senate amendment.

Section 15(a)(4) of the conference agreement follows the Senate version of determining the numbers of enplaned passengers for the purpose of the airport sponsor apportionment required under section 15(a)(1)(B) of the conference agreement.

Projects in national parks and recreation areas

Section 205(b)(3) of the Senate amendment provided that amounts available for distribution at the discretion of the Secretary of Transportation for general aviation airport development projects would be available for approved projects for airport development sponsored by the United States or any agency thereof in national parks and national recreation areas, national monuments, national forests, and special reservations for Government purposes as the Secretary considered appropriate for carrying out the national airport system plan.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

In accordance with the agreement reached by the conferees that no United States agency can sponsor a project for airport development under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, this provision of the Senate amendment is omitted from the conference agreement.

Submission and Approval of Projects for Airport Development

Section 16 of the House bill and section 206 of the Senate amendment contained a number of similar provisions dealing with the submission to, and approval by, the Secretary of Transportation of projects for airport development. In large part, the conference agreement follows the House version. The major differences between the House bill and the conference agreement are noted below.

Applications by Federal agencies

Section 206(b) of the Senate amendment provided that nothing in the Senate amendment would authorize the submission of a project application by the United States or any agency thereof, except in the case of a project in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, or in, or in close proximity to, a national park, national recreation area, or national monument, or in a national forest, or a special reservation for Government purposes.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

In accordance with the agreement reached by the conferees that no United States agency can act as a sponsor of an airport development project under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, this provision of the Senate amendment is omitted from the conference agreement.

Approval

Section 16(c)(3) of the House bill prohibited the Secretary from approving any airport development project unless he was satisfied that fair consideration had been given to the interest of communities in or near which the project would be located.

Section 16(c)(4) of the House bill declared it to be national policy that airport development projects should provide for the protection and enhancement of the natural resources and the quality of environment of the Nation. In implementing this policy, the Secretary was required to consult with the Secretaries of the Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare with regard to the effect a project might have on natural resources and other factors affecting the environment. The Secretary was prohibited from authorizing any project found to have adverse effect unless he rendered a finding, in writing, after a full and complete review which was required to be a matter of public record, that no feasible and prudent alternative existed and that all possible steps had been taken to minimize such adverse effect.

Section 206(d)(3) of the Senate amendment declared it to be national policy that airport development projects should provide for the protection of the natural resources and the quality of environment of the Nation. In implementing this policy the Secretary was required to consider the effect of each project on factors of environmental significance. The Secretary was prohibited from approving any project unless he was satisfied that adequate consideration had been given to the preservation of the environment and to the interest of the communities in or near which the project would be located.

Sections 16(c)(3) and (4) of the conference agreement follow the House version except that the application of the provisions of paragraph (4) relating to consultation concerning the protection and enhancement of natural resources and the quality of environment of the Nation is limited to major projects involving airport location, a major runway extension, or runway location. This will obviate the necessity of applying such provisions to minor projects which, in many cases, may amount to nothing more than maintenance operations having no effect on natural resources or on the quality of the environment.

Air and water quality

Section 206(g) of the Senate amendment contained special provisions relating to air and water quality standards. It prohibited the Secretary from approving any airport application unless the Governor of the State in which the project would be located certified in writing to the Secretary that there was reasonable assurance that the project would be located, designed, constructed, and operated so as to comply with applicable air and water quality standards. Where such standards had not been approved or had been promulgated by the Secretary of the Interior or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the certification was required to be obtained from the appropriate Secretary. Certification was required to be obtained within sixty days after the project application was received by the Secretary of Transportation. The Secretary of Transportation was required to condition his approval of any project on compliance during construction and operation with applicable air and water quality standards.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

Section 16(e) of the conference agreement follows the Senate version except that its application is limited to major projects involving airport location, a major runway extension, or runway location. As in the case of the provisions concerning consultation on environmental effects discussed above, this will obviate the necessity of applying these provisions to minor projects which, in many cases, may be nothing more than maintenance operations having no effect on air or water quality.

United States Share of Project Costs

Landing aids

Section 17(d) of the House bill provided that to the extent that the project costs of an approved project for airport development represent the cost of (1) land required for the installation of approach light systems, (2) touchdown zone and centerline runway lighting, or (3) high intensity runway lighting, the United States share should be not to exceed 90 percent of the allowable cost thereof.

Section 207(d) of the Senate amendment provided that the United States share should be not to exceed 75 percent of the same costs.

Section 17(d) of the conference agreement provides that the United States share shall not exceed 82 percent of such costs.

Project Sponsorship

Section 18(5) of the House bill provided that, as a condition precedent to his approval of an airport development project, the Secretary of Transportation must receive assurances in writing, satisfactory to him, that all of the facilities of the airport developed with Federal financial assistance and all those usable for landing and takeoff of aircraft would be available to the United States for use by military aircraft in common with other aircraft at all times without charge, except, if the use by military aircraft is substantial, a charge may be made for a reasonable share, proportional to such use, of the cost of operating and maintaining the facilities used.

Section 208(5) of the Senate amendment contained a similar provision except that it used the term "Government aircraft" in lieu of the term "military aircraft". The term "Government aircraft" is broader than the term "military aircraft" and is defined in section 11(7) of the conference agreement to mean aircraft owned and operated by the United States. This would include not only military aircraft but also aircraft owned and operated by civilian agencies.

Section 18(5) of the conference agreement follows the Senate version.

Project Costs

Costs not allowed

Section 20(b) of the House bill provided that the following are not allowable project costs: (1) the cost of construction of that part of an airport development project intended for use as a public parking facility for passenger automobiles; or (2) the cost of construction, alteration, or repair of a hanger or of any part of an airport building except such of those buildings of parts of buildings intended to house facilities or activities directly related to the safety of persons at the airport. The House bill continued unchanged the practice under existing law of prohibiting Federal financial aid for airport terminal buildings except those housing facilities or activities directly related to the safety of persons at the airport.

Section 210(b) of the Senate amendment contained provisions similar to those of the House bill except that it also contained additional language permitting Federal financial assistance to terminal buildings directly related to the handling of passengers or their baggage at the airport. With respect to these additional terminal facilities, the Secretary could not furnish Federal financial assistance unless he found that no reasonable financial alternative existed. His finding was required to be based upon consideration of the feasibility and extent of other sources of financial participation, the financial condition of the airport sponsor, and any other factors relevant to such determination.

Section 20(b) of the conference agreement follows the House version.

State Agencies

Section 22 of the House bill authorized the Secretary of Transportation to make grants to agencies designated by the States for the purpose of assisting those agencies in carrying out State programs for airport planning and development. A five-year program was contemplated. The total funds obligated under this section could not exceed $25 million. The total funds obligated in any one fiscal year could not exceed $5 million.

To be eligible to receive a grant, a State agency was required to be empowered to acquire property necessary to establish or develop airports, prepare a statewide airport system plan, undertake airport development or provide financial assistance for carrying out such development to public agencies within the State, and disburse to sponsors within the State payments made pursuant to grant agreements under section 19 of the House bill. Funds available each fiscal year for the purpose of making grants under this section were required to be apportioned among the States in accordance with an allocation formula based on State population and area. Amounts apportioned to a State which were not obligated by grant agreement at the expiration of the fiscal year for which it was apportioned, were required to be added to the fund available for distribution at the discretion of the Secretary to make grants for the development of air carrier and reliever airports. Not more than $80 thousand made available to any one State in any fiscal year could be used for administrative expenses. For the purposes of this section, the term "State" was defined to include Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, as well as the several States and the District of Columbia.

The Senate amendment contained no corresponding provision.

This section of the House bill is omitted from the conference agreement.

The agreement to delete section 22 of the House bill was made with the understanding that it is anticipated that the Secretary will continue to cooperate fully with, and seek the cooperation of, the several State agencies. The omission of this provision should not be taken as an indication of any intent to lessen the existing role of State agencies in the planning, development, and operation of airports. The managers on the part of the House feel that the role of State agencies in the planning, development, and operation of airports should be encouraged.

Use of Government-Owned Lands

Section 24 of the House bill provided that the Secretary of Transportation could request the head of any Federal agency having control over lands reasonably necessary for carrying out a project for airport development or for the operation of any public airport, including lands reasonably necessary to meet future development of an airport in accordance with the national airport system plan, to convey necessary property interests therein to the public agency sponsoring the project in question or owning or controlling the airport. The agency head receiving such a request, upon determining that the requested conveyance was not inconsistent with the needs of his agency, would be required, with the approval of the President and the Attorney General, to execute any instruments necessary to make the requested conveyance. At the option of the Secretary, property so conveyed would revert to the United States in the event it was not developed for airport purposes or not used in a manner consistent with the terms of the conveyance. In a case where only a part of the property interest conveyed was not developed for airport purposes, or not used in a manner consistent with the terms of the conveyance, only that particular part would, at the option of the Secretary revert to the United States. This continues, with minor modifications, the policy contained in existing law.

The House bill, however, added language which provided that, except where otherwise specifically provided by law, the provisions of this section would not apply with respect to lands owned or controlled by the United States within areas such as national parks and recreation areas, units of the National Wildlife Refuge System, or within any national forest or Indian reservation.

Section 213 of the Senate amendment contained provisions similar to section 24 of the House bill except that it did not contain the language added by the House bill and described in the preceding paragraph.

Section 23 of the conference agreement follows the House version.

Access to records

Audit reports

Section 27(c) of the House bill required that whenever an independent audit is made of the accounts of a grant recipient, he must file a certified copy of the audit with the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General was required to make an annual report to the Congress describing the results of each audit conducted or reviewed by him under this section. The Comptroller General was also authorized to prescribe necessary regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

The Senate amendment contained no corresponding provision.

Section 26(c) of the conference agreement follows the House version.

Withholding information

Section 27(d) of the House bill provided that nothing in section 27 of the House bill relating to access to records would authorize the withholding of information from the duly authorized committees of the Congress.

The Senate amendment contained no corresponding provision.

Section 26(d) of the conference agreement follows the House version.

PART III—MISCELLANEOUS

Amendments to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958

Procurement procedures

Section 51(a) of the House bill amended section 303 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to negotiate, without advertising, purchases and contracts for technical or special property related to, or in support of, air navigation, which property he determined would require substantial initial investment or an extended period of preparation for manufacture, and with respect to which he determined that formal advertising would likely result in additional cost to the Federal Government by reason of duplication of investment or would result in duplication of necessary preparation which would unduly delay the procurement of the property.

The House bill also contained language which required the Secretary to report at the beginning of each fiscal year to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate all transactions negotiated under this provision during the preceding fiscal year.

Section 302 of the Senate amendment contained a similar amendment to section 303 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 except that it did not contain the language relating to the reporting requirements imposed by the language of the House bill described in the preceding paragraph.

Section 51(a) of the conference agreement follows the House version.

Airport certification

Section 51(b) of the House bill amended title VI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the certification of air carrier airports and to make it unlawful to operate an air carrier airport without certification or in violation of the certificate. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration was empowered to issue airport operating certificates to air carrier airports and to establish minimum safety standards for the operation of such airports. If the Administrator found, after investigation, that the applicant was adequately equipped and able to conduct a safe operation in accordance with the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and rules prescribed thereunder, he was required to issue a certificate. Each certificate was required to contain such terms and conditions as might be reasonably necessary to assure safety in air transportation. Such terms and conditions must include terms and conditions relating to installation, operation, and maintenance of adequate air navigation facilities and terms and conditions relating to the operation and maintenance of adequate safety equipment, such as firefighting and rescue equipment. It would not be unlawful to operate an air carrier airport without a certificate or in violation of its terms, nor would any penalties be incurred under title IX of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, until the expiration of the two-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the amendment. This gave the Administrator two years within which to certificate existing airports.

The Senate amendment contained no corresponding provision.

Section 51(b) of the conference agreement follows the House version with a clarifying change to make it clear that the term "air carrier airports" means airports serving air carriers "certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board". This clarification will make it unnecessary to require certification of a small airport that may be served by an air taxi but not by a scheduled air carrier certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board. An air taxi operator is an air carrier by definition under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, but operates under an exemption issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board and is not an "air carrier certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board".

Repeal; Conforming Amendments; Saving Provisions; and Separability

Conforming amendments

Section 303 of the Senate amendment contained conforming amendments to change language in existing law to bring it into conformity with definitions and the short title of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970. The provisions of existing law amended by such section were as follows:

(1) The first section, section 3, and section 5 of the Act of March 18, 1950, relating to Department of the Interior Airports.

(2) Section 509(c) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

(3) Section 208(2) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966.

(4) Sections 313(c) and 1109(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

(5) Section 214(c) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

(6) Section 13(g)(1) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

(7) Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

Section 52(b) of the conference agreement follows the Senate version with technical and conforming changes. The technical changes are merely drafting changes to conform the Senate version to the drafting style of the conference agreement.

The conforming changes omit all the amendments to the Act of March 18, 1950, relating to the Department of the Interior Airports, except the amendment to the first section of that Act substituting the term "Secretary of Transportation" in lieu of the term "Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency". The other amendments to such first section proposed to substitute the terms "national airport system plan" and "Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970" in lieu of the terms "national airport plan" and "Federal Airport Act", respectively. Under such first section, no airport can be acquired,

established, or constructed by the Secretary of the Interior unless it is included in the then current revision of the "national airport plan" formulated under the "Federal Airport Act". The amendments to the first section of such Act which are omitted from the conference agreement conform to the agreement reached by the conferees that no United States Agency can sponsor an airport development project under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970. Omitting these amendments will permit the completion of any grant agreement lawfully executed under the Federal Airport Act (which is not repealed under the conference agreement until the close of June 30, 1970), and to which the Secretary of the Interior was a party, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Airport Act as it existed at the time any such grant agreement was executed.

Under section 3 of such Act of March 18, 1950, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sponsor certain airport development projects under the Federal Airport Act either independently or jointly with other public agencies. The Senate version proposed to add the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 as a conforming change. This proposed amendment is also omitted from the conference agreement to conform with the agreement reached by the conferees that no United States agency can act as a sponsor of an airport development project under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970.

Section 5 of such Act of March 18, 1950, provides that certain terms, including the terms "public agency" and "sponsor", shall have the same meanings prescribed in the Federal Airport Act. The Senate version proposed to substitute the term "Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970" in lieu of the term "Federal Airport Act". This proposed amendment is also omitted from the conference agreement because, under the conference agreement, no United States agency can sponsor an airport development project under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970. Also, the conference agreement changes the definition of the term "public agency" so as to exclude the United States or any agency thereof. This change affects the definition of the term "sponsor" because, under the Federal Airport Act and under the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970, only a public agency can act as a sponsor. Omitting this amendment from the conference agreement will permit the Secretary of the Interior to continue to act as a public agency under the Federal Airport Act in order to be a sponsor of an airport development project pursuant to a lawfully executed grant agreement entered into by him before the repeal of the Federal Airport Act.

Downed Aircraft Rescue Transmitters

Section 307 of the Senate amendment amended section 601 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide that minimum standards issued under that section must include a requirement that downed aircraft rescue transmitters would be required to be installed on certain aircraft used in air commerce after one year following the date of enactment of this provision and on any aircraft used in air transportation after three years following such date of enactment.

The House bill contained no corresponding provision.

This provision of the Senate amendment is omitted from the conference agreement.

The managers on the part of the House agreed with the managers on the part of the Senate that the omission of this provision of the Senate amendment should not be taken as an indication that there is a lessening of interest on the part of either House of the Congress with respect to the development of safety devices and procedures in the field of aviation. The committee of conference realizes that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration has ample authority under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to prescribe safety devices and procedures and would urge him to exercise such authority in an expeditious manner in the interest of public safety. This existing authority, of course, includes safety devices such as downed aircraft rescue transmitters.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
J. J. PICKLE,
W. L. SPRINGER,
SAM DEVINE,
ALBERT WATSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TITLE II

The managers on the part of the House as to title II of the House bill and as to section 306 of the bill as proposed in the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 submit the following explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to such title II and such section 306 and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The following amendments made technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming changes: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 57, 59, 60, 61, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 73. With respect to these amendments (1) the House either recedes or recedes with amendments which are technical, clerical, clarifying, or conforming in nature, or (2) the Senate recedes in order to conform to other action agreed upon by the committee of conference.

So much of amendment numbered 1 (proposed section 306) as relates to maximum overtime charges for customs, and so forth, services: Section 306 of the bill, as added by Senate amendment numbered 1, places a $25 ceiling on overtime charges for certain services in connection with the arrival in or departure from the United States of any private aircraft or private vessel.

Under the conference agreement a new section 53 is added at the end of part III of title I of the bill. This new section 53 contains the substance of the proposed section 306 in placing a $25 ceiling on overtime charges for the services of officers and employees of the Customs Service, of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, of the Public Health Service, and of the Department of Agriculture in connection with the arrival in or departure from the United States of any private aircraft or private vessel. However, technical changes are made in the language of this provision.

Amendments numbered 7, 8, and 9: The House bill inserted a new section 4041(c) in the 1954 Code under paragraph (1) of which a tax of 7 cents a gallon was imposed on any liquid (other than gasoline) sold for use, or used, as a fuel in aircraft in noncommercial aviation. Under the House bill (paragraph (2) of the new section 4041(c)) a tax (which was additional to the tax imposed by section 4081 of the Code) was imposed on gasoline sold for use, or used, as a fuel in aircraft in noncommercial aviation at a rate which, combined with the section 4081 tax, equaled 7 cents a gallon. Under the Senate amendments, the rate of the tax imposed by paragraph (1) of the new section 4041(c), and the combined rate resulting from the additional tax imposed by paragraph (2) of that section plus the tax on gasoline imposed by section 4081, is 6 cents a gallon.

Under the conference agreement, the rate of the tax imposed by paragraph (1) of the new section 4041(c), and the combined rate resulting from the additional tax imposed by paragraph (2) of that section plus the tax on gasoline imposed by section 4081, is 7 cents a gallon.

Amendment numbered 11: This amendment adds a paragraph (5) to the new section 4041(c) inserted in the 1954 Code by the House bill. Under this paragraph (5) the taxes imposed on fuel for noncommercial aviation by paragraphs (1) and (2) of the new section 4041(c) are not to apply after June 30, 1980.

The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 12: The House bill increased the existing taxes on amounts paid for the taxable transportation of persons by air (and on amounts paid for seating or sleeping accommodations in connection with such transportation) from 5 to 8 percent, effective with respect to transportation beginning on or after January 1, 1970. Under the House bill, as under existing law, the amount of tax was computed on the amount paid exclusive of tax and was in general payable by the person paying for the transportation or accommodations.

Under Senate amendment No. 12 tax is imposed at the rate of 7.5 percent on taxable transportation (and on amounts paid for seating or sleeping accommodations in connection with such transportation), effective with respect to transportation beginning after April 30, 1970. Under the Senate amendment the amount of these taxes is computed on the total payment (for transportation and for tax) and the taxes are payable by the person receiving the payment for the transportation or accommodations. The Senate amendment also provided for a reduction in these taxes, from 7.5 to 4.8 percent, with respect to transportation beginning after June 30, 1980.

Under both the House bill and the Senate amendment, a new $3 tax is imposed on the transportation of any person by air which begins in the United States, unless such transportation is fully taxable at the rates described in the preceding paragraphs.

Under the conference agreement, the tax on taxable transportation of persons by air is imposed, as under the House bill, on the amount paid for the transportation and is imposed on the person making the payment subject to tax. The rate of such tax is increased to 8 percent effective with respect to transportation beginning after June 30, 1970, but is to return to the existing 5 percent rate effective with respect to transportation beginning after June 30, 1980.

Under the conference agreement, the new $3 tax on transportation of persons by air is effective with respect to transportation beginning after June 30, 1970, and, as under the Senate amendment, will not apply to transportation which begins after June 30, 1980. In the case of a round trip from a location outside the United States to the United States and back (but not necessarily back to the point of origin) the new $3 tax is to apply with respect to the return trip from the United States.

Under the conference agreement, a new section 7275 is added to the Code setting forth certain requirements with respect to airline tickets and advertising. Under the new section 7275, in the case of a ticket for air transportation all of which is taxable transportation (as defined in section 4262 of the Code), the ticket must show only the total amount, including the tax, paid for the transportation. If the cost of various segments of the transportation is shown separately, each must be shown as the total amount, including tax, attributable to that segment.

Under the new section 7275, if in an advertisement of air transportation, all of which is taxable transportation or is transportation between Alaska or Hawaii and the 48 contiguous States, the cost of the transportation is stated, then such cost must be stated as the total amount, including taxes imposed under section 4261 of the Code, which is payable for the transportation.

Amendment numbered 13: The House bill added a new section 4271 to the Code which

imposed a tax on the amount paid for the transportation of property by air from one point in the United States to another. The tax was 5 percent of the amount so paid. The House bill also imposed a tax equal to 5 percent of the amount paid for transportation by air from a point outside the United States to a point within the United States. Under the House bill, both these taxes were effective with respect to transportation beginning after December 31, 1969.

Under Senate amendment numbered 13 a tax is imposed on amounts paid for the taxable transportation (as defined in the new section 4272) of property equal to 5 percent of the amount paid for such transportation.

The amendment differs from the House bill in—

(1) adding a subsection (c) to the new section 4271 of the Code providing a rule for determining the tax in certain cases where joint services which include taxable transportation are provided,

(2) defining taxable transportation (see the new section 4272(a) of the Code added by the amendment) as meaning transportation by air which begins and ends in the United States, thereby making the tax inapplicable with respect to transportation which begins outside the United States and ends within the United States,

(3) providing (in the new section 4272(b)) that in the case of Alaska and Hawaii the tax is not to apply to transportation which meets the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 4262(b) (generally speaking, this excludes that portion of the transportation which is outside the United States), and

(4) providing (in the new section 4272(c)) that the term "property" does not include excess baggage accompanying a passenger traveling on an established line.

Under the Senate amendment, this tax applies to transportation which begins after April 30, 1970, and before July 1, 1980.

The conference agreement follows the substance of Senate amendment numbered 13 but provides that the tax on the transportation by air of property is to apply with respect to transportation which begins after June 30, 1970, and before July 1, 1980.

Amendment numbered 18: Under the air-transportation taxes imposed by sections 4261 and 4271 did not apply to international organizations or to the Red Cross.

Senate amendment numbered 18 struck out this exemption.

The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 40: Under the House bill, a tax was imposed on the use of any taxable civil aircraft during any year at the rate of $25 plus 2 cents a pound (3½ cents a pound for turbine engine powered aircraft) for each pound of the maximum certificated takeoff weight of the aircraft.

Senate amendment numbered 40 (1) removed the $25 portion of the tax, (2) retained the 2 cents (and 3½ cents) a pound portion of the tax, but (3) made the tax based on poundage applicable only in the case of an aircraft capable of providing a seating capacity for more than 4 adult individuals (including the crew).

Under the conference agreement, the House recedes with an amendment which (1) restores the $25 portion of the tax, (2) imposes a tax of 2 cents a pound for each pound of the maximum certificated takeoff weight in the case of an aircraft (other than a turbine engine powered aircraft) having a maximum certificated takeoff weight of more than 2,500 pounds, and (3) imposes a tax of 3½ cents a pound for each pound of the maximum certificated takeoff weight in the case of any turbine engine powered aircraft.

Amendment numbered 43: Under the House bill, the tax on the use of civil aircraft applied to the use of such aircraft after December 31, 1969. Under Senate amendment numbered 43, this tax applies to uses after March 31, 1970, and before July 1, 1980.

Under the conference agreement, the tax on the use of civil aircraft applies to use after June 30, 1970 (see amendment No. 75) and before July 1, 1980.

For purposes of the tax on use of civil aircraft, the conferees do not intend the term "use" to include use by a manufacturer, dealer, wholesaler, or retailer for demonstration, testing, or delivery purposes. Personal or other use of the aircraft, however, will give rise to the imposition of tax.

Amendment numbered 44: This amendment adds a new section 4493 to the 1954 Code providing two special rules relating to the payment of the tax on the use of civil aircraft. The first of these rules provides for the payment of the tax by lessees in certain cases. The second of these provides that a significant user of taxable civil aircraft in foreign air commerce for the preceding taxable year may elect to pay a tentative tax, based on the refund experience of the taxpayer for the preceding taxable year, and then settle the net use tax liability at the end of the year.

The House recedes with technical changes.

Amendment numbered 51: This amendment provides procedures for the payment of amounts (under a new section 6427 of the Code) or for the crediting against income tax (under the existing section 39 of the Code) in the case of the retailers excise taxes on gasoline and special fuels. These procedures are similar to the existing procedures in the case of the manufacturers excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil.

The amendment also provides that, in general, the time for filing claims for credit under section 39, and the time for filing full-year claims by governmental bodies or exempt organizations for excise tax payments under specified sections of the Code, will be comparable to the time in which claim for credit or refund of income taxes may be filed.

The House recedes with technical changes.

Amendments numbered 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 62, and 64: The House bill took effect with respect to appropriations to, expenditures from, and transfers from the airport and airway trust fund on or after January 1, 1970. These amendments postpone such taking effect to April 1, 1970, and also terminate the trust fund as of June 30, 1980. Under the conference agreement these amendments take effect on July 1, 1970.

Amendment numbered 71: The House bill directed the Secretary of Transportation (in cooperation with such other Federal officers and agencies as may be designated by the President) to make a study of the tax burden of the airport and airway system.

Senate amendment numbered 71 provides that this study should be made through full consultation with and consideration of the views of the users of the system.

The House recedes.

Amendment numbered 72: This amendment provides that, with respect to the tax burden of the airport and airway system, the Secretary of Transportation is to identify the costs to the Federal Government that should appropriately be charged to the system and the value to be assigned to the general public benefit.

The House recedes with a clarifying amendment.

Amendment numbered 74: This amendment requires the Civil Aeronautics Board to direct the air carriers to file with the Board such passenger transportation fare changes as may be necessary so that the fares after reduction for tax will be equal to the fares in effect for transportation by air beginning on April 30, 1970. The CAB's right to accept or reject all (or any part) of the fare change is not to be affected by this provision. The amendment also contains a provision for reflecting in the rate structure future changes in the taxes imposed by section 4261 (a) and (b) of the Code.

The Senate recedes.

Amendment numbered 75: Under the House bill the revenue amendments in general took effect on January 1, 1970, except that the ticket and cargo tax changes applied to transportation beginning on or after January 1, 1970. This amendment changes these effective dates from January 1, 1970, to April 1 and May 1, 1970. Under the conference agreement, these effective dates are July 1, 1970.

W. D. MILLS,
HALE BOGGS,
JOHN C. WATTS,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
JACKSON E. BETTS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DRASTIC INCREASE OF MILITARY FURLOUGH TRANSPORTATION FARES

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

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the May 13 issue of the Air Force Times called my attention to another attempt on the part of the transportation industry to kick the military by increasing furlough travel fares.

Braniff and United Airlines together received almost $70 million from the Military Airlift Command during the last fiscal year to move military personnel, their dependents and cargo traveling on Government travel orders. Apparently this was not enough because they are now petitioning the Civil Aeronautics Board for an unjustified 20-percent increase in fares charged military personnel traveling on furlough or official leave at their own expense.

These two airlines are following the example recently set by the railroads who received a furlough fare increase from the Interstate Commerce Commission totaling almost 15 percent.

In the case of the railroads and the ICC, the Department of Defense was not even allowed sufficient time to file official protests to the proposed fare increase.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second attempt in recent months on the part of the scheduled airlines of this country to eliminate or drastically reduce a transportation benefit of members of the Armed Forces. Several months ago, the Civil Aeronautics Board was petitioned to restrict or in effect eliminate the military dependent charter flights. This proposed regulation is still being examined by the Civil Aeronautics Board and hopefully will be rejected.

I have requested the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate the recent action of the railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am considering reestablishing the Special Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee—that investigated the commercial airlines treatment of service personnel traveling on authorized leave—to review the proposal by the two carriers. Both are participants of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program and thereby beneficiaries of millions of dollars of military contract business.

Chairman STAGGERS has assured me of his support and sincere interest in our service personnel and their dependents. I commend the gentleman from West Virginia for his interest and welcome the support of our outstanding chairman on transportation matters.

I assure the Members of this House and the servicemen of our country that I will not stand idly by and observe further deterioration or erosion of the long-standing benefits previously accorded men and women of our Armed Forces in recognition of their service to this Nation.

WALTER REUTHER

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

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, many tributes have been paid the late Walter Reuther by a nation which is saddened and shocked by his tragic and sudden death.

Like so many of the greats of our time, I am sure that he would much prefer the tribute of actions, not words.

As Martin Luther King, with whom Walter Reuther stood side by side in the civil rights movement, had to leave the fulfillment of his dream to others, so too is the vision of social and economic justice of Walter Reuther now entrusted to the hands of those who share that vision.

These dreams, these visions, the "never world" to which Robert Kennedy challenged us are still goals which appeal to the best in us and in our society.

Walter Reuther was involved in the struggle to achieve all of these goals, and the most fitting tribute we can pay to him is to carry on with the work of perfecting this grand experiment in democracy which is ours.

Walter Reuther was among the giants of the labor movement and among the great of our time.

When applied to Walter Reuther, the words of Euripides seem particularly apt:

> When good men die, their goodness does not perish but lives through when they are gone.

Millions of our citizens will continue to reap the bounty of the efforts of this good man who will be sorely missed.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST IMPAIRS TRUTH

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Members of this body are now being grouped by skillfully manipulated methods in an obvious design to undermine public confidence, not only in the Members and in Congress but in our system of government.

"Exposures" of Member lists of lawyers, doctors, bankers, investors, insurance men, farmers are now followed by a suit attacking the several patriotic Members who have retained their military reserve status.

Concerted efforts seem directed toward creating an image of conflict of interest between the Members, their constituents, and the American people. The inference raised being that a Member so identified is suspect of special interest representation. Followed to a logical conclusion, we may next expect to hear that taxpayer Members should not vote on tax bills, Members from poor constituencies should not vote on poverty matters, city Members should not vote on HUD bills nor labor union Members vote on labor bills.

Noteworthy, the impressive sounding "ethical" committees that espouse such statistics and the communications people who "interpret" such disclosures do not themselves feel constrained to disclose to the American people their full sources of revenue, interlocking operations with additional outside funding, gifts nor favors and subsidies. Who raises the possible conflict of interest between opinion makers, news, and the first amendment right of the American people to get the truth? Credibility can be judged by the people only if they have the facts.

I refer not to salaries but expressly to grants and stipends from tax-free foundations, wealthy benefactors, and so-called responsible organizations with announced goals for radical change against the wishes of the American people, be it by thought control, loss of confidence in our system of government, and in some cases, even through violence.

Ethics requires a full disclosure of conflicts of interest by those in Government but it should also extend to the communications media so the American people can evaluate bias and distortion and arrive at the truth.

The purveyors of public opinion owe it to the public to announce, in the interest of impartiality, their outside interests and financial backers. The accusers and the prejudgers of ethics should willingly stand the same rigid examination of ethics as the Members of this House.

The failure to do so may well explain distortions, bias, and in some fields of communication, deliberate suppression.

I include a newsclipping at this point:

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1970]

PEACE GROUP SUES TO EXPEL LAWMAKERS FROM RESERVES

(By Peter Osnos)

A group of armed forces reservists opposed to the war in Southeast Asia filed suit in federal court here yesterday to have 122 congressmen and senators expelled from Reserves and National Guard.

The suit challenges the congressional membership in the military on constitutional grounds, contending that a conflict exists between the role of independent legislator and servant of the armed forces.

The constitutional provision in question is Article I Section 6, which holds that "no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either house during his continuance in office."

In a statement accompanying the action, the Reservists Committee to Stop the War said that at times throughout the nation's history, Congress has required its members to give up military commissions.

NEVER TESTED IN COURT

However, the statement adds, the issue has never been tested in court before. The Reservists Committee, which is based in Berkeley, Calif., filed its suit on behalf of all persons who "share its views and aims."

These are described as "opposition to U.S. military involvement in Vietnam and . . . use of legal means, including communication with and persuasion of members of Congress to end that involvement."

Congressional membership in the Reserves, the suit argues, deprives all such antiwar persons "the unbiased consideration by the Congress . . . of measures affecting the military establishment. . . "

On the conflict question, the suit notes that commissioned officers of the Reserves are appointed by the President, making a lawmaker beholden as an officer of the Executive Branch.

"POSSIBILITY OF INFLUENCE"

"Membership in the Reserves subjects a member of Congress . . . to the possibility of influence and or retaliation by the President," or various top Defense officials, the suit adds.

As of April 16, there were two members of Congress in ready Reserve status and 33 in active standby Reserve status. There were 24 members of Congress in inactive standby Reserve status. And, as of March 9 there were 63 congressmen in retired Reserve status.

Two of the highest-ranking former reservists are Sens. Barry Goldwater (R-Ariz.) and Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) who are both major generals. Of the 59 Reserve officers who have not resigned their commissions, 20 hold ranks equivalent to colonel or above.

Among the senators with Reserve or retired Reserve status are Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.), Hiram L. Fong (R-Hawaii), Howard Baker (R-Tenn.), Howard Cannon (D-Nevada) and Harry F. Byrd Jr. (D-Va.).

Among the House members are three members of the House Armed Services Committee, Samuel Stratton (D-N.Y.), Robert T. Stafford (R-Vt.), and William S. Mailliard (R-Calif.).

The suit alleges that the reservists constitute a "dominant minority" in the Armed Services Committees of House and Senate, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the House Veterans Affairs Committee and others.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM ST. ONGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the sad duty of informing the House of the death on May 1 of our dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. ST. ONGE. I stated then that I would request that time be set aside for those who were friends of BILL ST. ONGE to place upon the record their eulogies of his life and work, and for this reason I have asked for this special order today which is dedicated to BILL's memory.

I was privileged to act as chairman of the congressional delegation which flew to Putnam, Conn., on Tuesday, to attend BILL's funeral and to be present at his burial. The occasion was a sorrowful one, as one would expect in the case where a beloved person has suddenly been snatched from among his family and friends. The shock of his sudden death had clearly left its mark upon his wife,

children, and family and yet, at the same time, one sensed an all-pervading and sympathetic warmth in the gathering in that crowded church and one could not help but feel that BILL's life had been a well-rounded whole of achievement and that sorrow of his passing was joined by pride and satisfaction in the accomplishment that his life represented.

To have the wholehearted and affectionate support of the thousands of people of his community, his district, and his State many of whom thronged to Putnam to attend his funeral, was a tribute which few could achieve. In addition, the eloquent eulogy of Bishop Hines in its sincerity and scope was a tremendous and admirable memorial to BILL and one of which any one could be justly proud.

BILL's passing will be a loss to the people of his town and district, and it will also be a serious loss to the House of Representatives because in these difficult days we need in our national legislature people with the integrity, the maturity, and the judgment which BILL possessed. He was rapidly rising to a position of authority on the important Committee on the Judiciary and in that sphere, as well as in the broader area of general legislation and policy, the Nation can ill afford to lose his wise and reliable counsel.

I have worked closely with BILL since his coming to Washington in 1963, but during his last week I saw more of him than I had for a long time since we dined together on Wednesday, had lunch together on Thursday, and flew to Connecticut in the same plane the evening before his death. For these reasons, his passing was a particularly stunning shock to me.

BILL was devoted to his constituents and he set a high standard of performance in carrying out his congressional duties and it is significant that death came to him when at the end of a busy week in Washington he had gone home and was driving to a formal launching ceremony at a shipyard in his district. It can truly be asserted, therefore, that he died in the active performance of his duties and in striving for that excellence which he always held as his goal.

One could not close an appreciation of BILL without referring to his kindness. One of our colleagues in discussing him recently said he had never heard him say an unkind word about anyone and I am certain that this appraisal would be agreed to by all who knew him. He really practiced the virtue of charity, a practice which is not notably characteristic of today's world.

BILL leaves his devoted wife Dot, who cheerfully shared the trials of a public family, and their five children who are following their careers in exemplary fashion. I realize that BILL's death came as a great shock to them and that the void which his passing created will be impossible to fill. Nevertheless, I hope and believe that the wonderful memories and the outstanding reputation which BILL leaves behind will be a source of great pride and eventual consolation to them.

I express my deepest sympathy to Mrs. St. Onge and to BILL's entire family and, in doing so, I am confident that I express the sentiments of the leadership on both sides and of all the Members of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, with the death of Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, the State of Connecticut lost an extraordinary and extremely competent representative. May I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Mr. ST. ONGE brought to the House of Representatives an excitement about what he was doing and a breadth of ideas about how to accomplish his goals that will be difficult to replace. His sense of purpose and his ability to rise above special interests allowed him to effectively propose a higher quality of life for his State and the Nation.

A native of Putnam, Conn., BILL was educated in Putnam public and parochial schools. He studied at St. Thomas Seminary for 2 years and studied in France for another 3 years acquiring a language facility which was later to serve him well. He returned to the United States to complete his education at Tufts University, graduating in 1941 when he enlisted in the U.S. Army. After distinguished service in the North African and European campaigns he was discharged in September 1945.

Immediately following his release from the service, BILL married Dorothy Hughes of Bridgeport, Conn., and soon thereafter entered the University of Connecticut School of Law. After being admitted to the Connecticut bar in 1948, BILL returned to his hometown to establish a law practice and enter into civic and governmental life of the community. His legal ability was soon recognized with his election as corporation counsel and prosecutor of the city court, judge of the city court, and judge of probate. BILL was also active as a member of the board of education and served as chairman and executive director of the redevelopment agency for the city. Having served his community in the courts, in education and in its redevelopment effort, BILL was readily elected State representative and then mayor of Putnam. After an unsuccessful first attempt in 1960, BILL was elected to the U.S. Congress in 1962 and has returned with increasing ease since.

All his friends and many of those with whom BILL disagreed will remember his quick mind and keen wit. His ready intelligence enabled him to grasp the essence of any problem or proposal. He would restate the problem in half the words with humor added. He sought and became involved in the problems of his community, the State, and the country because he genuinely cared for the condition of those around him. He analyzed the problems of our society with acuity, compassion, and enough balancing humor to make the difficulties seem just a little less great and their solutions a little more hopeful.

In a day when many call for more love in the world and paint the word on city walls, BILL ST. ONGE was one man whose deep compassion leavened by his wit seemed to live guided by that regard for his fellow men. This ability was noted by the Most Reverend Vincent J. Hines, bishop of Norwich, who said:

> He had love—for his family, for the community, for the people of the four counties of Eastern Connecticut, and he had love for the nation he served in time of war. He loved his church and drew from it the moral strength to live a life of complete integrity.

Beyond all that, BILL ST. ONGE was my close and dear friend. For many years we found that a mutuality of thought and concern about our State and Nation brought us together. We have had friends in common—and this was expressly true in Middlesex County, which had been my home for so many years. It is never possible to forget the warmth of a man—and BILL ST. ONGE was a warm and friendly man—but he was much more than that—for he combined in wisdom and in character those essential ingredients of greatness. He has shown that by the heritage he has left us, for the work he has done has woven itself into the very fabric of our society. And because of that his memory will linger with us as we go about our work from day to day.

To his wife, Dorothy, and to his children—William H., Mary, Suzanne, Constance, and Anne—Mrs. Daddario and I extend our deepest sympathy and everlasting friendship.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DADDARIO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman in expressing my respect and my sadness on the passing of BILL ST. ONGE. I never knew BILL as well as I would like to have known him. But he was a valuable member of our Committee on the Judiciary and I did find him always, as the gentleman has said, to be a remarkably kind person—always a gentleman. I enjoyed my association with BILL and wish that it could have been more and deeper. We shall miss him.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. MONAGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, it is sad to lose a colleague; it is tragic to lose a friend. I speak today, therefore, with profound and heartfelt sorrow, for BILL ST. ONGE was my friend.

We mourn the loss of a man who was admired by all who knew him in Congress, a man who was loved and respected in his beloved home of Putnam and throughout his native State of Connecticut, a man of character and compassion, a dedicated public servant.

Yet words alone cannot do him justice, Mr. Speaker, for words alone cannot describe the aura of warmth and understanding which BILL ST. ONGE brought to this Chamber every day. This warmth and understanding was what made BILL ST. ONGE someone special; someone to admire and emulate. Those of us who were especially privileged to serve with him in the Connecticut delegation know how much Congress and the Nation will miss him.

There were other things, too, that en-

deared BILL ST. ONGE to us. Here was a man who endured serious illness and literally gave his life in order to serve his people. Here was a man who embodied that rare combination of strong conviction and genuine tolerance. Here was a man without the slightest trace of pomposity or arrogance or hate. Here was a man who was never so troubled that he could not manage a warm smile and friendly greeting: a man never so angry that he could not be courteous and kind.

In short, BILL ST. ONGE was, in every sense of the word, a gentleman. His untimely and tragic death has left a void in this House and in Connecticut which can never be filled.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to BILL'S widow Dorothy and to his fine children—William, Mary, Suzanne, Constance, and Anne.

Remembering that BILL ST. ONGE spent 3 years of his life as a student in France, I thought it appropriate to close with a brief expression in French, an expression made more meaningful because, above all, BILL ST. ONGE was a man of peace.

Que Dieu donne le repos a son ami, BILL ST. ONGE. Rest in peace, my friend.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PATTEN).

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in tribute to our late colleague WILLIAM ST. ONGE. Surely this would be a wonderful world if all of us could have the character he possessed. He came from Middlesex, Conn.; I am from Middlesex, N.J. From that point we became good friends. We would even sit together here in the House. We had much in common. I shall miss him. Ann and I express our deep sympathy to Mrs. St. Onge and to the rest of the family.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues from Connecticut and others in the House in paying a final tribute to our distinguished colleague and my dear friend, BILL ST. ONGE, whose life ended so tragically while he was en route with his wife and staff members to a submarine launching in New London, Conn., in his district.

It is fitting that BILL should have spent his final day on this earth doing his job. No Member took his duties more seriously and none devoted himself more completely to meeting all the myriad demands of his office. BILL ST. ONGE did not work by a stopwatch or a calendar. He was continually occupied with the business of representing his district. He was not, however, a parochial man. He had a well-informed and well-developed political and social conscience. The judgments he brought to bear on the issues were those of a thoughtful, responsible, and contemporary man, and his concerns embraced both the needs of his constituents and his country.

As has been stated, BILL was a highly decorated veteran of World War II, a lawyer, a civil servant, a judge, a prosecutor, a former member of the Connecticut Legislature, and a former mayor. He was goal oriented and had a busy, fruitful life. I hope that it may be a consolation to his widow and his children that his life has been marked by many great accomplishments.

BILL was held in the highest regard by his colleagues. Our respect for his ability and integrity is outshone only by the affection we held for him.

I extend to his widow and his children the deepest sympathy of Mrs. Albert and myself. May the Lord in his mercy comfort and support them.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the majority leader for his comments.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation of ours has got to mourn the loss of BILL ST. ONGE of Connecticut who untimely met His Maker last week.

BILL was a reliable liberal and representative of people. He asked nothing for his vote except a knowledge that the country and people would benefit.

BILL came to Congress with me in the 88th Congress in 1963. He represented well the shipping interests of his home State on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, on which we jointly served.

I will personally miss BILL ST. ONGE'S counsel and fraternity on the House floor.

In these critical times, this country does not have BILL ST ONGES to lose.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of my dear friend BILL ST. ONGE and will miss him very much. BILL ST. ONGE was a good man and a great man. He was possessed of great strength and courage. I admired, very much, the goodness which surrounded him. He was a happy man who enriched the lives of all of us who were fortunate enough to know him. Congressman ST. ONGE worked long and diligently for the people of his district and represented them in the halls of Congress with great distinction. His people, his State, and his Nation will miss Congressman ST. ONGE, for his was a dedicated life. Mrs. McCormack and I extend to Mrs. St. Onge and her loved ones our deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, a man of peace, a man of God, a good friend, a helpful neighbor, a man of quiet courage and noble service, a devoted husband and father—BILL ST. ONGE was all of these. Now he is no longer with us and we are so much poorer for this loss. "Only the good die young" is so true a saying in his passing from our midst.

BILL ST. ONGE and I shared an identical district boundary—the Connecticut-Rhode Island State line. The districts have the same numerical listing as they travel southward from Massachusetts to the Atlantic Ocean. Many of my constituents worked in BILL'S district and on a number of occasions we discussed the various problems and issues that affected the people we represented. BILL was never too busy to give assistance when it was needed.

BILL ST. ONGE had known the complete political experience. In his first race for Congress 10 years ago, BILL became a last-minute candidate when the incumbent, Chester Bowles, decided not to stand for reelection. BILL had only 2 months in which to campaign and an opponent who previously represented the district for 10 years. BILL lost the race by less than 500 votes but 2 years later came back to win a difficult victory. Success at the polls for a Democrat in Connecticut's Second District is never an easy accomplishment and BILL worked hard and long for the honor to represent this district in the Congress of the United States.

BILL was always willing to be of help whenever called upon and the people of his district have indeed suffered a severe blow in his death.

I shall miss his friendly smile and his thoughtful manner. I shall miss also the pleasant and fruitful times we spent together in this Chamber. But most of all, I shall miss BILL ST. ONGE because he was a good and kindly man.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the House who knew, admired and loved Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, and his many friends everywhere were greatly shocked and deeply grieved to learn of his sudden passing while engaged in vital work in his district last Friday.

BILL ST. ONGE was one of the greatest Members ever to serve in this body. He was highly trained for his work, and deeply dedicated to it, and in every sense he died as a soldier stricken in the service of his country.

Congressman ST. ONGE was superbly trained and educated, and was a man of many accomplishments.

He was also a natural-born leader, blessed with a fine mind, and great understanding of public questions and the principles and objectives of our Government.

His work in the Congress was outstanding and dedicated, and he will be long remembered in his district and State, and in the Nation, as well as in this historic body, for the great contributions that he rendered to the cause of good, forward-looking government and the preservation of American values, security and freedom.

He had enjoyed a very remarkable career in public service, and served with greatest distinction as mayor of the city of Putnam, Conn., judge of probate, and also as director of the Putnam Redevelopment Agency in 1956 after the flood of 1955, and rendered innumerable, extensive, praiseworthy services in all the positions he held.

His congressional career was marked by extraordinary performances of public service.

He was deeply devoted to his work and assisted very many people with their problems.

He was a man of strong convictions and never hesitated to express them. He stood staunchly for the measures he deemed best for the people and the country.

The work he did here, and the magnificent record he made in public life, will long be gratefully remembered by the people of his district, and by the Members of this House, who served with him and knew, respected, admired, and loved him, as we of the House all did on both sides of the aisle.

He was a leader of great ability, enthusiasm and integrity, a warmhearted human being with profound interest and loyalty to the country and his constituency who was unalterably committed to the cause of the people.

BILL was endowed with many God-given blessings of character, fitness, capacity, and talent and was deeply beloved by all of us who knew him as a warm helpful friend, whose word was his bond, and whose loyalty to his principles was truly inspiring.

I was greatly saddened by his sudden passing, and I extend to his gracious wife, his lovely daughters, and devoted family my most heartfelt sympathy in the very tragic, shocking loss that they have sustained, which I and many others so prayerfully and sorrowfully share with them.

My heart goes out to all his dear ones in their sorrow, and irreparable loss, and for my family and myself, with a heavy heart, I tender them our prayers and deepest sympathy in their very sad bereavement from those of us who knew and loved, this great American leader, BILL ST. ONGE.

Faithful and dedicated to the end, and true to the people, and the things in which he so devoutly believed, may our dear, gentle, and beloved friend, BILL ST. ONGE find eternal rest and peace in his heavenly home. And may the good Lord bless and comfort his dear ones.

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 1, while in Marlborough, Conn., I learned of the death of my friend and colleague, BILL ST. ONGE. Certainly, others in the Connecticut delegation and in the Congress had known BILL far longer than I. However, I would like to express as best I can my feelings about a man whom this freshman Congressman came to truly respect and hold in the deepest affection.

Upon coming to the Congress, I had only heard of BILL ST. ONGE by name and knew that he had courageously undergone a series of operations on his heart. I expected, therefore, to meet a man who would be conserving himself in the performance of his duties and who would have a rather reserved outlook on a new Member of Congress. Instead, I met a man who threw himself into his Nation's business with a vigor that few of us display. I met a man who always smiled, who was always responsive to my questions and who always had the time to sit down and discuss the issues, not as Democrat to Republican, but as friend to friend.

In short, what I am trying to say is that BILL ST. ONGE had that rare combination of boundless energy, a gentle humor, and a keen mind. Legislation was not a party or philosophical matter to him. Whenever discussed, it was always in terms of its effect on people.

When BILL ST. ONGE assured the people of his district that he would serve them without thought to the history of his health, he meant it. Sadly, that is what brings me to the well of the House this morning. To his wife and family, I wish God's strength in their hour of sadness. I know that as he spent his life caring for others, our Father now cares for him.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my many colleagues in the House in paying final tribute to our departed Member, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

Although I shall miss him, I feel fortunate and privileged to have known him personally—both as a Congressman, and as a person. I came to know him well in both capacities, since he was a member of my Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

As a Congressman, Mr. ST. ONGE served on the committee with the same devotion, sincerity, and warmth that characterized him as a man.

Here was a man whose life, though far too short, was exceptionally full and productive; he was a man of many interests, talents, and accomplishments. In his short life-span, he became a much-decorated World War II veteran, a teacher, a lawyer, a judge, and mayor of his native city before becoming a U.S. Congressman. He made many other contributions, and I know many of his colleagues will relate them here today, on the floor of this great body of Congress, which Mr. ST. ONGE served so ably.

But more important than all the titles was the man himself. I can sincerely say that I have never known a more warm, thoughtful, and dedicated human being.

Mr. Speaker, that feeling is deeply and unanimously shared by all members of my committee, and we have expressed that sentiment in a committee resolution, which will be presented to Mrs. St. Onge. Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert at this point in the RECORD a verbatim copy of that resolution, since I feel no finer tribute can be made. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

Resolved, That members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives hereby express their profound grief and sense of loss upon the tragic and untimely death of their beloved colleague and Committee associate, the Honorable William L. St. Onge, and order the Clerk of the Committee to spread upon its permanent records this heartfelt resolution to his memory.

Mr. St. Onge was first elected to Congress in November, 1962, and, beginning January, 1963, has faithfully and ably served his District, his native State of Connecticut and his Nation.

Recognizing the vital importance of ocean transportation, Oceanography and Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey and Navigation, to his State and to the Nation, Mr. St. Onge requested election to the Committee; as a Committee member, he served with distinction and devotion to his many difficult and important assignments. In addition to those duties, he was also a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

The passing of William L. St. Onge is a serious and grievous loss to our Committee. He will be mourned for many years and the product of his efforts will be undying.

Mr. St. Onge was a warm and friendly man. His quiet, soft-spoken manner, his genuine sincerity and his deep-seated, honest convictions, endeared him to all who knew him—whatever may have been their station or walk of life, or political conviction.

William L. St. Onge embodied the most inspiring attributes of the true public servant. He served in this great body of the House of Representatives for more than seven years before his master called him to a still higher service. His public career began with the government of his beloved State of Connecticut, to whose purposes he devoted himself with increasing distinction until he was chosen to come to Congress.

But this is only part of his story. During World War II, he resigned from his elected post as a State representative to join the Army Air Corps. Once again, he displayed complete dedication to his duty and loyalty to his country, winning five battle stars during 19 months of overseas duty.

After returning to his home State, Mr. St. Onge resumed his career as a dedicated public servant, first in various State positions of responsibility, and then in the House of Representatives. In both capacities, he worked tirelessly and made outstanding contributions, especially in producing legislation designed to promote education, better housing, aid to veterans, the sick and the elderly, and to bettter the lot of his fellow man.

We are fortunate to have been privileged to serve with William L. St. Onge. Our lives are richer thereby.

The Committee members wish to extend their sincere condolence to his beloved wife, Dorothy, and to their five children, William H., Mary, Suzanne, Constance and Anne.

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution be sent to Mrs. St. Onge.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the passing of our colleague, BILL ST. ONGE. As a freshman in the Congress, I had the opportunity to serve with BILL on the Merchant Marine Committee. Although we were on opposite sides of the aisle, his leadership and dedication to what was best for America soon became apparent. He was not afraid to say what he thought or stand up to the hard questions. It is men like BILL ST. ONGE who have made this a great country.

With a deep sense of loss, we mourn his passing.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, we talk today of a truly great American, Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE. In many respects BILL was a quiet man, not quiet in the sense that his voice was not heard, for BILL had much to contribute when he spoke. He gave us reason to think deeply about positions he had taken in his contributions of the molding of American history.

He had qualities that are rare in a man. In everything BILL did there was a sincerity that could make us envious. His feelings for the direction this country was to take were only made available to those of us who served with him after he had truly studied his position carefully.

To have served with him for the short time that he was here, and I consider the 7½ years to be a short time, for there was so much more he could do to help us in a legative body guide this great ship we call the United States, is indeed an honor.

I had the privilege of attending the funeral at Putnam, Conn., a beautiful countryside where those who visited, could not help but witness the esteem in which BILL was held by his neighbors. He will be sorely missed not only by the

residents of the Second District of Connecticut, but by all of us who served with him in the Congress.

To his wonderful companion, Mrs. Dorothy St. Onge, and his children, my wife LaVerne joins me in expressing our deepest sympathies.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my shock and sadness at the sudden death, on May 1, of BILL ST. ONGE. BILL was a skillful attorney and a good and conscientious Congressman. He was unfailing in his courtesy to his colleagues and always helpful to his many friends. It has been my privilege to work closely with him on many issues and I have found his counsel to be good, his decisions sound, and his sympathy always present. We, and indeed the entire country, shall miss him sorely. He was a man who had much to contribute and his untimely death deprived us all of an able and kindly human being.

I only hope that his wife and family will derive some consolation from the esteem in which he was held and from the fondness with which he will be remembered.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the tributes to my good friend, BILL ST. ONGE, whose premature death last week was a deep shock and source of great sorrow to us all.

BILL and I served together on the House Judiciary Committee and had a most enjoyable and cooperative relationship. His record of service in his committees and in behalf of his constituents in these past years is impressive, and I know that he will be sorely missed by the people of Connecticut, whom he served so ably and with deep dedication. The depth of his understanding of the problems and needs, not only of his district, but of the State of Connecticut and the Nation as well, is reflected in BILL's efforts and accomplishments in the House.

BILL ST. ONGE was one of the kindest and most courteous men it has been my pleasure to know. The Members of both Houses of the Congress had the greatest respect and regard for him. His loss will be felt, not only by those in the House with whom he worked so closely, but especially by those of us who had the warmth of his friendship.

My deepest sympathy is extended to Mrs. St. Onge and her children. I hope that the esteem with which BILL was regarded by his colleagues in the House and by his many friends will in some small way help to ease their sorrow.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 1, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, was taken from us. BILL was one of the first Members I met when I arrived in Washington in January 1965. We served together on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. It was a pleasure to know him and an honor to serve with him in this body. He represented the people of the Second District of Connecticut with distinction since his election to the 88th Congress. A promising legislative career has come to an abrupt end. I am sure we shall all feel the loss created by BILL's absence. I know I shall miss him deeply.

To Mrs. St. Onge and the children I extend my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE was a unique Member of this body. Both the ready smile and the unflappable urbanity were melded to some very firm commitments on the issues. BILL ST. ONGE was a "get along" Congressman; he was not a "go along" Congressman. His consistent liberalism and passion for constitutional rights made him a tower of strength on the Judiciary Committee and in the House as a whole. His colleagues will miss WILLIAM ST. ONGE; so will the country. There will always be a shortage in this country of men whose commitment to their own beliefs is so strong that they can respect and defend those who march to different drummers.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the passing of my dear and good friend, BILL ST. ONGE.

For his genuine compassion, his sense of purpose and dedication, he endeared himself to all who knew him as colleague and friend.

It is with a deep sense of loss that I mourn BILL's passing and extend my heartfelt sympathy to his family. While there is little one can say to ease their sorrow, I know that they can take consolation in the knowledge that his warmth and service touched all who knew him, and made all our lives more meaningful.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I suppose there is a short-hand description we conjure up, upon the mention of any Member's name. Such a description, of course, is inadequate to portray fully his work and character, but, perhaps, includes the more salient features of his personality.

Patience and compassion are the qualities BILL ST. ONGE calls to my mind. In the nearly 6 years I was privileged to know and work with him on the Judiciary Committee I can never recall seeing him lose his temper or indulge in the explosive outbursts to which some of us are prone under the stress of congressional service. When he disagreed with legislation or people, his reaction was more one of disappointment than anger.

Every Member of Congress and the people of the United States lost a good friend with the passing of BILL ST. ONGE.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the death of our colleague, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

The counsel of BILL ST. ONGE and his dedication to his duties and his fellowmen will be sorely missed in this very trying period in the history of our Nation. He made his mark on the history of the House of Representatives through his hard work, dedicated service, and his unswerving honor.

In this particular era, we need strong men of intellect, determination, courage, and honor. BILL ST. ONGE was such a man and it is indeed unfortunate that Our Maker took him from our midst when so many important decisions must be made for the good of all mankind all over the world.

I will particularly miss BILL ST. ONGE for he was one of the first Members that I came to know after my arrival in Washington early in 1965. Through 2 years of service with him on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I got to know him well and fully respected him and his judgment. His counseling of me was of the highest order and in keeping with his outstanding character.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the family of BILL ST. ONGE, and do pray that through this trying period the spirits of his wife and children will be lifted by the memories of a devoted husband and father and the deeds he accomplished.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Maine citizens who I represent, I join in mourning the untimely death of our colleague, WILLIAM ST. ONGE. In doing so, I must also express my own grief, upon the passing of a friend.

Since his election to the Congress in 1962, BILL ST. ONGE has shared the interests of many, many, residents of my own State. He was constantly seeking improved means of permitting elderly citizens to better enjoy their well-earned retirement. He was concerned about the need for clean air, and clean water. Through his distinguished service upon the Committee on the Judiciary, he reflected a sound knowledge and great respect for the law. As a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, he worked for greater realization of our Nation's maritime role.

Most important to me personally is the kindness and basic sense of decency for which I will always remember BILL ST. ONGE. Approximately half a million residents of the State of Connecticut were fortunate to have WILLIAM ST. ONGE as their Congressman. Many of them, and many of us were even more fortunate to have BILL as a friend. He was a gentle and good man, and we shall miss him.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my sincere sorrow at the passing of my good friend and colleague, BILL ST. ONGE.

BILL has served his country well during his many years of service as a member of the armed services, as a probate and city judge, as a mayor and board of education member, as a State representative in Connecticut, and finally as a Member of the House of Representatives. Along with all of his accomplishments and his distinguished service as a leader and loyal American, we will always remember him for his interest and dedication. He served on the Judiciary Committee with distinction. I will always value my association with BILL on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and will continue to remember his many contributions to committee work.

BILL ST. ONGE's worth never was measured by narrow or partisan standards. He served always as a statesman and not as a politician, thinking the most important thing to consider was the interests of the Nation.

We will miss him in this Chamber and

I know the people of the Second District of Connecticut will miss his leadership.

My wife and I both offer our sympathy in this hour to his wife, Dorothy, and his children, Bill Jr., Mary, Suzanne, Constance, and Anne.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the death of an active Member of Congress always evokes expression of sympathy from colleagues and friends. However, the passing of Representative WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE of Connecticut leaves me with a particularly strong sense of grief.

His sincere friendship, especially during my first few months in Congress, was of such depth and warmth that it eased my burdens as a freshman Congressman. He was no less to his many other friends and fellow legislators.

On Tuesday, May 5, I was privileged to participate in BILL ST. ONGE's funeral as a member of the Congressional Funeral Committee. It was an experience I shall long remember. The tremendous outpouring of genuine and heartfelt sympathy by the people of Putnam, Conn., Congressman ST. ONGE's hometown, was an extraordinary tribute to this wonderful man.

As a public servant, BILL ST. ONGE dedicated his entire adult life to the promotion of democracy in America at all levels and sectors of government. His outstanding war record during World War II, his service as mayor, judge, and State legislator prior to his election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1963, attests to BILL's singular devotion to the people of his State and his country.

His sincerity, his exemplary public service, and his humanitarian nature made him a unique man among men.

As a friend and respected colleague, I offer my deepest sympathy to his wife Dorothy and his five fine children. His family, the State of Connecticut and this Congress will sorely miss Representative WILLIAM ST. ONGE, one of the few truly "beautiful" persons of our time.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the passing of WILLIAM LEON ST. ONGE removes from our midst one of the most popular and able men serving in the U.S. House of Representatives.

His passing was particularly felt by me as I considered him to be a personal friend after meeting him as we were both elected to begin our service in the 88th Congress. The fact that he did an outstanding job for his people is evidenced by the fact that they returned him for three more terms and I am certain if he had been permitted to live, he would have been easily reelected for a fifth term.

It is always distressing when someone you feel close to passes away and of all those I first entered the Congress with, BILL ST. ONGE is the first of our group to pass away in office.

I knew him to be a quiet and conscientious legislator. He had profound convictions and he was very effective in the work of the House. He was one of those people who could get things done without making a great deal of noise or attracting attention to himself.

A native of Putnam, Conn., where he still resided, he was a graduate of Tufts College and the University of Connecticut Law School. He served in North Africa and Europe in World War II in the U.S. Army and returned to his home to begin a distinguished public career.

He served as the mayor of Putnam and in many other positions of responsibility. It was this record of service that caused him to seek and win election to the Congress.

To his wife and five children, I extend my deepest sympathy. Theirs is a loss which none of us can fill, but I know it is comforting to them to know of the genuine respect and admiration in which he was held by his colleagues.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, BILL ST. ONGE came to the House of Representatives in January 1963 as a newly elected Member of the 88th Congress and he served the House with honor and distinction for the rest of his life. He was well prepared for congressional service, having been elected to executive, judicial, and legislative positions at State and local levels. He interrupted his service as a member of the Connecticut Legislature when he waived his draft exemption to volunteer in World War II.

For many years preceding his election to the House, BILL had been actively interested in education and housing. In the latter area he became director and vice president of the Connecticut Urban Renewal Association. These interests also tended to qualify him for the national legislature.

As a lawyer, he was eligible for and was elected to the Committee on the Judiciary, where he was appointed to Subcommittee No. 3, the subcommittee dealing with patents, trademarks, and copyrights and other legislation on assignment. In his second term in Congress, BILL continued to serve on the Judiciary Committee and was also elected to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, becoming a member of three subcommittees of that group.

My own association and friendship with BILL ST. ONGE, however, grew out of our service on Subcommittee No. 3 of Judiciary. Ed Willis was the chairman. When he left Congress, the chairmanship fell to me. And it is my hope that these brief remarks about BILL may reflect not only my feelings but also the feelings of our subcommittee colleagues who worked with BILL at the time of his death.

Mr. Speaker, BILL ST. ONGE was a modest man and he was a gentle man, yet he combined these qualities in rare proportions with diligence and determination. His searching questions to witnesses at hearings, quietly propounded, probed to the crux of problems and elicited answers that often clarified the issues for his colleagues. So, too, in executive sessions we came to count on his insights and contributions.

In the area of the subcommittee's specialty BILL introduced and worked for the enactment of important copyright and related bills and the subcommittee found his contributions invaluable.

BILL was a liberal in the best sense of the word. He was a balanced man. A devoted humanist, he pursued reason and could not be deflected from the search for truth.

I feel that the real essence of BILL ST. ONGE's service is best summed up by the title of an award that was given him in 1968 by the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—AHEPA:

For dedicated public service and steadfast pursuit of legislative excellence in promoting the enduring interest of nation and state and devotion to the dignity and rights of men.

Though plagued in recent years by recurrent ill health, BILL did not complain. He bore his troubles quietly and continued to deliver his best efforts. We sorely miss him, his gentle humor, his devoted support, but his memory remains and it is an inspiration to us.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker. I often referred—with affection and pride—to BILL ST. ONGE as "my Congressman." I could say this because I have spent at least part of each summer in the lovely Salem Valley which was a part of his district.

I did not have the good fortune to work closely with BILL in the Congress, or even to spend any great amount of time with him. But I always enjoyed our brief encounters, and I was deeply pleased when he kept winning his battles—for reelection and for life—against long odds.

I should like to say to his colleagues from my native State, and to his family, just this: I loved BILL ST. ONGE and I shall miss him very much.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the recent death of my good friend and close associate, Representative WILLIAM ST. ONGE of Connecticut, has removed from our midst a man who had distinguished himself in all phases of public service.

BILL was a fine American, dedicated and hardworking, who performed his duties to his district, his State, and his country in the finest traditions of public service. He might be described as a "generalist"—a person who could make judgments and take action on the basis of an understanding of the overall considerations, human and political, as well as those requiring a highly developed critical intelligence applied to complex data.

It was my privilege to serve with Representative ST. ONGE on the House Judiciary Committee. There I came to know that his was a strong character, a warm personality, and of his firm patriotism and integrity.

In the House, he also served with distinction on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. He had been the Mayor of Putnam, Conn., and a practicing lawyer, a judge, and a State representative.

I ever valued his warm friendship and his cool judgment. He contributed greatly to his country's causes. We may say of him that "at the going down of the sun and in the morning, we shall remember him."

We have lost a valued colleague. To Mrs. St. Onge and her children, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives,

the State of Connecticut, and the Nation was saddened by the passing of our colleague, WILLIAM LEON ST. ONGE.

Since the 88th Congress this outstanding legislator has served his country in a dedicated, admirable, and capable manner. As a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries he was in a position to work on matters vitally affecting the welfare of our Nation.

BILL'S stature as a person will be long remembered.

Mrs. Johnson joins me in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. St. Onge and their children.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I join with Mr. MONAGAN and the other distinguished members of the Connecticut delegation in expressing my sorrow and regret at the death of Congressman BILL ST. ONGE.

He was a respected and able colleague and one of the nicest people I knew.

His life has been filled with service to his hometown, district, State, and Nation. Shortly after he completed college, he served his Nation in World War II and followed that with active participation in law and affairs of our Government. His work in Congress was distinguished. His thoughts and counsel will be missed—more than that, his smile and friendship are missed. Connecticut has lost a distinguished and able citizen. We have all lost a friend and the world is a poorer place for his going.

I extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. St. Onge and her children.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my voice to those who pay tribute to our distinguished former colleague, Hon. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

I have had a special opportunity to come to know BILL. We have served together on the full Committee on the Judiciary and on subcommittee No. 3, which has special jurisdiction over patents and copyrights. In the day-to-day, shirtsleeve work of the subcommittee, one sees at firsthand the qualities his colleagues bring to their jobs.

I soon came to know BILL ST. ONGE as a man of brilliant dimensions, perceptive insight, and deep compassion. He was disciplined by a keen instinct for equity in all things. Always patient, always methodical, always faithful in his attendance and his attention to tedious detail, he was firm in his convictions and yet ever-tolerant of the viewpoints of others.

And all that he did was graced by an ever-present good humor. His benign wit was always waiting just beneath the surface of a composed, tranquil personality to burst forth and illuminate issues and harmonize conflicts.

He will be sorely missed here in the Congress. My profound sympathy goes out to his loved ones who bear the burden of this tormented time.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow and condolences to the family of my good friend, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, who passed away suddenly on May 1.

The contributions BILL made during his active and very successful political career are well known to all of us, and his family can be justifiably proud of his distinguished record of public service.

BILL was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1962 and represented the Second District of Connecticut which includes the four eastern counties of that State. He was a valued and highly regarded member of the Connecticut congressional delegation, the House Judiciary Committee, and the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

I had the privilege of serving with him on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and know firsthand of the outstanding contributions he made to the legislative proposals which have come before our committee.

Congressman ST. ONGE was a graduate of Tufts College, and received his law degree from the University of Connecticut Law School. He served as a State representative, probate judge, prosecutor, chairman of the housing authority, director of the redevelopment agency, and finally as mayor of Putnam, Conn., before being elected to the Congress of the United States.

It is a tragedy that BILL ST. ONGE passed away at the comparatively young age of 55. His skill in the legislative field, and his keen insight and sensitivity to the needs and wants of the American people, will be missed not only by his colleagues but also by his constituents whom he had served so well during the 88th, 89th, 90th, and 91st Congresses.

Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending to his widow, Mrs. Dorothy St. Onge, and to his five children, our personal and deepest sympathies on the loss of their beloved husband and father.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad duty which I feel impelled to perform in paying final tribute to my beloved colleague—Representative BILL ST. ONGE of Connecticut.

This soft-spoken, yet thoughtful and intense, lawmaker served with me on the House Judiciary Committee during the past 5 years.

Representative ST. ONGE'S contributions to the work of our committee were always constructive and meaningful.

Representative ST. ONGE'S personal qualities endeared him to all of his colleagues. His infectious smile, his persuasive speech, and his personable manner truly characterized him as a beloved man whose friendships were numerous on both sides of the political aisle. Representative BILL ST. ONGE'S passing has come as a shock to those of us who have had frequent contact with him. My wife, Doris, joins me in extending to his wife, Dorothy, and to other members of his family our deep sympathy.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM LEON ST. ONGE was a great but quiet man. Educated at Tufts College, by profession a skillful lawyer, a veteran of the north African and European campaigns during World War II, BILL ST. ONGE brought the rare combination of intellectuality and compassion and the capacity for rational judgment to his role as national legislator. He was also a great family man, whose loving wife and five children will sorely miss his strength and confidence.

In these irrational times of strident debate and destructive reaction, WILLIAM ST. ONGE is the sort of man whom this country most needs. He was never a shouter. He never operated on the assumption that he must prove himself to be anything other than just the sort of man he was: quiet, rational, unafraid. We could do no better than to emulate the character of Congressman ST. ONGE during these days of crisis. He moved among men with the spirit of the counselor and the conciliator; he never threatened what he could not produce. The Halls of this Congress never rang with his loud denunciations or castigations of any class of people, rich or poor, old or young. He never sought to repress the feelings of others with whom he did not agree. No, BILL ST. ONGE was rather a model of love, quietude, and tolerance. Let us not only mourn BILL ST. ONGE, but also strive to emulate him.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the untimely death of our distinguished and able colleague, WILLIAM ST. ONGE.

When the news came this weekend of BILL ST. ONGE'S passing, I immediately thought of how helpful and constructive he was on the many projects on which we worked together. Foremost among these was conservation of Long Island Sound. Perhaps it is an important insight into this man's foresight and sensitivity that he was active in matters of conservation long before this became a popular public issue.

I also thought how BILL ST. ONGE was an excellent Congressman, not only for his constituents in Connecticut but for the entire Nation. Congressman ST. ONGE has a sweeping view of national issues and was in the forefront of many public undertakings of importance to the United States.

What was especially appealing about Congressman ST. ONGE was that he combined his intensity on public issues with a congenial personality that made him one of the best liked men in this body.

I will miss, and I know my colleagues will miss, BILL ST. ONGE who had the drive to continue following a difficult schedule even though he was sometimes in ill health. I wish to extend my most sincere and deepest condolences to his family along with the assurance that in his life Congressman WILLIAM ST. ONGE made many positive and lasting contributions to American life.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a man who added much to the dignity of this distinguished body, who contributed to the events of our time honorably and significantly by his actions in this Chamber, who earned the love and respect of his colleagues and the people of his district, and who will be greatly missed—Honorable WILLIAM ST. ONGE.

Congressman ONGE, serving his fourth term in office, died as we all would probably wish—still in the harness and performing his duties. But it saddens me that a man should be taken in his prime when he had so much to contribute.

The list of honors accorded him is long, but no less than a man of his mettle would deserve, for WILLIAM ST. ONGE

was a dedicated public servant in every sense of the word, giving of his time and efforts for the betterment of all mankind.

WILLIAM ST. ONGE was an able attorney, an educator, a civic-minded, public-spirited citizen who served his country in World War II with distinction, then returned home to serve his native city of Putnam as probate judge, prosecuting attorney, judge of the city court, chairman of the Putnam Housing Authority, director of the Putnam Redevelopment Agency and mayor before a successful bid for Congress.

All our lives have been enriched because we knew WILLIAM ST. ONGE, and it is a privilege for me to pay tribute to a man whom I admired and respected. I know my feelings are shared by all Members when I say the death of WILLIAM ST. ONGE is a deep loss to the House of Representatives.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow and profound sense of loss at the death of our friend and associate, BILL ST. ONGE. The passing of someone with whom you have worked and shared the burdens and sense of accomplishment of daily legislative endeavor toward common goals always comes as a tragic shock, and I think this is especially so in case of our late colleague, WILLIAM LEON ST. ONGE of Connecticut.

Across party lines and regional differences of perspective, there are bonds that link all of us together as Members of our national legislature with shared purposes and traditions. BILL'S untimely passing is thus a double loss—of a unique and wonderful friend, and of an admired and respected colleague whose wisdom and dedicated service to the public will be greatly missed by all of us.

BILL spent his entire adult life in service to his community, his State, and his country. As a lawyer, he drew on his expertise and experience to make an outstanding contribution to the work of the House Judiciary and Merchant Marine Committees. His achievements in community leadership earned the loyalty and gratitude of his constituents in Connecticut, who returned him to Congress in every election since the one that brought him to the House of Representatives in 1962.

It is a terrible loss to the country when a fine man and great public servant like WILLIAM ST. ONGE passes away. But in his lifetime he set an example of devotion to public service and leadership which inspired those around him to finer efforts and others, perhaps, to follow in his path. Our country can truly take pride in the kind of citizenship that he demonstrated, for it was in the tradition that has made this the greatest Nation in the world.

To BILL'S bereaved family, I extend my deepest sympathy. Their grief and sorrow is shared by everyone who knew him.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late colleague and friend, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, who represented the Second District of Connecticut in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Prior to his election to the Congress in 1961, Mr. ST. ONGE had a varied and distinguished career as a State representative, mayor of the city of Putnam, probate judge, judge of Putnam City Court, prosecutor of Putnam City Court, and chairman of Putnam Redevelopment Agency. During World War II, Mr. ST. ONGE served his country as a member of the Army Air Corps. While in service, he won five battle stars during his 19 months of overseas service in North Africa and Europe.

Throughout his career in the House of Representatives, he demonstrated a deep commitment to both the people of the Second Congressional District in Connecticut and to the Nation. Those of us who knew and worked with him respected him not only for his dedication and hard work as a legislator, but also for his warmth and friendliness as an individual.

His death deprives Congress and the State of Connecticut of a valuable public servant. His colleagues have lost a good friend.

Mrs. Murphy joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife Dorothy and their five children on their great loss.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the death of Representative WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut.

Representative ST. ONGE enjoyed the respect and friendship of every Member of this House. I know that I have had occasion to work with him on numerous occasions on legislation of mutual interest, and his contribution to the Congress was both profound and distinguished.

As a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, his committee work was of great importance to the people of my State which is dependent on merchant marine transportation and has a large fishing industry. We are all thankful for the many times when Representative ST. ONGE took actions favorable to the interests of our respective States and the Nation as a whole.

In his beliefs, he represented what I construe to be the finest ideals of America—the concept of freedom of the individual, equality, and justice for all. He worked ceaselessly on behalf of the poor and hungry and oppressed of this country, and his efforts were rewarded by the knowledge that he had made significant accomplishments for our people.

It is a cruel twist of fate that the residents of his district are deprived of his continued service, and the Members of this House lose a respected and effective colleague. It is a tremendous loss to our entire Nation, and I devoutly feel that we can ill afford to lose a man of the stature of WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

Yet we will continue to benefit from the inspirational example provided by this most exemplary Congressman whose dedicated, visionary achievements will always stand in cherished memory. Let us always be proud to have known him, and follow in the idealistic spirit of Representative WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years, BILL ST. ONGE and I sat together on the Judiciary Committee, where he was my immediate senior. I had a keen admiration for his ability. In his quiet, logical way, he was very effective. But more than that, I got to know him as a human being, and came to respect him deeply for his goodness. He was a very human man who exhibited a tremendous concern for his constituents in Connecticut's Second District and an extraordinary feeling for his family. Our own sense of loss at his death, deep as it is, must be small compared to theirs. My sympathies are with his wife, Dorothy, and their five fine children.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sense of profound grief that I learned of the untimely death of BILL ST. ONGE. As a fellow New Englander and colleague, I knew BILL as an able statesman and warm and trusted friend. His overwhelming commitment to his country, his devotion to constituents, and profound dedication to Congress served as a source of inspiration to us all. In the present time of national dilemma and dissent in which we find ourselves, the loss of BILL'S leadership and example is particularly hard to bear. No eulogy to BILL ST. ONGE could serve as adequate testimony to this noble Congressman from Connecticut. We in the House of Representatives shall miss him, and we take this opportunity to extend our heartfelt sympathy to his family in their bereavement.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join the many colleagues and friends of BILL ST. ONGE in paying tribute to a magnificent man and an unusually gifted legislator. As a lawyer, public official, and Member of Congress he rendered great service to his State and country. His gentle manner, pleasant and cooperative disposition, and quiet courage were attributes which gave him a special place in the affections of his colleagues in this House. I shall miss him, and I extend to his family my deepest sympathy on their personal loss.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very grieved at the loss of BILL ST. ONGE of Connecticut. As I join the House leaders and membership today in expressing our sorrow at his passing, I want to say that I had nothing but the highest regard for his actions as a Member of this body.

BILL ST. ONGE was always well versed on the subject under discussion and above all was courteous and fair to everyone. These attributes coupled with the many others he possessed will indeed be missed. The St. Onge family has lost a devoted husband and father and the Nation has lost an outstanding public servant.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I join with my colleagues to pay tribute to our departed colleague BILL ST. ONGE, whose sudden passing shocked and saddened us all.

It was my privilege to serve with BILL on two committees, which afforded me an opportunity to benefit from his friendliness and his keen insight into problems and issues we faced.

BILL was a man of sterling character and dedication to the highest principles which always motivated him. BILL was a devoted worker for peaceful and humanitarian causes and we shall miss him.

I extend to Mrs. St. Onge and their children my sincere sympathy.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we Members of the House and the constituents he so ably represented were saddened by the death last week of our good friend and colleague, WILLIAM ST. ONGE.

BILL will be remembered by all of us since he was a good friend and one of the most respected Members of this body. Those of us who knew him well realize that BILL ST. ONGE had recovered from previous physical setbacks and that he constantly provided service to his constituents even when setting a slower pace might have been more expedient for him.

It has been a privilege for me to have known and worked with such an outstanding public servant as BILL ST. ONGE who will be long missed by all of us and long remembered by us.

Mrs. Derwinski joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife Dorothy and their son and daughters.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WILLIAM ST. ONGE was one of the most gracious men with whom I have ever served. The gentleman from Connecticut had a keen, incisive mind and wit. He had a very perceptive understanding of people, effectively combined with a deep concern for their well-being. Added to this was his knowledge of the inner workings of Congress and his objective appreciation of its deliberations, all of which made him a highly competent and extremely effective Member of Congress. He was a diligent legislator and his concern was always doing his utmost for his District, his State, and his Nation.

BILL ST. ONGE was a man of absolute integrity for which I and all of his fellow Members in Congress held him in the highest regard. I extend to his wife and children my deepest condolences at this time of sorrow with the thought that his long dedication and efforts on behalf of his family and country are of some solace.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) and the other Members of the House in pausing this afternoon to recognize the service to this House and the Nation of our late colleague, BILL ST. ONGE.

Mr. Speaker, I did not have an opportunity to get to know BILL well during the little more than 3 years we served together. However, I was especially impressed by his experiences in housing and redevelopment which were particularly helpful to those of us who represent urban areas. I also was impressed by the pleasant and amicable manner he always extended to Members on both sides of the aisle.

Too, I believe we should recognize the distinguished service which he rendered as a member of the House Judiciary and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees.

To his wife and five children, I extend my deepest sympathy. May he rest in peace.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this sad occasion to join with others in paying tribute to our dear friend and late colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

BILL and I came to Congress in 1963 as freshman Members of the 88th Congress, and for nearly 8 years I was privileged to enjoy his friendship. He and I occupied offices in adjoining hallways of the Cannon House Office Building, and I found our sharing of views on various matters both stimulating and enlightening.

BILL was highly knowledgeable as a legislator, and he was particularly well informed on matters relating to his work as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Only a day before his death, I had occasion to confer with BILL on a maritime matter of vital importance to our Island State. As always, he was highly discerning in his judgment and very considerate of my request. Indeed, Hawaii has lost a valued friend, the State of Connecticut a great Congressman, and the Nation a distinguished leader.

BILL's service in Congress was marked by integrity and devotion to duty. In fact, death came to BILL ST. ONGE while he was engaged in the performance of his duties. He was being driven to a submarine launching ceremeny in his home State of Connecticut when he suffered a cardiac arrest that was to end his life. As our distinguished colleague from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) pointed out when he informed the House of the sudden death of BILL ST. ONGE:

> So he died in the pursuit of his duty, as I am sure he would have been proud to do.

Mr. Speaker, together with the Members of the House, I mourn BILL ST. ONGE's passing, and extend to his bereaved family my deepest sympathy. May there be some measure of consolation for them in knowing that he met death while pursuing the work he loved best—service to his country.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late WILLIAM ST. ONGE, one of this body's most able and astute Members. BILL ST. ONGE was known throughout the Congress for his dedication, for his legislative skill, for his remarkable ability to get things done swiftly and expertly. A host of friends all the way from his hometown of Putnam, Conn., to Washington, D.C., can testify to his striking success as Representative for Connecticut's Second District.

Educated at Tufts College and the University of Connecticut School of Law, BILL began practicing law shortly after his admission to the bar in 1948. Earlier—between 1941 and 1945—he served with the U.S. Army in Europe and North Africa. After the war he served his native region of Connecticut in a wide diversity of posts: probate judge, State representative, mayor of Putnam, judge of Putnam's city court, chairman and executive director of the city's redevelopment agency.

Elected to Congress in 1962, he served with distinction on the House Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

BILL will be missed—and missed greatly—by his colleagues on Capital Hill and his constitutents in Connecticut.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, the death last week of Congressman BILL ST. ONGE came as a shock to me.

BILL was a good friend whose service to the people of his district and to the residents of Connecticut will long be remembered. Serving together on the Judiciary Committee, I had an opportunity to observe BILL at work. I quickly learned that he was a hard working, effective Member of Congress. He was one of the best liked Members who had friends on both sides of the aisle.

BILL's knowledge of and experience with the workings of Congress were a great help last year in securing the House passage of the Connecticut-New York Railroad Passenger Transportation Compact. He performed yeoman service in rounding up support for this important legislation which enabled the two States to proceed with a comprehensive railroad modernization program.

BILL's concern for the future of education was well known in Connecticut. He worked continuously for increased funding of the aid to impacted areas program.

He was also concerned about the world refugee problems and supported increases in the immigration quotas to permit refugees to enter the United States.

BILL was a sincere man of great compassion. His kindness, his humility, his dedication, his devotion to duty—to serving his constituents, his State, and his Nation—are an indication of this kind of man that BILL ST. ONGE was. All who knew him respected and admired him as a man of high standards and great integrity.

BILL was a credit to the Congress, and the Congress will sorely mourn his passing.

In closing, I wish to express my deepest sympathy to BILL's widow, Dorothy, and the members of his family.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, "if men be good," wrote William Penn, "government cannot be bad." These words may serve as a tribute to the life and career of our departed colleague, Congressman WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, whose sudden passing has profoundly affected this House. We all feel a sense of genuine loss. Conscientious, diligent, resourceful, unfailingly good-natured, he faithfully upheld the highest traditions of public service.

Deeply attached to his home State of Connecticut, BILL ST. ONGE served her as judge of probate and State representative, always with dedication and integrity. He enjoyed the distinction of being elected mayor of his hometown and birthplace, Putnam, Conn., indicating the confidence he inspired in those who knew him best.

In 1962 he won election to the 88th Congress and was reelected to each succeeding Congress. In the House his record is well known. He was a member of the House Judiciary Committee and of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

I was privileged to serve with BILL ST. ONGE on the House Judiciary Committee where he earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues. I valued his friend-

ship and will miss him. His unassuming personality and quiet wit always made it a delight to be with him.

To his wife and to his five children I extend my deepest sympathy and that of my family for a loss which, while especially grievous for them, will also long be felt by us, his friends and colleagues. I am sure that the enduring memory of his life will be for his family, as for all of us, a continuing consolation and inspiration.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, BILL ST. ONGE was more to me than just a colleague. He was a friend.

His passing was a particular shock to me. As a fellow member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, he was a wise counselor to me in the formation of important legislation. As a colleague in the House, his sage advice was always welcome. As a fellow Democrat, he was a politician's politician, and as a friend, his quiet confidence and good humor were inspirational.

WILLIAM LEON ST. ONGE was many things: lawyer, combat veteran, probate judge, State representative, mayor of Putnam, city court judge, prosecutor, board of education member, corporation counsel, and U.S. Representative from Connecticut's Second District. All of these things he did well.

He died while engaged in the work of his office, serving the people of his district. BILL was driving to a launching ceremony at the time of his death. His wife, Dorothy, was with him and members of his staff were with him. So he died in pursuit of his duty. That is how BILL ST. ONGE would have wanted it.

All of us in the House, particularly those of us who served closely with him in the committee, will always have in mind his courtesy, kindness, his devotion to his constituents, his high standards of individual integrity, and his dedication to excellence in the performance of his congressional duties. I know that I will miss him.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in expressing my shock and regret over the untimely death of BILL ST. ONGE. A finer human being never graced the Chambers of the House of Representatives.

BILL was one of the first Members I met when I was elected to the Congress, and our friendship grew greatly during the intervening years. I often sought him out when I had matters pending before both the Judiciary and Merchant Marine Committees, and he was always helpful.

Although we were all aware of his health problem, we were also amazed at the way in which he plunged into his work, more interested in the plight of his constituents than in his own well-being. He was a dedicated Member of Congress and a true representative of his people. Connecticut will miss his firm voice here in the House. His colleagues will miss his wisdom and his wit. Most of all, however, Mr. Speaker, his family will miss a loving husband and a dedicated father. I extend to his family my deepest personal regrets.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, although I knew the Honorable WILLIAM ST. ONGE only briefly, I grew to respect and admire both the man and his work. He was well liked, I feel sure, by not only his friends, but his adversary as well, due to his warm, sincere manner. He always had a smile, he always had humility, and he always had reverence. Congressman ST. ONGE's genuine empathy for his fellowman was evident in his speech and in his conduct. I feel certain that the people of the Second District of Connecticut, no matter what their political affiliation, feel that they have lost a very good friend.

Congressman ST. ONGE's stand on the issues was always supported by his thorough knowledge of the subject to which he addressed himself. When he spoke, he had the knack of pinpointing the problem, and he had the ability to present lucid, logical solutions that hit at the heart of the matter.

It seems inadequate to merely extend words of sympathy to his wife and family, but I am sure that their experience and life with him has been of such quality that it makes up for the inadequacy of these expressions.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, on May 1, 1970 the United States lost a devoted public servant.

Congressman WILLIAM LEON ST. ONGE spent most of his adult life in service to his country. His public career spanned the three branches of government at the local, State, and Federal levels. BILL ST. ONGE was a city prosecutor, a judge, a mayor, a State legislator, and, finally, a U.S. Congressman.

It was my good fortune to have the opportunity to work with this dedicated and able man on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. His constructive contributions to that committee were invaluable.

Mr. Speaker, because of his outstanding record of service and his gentle nature, BILL ST. ONGE will be profoundly missed in this Chamber.

My wife and family join me in expressing our deep sympathy to Mrs. St. Onge, her children, and other members of the St. Onge family.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, It was with deep regret that I learned of the sudden passing of our colleague WILLIAM ST. ONGE.

It is a pity that BILL ST. ONGE was taken from us while still in the prime of his public life. He was a dedicated public servant in the highest sense of those words. He was unassuming, ethical, and industrious in his preparations.

His pattern of public service promised a solid contribution to the affairs of the U.S. Congress. He was successively a judge of probate in his hometown of Putnam, Conn., State representative, mayor, prosecutor, corporation counsel, and then a Member of Congress.

We who are in politics cherish the good men who honorably practice this profession. As Andrew Oliver said in Boston more than 150 years ago:

> Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is not another in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures; neither is there any in which, by a mere loss of nerve, he may do such widespread harm; nor is there another in which he may so easily lose his own soul; nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all the temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose.

When I think of WILLIAM ST. ONGE, I will think of those words. We will miss him greatly.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, with a deep sense of personal regret, I would take this occasion to pay my respects to the memory of the Honorable WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE of the Connecticut Second District. His conscientious spirit, while serving as a Member of the House of Representatives, placed him in the forefront of those public officials truly concerned with the requirements of Government. Astute, energetic, and remarkably capable in a hundred different ways, he was one of the best of us, and we shall miss him to an extraordinary extent.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, BILL ST. ONGE displayed at all times a forceful knowledge of the law, acquired in large part at the Connecticut University Law School. He also was fully aware of human needs in general and could always be counted on to serve as the representative of justice.

BILL ST. ONGE was a native of Connecticut and a graduate of Tufts College. Entering politics at an early age, he was elected State representative but resigned to serve in North Africa and Europe as a member of the Army Air Corps. In this capacity he was awarded five battle stars during these months service overseas. Returning home, he studied law, was admitted to the bar, and entered upon his career at Putnam, Conn., where he was elected and appointed to a vast array of public offices, ranging from probate judge to city prosecutor and city judge, to chairman of the housing authority, director of the redevelopment agency, and mayor, before being elected to Congress. In addition to his legal abilities, BILL ST. ONGE was always interested in nautical matters, and upon his arrival in Washington was at once appointed to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. In keeping with this development, he was selected as a member of the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy.

During my years in Washington, I never had the pleasure of working with anyone more concerned, conscientious, or able than BILL ST. ONGE, who served his district and the country with a special zeal and ability deserving of the highest commendation.

The loss of Congressman ST. ONGE is a serious blow not only to his friends and relatives, but to his constituents, his colleagues, his party, and the Congress itself.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our friend and colleague, WILLIAM ST. ONGE, has moved many of us to express publicly our sense of loss, the sorrow we feel for his family, and the deep respect in which his memory is held by all who knew him. It is my privilege to share in this expression of tribute to a man whose public and private lives were united by his personal integrity and sense of civic responsibility.

His career in this House had, in a sense only begun. He came here in 1962, and in his 8 years of service served with distinc-

tion on the Judiciary Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. His previous career had prepared him well for his work in this House. Attorney and judge, mayor and State representative, he understood the life process of popular government at the local and State level, and he brought to the Congress a wealth of insight into the problems of American democracy. He was deeply sensitive to the cause of justice and that respect for the law which is the basis of any free society.

To his wife and children I extend my heartfelt sympathy, knowing that their strength in their loss, today and in the years to come, will be found in the memory of his life.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently when I saw the flag flying at half-mast over the Capitol I inquired of a colleague as to the reason and was deeply saddened to learn of the untimely passing of our colleague and friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, the late Representative WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

I want to take this means of joining with the Members from Connecticut and others in paying a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of this fine man—a scholarly gentleman, able, genial, kindly—a man beloved by his colleagues.

BILL served ably and well as a Member of the 88th and succeeding Congresses. He served his district, State, and Nation faithfully and diligently. His work on the Committee of the Judiciary and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was outstanding.

I also want to take this means of extending to Mrs. St. Onge and their five wonderful children and other members of the family this expression of my deepest and most sincere sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am a freshman Member of this House and I remember that when I came to Washington one of the first Members to befriend me was BILL ST. ONGE.

To a new Member, the House is sometimes overwhelming because of its tradition and history. BILL ST. ONGE, recognizing and understanding the anxieties of a freshman, went out of his way to be helpful to me.

BILL was a sensitive and modest person with a gentle but wry sense of humor. I always will remember his consideration and many kindnesses—and particularly the help and encouragement he gave me when one of my bills was the subject of a hearing before his subcommittee.

I am so sorry for his family and can only say to them that the Members of this House who knew him mourn with them. We shall miss his warm friendship but remember his singular commitment to his fellow man.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, we have lost a friend whose warm personality and kind nature endeared him to all who knew him. Our colleague from the State of Connecticut, WILLIAM ST. ONGE, was a colleague in every sense of that word and his premature passing will leave a feeling of emptyness in this Chamber which can never be filled.

I join in extending my sympathies to Mrs. St. Onge and to their five children, who must take comfort in the unblemished reputation which BILL earned for himself and for them while serving his constituents. Few men reach that height of admiration and respect but BILL was such a man.

BILL ST. ONGE was a man who really cared about people and their problems and perhaps for that reason, people sincerely cared about BILL. They will share the burden of his passing and they will be better human beings because of their concern.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we have all lost a treasured colleague and I a close and dear personal friend with the untimely death of Representative WILLIAM LEON ST. ONGE.

During our joint service on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I had the opportunity of seeing BILL ST. ONGE in action, to recognize those qualities of leadership and scholarship that made him an outstanding Member of this body.

His service in the 88th, 89th, 90th, and 91st Congresses climaxed a life of community and public service, cut short at the age of 55.

After graduating from Tufts College in 1941, he enlisted in the U.S. Army and served with distinction in the North African and European theaters. Discharged in September 1945, BILL began a career of marriage with his lovely and devoted wife, Dorothy, and a career in law by entering the University of Connecticut Law School. Three years later, he received his degree and began his distinguished life in public service.

His preeminence in law and public affairs was well recognized by his native city of Putnam, which he served as mayor, judge, corporation counsel, prosecuter, State representative, and chairman and executive director of its redevelopment authority.

Upon his election to the Congress in 1962, the counties of Middlesex, New London, Tolland, and Windham received a hard-working, devoted, and conscientious Representative; and the Congress received youthful, dynamic leadership.

Our hearts go out to BILL'S devoted Dorothy and their five wonderful children, Bill, Suzanne, Constance, Anne, and Mary, for the loss of a loving husband and father.

At the same time, we must reflect on the great loss suffered by this body with the death of our brilliant colleague and friend. We will miss his counsel and leadership.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate having the opportunity at this time to honor the memory and devoted service of one of our most distinguished colleagues, BILL ST. ONGE. His death marks the loss of not only a great friend and colleague, but also a fine man who worked tirelessly in this body for the good of the Nation and his constituents.

As we know, one does not gain the honor of being elected to this body without hard work and dedication to duty. These traits were paramount in BILL ST. ONGE'S life. After compiling a distinguished record as a student in both the United States and France, and as a soldier in World War II, BILL returned to Connecticut to make outstanding contributions to his community and State as an attorney, judge, and professor.

BILL'S superiority in his performance of these duties, as well as his qualities as a fine person, made him an ideal congressional candidate from the Second District of Connecticut. This came about in 1963 when WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE was elected to the House of Representatives as a Member of the 88th Congress. BILL was with us from then until his sad passing last week. His margin of victory in each succeeding election from 1962 until his last election in 1968 was larger every time, a firm indication of the faith the citizens of Connecticut's Second District invested in his total ability as their Representative. That faith and confidence was not restricted to his constituency, however, for he was held in high esteem by his colleagues and all of those in the Capitol that knew him.

BILL continued to work in Congress on his intense interest in and concern for more adequate housing and conservation programs. His responsiveness to the changing needs of the country and his district was a subject of admiration for all of us. In short, Mr. Speaker, this was an exceptional representative, statesman, and person who has passed so tragically from our midst. It is only fitting that we have a moment of silence in memory of my fellow Congressman from New England. The honor of working with this fine man for over 7 years is superseded only by the sad prospect of having to go on working without him.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened when I heard of the passing of our fellow colleague from Connecticut, BILL ST. ONGE. BILL was a good Congressman who worked hard and ably for the people of his district and New England. His presence on the floor of this great assemblage and his initiatives to institute fair and equitable legislation will be greatly missed by us and the constituents of the Second Congressional District of Connecticut.

His deep concern for the consumers of his district, New England, and the entire country exemplifies BILL'S efforts for a better country in which to live. Last month BILL joined myself and 61 other colleagues in cosponsoring the Conte-Reuss bipartisan oil import resolution pertaining to the Oil Import Task Force report in an attempt to bring some relief to the homeowners in this country who heat their homes with No. 2 heating oil. BILL recognized this problem and the inflation of spiraling oil heat costs in his district and throughout the country, and was quick to respond to the pressing need for immediate action. This is but one example of his ability to responsively face one of the countless problems confronting us today.

BILL'S long and distinguished career in public service should serve as an inspiration to those of us who knew him well and to the people of his district. His career is a perfect example of a concerned citizen getting something done for his community, his country, and the world. Although we sometimes disagreed, BILL ST. ONGE represented the people of his district effectively and well.

The House of Representatives is grieved by the loss of our dedicated col-

league and good friend, BILL ST. ONGE. I extend by heartfelt condolences to BILL's family, friends, and staff.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to join my distinguished colleague in paying tribute to the Honorable WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, late a Representative of the Second District of Connecticut. At a time when our Nation needs all of its good men, the loss of BILL ST. ONGE is felt most deeply. Now, in the midst of growing crisis, the absence of BILL ST. ONGE is felt strongly by every Member of the House.

BILL was a dedicated and determined public servant. His name was not often in the headlines, for he was a quiet man. BILL's satisfaction came from knowing that he was accomplishing a great deal for the people of his district, and indeed for the entire Nation. BILL was interested in enacting programs that would provide for the needs of all people in America, and in enabling them to progress and develop.

BILL's concern was for the growth and progress of the Nation and its people, for equality of opportunity, and for the protection of civil and economic rights. In the Halls of Congress, BILL ST. ONGE produced a legislative record that reflects that concern.

As a man who wanted a decent standard of living for all Americans, BILL actively and vigorously supported medicare, social security increases, the food stamp program, and many other social programs. As a man who wanted to enlarge the cultural horizons of the American public, BILL was an avid supporter of the Arts and Humanities Foundation.

In every fight to improve the quality of American life, BILL ST. ONGE was there—quiet but forcefully determined.

BILL's personal qualities, his integrity, his humor, and his dedication, brought honor to this House and his colleagues. His family, though grieved, must take some solace from that fact and from the great work that BILL accomplished here.

I knew BILL best from our work on matters affecting the New England region. The New England delegation is a cooperative one, and BILL was one of its hardest and most dedicated workers. He readily saw the complexity of issues and was eager to find the solutions to problems.

BILL was always a faithful and hard-working Representative of his district. His office was always open to those who had problems, who needed help.

I am grieved at our loss. I extend my deepest sympathy to BILL's lovely wife, to their five children, and to all his friends.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the passing of a competent and compassionate man is all the more distressing during difficult times such as these.

Congressman WILLIAM ST. ONGE combined in his life ability and dedication as a public servant with extraordinary warmth and humanity. In often heated debates on controversial issues he refused to resort to pettiness and personal attacks. His balanced view of the questions he faced reflected both his conviction in the public good and his tolerance for others.

His presence in the House will be sorely missed.

Thus, we mourn the untimely death of Congressman ST. ONGE and extend our sympathy to his wife and children.

At the same time we know that his loved ones can take pride in the fact that his life was a full one which was distinguished by dedicated service to his country.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of Representative WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE has taken from this Congress an effective legislator, a patriotic American, and an exceptionally fine human being.

Since my earliest days as a Member of the House, I had found BILL ST. ONGE to be a warm and friendly person, always willing to cooperate and always willing to offer advice and assistance to newer members.

As a dedicated public official, BILL ST. ONGE was always ready to stand and be counted on the issues. He was also willing to hear all arguments and listen to all sides. This quality made him a valuable and influential member of the House.

During his relatively short lifetime of 55 years, BILL ST. ONGE accomplished much, and left an impressive record. He was an attorney, a soldier, probate judge, state representative, mayor, prosecuting attorney and member of the board of education.

I consider myself priviliged to have known BILL ST. ONGE as a colleague and a friend. I offer my warm condolences to his wife and five children, who are buoyed in their sorrow, I am sure, by the knowledge that he lived a full and rewarding life.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House were saddened to learn of the death of our colleague, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE.

He was a dedicated public servant and a fine and warm human being. He served the people of his district, State, and the Nation ably with a deep personal concern and commitment. His voice and his presence will be missed in this Chamber.

I join with my colleagues in expressing regret and most sincere sympathy to his family.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the sudden death of my good friend and colleague, WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, of Connecticut.

The House of Representatives has lost one of its most active and respected Members with his death.

I felt a certain kinship with BILL ST. ONGE, as we had served together in Congress for 8 years. I had come to know him quite well, and greatly admired him for his dedication to his work, and his obvious devotion to his family.

He served his State and country to the best of his ability—first in the State legislature, then in the military service, and subsequently in the House of Representatives where he ably demonstrated his talents and his desires to serve others even at the cost to self.

His conduct was exemplary during his years as a Representative from the State of Connecticut, and I am certain that his influence will continue to be felt by us in the Halls of Congress for many years to come.

He was warm and outgoing, and he will be sorely missed by all of us who had the privilege of knowing him, for even a short time.

I extend to his lovely wife and wonderful family my deepest sympathies, and I pray that they will be comforted in their sorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of our late beloved colleague WILLIAM ST. ONGE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. The United States is the world's largest manufacturer of men's leather footwear. In 1966 the United States manufactured 125,900,000 pairs of men's shoes compared to 51,257,000 pairs by Czechoslovakia, the second ranked nation.

ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, May 11, 1970, marks the 22d anniversary of the State of Israel. In its 22 years of existence as a nation, Israel has grown and prospered. It has done this in the midst of a constant struggle with the surrounding Arab States.

For 22 years, Israel has sought peace with its neighbors. But to no avail. The Arabs still dream of annihilating Israel and what it stands for. Three times in 22 years the Arab dream of destroying Israel has turned into the bitter nightmare of defeat.

Israel today is an example to all the people of the world that the Jewish people, representing Israel's majority, will no longer stand by while their basic human rights are violated. That is finished forever.

Officially Israel has existed for 22 years. But the idea, the promise, the hope of Israel has existed throughout Jewish history. Today the progress that Israel has made has surpassed our fondest dreams.

In looking toward Israel's bright future we must not forget the constant peril that threatens this brave little nation. It is the duty of all freedom-loving men to support the only democracy in

the Middle East today. To forsake Israel is to forsake the very principles that this Nation is founded on—love of freedom and liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is my hope that Israel's future will be characterized by continued prosperity and lasting and meaningful peace. With God's help I am certain this will come about.

THE KENT STATE TRAGEDY: WHERE LIES THE BLAME?

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the search for an answer to the question "who is to blame for the Kent State tragedy," will surely go on for many months, if not years. With the outpouring of grief, shock, claim, and counterclaim, surely an answer will be found. But will we like the answer?

Lawrence Lee, columnist for the Pittsburgh Press, has pointed a direction for our individual inquiries. In an article entitled "Blindness to Anarchy Killed Kent Students," Mr. Lee makes a good case for laying the blame on ourselves. He notes in brief:

We are all guilty for seeing in every act of violence some excusable aspect favorable to the perpetrators of the violence.

In our preoccupation with insuring the protection of the law to the demonstrator, we have forgotten that the majority of society also has a right to protection. This overemphasis on the "right to dissent" leads Mr. Lee to conclude that we are in the "last seconds" where reason can prevail over riot and ruin.

Mr. Lee's foreboding analysis of the cause of the Kent State tragedy is worthy of consideration by all free men; I have included his article here for our colleagues' attention:

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, May 10, 1970]

BLINDNESS TO ANARCHY KILLED KENT STUDENTS

(By Lawrence Lee)

"And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

John Donne (1573–1631), English poet and theologian, wrote the lines.

Ernest Hemingway renewed the fame of the short devotion by printing it as the epigraph to his novel, "For Whom the Bell Tolls."

As a sermon it is also poetry. As all significant poetry, it spoke for the moment and for all moments thereafter in which the same loss to the human spirit occurred.

With Kent State University, a part of the continent was lost. We were all injured. We were all shamed.

Part of all of us went mad and raged as a massive, mindless mob.

Part of us pulled the triggers and fired the shots.

Part of us lies dead with the innocent and the guilty.

It would be shallow cynicism to designate the Ohio National Guard as the guilty party and then turn away in relieved evasiveness, smugly content with our own guilty selves.

We are all guilty for having failed in the last years to know what is happening to our country.

We are all guilty for seeing in every act of violence some excusable aspect favorable to the perpetrators of the violence.

Youths who blow apart their families' homes and destroy themselves in an anarchistic dream of instant reform are celebrated as heroes.

Racial minorities in paramilitary uniforms are idols whose trials for crime can summon multitudes and gain the praise of college presidents.

SOCIETY DROPOUTS

Defectors from the obligations of society, in its responsibilities and in its errors, invoke the approval of mayors.

And so it is wondrously convenient to have small soldiers, who in units of 30 are reported to have faced missile-throwing mobs of 2,000, at which to look in blame.

We are all to blame.

University students who became a raging mob are guilty with all of us. The faculties who taught them are guilty with the mob.

It has been reported that more than 100 professors at Kent State met after the catastrophe and declared, following their meeting, that they do not desire to teach at a place which permits its students to be killed in this fashion.

ACT, DON'T TALK

Their publicized self-righteousness is not worth one fig for the welfare of mankind. If they mean it, they will act on it, not talk about it.

Who permitted it more than they? Who sensed the growing spirit of rebellion and failed to direct expression and sincere search into the ways of reason rather than riot?

Do not point at other youths suddenly summoned into uniform. You, more than they, pulled the triggers and fired the killing shots when you did not advocate and insist upon reason and the counsels of reason.

CRIES FROM THE LEFT

The Left cries that fascism will come. The temper of the times is such that we may have it. And the Left will have brought it into being.

Ambassadors have been murdered when governments refused to ransom political prisoners.

Young dynamiters have boasted that returning military men will join them.

Mob actions on our campuses are permitted to assume the holy air of high-minded causes.

Is this not the mood and atmosphere of the storm trooper and the bully?

Anarchy achieves nothing for the perpetrator nor for mankind except destruction.

We are perhaps in the last seconds where reason and reasonable procedures may be used. If we do not use them, dissolution and chaos will follow.

IRS SUPPORTS ACTION TO CONTROL SECRET FOREIGN BANK ACCOUNTS

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Internal Revenue Service announced that it would require taxpayers to disclose on their 1970 tax returns whether they have foreign bank accounts.

The Commissioner of the Internal Service, Randolph W. Thrower, is to be commended for taking this step. The reporting of these accounts on the tax return will be another help in the effort to control the use of foreign bank accounts for illegal purposes.

The tax return, of course, will provide only the fact that such an account is maintained. It will not carry with it any recordkeeping requirements which are, of course, necessary for the proper control of the use of these accounts.

As the House knows, the Banking and Currency Committee has reported out H.R. 15073 which will require the maintenance of records of transactions involving secret foreign bank accounts. This legislation is the biggest step that has been taken in providing law enforcement officials with the necessary tools in controlling crime which has been aided and abetted by the availability of secret foreign bank accounts. Mr. Thrower's decision to include the disclosure on the tax return will be an excellent supplement to this vital legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that H.R. 15073 will be coming up for action on the floor of the House very soon. And I hope it will have the support of Members on both sides of the aisle. The Banking and Currency Committee conducted lengthy hearings into the abuses and misuses of these foreign bank accounts, and H.R. 15073 is badly needed. I regard Mr. Thrower's decision as a recognition of the need for this legislation and I congratulate him on his action.

THE CONGRESS SHOULD ACT ON HOLDING COMPANY LEGISLATION NOW

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the next few months, I hope that the 91st Congress will put the final touches on legislation to control and regulate one-bank holding companies.

The legislation, which the House passed on a record vote of 351 to 24 on November 5, 1969, is now pending before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which opens hearings Tuesday.

By using a loophole in the 1956 Holding Company Act, the one-bank holding companies have swallowed up thousands of small businesses around the Nation and have greatly increased the danger of a sharp concentration of economic power in the hands of a few. The Congress cannot afford to delay enactment of this vital legislation. Our very economic system is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, I addressed a meeting of the National Association of Insurance Agents on April 28 in Dallas and outlined the dangers of the unregulated one-bank holding companies and the need for immediate legislative action. Mr. Speaker, I place a copy of this speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF HON. WRIGHT PATMAN TO THE NATIONAL DIRECTORS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INSURANCE AGENTS

Thank you very much for inviting me here today.

I know that one subject—the one-bank holding company bill—is uppermost in the minds of all of us. We are now in the critical stages of this issue. Time is moving rapidly and it remains touch and go whether we will enact legislation to control one-bank holding companies in the 91st Congress.

The stakes are high. The pressures are some of the greatest that have ever been brought to bear on banking legislation in this century. The outcome will decide—for years—the nature of banking and its rela-

tionship to the business community. The outcome will decide—I am convinced—whether we continue to have a competitive enterprise system that allows room for the small independent businessman.

Only in recent months has the national press began to realize the significance and the depth of the issues involved. Originally, many regarded this as another complex piece of banking legislation, affecting only a narrow segment of the economy. Today, the holding company issue looms as one of the biggest economic decisions facing the Nation.

It is the only issue before the Congress that really touches the basic structure on which the entire enterprise system hangs. If the one-bank holding company bill fails—and the existing holding company law is weakened—we will see a drastic change in our economic life.

To their credit, the big banks have been rather candid in their actions and statements. They have made no bones about it—they plan massive seizures of other business enterprises if the Congress turns on the green light. There simply is no question about this fact. The banks' intentions are clear. They are convinced that they are right and that their boardinghouse reach across the economy is good for the Nation. In the boardrooms of the big banks, this comes under the category of "divine right."

The big question is not the banks' intentions, but the intentions of the Congress and the Administration. In the final analysis, will the Congress decide that the small businessman—the independent enterpriser—is a thing of the past? Will the Congress vote a major change in our economic structure, deciding that our system is better run from a handful of boardrooms and with most enterprises tied closely to a major banking institution?

In the coming months, every effort will be made to cloud these issues, to hide them behind smokescreens, to obscure and to minimize them. The supporters of the banks' position do not want to face the fundamental economic issues. But, the issues are there and they will not go away—even at the urging of the bank lobbyists and public relations pitchmen.

You in the insurance agency business understand the issue. You know first-hand that the banks intend to take over your business. You simply won't exist unless there is meaningful regulation of bank holding companies. In fact, in many areas the destruction of the independent insurance agent has already been accomplished by these holding companies.

For the insurance agent, this is not a theoretical issue to be faced years hence. It's here right now and your survival depends on the Congress having the courage to stand up to the bank lobby.

The insurance agents have done a magnificent job of putting their story over to the Congress. You have been persistent; you have kept the issue in front of the Members of Congress and the Administration. I have been greatly impressed by your Washington representatives and the willingness of individual insurance agents to come to Washington to personally present their case.

Your people in Washington have persisted in the face of some pretty bitter attacks by politicians who don't sympathize with your position. When you step on the toes of the big boys you can expect to be attacked, and as President Truman used to say, "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen."

But the issue is much broader than any single segment of our business community. I do not come here today as a special advocate for any group—whether it is insurance agents, travel agents, data processors, leasing companies or anything else. I do champion—without apology—the small businessman; and I am convinced that the continued existence of the independent enterpriser is essential to the public interest. The small businessman has every right to exist, the power of the banks notwithstanding.

It would be a mistake, however, to paint this simply as an issue involving a fight between the small businessman and the banks. As important as this is, the issue is much more complex and involves much more.

The banks are not limiting themselves just to small businessmen. The takeovers cut a wide swath across the economy and include a number of huge complexes—businesses like the far-flung loan company empire of CIT Financial Corporation, the Sperry and Hutchinson conglomerate; and the huge General American Transportation Corporation. The list fills page after page and involves billions of dollars of assets. Nothing is exempt from the bank raids—whether it's manufacturing insurance companies, pizza parlors, retail stores, transportation, or car rentals . . .

The list grows every day while we await final Congressional action. In the absence of regulation, it is difficult to keep track of these new movements by the one-bank holding companies, but my staff has identified more than 100 one-bank holding company creations and non-bank acquisitions just in the past year. And the regulated holding companies—those with two or more banks—also are moving into a position to take advantage of any weakening of the present holding company regulatory structure. The Federal Reserve reports that activity involving applications for multi-bank holding companies increased two-fold last year and is up 500 per cent above the 1965 filings.

Today, there are more than 900 known one-bank holding companies. The banks in these holding companies have total deposits of more than $180 billion—about 43% of all commercial bank deposits in the United States.

All of this spells out a massive concentration of economic power. Unfortunately, we have some people in this country who do not care deeply for the American way of life. These people quite readily accept a shift from a competitive, free enterprise system to a tightly controlled and concentrated economy.

Happily, the great majority of the American people believe in our system and are adamantly opposed to a concentration of economic power in the hands of a few.

A few years ago, Mr. William H. Orrick, Jr., who served as Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust in the Kennedy Administration, and who is regarded as one of the Nation's top experts in this field, said:

"Concentration of economic power has always been regarded as a threat to our most important social and political institutions. *Can anyone doubt that the pre-war experiences of Germany, Japan, and Italy have proven the wisdom of this Nation's concern over concentration of economic power?*

Such concern obviously goes far beyond the interests of a single segment of the business community. It reaches into every area of American life and the political and social implications may eventually far outweigh the obvious economic consequences of a concentration of economic power. Concentration of economic power—economic fascism—threatens every free democratic institution in America.

And for the consumer, a concentration of economic power would invariably mean higher prices, poorer products and services, fewer choices—not to mention a general loss of freedom for the entire nation.

Recognizing the growing seriousness of the problem, the House of Representatives, last November 5, moved to control the one-bank holding companies. The House, in my opinion, acted with great ccurage in the face of one of the most bitter and well-financed lobbying campaigns ever pushed by the banks.

The House-passed bill is good legislation. It firmly separates banking from non-banking business and puts an end to the one-bank holding companies' boardinghouse reach into other areas of the economy.

The House bill is being attacked because it is a no-nonsense piece of legislation that regulates without special interest loopholes. For example, the House refused to play favorites with a grandfather clause. The House-passed bill says the regulation will apply to all one-bank holding companies which have been formed since the original bank holding company bill was passed in 1956. Any one-bank holding company formed prior to that time with more than $30 million in banking assets or $10 million in non-banking assets would, likewise, be subject to regulation.

This means that a one-bank holding company won't be allowed to go unregulated simply because it made a non-banking acquisition a few days or a few months ahead of some other holding company. It treats them all equally; the regulations will apply across the board without favoritism.

The House bill also shores up some of the key areas of the 1956 Holding Compay Act. The 1956 Act said that a holding company didn't control a bank until it owned 25 per cent or more of the stock and, as a result, a great number of holding companies went out and acquired 24.9 per cent of a series of banks. Thus, this neat little loophole kept them out from under regulation. This loophole has been used often right here in the State of Texas.

So, in the House bill we moved to close this loophole by allowing the Federal Reserve to make a finding of "actual control" regardless of the amount of stock held by the holding company. The House bill also requires the Federal Reserve to determine that a holding company acquisition is not "anti-competitive" *before* it is approved.

As soon as they had recovered from the shock of the passage of the bill in the House of Representatives, the bank lobbyists started making the rounds trying to discredit the legislation. The lobbyists insisted that the bill was "extreme" and "anti-bank."

These lobbyists have never explained just what was "extreme" about suggesting that a banker be a banker and not an insurance agent, a car rental expert, a travel agent, a furniture manufacturer, a transportation mogul or a pizza parlor operator.

Banking is a very lucrative and powerful industry. So I wonder why a banker suddenly feels so mistreated when the Congress suggests that he stay in the banking business.

Unfortunately, some of the press has inadvertently picked up the line and major publications have, on occasion, described the House bill as "highly restrictive," "stringent," and "extreme." I hope that these publications will look carefully at the issue.

The House-passed bill does nothing more than apply to one-bank holding companies the same standards under which the rest of the banking community has been required to exist for decades. Since the banks' involvement in the securities scandals of the Great Depression, the Congress has always insisted on a firm separation of banks from non-banking enterprises. That was the thrust of the 1956 Holding Company Act and it is the basic tenet of the House-passed one-bank holding company bill. I am at a loss to explain why anyone would regard this as "highly restrictive."

What the press, the public—and sometimes Members of Congress—forget is the fact that banks are not like the rest of the business community. They are unique with great powers and monopoly privileges. These privileges are fine—when used in the public interest—but no one ever intended for the banks to be allowed to use these special powers to compete unfairly with the rest of the business community.

Every business in the United States depends on credit, and when the principal source of that credit—a bank—becomes a

competitor through a holding company, the independent business does not have a chance. The banks' use of their great power to grant or withhold credit can drive any non-bank competitor to the wall.

There are an endless variety of credit "tie-in" arrangements that the bank holding companies can employ to put their competitors out of business. They can force their bank customers to use many services of the holding company subsidiaries in order to obtain needed credit. For example, in order to obtain vital credit from a bank, a businessman may also be forced to buy his insurance from another of the bank holding company's subsidiaries; have all of his data processing done by another bank subsidiary; book travel for his salesmen from another subsidiary; and lease his equipment from still another subsidiary.

Under such tie-ins, there simply can be no competition. No competitor of these bank subsidiaries has a chance against this kind of economic pressure.

In addition, banks have access to a tremendous amount of "confidential" business information obtained in the process of considering credit applications. This information can be used by a bank holding company to provide an unfair competitive advantage over other businesses.

It is as clear today as it was in the wake of the great depression that the business of banking should be exclusively banking. It should be firmly separated from non-banking enterprises. The banks have a lucrative franchise in their loan-making powers and these powers should be used to promote competitive enterprise and not to stifle it.

Surely, no one denies that the banks have tremendous power and influence. What public good is served by allowing the one-bank holding company devices to extend this power into every corner of American business? What public good is served by expanding the power of Chase Manhattan National Bank, the Bank of America, the Continental-Illinois National Bank, or any of the other banking giants?

What public good is served by extending the power and the influence of a David Rockefeller over American life? Surely a Rockefeller has enough power already without the Congress granting even more.

Why do the banks need more powers? It can't be a need for more profits. Bank profits are already at record levels with the major banks showing a 13% increase in net income in 1969. Some banks had profit increases of 40, 50 and even 60%.

So, obviously, an unregulated holding company device is not needed to keep the banks out of the poorhouse.

Some of the bank apologists have put out the line that the banks need an unregulated holding company so that they may provide "innovation." This has got to be one of the more ludicrous claims in this fight. The banking industry has always been the conservative, "moss-back", status quo element of our economic system. And now they tell us that the banks are going to provide innovation if we will just let them have this holding company device. Hogwash!

What innovation will the banks bring to the insurance agency business? What innovation does a bank bring to the furniture manufacturing business? Maybe it's that some unknown banker has a new recipe for those bank-owned pizza parlors. Maybe that is the innovation everyone is talking about.

Despite the absurdities of the banks' claims, we still face a tremendous fight before enactment of a decent regulatory law. The banks have friends—friends in high places—whose influence is great. It is still a fifty-fifty proposition whether the 91st Congress and the Nixon Administration will allow your businesses to survive.

This issue is too serious to become a partisan matter, but the facts have to be faced without pulling any punches.

My friends, I am deeply concerned about the maneuvering that has gone on inside the Nixon Administration on this issue. I am deeply concerned that the bankers are still calling the shots. The Treasury Department, in my opinion, is rapidly becoming nothing more than the second branch of the American Bankers Association and this is largely due to the influence of Mr. Charles Walker. Mr. Walker, of course, was the Executive Director of the American Bankers Association, and his actions indicate that his heart and soul are still with the American Bankers Association.

It is an open secret in Washington that Charlie Walker wanted to delay the hearings on the one-bank holding company legislation in the Senate. He wanted them to be delayed long enough for the House bill to die with the adjournment of the 91st Congress. He wanted to require that the House begin all over again in the 92d Congress and try to rewrite legislation in the teeth of a fully-prepared bank lobby.

To his great credit, Senator John Sparkman did not follow this line. Senator Sparkman has called hearings for May 12 and this is very encouraging to me and I am sure it is to you. I commend Chairman Sparkman for bringing this matter to a head.

But, you must remember that Charlie Walker and his allies are still lurking in the background and that they will leave no stone unturned to kill this legislation or to force through the weakest kind of bill. I am convinced that Mr. Walker was the mover behind the strange letter that came forth from the White House last Tuesday, when the Senate Banking and Currency Committee met to consider hearings.

That letter was signed by President Nixon. It talked about the new Commission on Financial Structure and Regulation and then dropped in some very broad hints about the Commission being used as a delaying tactic for the one-bank holding company bill. If you follow the timetable of the President's letter, it woud mean that the legislation would be delayed almost to the final day of this session of Congress, too late for final action.

I was shocked that the President sent this letter to Chairman Sparkman on the day that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee met. I was surprised that the President would lend his name to such a transparent device. Such action does nothing but demean the highest office in this land. I regret it greatly and I can only think that the President has been given poor advice. And I have little doubt in my mind where that advice came from.

The President's letter is a direct contrast to what he told the Congress only about a year ago—on March 24, 1969. At that time, he said:

"Legislation in this area is important because there has been a disturbing trend in the past year toward erosion of the traditional separation of powers between the suppliers of money—the banks—and the users of money—commerce and industry.

"To protect competition and the separation of economic powers, I strongly endorse the extension of Federal regulation to one-bank holding companies and urge the Congress to take prompt and appropriate action."

That was a clear and unmistakable statement for action on this legislation in the 91st Congress—commissions and studies notwithstanding.

And only last month, I corresponded with the President and received from him a further assurance that the Administration was still behind passage of one-bank holding company legislation.

Now—under date of April 21—comes a letter from the President suggesting that we all sit back and wait until his new commission comes forth with an "interim report." He says it might be ready in two or three months after the Commission begins work on June 1. The President might as well have said that it would be ready in 1980 for all the good it would do for passage of an effective one-bank holding company bill.

Even more disappointing is the fact that a major bank lobbyist walked the halls of Congress describing the contents of President Nixon's letter more than 24 hours before it reached Senator Sparkman. The office of President of the United States is an office that belongs to all of the people and this is true regardless of what party occupies that great office. The correspondence of the President of the United States should not be revealed first to the bank lobbyists.

If this legislation—for any reason—is delayed and killed in the 91st Congress, it may mean the end of any chance for regulation of one-bank holding companies. It would be a long uphill fight to revive this bill in the 92nd Congress. I am not sure that it could be done. It must go forward in this Congress if we are to be assured of the right kind of law.

And even should it be revived in the 92nd Congress, the delay would be so great that it would have little meaning for many of you. The bank holding companies are waiting, ready to spring. If there is a delay, they will intensify their campaign to grab off non-banking enterprises across the nation. Many of your insurance agencies will be gone if there is a delay of a year or two in the enactment of a one-bank holding company bill.

Over the past 15 months, your organizations have put on a tremendous battle to protect your rights. You can be proud of your efforts. But the real hard fighting is still in front of you and I hope none of you are planning to let your guard down now. Everything that we have accomplished would be lost if there is a slackening of the effort to get a good, effective, public interest holding company bill in this Congress. Your organizations as well as other small business groups must continue and intensify the fight until victory is achieved.

Thank you very much for inviting me.

MICHIGAN CREDIT UNION LEAGUE HELPS SOLVE HOUSING PROBLEM

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing the housing industry today is not only the drastically reduced number of new housing starts, but also the limited number of moderately priced homes that are being built.

For the most part, the only new homes that are being constructed are those for individuals with large incomes. In some areas, there are so few new homes in the $15,000 to $20,000 range that many moderate-income families may never be able to own their own home.

There has been a great deal of talk about ways to solve the problem but the Michigan Credit Union League, one of the most progressive credit union leagues in the country, has taken action to correct the situation. The league has moved into the cooperative housing field and as its first project is constructing 2,000 units of housing composed of 1,500 townhouses, 300 garden-type apartments for the elderly, and 500 single-family units.

Eventually, the league hopes to operate a housing business of between $50 million to $100 million a year.

The first project is a development of a 425-acre site about 35 minutes by expressway from downtown Detroit and it is planned that the project will be in the selling stage by early summer.

The full story on the Michigan league's new venture is contained in the April issue of the Credit Union magazine and it is my hope that other credit union leagues throughout the country, reading this article, will also move into the cooperative housing field and start home construction back on the road to recovery. Mr. Speaker, I am including a copy of the article in my remarks since it does provide a positive course of action to helping the housing problem:

MICHIGAN LEAGUE MOVES INTO CO-OP HOUSING

Housing is in trouble. In most parts of the continent, adequate housing is out of reach for people earning $7,500 to $12,500 annually.

In the United States alone, the current 10-year goal for new housing units is 26 million, and last year's share was 2.6 million. Only half of those were actually started.

Anguish among young and older families in search for housing describes the scene as the Michigan Credit Union League plans massive housing developments for middle-income families, who make up 80 per cent of southern Michigan's credit union members.

Sidney Barnes, who as league counsel developed the league's first plans for factory-built cooperative housing, is enthusiastic about the program. "We're going to have housing with all the 'millionaire' advantages, but costs of 15 to 20 per cent less than monthly occupancy rates for ordinary housing."

The league is now developing a first project of 2,000 family units on 425 acres of prime land ("one of the most desirable land parcels available"), located in Avon township, south of Rochester, Michigan. Its selling price at about $5,000 an acre is substantially less than the price on the open market.

"This land has everything—a slight upward slope from edges, providing excellent views, good soil and drainage, proximity to shopping, churches, superhighways, and a location near the employment sites of 135,000 families," Barnes explained.

"It's located across the way from a small college, is within two miles of a new major university and a junior college, and is 35 minutes by expressway from downtown Detroit. A state-maintained swimming lake is only three miles to the northeast, and there are state parks two miles and 10 miles away. ("Don't forget," he interjected, "we're talking about urban land.")

Actual construction on one of four sections of the land should begin before the end of May, and Barnes believes that section will be completed in two years. The entire acreage should be developed within five years.

"When that time comes, you'll see what we mean by 'millionaire' facilities," he added.

The property was rezoned for planned neighborhood development to allow as many as 5.6 buildings per acre on the over-all acreage. This, in turn, will allow generous open spaces for recreation and beauty in some areas. There'll be tree-lined walkways, bike paths, a multi-purpose community center, tennis courts, swim pools, a gym, nursery schools, and a large shaded area.

Self-contained schools and a day care center are also planned, and the development contains 10 acres of commercial property.

The project will have 2,000 units—1,500 townhouses; 300 garden-type apartments for the elderly; and 500 single-family units.

"This development is just a beginning," noted Barnes. "We see no reason that housing couldn't become a $50 to $100 million-a-year business under league sponsorship. The need for it appears virtually unlimited."

To prepare for such activity, in fact, specialist Sidney Blitz was appointed in August to direct the league's cooperative housing program. Blitz has more than 13 years' administrative experience, nearly two as manager of a 2,000-apartment cooperative housing development in New York. For seven years he directed education and research for the New York State Credit Union League. Most recently, he headed Boston's Action for Community Development agency.

Actually, league staff involved with housing numbers three, with Blitz, Barnes, and Jim Fisher, who works in sales. Major development work will be contracted.

"We see our role as a seeding agent," said Barnes. "We hire an architect and a lawyer, arrange the purchase of land and make a down payment, then keep our eyes on developments. In short, we get the ball rolling."

To date, the league has spent $310,000 as a down payment on the $2,175,000 Avon township acreage, bought under a seven-year contract at 6½ per cent interest. Interest payments start after the first year.

All money has come from a fund to which Michigan's state-chartered credit unions can lend 1 per cent of their capital. While this could amount to $7 million, at present 120 credit unions have contributed $2 million. Plans are also being made to permit participation by federal credit unions.

In addition, under a 1967 amendment to the state credit union act, state-chartered credit unions may now advance as seed capital for cooperative housing up to 5 per cent of their total capital.

Barnes doubted that anywhere near the fund's $35 million potential will be needed. Of actual developmental costs (an estimated $50 to $60 million for the Avon Township project), 3 to 10 per cent will come from individual down payments, the balance through mortgages. And once mortgages are negotiated, pilot funds may be returned to the credit unions.

The Avon project should be ready "to take to the people" in an extensive pre-selling period by early summer, Barnes said. Credit union members will have first choice. Virtually anyone, of course, can join either of the two community credit unions in the Detroit area. Non-members, too, will be accepted later.

So far, all is on schedule. A detailed master plan on the first section was completed in January. Municipal approval has also been granted, and construction will be started by installing underground pipes, pavings and roads.

While the league looks for other potential sites for housing, "we're not pushing right now," Barnes said. "Money is tight." Credit union loans to the league are paid the highest interest possible, now in the range of 6 to 7 per cent.

One of Blitz' big hopes is that the league be given the opportunity to develop cooperative housing for Detroit's impoverished inner city. Notably, the league is only one of nearly 1,300 groups to file application for such development with the Detroit Housing Commission.

Most applicants, however, represent individual neighborhoods or churches. Blitz believes that if development is split up in the inner core, "it will be difficult to do something really worthwhile. A large program in the inner city has the best chance of success from the standpoint of cost, design, and community facilities."

"We could handle a big development like that," Barnes added confidently. "We might also have the opportunity to give everybody a free membership in the New Detroit Consumers Credit Union."

The league also plans to propose a housing project for senior citizens to the Federal Housing Administration.

"Either of these projects could move quickly, once we receive the right word," said Barnes. "We're on the way now."

The Michigan league recently announced its co-sponsorship of four additional cooperative housing projects, three of which are still in preliminary talking stages.

The Auto Body Credit Union of Lansing, Mich., is reported to be ready to sponsor a 180-unit development. Construction may depend on receiving authority to use a part of the $250 million in tax-exempt 6-per-cent revenue bonds now being requested by Governor William Millikin for the Michigan State Housing Authority.

The projects being discussed are in central Detroit by Detroit Teacher Federal Credit Union and projects for credit union members in the Benton Harbor and Escanaba areas.

ECONOMIES CITED IN DEVELOPING CO-OP HOUSING

Six cost-saving features emerge through the large-scale development of cooperative housing, such as that in Michigan.

Production by factory methods. The league recently signed a contract with Levitt and Sons, the world's largest builder of housing and now a subsidiary of International Telephone and Telegraph.

Although this firm has yet to start building by factory methods, it is far advanced in the technology, having long engaged in research and having developed a sophisticated way to combine pre-constructed units. The firm plans to build a plant in Michigan, and quality controls can be exercised at the plant, as well as on the site.

Levitt, as an extremely large buyer, can also get materials and manufactured goods at the largest discounts possible. In addition, it can cut down on waste in such items as carpeting, where wastage ordinarily accounts for a quarter to a third of the price.

The volume factor. Most important of all, in Sidney Barnes' view, a large project can be planned over several years, allowing production to be scheduled with no loss of labor or productive facilities. This decreases costs appreciably.

Land banking. The elimination of intermediate speculative profits in the sale of a large parcel of land is another significant factor. Property can be purchased before speculation begins. Barnes calculated that the residential property purchased last September has already increased in value by about $500,000, despite the depressed condition of the market. In five years, the 10 acres of commercial property purchased for about $5,000 an acre will likely be worth more than 10 times that amount.

In addition, the property in Avon township might have cost substantially more if it had been rezoned before sale.

Cost of mortgage money. This may be reduced about 25 per cent if the program is designated under Michigan law as one having broad social objectives. Under this designation, the law provides for financing through tax-exempt, state-floated bonds. Other leverages to reduce the cost of money may become available through credit union activity in the money markets, and because of the program's scale.

Elimination of non-productive costs. These include such factors as closing costs on the sale of individual properties, processing, legal, inspection, and other fees. These will be eliminated or reduced through involvement of the league's technical staff.

Development of communities. Finally, Barnes noted, "it is our intent not to develop on a subdivision-by-subdivision basis, but to produce total communities designed for the needs of people, to maximize cultural, recreational, and educational factors. We start with existing groups, and our sole motivation is to serve them on a non-profit basis.

Our goal is to achieve the best family living possible at the least possible cost."

STATEMENT ON CAMBODIA BY AUSTRALIAN PRIME MINISTER GORTON

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, few men have as capable a grasp of Asian affairs as Australian Prime Minister John Gorton. It was with special interest, therefore, that I noted remarks on the Cambodian situation made recently by Mr. Gorton in the Australian House of Representatives.

Speaking of President Nixon's decision to make a sweep into the Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia, Mr. Gorton declared that this action was taken "on operational military grounds and was designed to protect the lives of Allied servicemen."

Citing criticism of the President's decision by the opposition party in the Australian House, Mr. Gorton commented:

We find it odd that the Leader of the Opposition should, on behalf of his Party, viciously criticize that action. It is worth noting that so far as I know not one member of the Opposition, at any time, has criticized the violation of Cambodian neutrality during the last 5 years by the North Vietnamese.

Mr. Gorton said he cannot understand those who "are prepared to subject Allied forces to military threat and to endanger the lives of soldiers in action."

Mr. Speaker, I believe all Members of the House would benefit from reading Mr. Gorton's speech. His address follows:

EMBASSY OF AUSTRALIA,
May 5, 1970.

STATEMENT ON CAMBODIA

The Australian Prime Minister, Mr. John Gorton, made the following statement on the situation in Cambodia in the Australian House of Representatives on Tuesday, 5 May.

For some years North Vietnamese regular forces, and other forces controlled by North Vietnam, have been withdrawing across the Cambodian border after battles in South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese have built, in Cambodia, base camps in which their forces could rest, refit, regroup, and be prepared for further military action against allied troops in South Vietnam.

This military disadvantage was endured with great forbearance by United States and South Vietnamese forces—for even though the neutrality of Cambodia was being violated by the Communists, the allies continued to hope that the protests of the Cambodian Government might lead to a cessation of the North Vietnamese invasion.

This was a vain hope and since the displacement of the Sihanouk Government by the Lon Nol Government in Cambodia, North Vietnamese and forces controlled by them have extended and expanded their invasion of Cambodia's neutrality.

There has been a gradually increasing violation of this neutrality a violation which was grossly wrong in itself—which was carried out by a nation which had signed the Geneva Agreement to respect Cambodia's neutrality and which increasingly gave a military advantage to the enemy and posed growing military danger to allied forces in South Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese have extended westward from the bases they had been occupying. They have attacked, in Cambodia, administration centres, communications and populated areas in Eastern and South Eastern Cambodia. And along with this increasingly cynical and increasingly overt invasion, they have taken steps designed to create a zone in Cambodia, occupied by them, along virtually the entire length of the South Vietnamese border with Cambodia. As President Nixon pointed out, they have embarked on a programme to make Cambodia a vast enemy staging area, and a springboard for attacks on South Vietnam along 600 miles of frontier.

They have in fact begun a wider invasion, and embarked on a course which poses greater military dangers to allied forces than before. This new military threat, increased in gravity, has led to South Vietnamese and United States forces taking action to protect themselves by crossing the border into Cambodian territory occupied by the North Vietnamese.

The decision, reached by the President of the United States, was taken on operational military grounds and was designed to protect the lives of allied servicemen.

Those who condemn this decision, as the Government does not, must either argue that there has not been an increased threat to allied forces as a result of North Vietnamese action—and this is scarcely arguable or tenable—or they must hold that it does not matter whether there has been an increased threat or not—that regardless of increased danger allied forces should be left in that danger from the flank and should not try to prevent it. We do not accept this.

Our own Australian forces are not engaged in this operation and I see no prospect that they will be. But the effect of the operation could well be to make all allied forces in South Vietnam, including our own, more safe.

Our own objective for Cambodia is known. We wish to see a neutral Cambodia—a country which is not used by anyone as a base or a battleground; a country which enjoys in truth that freedom from interference, that real neutrality which it was guaranteed under the Geneva Agreement and which was breached by North Vietnam.

We will try by diplomatic means to bring this about—and to bring about a method of international inspection designed to ensure that respect for the neutrality of Cambodia is real and is continuing.

For let me make this clear. We do seek a Cambodia whose neutrality is respected in fact and in truth. We do not seek a Cambodia which is called neutral but which is occupied in greater or lesser part by North Vietnam. For this would be a continuance of the pretence which has prevailed. It would not mean that the neutrality of Cambodia was real. And it would mean that South Vietnam was endangered.

In the Government's view this is the situation. The neutrality of Cambodia has been consistently and progressively violated by North Vietnam.

The increasing tempo of the violation has posed an increasingly grave military threat to the lives of allied servicemen. It has also, by widening and escalating the war, threatened to prolong it, and to delay Vietnamisation and to delay the time when allied forces could be withdrawn.

The action taken by the United States and South Vietnam was action to protect the servicemen against attack by an enemy which was increasingly occupying a neutral nation.

We understand the reason for their action and we find it odd that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Whitlam) should, on behalf of his Party, viciously criticise that action. It is worth noting that so far as I know not one member of the Opposition, at any time, has criticised the violation of Cambodian neutrality during the last 5 years by the North Vietnamese. There have been no claims that these Communist actions were 'fatefully widening the war' or that their increasing invasion of Cambodia ought to be condemned. There were no fulminations from the Opposition against that violation of neutrality. Those were Communist actions and immune to criticism from the Opposition.

But now that counter action has occurred, our allies are criticised by the Opposition—they, we are told, have widened the war, they, we are told, have engaged in escalation; they are in the wrong now that this has happened.

Such comments I believe are support for the theory that Communist forces should be allowed to operate as and when they like; that they should be excused for invading and occupying neutral countries; and that it is wrong for action to be taken to stop them; and that such comments, by giving that support, to me, show a willingness, even a desire, to accept the defeat or surrender of allied forces in South Vietnam.

I can understand—though strongly disagree with—but I can understand—those who wish to surrender in Vietnam, and abandon the South Vietnamese, and let aggression succeed. But I cannot understand those who, while the struggle continues, are prepared to subject allied forces to military threat and to endanger the lives of soldiers in action.

We entirely reject this attitude. We will continue to work for a truly neutral Cambodia by all means we can. But we will not excuse our enemies and attack our allies in our joint endeavours to bring peace and self-government to South Vietnam in the way the Opposition has done.

PROFILE IN COURAGE

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, certainly nobody would accuse Kenneth Crawford, longtime Newsweek columnist, of being a Nixon apologist. It was therefore with great interest that I read Mr. Crawford's analysis of President Nixon's Cambodia decision in the May 11 issue of Newsweek. Mr. Crawford aptly characterizes the President's Cambodia action as a decision requiring great personal courage and Newsweek appropriately headlined the Crawford column, "Profile in Courage." Now that congressional tempers have cooled somewhat, it would be well for all Members of Congress to read a reasoned analysis of the President's Cambodia decision by a man who has approached it with an open mind, Mr. Kenneth Crawford. Mr. Crawford's column follows:

[From Newsweek, May 11, 1970]

PROFILE IN COURAGE

"To save mankind's future freedom, we must face up to any risk that is necessary. We will always seek peace—but we will never surrender . . . We are Americans, determined to defend the frontiers of freedom . . ."

This is a quotation not from President Richard M. Nixon's televised announcement last week that American and South Vietnamese troops had crossed into Cambodia territory but from a speech President John F. Kennedy delivered in November 1961.

Mr. Nixon paraphrased it and made it his own. Moreover, he set the words to the awesome music of hazardous action. What for President Kennedy had been only inspirational oratory was for President Nixon a solemn commitment already being carried out.

After ten years, 40,000 killed-in-action casualties and $100 billion invested, Mr. Nixon was trying by bold military maneuver to bring to a reasonably acceptable conclusion a war Kennedy had tentatively joined by sending American soldiers and equipment to the South Vietnamese.

Some of Kennedy's posthumous interpreters have insisted that, had he lived, he would have refused to escalate American intervention in the Vietnamese war. This is necessarily a guess. There is as much reason to guess that he would have admired what Mr. Nixon has now done. It has in it the stuff celebrated by his book "Profiles in Courage." An American statesman has again done what he thinks right in the face of opposition both formidable and determined.

PREDICAMENT

This was Mr. Nixon's predicament: he had promised to wind down the war and bring American troops home as rapidly as prudent. This promise, and evidence that it was being carried out, had quieted opposition to the war. But impatience with the continued fighting and the weekly casualty figures was growing. Polls showed that both support of the war and of the President himself were suffering attrition. Reasonable critics of Administration policy were asking the pertinent question: "If we couldn't bring the enemy to terms while escalating how could we hope to do it by de-escalating?" Vietnamization was not a wholly persuasive answer.

Military realists recognized that the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong sanctuaries in Cambodia had become, especially after the Communists' Tet disaster in 1968, the key to the enemy's durability. Yet Prince Sihanouk's nominal neutrality and, after his overthrow, the outcry in Congress against "widening the war" seemed to assure continued immunity for the Cambodian hideouts.

Nobody outside of the innermost White House circle thought Mr. Nixon would dare attack these sanctuaries. For this reason, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, center of the run-sheep-run game now so popular in Congress, concentrated its attention on ways of preventing the President from arming the Cambodians. Meanwhile, he was secretly preparing a far more promising initiative. Secrecy was maintained in the hope of achieving surprise on the battlefield. There was no leakage, and initial surprise apparently was achieved.

COURSE

It was an audacious move. Mr. Nixon knew it would be accepted reluctantly, given the temper of the times, even by a silent majority, and that it would infuriate his Congressional opposition and in all probability add to it. Even so, it seemed doubtful that Congress would go to the length of forbidding him to pursue the course he had chosen. This was one of the many chances he thought worth running. For the alternatives—doing nothing or trying to shore up the weak Cambodian Army—promised only drift and ultimate humiliation.

Now it is up to the soldiers attacking such exotically named places as the Parrot's Beak and the Fishhook, sites of Communist command headquarters, staging areas and supply dumps. If the operation goes well, the enemy will have suffered his worst defeat of the war and recovery will be difficult, given his already weakened position in South Vietnam. If, on the other hand, the operation goes badly or the enemy merely retreats deeper into Cambodia and regroups rapidly, the gamble will pay off only in small change.

Whatever the outcome, Richard Nixon deserves reappraisal. Skeptics who have said he is a compromiser incapable of standing up to pressure should, but probably won't, recant. Foreign Offices making the same mistake probably will. The effects may reach far beyond Cambodia. Perhaps Kennedy's words live a little.

MURRAY L. WEIDENBAUM

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's appointment of Murray L. Weidenbaum to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy, has proved in my estimation at least, to be a stroke of genius.

In my years as a Member of this body I have read and listened to many dissertations by many qualified and learned economists, but none, to my knowledge, has the ability to make themselves understood as well as Murray Weidenbaum. He has that rare knack of being able to say what he means in simple, down to earth, readable language, while at the same time portraying his considered judgments in a most erudite way.

Secretary Weidenbaum recently spoke before the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks in New York City. His talk dealt with the American economy for 1970. For those who are concerned about the inroads of inflation, and the outlook for controlling it, I offer Mr. Weidenbaum's remarks.

The speech follows:

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY IN 1970

(Address by Hon. Murray L. Weidenbaum, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Economic Policy)

For me, it is a very personal pleasure to be here. It must be well over 35 years ago that, as a school boy, I opened my first bank account with one of the member banks of this distinguished association. That early relationship with a thrift institution really had a lasting effect on my savings ratio. Ever since, I have always made my personal contribution to combating inflation.

I am also here to express our appreciation for the forthright anti-inflationary stand that the National Association of Mutual Savings Bank consistently has taken. That has been most welcome support.

SOME ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE

I would like to offer some observations on the American economy. Perhaps you will find that my remarks follow that old jingle—something old, something new, something borrowed, something blue. To begin with, some perspective is useful: the long-run economic objectives of the Administration are threefold—reasonable price stability, high employment, and a healthy rate of growth. But in the short run, the strength and persistence of inflation temporarily makes that our number one economic problem.

Until prices are rising much less rapidly than they are now, the economy must be kept under mild restraint, which is what we are doing. Output has been declining, and there has been some rise in unemployment. These are unwanted—but unavoidable—side effects of bringing inflation under control. I do not know of any quick and easy cure once inflationary momentum has been allowed to build up—and it certainly was allowed to during those critical years—1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968. But since 1969, we have been applying the fundamental corrections; and they are beginning to work.

This Administration inherited a difficult economic situation, a sort of economic hangover resulting from the spending spree that culminated in the massive $25 billion budget deficit in 1968. We had some choices to make in setting our economic policy.

One solution—to let the inflation run its course—was really no solution at all. Inflation had to be brought under control; it certainly would not cure itself. Another solution—to aim deliberately for recession—had little to recommend it. Even with expanded unemployment compensation and similar offsets, the cost of unemployment would be high. Furthermore, a sharp contraction followed by rapid expansion might still leave prices rising too rapidly.

The workable and sensible solution seemed to lie between the two extremes. A policy of firm economic restraint was needed, but not one that would be carried so quickly or so far as to cause deep recession. Instead, total demand for the Nation's output would have to be held below our total productivity capacity, and for an extended period of time. Only then could a moderate expansion be resumed without setting off renewed inflation. This is the undramatic and somewhat painful course that was chosen. I believe that it was, and is, the right and responsible course to follow.

A PROGRESS REPORT

What are the accomplishments to date? Let me be quite frank; they fall short of our more optimistic expectations. We are running about on track in terms of slowing down the economy, that is, the behavior of total spending and output. But we are running behind schedule in terms of visible relief from inflation; yet, we are making progress. First of all, the acceleration in the rate of price increases has been stopped. That was a critical, although often overlooked, development in the fight against inflation. Now there are signs of the important next stage—the actual slowing down in the rate of inflation. There has been some progress, but we are still plagued by rapidly rising costs and prices. Obviously, even though the tide may be turning, the battle against inflation is hardly over nor yet has it been won.

The fact that total demand is no longer excessive does mean that we have passed through a vital first phase. The application of fiscal and monetary restraint throughout last year was successful in slowing down the rate of total spending. Until that occurred, there was little prospect of lasting relief from inflation.

In the first quarter of this year, there were rather clear signs that demand was no longer excessive:

In physical volume—what economists call "real terms," that is, after correction for price changes—total production in the United States fell slightly in the first there months of 1970; meanwhile, prices continued to rise at about the same rate as in late 1969.

Retail sales have moved up only moderately this year; industrial production had been in a down-trend before edging up in March; and the unemployment rate averaged 4.3 percent in the first four months of 1970, up from a low 3.6 percent in the last four months of 1969.

But, even with the economy moving slowly, prices are still under strong upward pressure from the cost side. This is the natural sequence after a period of prolonged inflation. Costs and prices continue to rise for a time on their own momentum. But this "operation bootstrap" cannot continue indefinitely if total spending is kept in check.

Are we really better off now, having exchanged "demand-pull" inflation of 1968 for the "cost-push" inflation of 1970? I think that we are far better off. As long as total demand was excessive, costs and prices were bound to continue rising. Under those circumstances, no relief could be expected. However, once demand is restrained, cost-price pressures could eventually diminish. There are lags in this economic adjustment process, as we know all too well. But with demand restrained, the conditions have been established whereby inflation can recede.

What are the tangible signs that inflation

is, in fact, coming under control? They may not exactly overwhelm you, but here are some recent favorable signs:

Although the Consumer Price Index rose at a hefty 6 percent annual rate in the first three months of 1970, on a seasonally adjusted basis, the rise was successively less in each month so far this year.

The wholesale price index rose at about a 5 percent annual rate in the first three months of 1970, but by successively less in each month. The preliminary report for April shows an actual decline of one-tenth of one percent. Personally, I do not attach nearly as much weight to the small fraction of one percent price decline in just one month as I do to the cumulative slowing down pattern in the price indices.

Not all of the economic news is that favorable. For example, the productivity and unit labor cost statistics for the first quarter of 1970 were somewhat less encouraging:

Output per man-hour apparently edged down fractionally, after rising in the fourth quarter 1969.

With compensation per man-hour rising at a 7.7 percent annual rate, unit labor costs rose at nearly an 8½ percent annual rate.

On the basis of past experience, however, we would expect sharp rises in productivity when the economy once again begins to expand. This would help to dampen cost-price pressures.

It obviously is going to take awhile longer before the inflationary process can be unwound. For a time, we may still find that there will be risks on either side: excessive slowdown or premature speedup. It will be particularly important in the period immediately ahead to keep the policy dials on a fairly steady setting. This may mean something like an "even keel" for fiscal policy. I do not believe that it is wise to rush in with new policy proposals each time some erratic economic indicator turns for the worse or for the better.

THE BUDGETARY SITUATION

In the present economic environment, the maintenance of a strong budgetary position is extremely important. Certainly in the absence of any sharp reversals of the apparent trends in the private sector, the Federal budget should be kept in the neighborhood of balance during the next few years. In order to achieve that, the Administration is finding it necessary to follow a policy of holding the line on expenditures.

Now that does not mean that every single request for increasing spending is automatically turned down. Economic policy is not set on automatic pilot. The needs of economic stabilization inevitably must be reconciled with the pressing needs of programs given high priority. The important element is to maintain the overall posture of budgetary restraint, to make the hard choices which are necessary in rejecting a good many of the available and attractive candidates for government spending. Thus, while there have been some well-publicized "pluses" on the expenditure side, there will be some compensating "minuses" as well. For example, the Administration intends to absorb a good part of the Federal pay raise, keeping its full impact from raising expenditures.

Some lessons learned from recent experience may help in keeping the economy on a steadier path of expansion. Many of our present difficulties can be traced to the large budget deficits which emerged after 1965. There is general agreement on the need to avoid large and destablizing swings in the budget. But some argue whether the swing of a few billion dollars from surplus into deficit really matters in a trillion dollar economy.

Although I relish academic disputations as much as any other economist who has earned his Ph.D., frankly I just do not think that this is the pertinent question in the present environment. As I see it, the key point now is the need to maintain budgetary restraint in order to dampen down the continuing inflationary pressures. To the extent that the Federal Government can continue to slow down the rise in Government spending, to that extent we can expect the private sector to exercise similar restraint.

In contrast, if revenues do not come up to expectations because economic restraint takes hold in some sectors more rapidly or fully than anticipated, this in itself does not strike me as a cause for economic concern. This is the well-known, built-in automatic stabilizers at work, a phenomenon which is welcomed by economists of all political persuasions.

The present does not impress me as the appropriate time to relax the downward pressure on the expenditure side of the budget. To be sure, no budget is ever "set in concrete." A budget is an action document, modified from time to time.

Even after taking account of the modifications which have occurred to date, the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1970 is a restrictive one. In "real terms"—adjusting the actual figures for the effects of inflation—Federal spending is declining between the fiscal years 1969 and 1970. On the basis of present policy, "real" spending will decline again in the fiscal year 1971.

In fact, some extremely capable economists outside of the Federal Government contend that a more sophisticated analysis—that using the so-called "full employment budget surplus" concept—would show that the degree of economic restraint may even become greater than they would care to see. While I do not share their confidence in the exactness of such calculations, they do tend to reinforce my own evaluation of continuing Federal fiscal restraint.

In recent days, I have been asked what, if any, is the impact of developments in Southeast Asia on the budgetary outlook. My reply is that the Treasury Department has been assured that the recently taken actions in Cambodia will utilize existing and available forces and equipment. On that basis, the existing budget estimates take account of these developments.

At this point, I think it might be useful if I report on an effort under way which indicates our continuing concern with improving the effectiveness of governmental budgeting and financial planning. A subcommittee of the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy has been studying the operation of the unified budget—that budget concept which resulted from the recommendations of the Commission on Budget Concepts.

An area of particular interest is the operation of the various types of Federal credit programs. These programs include direct loans by Federal agencies, which are in the budget, and Federally-assisted credit extended either by Government-sponsored (and now privately owned) institutions or by entirely private organizations with a Federal guarantee.

In recent years, the amount of Federally-assisted credit, which is financed outside of the budget proper, has been expanding rapidly, particularly as agencies (such as Fannie Mae) which had been partially Federally owned became privately owned, although with some continuing Federal involvement or relationship.

We are now at the point where the volume of borrowings to finance Federally-assisted credit programs is roughly equal in size to the total corporate bond market and is about twice as large as the municipal bond market. Thus, our subcommittee is taking a fresh look at some of the implications for financial markets as well as the overall impact of these programs on the economy.

As chairman of this activity, I would like to be in a position to report that we have come up with a sure fire solution. However, that is not the case, at least not yet. In a positive way, we have been exploring alternative methods whereby the various forms of Federally-assisted credit can be reviewed in a more comprehensive manner so as to permit more effective allocation of credit resources. Certainly, it would be desirable to provide greater attention to these programs, both those "in" and "out" of the budget, in the formulation of overall fiscal and monetary policy.

The Economic Outlook

The first half of 1970 is not likely to be a period of any significant expansion in the economy as a whole. Of course, in dollar terms, the economy is rising and will likely continue to rise. The measures of personal income, money supply, gross national product, etc., all are likely to continue going up all through 1970. However, in physical volume terms, the economy is marking time right now as inflationary pressures and psychology are being reduced.

Even though I would like to be obliging, I just cannot confidently predict the exact extent to which inflationary pressures will be brought down. In our society, that will depend on actions in both the private sector as well as in the public sector. To a major extent, the public sector itself was the basic source of the current inflation. The Administration has taken important actions to put our public sector house in order. The maintenance of fiscal restraint, of course, will continue to be needed in order both to make further progress in bringing down the rate of inflation and to demonstrate that we are serious about bringing inflation under control.

Yet, there is a division of labor in the American economy. We are primarily a private sector oriented economy. In good measure, the responsibility for fighting inflation also now lies in the private sector, for business, labor, and consumers alike to conduct their economic affairs in that manner characterized by enlightened self-interest which will avoid a new round of inflation.

The expectations for 1971 are somewhat brighter than those for 1970. However, 1971 is not likely to be a boom year. We do not want a repetition of the 1967 experience, when a pause in the economy led to overreaction by Washington and then to another major burst of inflation.

In 1971, inflation should be rising more slowly than in 1970. In 1971 and the years following, we should be obtaining the payoff for the necessary economic medicine that we have been taking during the past year.

With the continued use of a proper combination of monetary and fiscal policies, we should be able to achieve that reduction in the rate of inflation which will set the stage for achieving our more fundamental economic objectives, which are the expansion of production, employment, and living standards.

The slow going of the past several months will then appear in a somewhat different perspective. But for the time being, we must complete the job of reducing the rate of price increase to much more tolerable proportions. Thus, the economic medicine that we have been taking should yield many vintage years later in the decade of the 1970's.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM ST. ONGE

(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, there have been many expressions of loss and appreciation in the press of our State

for BILL ST. ONGE, but two of these I believe to be worthy of reprinting.

The first, is a more traditional and restrained editorial entitled, "WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE," which appeared in the Waterbury Republican on May 4, 1970. This editorial with its brevity and spareness well describes the career of BILL ST. ONGE and provides an appropriate epitaph for him.

The second, from the Norwich Bulletin by Arthur Mattson is a particularly sensitive and observant column written with a unique force and eloquence.

For the appreciation of Members of the House, I append these articles to my remarks:

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican, May 4, 1970]

WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

U.S. Rep. William L. St. Onge rose from political obscurity in Eastern Connecticut to become a distinguished congressman representing the Second Congressional District. His sudden death from a heart attack deprives his district and the entire state of a congressional representative who has served well.

He comes from a religious family—his brother is a monsignor and his sister, a mother superior. He started in politics in Putnam, his home town, early in life. He was elected to the Board of Education while still attending college.

He was elected to the legislature in 1941 but entered the Air Corps. He received his law degree after the war and later was elected mayor of Putnam. In 1962 he was elected to Congress in the Second District which covers all of Eastern Connecticut.

St. Onge always maintained a special interest in education. For four years he was an instructor at the College of Pharmacy at the University of Connecticut.

He had a special feeling for the needs of the people. Among the issues which he fought were funding for refugees in Europe, elimination of artificial restrictions on aid to dependent children and tax relief for communities with major defense industries. St. Onge made his mark in Congress and in Connecticut politics, not by being flamboyant, but by being sincere.

He had previously suffered a series of heart attacks, but his health had improved and he was preparing to run for a fifth term in Congress. His sudden death at the age of 55 is a tragic loss to his family and to the entire state. Both political parties will have to look hard to find candidates who are as competent to run for his seat.

[From the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin, May 3, 1970]

CAMPAIGN, 1970

(By Art Mattson)

"The courage of life is often a less dramatic spectacle than the courage of a final moment; but it is no less a magnificent mixture of triumph and tragedy. A man does what he must—in spite of personal consequences, in spite of obstacles and dangers and pressures—and that is the basis of all human mortality."

That passage from John F. Kennedy's "Profiles in Courage" best typifies the life and service of U.S. Rep. William L. St. Onge of Putnam, whose untimely death Friday marks a void in a record of dedicated public service to his community, his country and more importantly to his constituents in Eastern Connecticut.

Congressman St. Onge was a different breed of representative on Capitol Hill. He was not a mover and shaker of the tight-knit club membership in the House, but his quiet and efficient involvement in the affairs of his office did make a dent, and often a refreshing dent, in the staid workings of Congress.

At the time of his death Friday afternoon, we were just putting the finishing touches on this week's column . . . a column that noted the loss Connecticut would receive this year with the entry of three of Connecticut's congressmen into the state political arena. We had noted that of the three congressmen seeking re-election this year (U.S. Reps. John S. Monagan, Robert N. Giaimo, and St. Onge), there was a total of 32 years of seniority . . . and now that figure has dropped to 24, with passing of Bill St. Onge and his eight years of service in Washington.

We had noted the futility of the absolute "rule of seniority" in the House, which would in all likelihood deny him the chance for a chairmanship of a House committee. Bill St. Onge knew of this futility, but would not be deterred from his prime objective . . . that being to service the needs of his constituents in the machinations of Washington, and to represent them in the affairs of their country.

He was content in Congress, and gave little, if any thought, of seeking higher public office. It was in the House, he felt, where, he could be of service to his constituents, and it was this need, overwhelming desire, that perhaps contributed to his death.

Bill St. Onge had suffered several heart attacks during his third term in Congress and had undergone serious heart surgery in the Spring of 1968. On his return home for a period of recuperation, we met with him in his unpretentious Putnam home for a long talk about his plans for re-election that year, and his views on the state of the nation.

He was well prepared for that interview, having spent most of his time in Cleveland reading and contemplating the affairs of state. One of the items that concerned him most at the time was the escalating war picture in the Asian nation of Vietnam, and it was during this period of time that Bill St. Onge developed a "dovish" position on the Vietnam War and urged the need for a re-evaluation of his nation's role in that war.

His hopes at that time were for a withdrawal of American forces from that land, leading him to support the "peace plank" in the party's platform at the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago.

1968 was a rough year for the congressman, still recuperating from his heart surgery, he embarked on what was to be the toughest campaign of his political career. But the surgeons in Cleveland had done their work well, and the rigors of that campaign were not as great upon the candidate as they had been in prior years.

But one thing we noticed in that campaign was the amount of tension that develops within a candidate . . . and the tension we saw in the Fall of 1968 was visible at this early date in 1970. This was to be a bad year for candidate St. Onge, he would have to work hard to regain re-election in November, and he was hard at work when he died.

St. Onge's appointment with his God came while he was on his way to a launching of a submarine in Groton, but that was not the last stop in his schedule for the day, he had several more stops to go before the day was over, and Saturday and Sunday offered no respite.

It was this kind of activity, piled on top of being a good congressman seven days a week that eventually took its toll. Dining with St. Onge in Washington seven days ago, we could visibly discern that tension and the tired look, one that doctors had advised him to forego.

But, Bill St. Onge was a Congressman, and to him that meant service to his constituents day and night, seven days a week, without regard for personal consequences and dangers.

To the end, Bill St. Onge was representing his people . . . he had not forgotten who he was, where he came from . . . and most importantly . . . who had sent him.

In brief, the life and service of Congressman William L. St. Onge can best be written with what Virgil called the tears of things:

"Now the trumpet summons
And he will tread these paths no more
But by his example he has set the mark
For him who would follow a star."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for today and tomorrow, on account of family illness.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. ICHORD), on account of official business.

Mr. REIFEL (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 12 and 13, 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. PATTEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN, for 30 minutes, on May 14.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous content, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. PERKINS immediately prior to the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 199 today.

Mr. MCDADE, and to include extraneous material today during consideration of H.R. 17548 in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MILLER of California to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HOGAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD in two instances.
Mr. ROUDEBUSH in two instances.
Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.
Mr. SCHADEBERG in two instances.
Mr. WIDNALL in two instances.
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.
Mr. DEL CLAWSON.
Mr. MYERS.
Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. TALCOTT in two instances.
Mr. BURKE of Florida.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. BURTON of Utah in five instances.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.
Mr. PRICE of Texas in three instances.
Mr. ARENDS.
Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. DELLENBACK.
Mr. FREY in two instances.
Mr. MESKILL in two instances.
Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. PEPPER in two instances.
Mr. PODELL in three instances.
Mr. COHELAN in two instances.
Mr. PURCELL in two instances.
Mr. CLAY in six instances.
Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.
Mr. RARICK in two instances.
Mr. ICHORD in two instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.
Mr. DOWNING in three instances.
Mr. POWELL.
Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.
Mr. CAREY.
Mr. WOLFF.
Mr. RYAN in three instances.
Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in three instances.
Mr. DORN in two instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California.
Mr. GAYDOS in three instances.
Mr. GILBERT in three instances.
Mr. SYMINGTON.
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.
Mr. ANNUNZIO.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 774. An act to authorize the mortgaging of tribal lands on the Fort Berthold Reservation for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2162. An act to provide for special packaging to protect children from serious personal injury or serious illness resulting from handling, using, or ingesting household substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2991. An act to extend the Act establishing Federal agricultural services to Guam; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9477. An act to provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation;

H.R. 10105. An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10106. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the definition of the term "child" to recognize an adopted child of a veteran as a dependent from the date of issuance of an interlocutory decree, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to dependent children of deceased veterans, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1458. An act to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged by a nonprofit corporation or association; and

Senate Joint Resolution 199. Joint resolution to further amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 9477. To provide for the disposition of judgment funds of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation;

H.R. 10105. To amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 10106. To amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the definition of the term "child" to recognize an adopted child of a veteran as a dependent from the date of issuance of an interlocutory decree, to increase the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to dependent children of deceased veterans, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 13, 1970, 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:

2052. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report on the implementation of section 620(u) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, concerning aid-recipient countries which are in arrears in payments of dues, assessments and other obligations to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2053. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the examination of financial statements pertaining to insurance operations of the Federal Housing Administration, fiscal year 1969. Department of Housing and Urban Development (H. Doc. No. 91-336); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

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. ROONEY of New York: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 17575. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91-1072). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 15424. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1073). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 14465 (Rept. No. 91-1074). 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. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 17575. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 17576. A bill to provide for drug abuse and drug dependency prevention, treatment and rehabilitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 17577. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain functions relating to animal damage control from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 17578. A bill to supply the manpower needs of the Armed Forces of the United States through a voluntary system of enlistments, to further improve, upgrade, and strengthen the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 17579. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 with respect to determining the effects on national security of imports of articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 17580. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 17581. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions to make permanent certain provisions thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 17582. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions to make permanent certain provisions thereunder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. MOLLOHAN):

H.R. 17583. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. OTTINGER):

H.R. 17584. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 17585. A bill to establish a Federal Broker-Dealer Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 17586. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 17587. A bill to provide for orderly

trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 17588. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 17589. A bill to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 17590. A bill to provide for a study of the feasibility of the establishment of a quasi-public corporation for oceanographic research and development; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. VANIK):

H. Res. 1003. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

380. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to block education grants from the Federal Government, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SAN GABRIEL VALLEY STUDENTS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to be concerned about environmental pollution, but it is something else when lives are directly affected by such hazards.

For students in the San Gabriel Valley—which is part of the 29th Congressional District—smog already endangers their future.

The following Los Angeles Times article describes the current situation:

INCREASE SMOG THREAT TO PREP SPORTS ACTIVITIES

(By Earl Gustkey)

"Attention, all students! The current ozone reading is 0.37. Today's track meet is postponed."

A prank? No, it's an announcement that students in almost 500 Southern California schools may soon be hearing frequently. Athletic events will be smogged out as well as rained out because doctors are becoming increasingly worried about the effects of polluted air on athletes.

A year ago, the Los Angeles County Medical Assn. unanimously passed a resolution stating, in part:

"Smog is an increasing health hazard which may seriously affect the lungs of young people, and the committee on envionmental health of the LACMA strongly recommends that when the forecast concentration of ozone (oxidants) in the atmosphere reaches 0.35 parts per million, students should be excused from strenuous indoor and outdoor activities.

SERIOUS HAZARD

Alarmed, Ken Fagans, commissioner of the 441-school California Interscholastic Federation, appointed Ken Bullock, San Marino High School principal, to head a committee to investigate the problem.

Bullock's committee met first with the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District and then with the county's environmental health committee.

"We came away from those meetings feeling that we should consider smog as a very serious hazard to not just our athletes but to all our students," said Bullock.

The LACMA warning, he said, also referred to physical education classes.

OFFICIALS NOT DISTRESSED

Athletes and students in physical education classes have complained for years about smog-produced burning throats and labored breathing. But until the Medical Assn. warning there was no widespread distress among school officials.

Now, Fagans says he will advise all CIF schools "to be prepared next year to cope with athletic postponements due to smog."

Postponements due to smog are not new in the CIF, according to the commissioner. Some events have been called off by local school authorities. But now, he says, "we have a method of knowing just when athletics or physical education should not be conducted."

The method is a Hoagan-Smit-Bradley ozone detection device, an inexpensive ($2 per test) means of measuring smog. According to Robert Barsky, deputy air pollution control officer of the APCD, any high school chemistry teacher can operate the system.

The device consists of special compounded rubber strips which are sensitized to ozone and packaged in airtight containers. A strip is exposed to the air, observed through a jeweler's eyepiece and timed with a stopwatch. The time it takes for the ozone in the air to make the rubber start cracking indicates the ozone concentration. The actual figure is calculated by using a chart.

Bullock's committee will soon recommend that all CIF schools obtain the device.

Smog-belt schools like San Marino, Arcadia and San Gabriel are particularly concerned about the problem, says Fagans. All Rio Hondo League B football games last season were switched from daytime kickoffs to 5:45 p.m. to take advantage of lower nighttime ozone readings. Class C games were moved from 3 to 4 p.m.

Dr. Clark Lauder, a team physician for Arcadia High, says he was happy to see the CIF display alarm.

"With a heavy ozone count, you don't get proper amounts of oxygen and you can't oxygenate your muscles properly when engaged in exercise and the harder you breathe the more pollutants you're inhaling—that has to be causing some kind of damage," said Dr. Lauder.

An attempt was made in the early 1960s to determine if smog actually reduced an athlete's performance. The investigation, supported by the U.S. Public Health Service, concentrated on cross country and track runners at San Marino High from 1959 to 1964.

The findings, published in the Journal of the American Medical Assn. in 1967, weren't conclusive but did suggest that smog hampers long distance running performance.

OXIDANT LEVEL

"The four meets in which the average team time did not improve were the four worst days of the series for air pollution as measured by oxidant level in the hour before the race," the report said.

The report also stated, "The percent of team members who failed to improve their performance is highly correlated to the level of oxidant in the air."

Dr. Hurley Motley, who helped write LACMA's warning a year ago, admits that doctors are worried about the cumulative effects of smog on athletes and physical education students.

"An athlete, depending on what activity he's participating in, can breathe up to five times harder than normal and that means he's inhaling five times as many irritants. We just aren't sure what long-range effects this might have on our young people, but it's not doing their lungs any good."

Indoor sports like basketball will also be subject to postponement because the medical association said it believes there isn't much difference between indoor and outdoor ozone density.

QUICK COMMUNICATION

The 48 Los Angeles city schools are prepared to eliminate vigorous activities from their PE programs on short notice and to postpone athletic events. So far, however, the only two smog-alert days since July were non-school days.

The L.A. schools are connected with the APCD via a radio network and can be notified of a smog alert within minutes.

Apparently, no other metropolitan area has L.A.'s problem. San Francisco and San Diego sections of the CIF reported they were not concerned over air pollution in connection with high school athletic and PE programs.

Mr. Speaker, but, of course, smog is not the only pollution endangering the San Gabriel Valley, and students there recently have begun mobilizing against the whole range of environmental hazards.

In addition, they have taken the time to write me, as their Representative in Congress, expressing their views of these dangers and asking what is being done to safeguard their future.

Today I would like to insert into the RECORD some of the letters I have received from these students. These are only a selection of the letters since the total amount of such letters reached well over 150. As I do this, again I remind my colleagues that the lives of these students, indeed, is in our trust, and that we cannot procrastinate any longer in dealing with these important questions.

The letters follow:

MONTEREY VISTA SCHOOL,
Monterey Park, Calif.

Hon. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.:

We have been studying about pollution in our city. We have found pollution in air, water and litter along our highways. We feel that pollution is not good for mankind. We feel that there should be a stop to pollution. We have made signs and posters calling