

the able Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook) will be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes, following which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

Upon completion of the routine morning business, the unfinished business will be laid before the Senate, at which time the able Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) will be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, May 15, 1970, at 11:30 o'clock a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 14, 1970:

U.S. PATENTS OFFICE

Robert Gottschalk, of New Jersey, to be First Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

Lutrelle F. Parker, of Virginia, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office.

U.S. MARSHAL

Donald D. Hill, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 14, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Beverly Felty, pastor of Ghent United Methodist Church, Norfolk, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we come to Thee because we are misguided without Thy guidance, we are weak without Thy strength, we are unable without Thy competence. Help us to remember that whether we deal with outer space or the inner man, Thy laws govern. Speak Thy word to each one of us now. As we attempt to deal with unrest and dissension within our land help us to keep perspective. Cause us to remember that often better things come through the birth pangs of struggle. Lead us to understand anew that in a world of instability Thou art stable, that even though change is all about us Thy truth abides, that even though the will of men is strong, Thy will will be done.

Grant us Thy peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 856. An act to provide for Federal Government recognition of and participation in international expositions proposed to be held in the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 2999. An act to authorize, in the District of Columbia, the gift of all or part of a human body after death for specified purposes.

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

S. 2208. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a national lakeshore on Lake Tahoe in the States of Nevada and California, and for other purposes;

S. 3011. An act to establish a revolving fund for the development of housing for low- and moderate-income persons and families in the District of Columbia, to provide for the disposition of unclaimed property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 3818. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

REV. BEVERLY FELTY

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

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great joy and privilege for me today that the opening prayer was given by my pastor, the Reverend Beverly Felty, of Ghent United Methodist Church, in Norfolk, Va. He has been the minister at Ghent for 4 years, and is the first minister in over 35 years to be asked to stay for a fifth year. Reverend Felty and his fine family, his wife Margaret, his daughter Gwen, and his son Mike, are highly thought of by the congregation, and it is my privilege to claim him as a close personal friend, as well.

I am confident that the message in his prayer today brought the same inspiration to the House that Reverend Felty brings to us at Ghent every Sunday. His goodness and faith strengthen us all.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS—1971

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Department of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 17070—UNTIL MIDNIGHT MONDAY

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has until midnight Monday to file a report, together with supplemental and minority views, on H.R. 17070, the Postal Reorganization and Salary Adjustment Act of 1970.

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

There was no objection.

CONSTITUENT MAIL RUNS 98.7 PERCENT AGAINST THE PRESIDENT'S INVASION OF CAMBODIA

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, there has been a spontaneous outpouring of letters from my constituents expressing their views on the President's invasion of Cambodia. To date, I have received 4,787 letters; 4,728, or 98.7 percent of those letters, oppose the President's decision; 59, or 1.3 percent, support the President's action.

The emotional content of these letters exceeds anything I have received on any subject since taking office 17 months ago. The bitterness, outrage, and despair of my constituents reinforces my remarks made on the floor of this House 2 weeks ago when I said that President Nixon has shown utter contempt for the overwhelming desire of the American people to get our troops out of Southeast Asia.

The letters continue to inundate my office. Every day that passes makes clear that the President, in his press conference of May 8, did not calm their fears nor halt their criticism.

A large number of the letters also strongly protest the killing of the four Kent State students and accuse the President and Vice President of consciously dividing this country for their own political gain. Those condemning the intemperate speeches and actions of the President and Vice President support my contention that there has been a terrible abuse of the awesome power of the Presidency.

I now will urge my constituents to write the President so that he may know that his Pentagon's body counts in Vietnam and his party's telegram counts at the White House are objectionable and unacceptable.

COME AND DEMONSTRATE WHERE THE ACTION IS—LETTER FROM VIETNAM

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

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a letter that one of my brave young constituents, serving with the Army in Vietnam, wrote to his parents.

Hello: Today is the 6th of May. In six more days I go to Chu Lai for stand down

for three days. So, by the time you get this letter, I should be in Chu Lal. I guess all that you hear on the news lately is about Cambodia. If I were to try to explain it, it would take forty pages. All I can really say is that I was there with the First Division for eight months. I know that area and place. It was something that had to be done. I only wish they had done it much earlier. I guess you know that when we pulled out of the area they started hitting everything. We had kept them across the line and should have done something then. But, now is better than never.

I hear all about the anti-war demonstrations in the news (burning and killing). I can only say if they want to fight send them all over here. Let them demonstrate where the action is. Maybe they will feel a little different when they get shot at and cannot shoot back because ole "Charlie" has gone back to his R & R center across the Cambodian and Laos Borders. And that's exactly what it is over there, a R & R Center and resupply center for the Communists. It is about time we finally did something about it.

Well, I guess you know how I feel. I hope I do not have to bust any heads when I get home. Anyway, it is sickening to know how so many people feel. If they are so damn sore, they are right by demonstrating, but let them come over and find out for sure.

Well, I guess I had better close. Not much happening around here today. Be home soon.

Sp4C. WILLIAM L. PERKINS.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 1232, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution:

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 1232

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there are hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government such amounts as (1) may be necessary to cover salaries, compensation, and pay (including pensions, retired pay, and veterans' readjustment benefits) for the fiscal year 1970, and are provided for in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970, as passed by the House of Representatives May 7, 1970, and (2) may be necessary for the activities for which disbursements are made by the Secretary of the Senate, and by the Architect of the Capitol for Senate items, to the extent and in the manner which would be provided for in the supplemental estimates therefor submitted to the second session of the Ninety-first Congress House Document Numbered 91-272).

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in clause (2) of section 1 of this joint resolution, appropriations made by this joint resolution shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970, and all expenditures made pursu-

ant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever such Act is enacted into law.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing resolution to make available certain funds contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1970 in order to avoid possible payless paydays for civilian and military personnel and to make sure that readjustment benefit payments to veterans who are students and who were recently granted a retroactive increase will be paid on a timely and orderly basis.

Pension and retired pay funds in the supplemental bill are also covered by the joint resolution.

The supplemental bill is now pending in committee in the other body. While we do not of course know just what may develop, it now seems likely that the bill may not be enacted into law in time to avoid some disruptions to scheduled payroll and benefit payments.

The joint resolution was reported to the House this morning. It was a unanimous report from the Committee on Appropriations.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is this the first continuing resolution this year? Are we getting an early start on continuing resolutions?

Mr. MAHON. This is for the remainder of the current fiscal year 1970, which ends in about 6 weeks. It is a means of making sure the Government does not encounter payless paydays and that veterans' payments are made on a timely basis.

Mr. GROSS. It is made necessary in substantial part by the pay increases which were voted by Congress earlier this year?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, and also as a result of increased benefit payments to returning veterans and for other veterans and benefit payments.

Mr. GROSS. The reference in the resolution to the Architect is in relation to pay, is it, or are there other obligations?

Mr. MAHON. That relates to the Senate Office Building. In line with the practice, that item was not in the supplemental bill as passed by the House, so it was necessary to refer to the budget estimate, which is what the language does.

Mr. GROSS. The Senate Office Building? Are they building a new Senate Office Building?

Mr. MAHON. This refers to pay costs of employees engaged in maintaining and operating the Senate Office Building.

Mr. GROSS. For the operation of the Senate Office Building?

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It is included because of comity?

Mr. MAHON. It was not in our version of the supplemental bill. The general practice is to leave it to the other body

to insert items relating solely to housekeeping costs of that body. Similarly they leave to the House the question of determining the requirements for housekeeping costs of the House.

Mr. GROSS. And we always lean over backward in consideration of the other body?

Mr. MAHON. In respect to determination of housekeeping requirements of the other body, I would say that is the general practice.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include excerpts from the committee report in more detailed explanation of the joint resolution:

This joint resolution is intended as a stopgap measure to avoid possible payless paydays for Government employees and interruption of veterans' benefit payments in the event the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1970, H.R. 17399, is not enacted in a timely enough fashion.

The House passed that bill on May 7. Additional supplemental estimates were submitted to the Senate on May 8. This fact, plus the likelihood some hearings may be held in the other body on House actions on the supplemental bill, plus the added probability of conference time, make it seem certain that the bill will not become law in time to avoid delays in some payroll and benefit checks. The committee has been given to understand that there is an especially acute timing problem on veterans' readjustment benefit payments as a result of the recently enacted Veterans' Education and Training Amendments Act.

Government agencies have been operating on a deficiency basis since the beginning of the fiscal year 1970 last July on account of the so-called comparability pay raises under Public Laws 90-206 and 90-207. Supplemental funds for these added costs are contained in titles I and II of the second supplemental bill.

But the day of possible payless paydays for Government employees was hastened somewhat by the recent enactment of Public Law 91-231—the so-called 6-percent retroactive pay bill, effective generally back to December 27, 1969. Supplemental funds for these added costs are contained in title III of the second supplemental bill.

The regular appropriations for fiscal 1970 did not make specific provision for any of these salary increases. But the increased payments have of course been made to personnel throughout the fiscal year in the first instance and more recently in the case of the 6-percent pay raise.

In addition to the timing problem for veterans' benefit payments (supplemental funds for this are in the second supplemental bill), information available from the executive branch indicates that payless paydays will begin to arrive shortly. Pay periods are on a staggered basis, so additional paydays will come along as time goes by. It seems probable from the information at hand that there will be a number of these before the second supplemental bill can reasonably be expected to become law.

In these circumstances, a stopgap resolution seems to be the orderly solution to assure that everyone who is entitled to receive salary or compensation will do so at their regularly scheduled times.

This joint resolution does not authorize any new employees.

This joint resolution does not increase the pay of anyone.

This joint resolution does not authorize any new contracts to be entered into.

This joint resolution does not initiate any new programs.

This joint resolution does not permit expansion of any existing programs.

The sole purpose of the joint resolution is to avoid disruption and delay in respect to otherwise authorized salary and compensation payments.

The joint resolution does not make additional appropriations. That is, it does not add to what the House has already passed upon in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1970. Rather, it is in the nature of a limited advance against what has already been voted by the House for salary and specified compensation purposes heretofore authorized by separate law. (Note.—The minor exception to this is with respect to salary items for Senate housekeeping costs in H. Doc. 91-272 which were, in accord with custom, not in the House bill.) On this latter point, in the words of the joint resolution:

"Appropriations made by this joint resolution shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970, and all expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever such Act is enacted into law.

The accompanying joint resolution as to scope and purpose is in all substantial respects identical to a similar resolution of a year ago when the Government was faced with some payless paydays as a result of delay in finalization of the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969, late in the fiscal year 1969. That joint resolution became Public Law 91-31.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS FOR BILL TO LIMIT EXPENDITURES FOR SOUTH VIETNAM AND PROVIDE FOR WITHDRAWAL OF AMERICAN FORCES BY JUNE 30, 1971

(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, I rise to announce that we now have 73 House cosponsors of H. Res. 1000, the resolution that sets forth the expenditure limitation on money for U.S. military effort in South Vietnam. It would provide for the withdrawal of all American combat and support troops from Vietnam by June 30, 1971.

I hope the people of the country will urge their Congressmen—and all the candidates running for the Congress this year—to indicate their support for H. Res. 1000.

PROTEST DEMONSTRATIONS

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

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, some very dangerous subversive elements are being injected into campus demonstrations. We must warn those who feel tempted to join protest movements of the possible consequences of their actions.

I recently received a copy of an instruction sheet that was provided to student demonstrators at Purdue University in Lafayette, Ind. This sheet tells how to make the most effective use of Molotov cocktails, how to shut down the electric power, how to disrupt the telephone system and the radio communications. The sheet also gives instructions on how to elude police dogs, how to administer ammonia-balloon bombs, how to make slingshots that shoot bolts, how to wreck railroad trains, and how to introduce chemicals into university residence hall water supplies.

Does this sound like the actions of well-meaning students? Or does this sound like deliberate anarchists at work? The dangerous subversives who are organizing these activities travel from campus to campus. Their purpose is to drive a wedge between decent students and their parents, between law-enforcement agencies and youngsters who have never been in trouble, and between misguided citizens and their Federal Government.

It is time we recognize that some of these campus disorders are not led by children playing pranks. They are the deliberately planned activities of a tiny minority of dangerous criminals who want to overthrow the American Government and all of its institutions.

I deeply fear that the majority of well-meaning students who would merely exercise their peaceful right of dissent may be made the pawns of these few.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 952, PROVIDING FOR APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. CELLER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 952) to provide for the appointment of additional district judges, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1086)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 952) to provide for the appointment of additional district judges, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That (a) the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the northern district of Alabama, one additional

district judge for the middle district of Alabama, one additional district judge for the district of Arizona, two additional district judges for the northern district of California, three additional district judges for the central district of California, three additional district judges for the southern district of California, one additional district judge for the district of Colorado, one additional district judge for the middle district of Florida, two additional district judges for the southern district of Florida, three additional district judges for the northern district of Georgia, one additional district judge for the southern district of Georgia, two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Kentucky, one additional district judge for the western district of Kentucky, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Louisiana, one additional district judge for the western district of Louisiana, two additional district judges for the district of Maryland, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Michigan, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Missouri, one additional district judge for the district of Nebraska, one additional district judge for the district of New Jersey, one additional district judge for the district of New Mexico, one additional district judge for the eastern district of New York, three additional district judges for the southern district of New York, one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio, one additional district judge for the southern district of Ohio, six additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, two additional district judges for the western district of Pennsylvania, one additional district judge for the district of Puerto Rico, one additional district judge for the district of South Carolina, one additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee, one additional district judge for northern district of Texas, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas, one additional district judge for the southern district of Texas, one additional district judge for the western district of Texas, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, and one additional district judge for the southern district of West Virginia.

(b) The existing district judgeship for the middle and southern districts of Alabama, heretofore provided for by section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, shall hereafter be a district judgeship for the southern district of Alabama only, and the present incumbent of such judgeship shall henceforth hold his office under such section 133, as amended by subsection (d) of this section.

(c) The existing district judgeship for the district of Kansas, the existing district judgeships for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, and the existing district judgeship for the eastern district of Wisconsin, created by section 5 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes", approved March 18, 1966 (80 Stat. 78), and amended by the Act of September 23, 1967 (81 Stat. 228), shall be permanent judgeships and the present incumbents of such judgeships shall henceforth hold their offices under section 133 of title 28 United States Code, as amended by subsection (d) of this section. The Act of September 23, 1967 (81 Stat. 228), and section 5 of the Act of March 18, 1966 (80 Stat. 78), are repealed.

(d) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of permanent district judgeships for certain judicial districts and combinations of districts, such table is

amended to read as follows with respect to those districts:

Districts	Judges
Alabama:	
Northern	4
Middle	2
Southern	2
Arizona	5
California:	
Northern	11
Central	16
Southern	5
Colorado	4
Florida:	
Middle	6
Southern	7
Georgia:	
Northern	6
Southern	2
Illinois:	
Northern	13
Kansas	4
Kentucky:	
Eastern	2
Western	3
Louisiana:	
Eastern	10
Western	4
Maryland	7
Michigan:	
Eastern	10
Missouri:	
Eastern	3
Nebraska	3
New Jersey	9
New Mexico	3
New York:	
Southern	27
Eastern	9
Ohio:	
Northern	8
Southern	5
Pennsylvania:	
Eastern	19
Western	10
Puerto Rico	3
South Carolina	5
Tennessee:	
Western	3
Texas:	
Northern	6
Southern	8
Eastern	3
Western	5
Virginia:	
Eastern	6
West Virginia:	
Southern	2
Wisconsin:	
Eastern	3

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the district of New Jersey. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in that district shall not be filled.

(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in that district shall not be filled.

(c) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the eastern district of North Carolina. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in that district shall not be filled.

SEC. 3. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, who shall hold office for the term of eight years and until his successor is chosen and qualified, unless sooner removed by the President for cause.

(b) In order to reflect and implement the changes made by subsection (a) of this section, section 24 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 24. (a) The President shall, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint two judges for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, who shall hold office for terms of eight years and until their successors are chosen and qualified, unless sooner removed by the President for cause. The salary of a judge of the district court shall be at the rate prescribed for judges of the United States district courts. Whenever it is made to appear that such an assignment is necessary for the proper dispatch of the business of the district court, the chief judge of the Third Judicial Circuit of the United States may assign a judge of the municipal court of the Virgin Islands or a circuit or district judge of the Third Circuit, or the Chief Justice of the United States may assign any other United States circuit or district judge with the consent of the judge so assigned and of the chief judge of his circuit, to serve temporarily as a judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands. The Compensation of the judges of the district court and the administrative expenses of the court shall be paid from appropriations made for the judiciary of the United States.

"(b) The judge of the district court who is senior in continuous service and under seventy years of age shall be the chief judge of the court and shall have power to appoint officers of the court when and as provided in section 756 of title 28, United States Code. The division of the business of the court among the judges shall be made as prescribed in section 137 of that title.

"(c) The Attorney General shall appoint a United States marshal for the Virgin Islands, to whose office the provisions of chapter 33 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 128(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"EASTERN DISTRICT

"(a) The Eastern District comprises the counties of Adams, Asotin, Benton, Chelan, Columbia, Douglas, Ferry, Franklin, Garfield, Grant, Kittitas, Klickitat, Lincoln, Okanogan, Pend Oreille, Spokane, Stevens, Walla Walla, Whitman, and Yakima.

"Court for the Eastern District shall be held at Spokane, Yakima, Walla Walla, and Richland."

(b) Section 128(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"WESTERN DISTRICT

"(b) The Western District comprises the counties of Challam, Clark, Cowlitz, Grays

Harbor, Island, Jefferson, King, Kitsap, Lewis, Mason, Pacific, Pierce, San Juan, Skagit, Skamania, Snohomish, Thurston, Wahkiakum, and Whatcom.

"Court for the Western District shall be held at Bellingham, Seattle, and Tacoma."

SEC. 5. Section 92 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 92. Idaho

"Idaho, exclusive of Yellowstone National Park, constitutes one judicial district.

"Court shall be held at Boise, Coeur d'Alene, Moscow, and Pocatello."

SEC. 6. Section 118(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"EASTERN DISTRICT

"(a) The Eastern District comprises the counties of Berks, Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Lancaster, Lehigh, Montgomery, Northampton, Philadelphia, and Schuylkill.

"Court for the Eastern District shall be held at Allentown, Easton, Reading, and Philadelphia."

SEC. 7. The second sentence of section 117 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Court shall be held at Coquille, Eugene, Klamath Falls, Medford, Pendleton, and Portland."

SEC. 8. Section 93(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Court for the Western Division shall be held at Freeport," and inserting in lieu thereof "Court for the Western Division shall be held at Freeport and Rockford."

SEC. 9. The third sentence of section 94(b) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Court for the Indianapolis Division shall be held at Indianapolis and Richmond."

SEC. 10. The second paragraph of section 89(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting "Fort Lauderdale," immediately after "shall be held at".

SEC. 11. Section 102(b)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof "and Lansing" and inserting in lieu thereof "Lansing, and Traverse City".

SEC. 12. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 123 (c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting "Haywood," immediately after "Hardin."

(b) Paragraph (2) of such section is amended by striking out "Haywood."

SEC. 13. Section 41 of the Act of March 2, 1917 (ch. 145, 39 Stat. 965; 48 U.S.C. 863), is repealed.

SEC. 14. Section 753 of title 28, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence of subsection (e) is amended by striking out "at not less than \$3,000 nor more than \$7,630 per annum".

(2) A new subsection (f) is added to read as follows:

"(g) If, upon the advice of the chief judge of any district court within the circuit, the judicial council of any circuit determines that the number of court reporters provided such district court pursuant to subsection (a) of this section is insufficient to meet temporary demands and needs and that the services of additional court reporters for such district court should be provided the judges of such district court (including the senior judges thereof when such senior judges are performing substantial judicial services for such court) on a contract basis, rather than by appointment of court reporters as otherwise provided in this section, and such judicial council notifies the Director of the Administrative Office, in writing, of such determination, the Director of the Administrative Office is authorized to and shall contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), with any suitable person, firm, association, or corporation for

the providing of court reporters to serve such district court under such terms and conditions as the Director of the Administrative Office finds, after consultation with the chief judge of the district court, will best serve the needs of such district court."

Sec. 15. (a) Chapter 51 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 795 thereof the following new section:

§ 796. Reporting of court proceedings

"The Court of Claims is authorized to contract for the reporting of all proceedings had in open court, and in such contract to fix the terms and conditions under which such reporting services shall be performed, including the terms and conditions under which transcripts shall be supplied by the contractor to the court and to other persons, departments, and agencies."

(b) The analysis of chapter 51 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"796. Reporting of court proceedings."
And the House agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,
RICHARD H. POFF,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
ROMAN HRUSKA,
HUGH SCOTT,

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 amendment of the House to the bill (S. 952) to provide for the appointment of additional district judges, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below except for minor technical and clarifying changes made necessary by reason of the conference agreement.

ADDITIONAL PERMANENT DISTRICT JUDGES

The first section of the Senate bill authorized 67 new permanent district judges and the first section of the House amendment authorized 54 new permanent district judges. The conference substitute authorizes 58 new permanent district judges, 4 more than was authorized in the House amendment. The 4 new judges not in the House amendment are authorized as follows:

(1) Middle district of Florida.—The Senate bill authorized 2 new judges and the House amendment authorized no new judges. The conference substitute authorizes 1 new judge.

(2) District of Maryland.—The Senate bill authorized 2 new judges and the House amendment authorized 1 new judge. The conference substitute authorizes 2 new judges.

(3) District of Nebraska.—The Senate bill authorized 1 new judge and the House amendment authorized no new judges. The conference substitute authorizes 1 new judge.

(4) Southern district of West Virginia.—The Senate bill authorized 1 new judge and the House amendment authorized no new

judges. The conference substitute authorizes 1 new judge.

DIVISION REALIGNMENT

The House amendment contained a provision not in the Senate bill which moved Panola and Shelby Counties in Texas from the Tyler division of the eastern district of Texas to the Marshall division of that district. The conference substitute conforms to the Senate bill.

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH,
RICHARD H. POFF,

Managers on the Part of the House.

THE DOMINO THEORY

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is my duty today to announce the discovery of a new "domino theory" that says in essence, if you disregard the advice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur and go into the quicksand of an Asian country, like a domino you will fall into the quicksand of another Asian country next to it.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE PARKE MONROE BANTA

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, with a great measure of sadness I rise to officially report to the House the passing on Wednesday, May 13, 1970, of a former Member, the Honorable Parke Monroe Banta, who represented the district I now represent from 1947 to 1949.

I know that all of his former colleagues in the House join me in extending deepest sympathy and condolences to his widow, his three daughters and their families.

The last rites for Mr. Banta will be held this afternoon in Potosi, Missouri, in the Methodist Church.

HOME COMING DAY FOR CONGRESS

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been trying to get the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman

from Maryland (Mr. FRIEDEL), to bring out a resolution, and he says he is working on it, and he is ready for it to come out, to establish a homecoming day for Congress so that all former Members can come back, and let us suspend the rules and permit them to come down and to give them whatever time is available for the number who are present so they can tell us how they are getting along.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked with several former Members, and they are all enthused over the idea. As the Members know, they are now having a series of luncheons, periodically, so I think it would be a great thing for us to do to establish a day each year designated as Homecoming Day for those who served with us, and who have gone on out—and most of whom are doing better than they did when they were here.

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama provide the tea and crumpets to go along with his suggested meeting?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Would I provide what?

Mr. GROSS. The tea and crumpets to go with it?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The tea and crumpets?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I will provide the crumpets if the gentleman will provide the tea.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "REPORT OF SPECIAL STUDY MISSION TO SOUTHERN AFRICA"

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1087) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 520), authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of House Report No. 91-610, 91st Congress, first session, entitled "Report of Special Study Mission to Southern Africa," for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 520

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That an additional one thousand copies of House Report 91-610, Ninety-first Congress, first session, entitled "Report of Special Study Mission to Southern Africa" be printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us the cost of this?

Mr. DENT. The cost of this particular resolution is \$1,125.37.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, will the gentleman, in presenting the other resolutions he has to present, provide us with the costs of those also?

Mr. DENT. All of the resolutions?

Mr. BOW. All of them.

Mr. DENT. I will be happy to do so.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT TRIBUTES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO THE SERVICE OF CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1088) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 537), providing for the printing as a House document the tributes of the Members of Congress to the service of Chief Justice Earl Warren, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 537

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed, with an appropriate illustration, as a House document, a compilation of tributes by Members of the House and the Senate in the Halls of the Congress, to commemorate the years of service of Chief Justice Earl Warren on the occasion of his retirement from the Supreme Court.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed and bound as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing four thousand five hundred copies, of which one thousand seven hundred and ninety copies shall be for the use of the House Administration Committee, two thousand one hundred and ninety-five shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and five hundred and fifteen copies for the use of the Senate.

SEC. 3. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House document rooms.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members of the House, the cost of this resolution is \$2,962.67.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman be good enough to tell us who insisted on this publication?

Mr. DENT. There was really no insistence. It was introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) and there were only two opposing votes.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPILATION OF WORKS OF ART AND OTHER OBJECTS IN THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration,

I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1089) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 578) authorizing the reprinting of a "Compilation of Works of Art and Other Objects in the U.S. Capitol," as a House document, and for other purposes, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 578

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be reprinted with black and white and color illustrations and with emendations as a House document a "Compilation of Works of Art and Other Objects in the United States Capitol", as prepared under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol; and that there be printed thirty-six thousand two hundred and fifty additional copies of such document, of which ten thousand three hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, twenty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and four thousand copies for the use of the Architect of the Capitol.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of information, the exact cost of this resolution is not available at this time, but it has been estimated that the cost is \$76,800.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PRINTING FOR THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1090) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 580) authorizing certain printing for the Select Committee on Crime, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 580

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Crime of the House of Representatives ten thousand additional copies of House Report Numbered 978 of the Ninety-first Congress, second session, entitled "Marihuana".

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of information, the cost of this resolution is \$1,821.30.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1091) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 584) relative to printing as a House document a history of the Committee on Agriculture, and ask for

immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 584

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed, with illustrations, as a House document a brief history of the House Committee on Agriculture, and materials relating to it, in connection with its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary (1820-1970).

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed five thousand copies of such document for use of the Committee on Agriculture.

SEC. 3. Seventy-five copies shall be bound with a buckram cover and gold lettering for the use of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of information, this particular resolution costs \$2,295.19.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUMMARY OF VETERANS LEGISLATION REPORTED, 91ST CONGRESS

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Rept. No. 91-1092) on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 585) authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and ask for immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 585

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives fifty-six thousand one hundred copies of a publication entitled "Summary of Veterans Legislation Reported, Ninety-first Congress", with an additional forty-three thousand nine hundred copies for the use of Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. DENT. For the purpose of information, this resolution costs \$3,882.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF "INVESTIGATION OF STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY, PART 7-A (RETURN OF PRISONERS OF WAR, AND DATA CONCERNING CAMERA NEWS, INC., 'NEWS-REEL')"

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged report (Report No. 91-1093) on the resolution (H. Res. 1006) authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings entitled "Investigation of Students for a Democratic Society, Part 7-A (Return of Prisoners of War, and Data Concerning Camera News, Inc., 'Newsreel')", and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1006

Resolved, That there shall be printed concurrently two thousand additional copies of the hearings held December 9-11, and 16, 1969, entitled "Investigation of Students for a Democratic Society, Part 7-A (Return of Prisoners of War, and Data Concerning Camera News, Inc., 'Newsreel')" for the use of the Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of information, the resolution costs \$1,108.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. 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. 119]

Anderson, Tenn.	Flynt	Minshall
Ashbrook	Fraser	Mollohan
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	Moorhead
Baring	Frey	Morse
Blaggi	Gallagher	Morton
Bingham	Gray	Mosher
Blanton	Green, Oreg.	Olsen
Blatnik	Griffiths	Ottinger
Brademas	Gubser	Pelly
Brasco	Hall	Podell
Brooks	Halpern	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hanna	Price, Tex.
Bush	Hansen, Wash.	Purcell
Button	Harvey	Reid, N.Y.
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Schadeberg
Celler	Hébert	Scheuer
Chappell	Heckler, Mass.	Schneebell
Chisholm	Horton	Sikes
Clark	Hull	Skubitz
Clay	Kirwan	Steiger, Wis.
Cohelan	Kluczynski	Stokes
Collier	Kuykendall	Stratton
Conyers	Kyros	Stubblefield
Culver	Lennon	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	Long, La.	Teague, Tex.
Daddario	McCarthy	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	McCloskey	Tunney
Dickinson	McEwen	Waldie
Edwards, La.	McFall	Whalen
Esch	McMillan	Wilson, Bob
Fallon	Mann	Winn
Farbstein	Melcher	Yatron
	Meskill	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 332 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 13, 1970.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been an honor and a privilege to work with the many fine men who are members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on which I have served during the 90th and 91st Congress.

My association with the members and the benefit of their counsel will always mark a high point in my career.

The problems which come before the Committee have been challenging and the work rewarding. New fields have been explored, and new technological knowledge has been gained.

However, I wish to submit my resignation effective today.

Respectfully,

DANIEL E. BUTTON,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES TO FILE A
REPORT ON H.R. 17604, UNTIL
MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight, Friday, May 15, to file a report on H.R. 17604.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON
PUBLIC WORKS TO FILE A
REPORT ON H.R. 15712, UNTIL
MIDNIGHT FRIDAY

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight on Friday, May 15, 1970, to file a report on H.R. 15712, to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, to extend the authorizations for title I through IV through fiscal year 1971.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE,
AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY,
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1004 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1004

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move, clause 6 of Rule XXI to the contrary notwithstanding, 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. 17575) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the provisions contained under the following headings are hereby waived: "Law Enforcement Assistance Administration" beginning on page 19, line 14 through line 19; "Economic Development Administration" beginning on page 23, line 5 through line 23; "National Bureau of Standards" beginning on page 29, line 7 through line 16; "Maritime Administration" beginning on page 30, line 13 through page 33, line 12; "Arms Control and Disarmament Agency" beginning on page 43, line 8 through line 12; "Commission on Civil Rights" beginning on page 43, line 14 through line 17; and "Small Business Administration" beginning on page 45, line 17 through page 46, line 10.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1004 waives points of order against the consideration of H.R. 17575, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1971. Otherwise the bill could not have been considered today because it would not have been in compliance with clause 6 of rule XXI, which provides that printed hearings and the committee report must have been available at least 3 calendar days before an appropriation bill is considered in the House.

Due to the fact that the authorization bills have not been signed into law, points of order are also waived against certain provisions of the bill contained under the following headings: "Law Enforcement Assistance Administration," page 19; "Economic Development Administration," page 23; "National Bureau of Standards," page 29; "Maritime Administration," page 30; "Arms Control and Disarmament Agency," page 43; "Commission on Civil Rights," page 43; and "Small Business Administration," page 45.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1004.

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, House Resolution 1004 has been explained in minute detail, also the bill, by the gentleman from Indiana. I concur in his remarks and urge adoption of the rule.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

I want to say that, as with the Independent Offices Appropriation bill we have had all too little time to get into the hearings on this bill.

Here are four volumes of hearings, and the gentleman can see they are not small volumes. I believe they contain between 4,000 and 5,000 pages. It has been difficult in the short time we have had, as evidenced by the waivers of points of order on this bill, to profit by the extensive hearings that were held. I commend the chairman (Mr. ROONEY) and the Subcommittee on Appropriations which handles these various departments and agencies of Government for the exhaustive hearings they have conducted. But here we are with practically no time to read the hearings and profit thereby.

I would suggest, as I did to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill, that hereafter as the various volumes are completed they be released so that we may have some time in which to peruse them.

Mr. SMITH of California. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from

Iowa that once again the Rules Committee is attempting to help in connection with the legislation and consideration of it so that eventually we can adjourn this year before December 23.

In February our distinguished Speaker—for which I commend him very highly—called a meeting of the leadership on both sides and of the chairmen and ranking minority members of all the committees. At that time each committee discussed the legislation and the procedures and how many bills they thought they would have before the Rules Committee. We particularly wanted to know, because as the gentleman will recall a couple of years ago we set a cutoff date. Following that, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) chairman of the Appropriations Committee, submitted a time schedule to the committee as to the time when the Appropriations Committee would consider the bills. This bill was supposed to have been reported on Friday, May 15, and considered on May 19. So they are ahead of schedule.

We are attempting to cooperate. I certainly understand the predicament of the gentleman from Iowa. I guess we will have to see what the Senate does and where we go with the other body, and maybe later on we will have to have a supplemental, but we will never get out unless we cooperate on this schedule.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the Rules Committee. I understand the facts of life that the gentleman mentioned, and I realize that the authorization bills covering many of the appropriations in this bill have not been finally approved, and therefore, if we are going to get the appropriation bills through in any reasonable time, this method must be adopted.

I only urge that the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee certainly under these circumstances should release their hearings as they become available so that we may have the benefit of them, if there is any benefit to be gained.

Mr. SMITH of California. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from California yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in this particular case the hearings were released practically upon receipt from the Government Printing Office. The Justice-Judiciary volume was released to the press and was available to all the Members of the House on Wednesday, May 6; the State Department hearings were available on Thursday, May 7; the Commerce hearings, on Friday, May 8; and the Related Agencies volume on Saturday, May 9.

There has been some trouble this year, as we all know, with the Government Printing Office getting our printing out. This has contributed to the delay in getting some of these hearings available for the Members of the House.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.R. 1004.

I do not have any further requests for time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana or of the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the subcommittee, when the report of this bill became available to the Members of the House?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. On Saturday last.

Mr. O'HARA. Was it filed on Saturday?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No; it was printed and available on Saturday.

Mr. O'HARA. Of course, as the gentleman knows, the difficulty with that is that the document room does not open up until some time Monday. If the report is available on Saturday the Members of the House generally are not able to get it until Monday, and usually not until around noon Monday. In any event, the date on the report is May 12.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is the date on which the full Committee on Appropriations met and approved this bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Then the report could not have been available before then, could it?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes; it was.

Mr. O'HARA. It is like "Alice in Wonderland." You will remember the Queen of Hearts said, "Sentence first, and then verdict."

Here we had the report before the committee had acted.

Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of agreeing with the gentleman from Iowa.

If we examine the procedures of the Committee on Appropriations generally, they are subject to some legitimate criticism because time after time the committee obtains until midnight Friday to file a report. The rules require that reports be available for 3 days, and the 3-day requirement is met then on Saturday, Sunday, and Monday. The Members of the House do not have an opportunity to see the report until around noon on Monday. Then on Tuesday we are confronted with the bill.

It is virtually a fait accompli. It makes it difficult for Members even to know what is in the bill, much less how to go about amending it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. This is no criticism of the gentleman from New York. It seems to be the regular practice. I believe we ought to change that regular practice. I do not believe we ought to do it on this particular rule or on this particular bill, because that would imply some criticism

of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I do not intend any, because I do not believe he has done anything for which he ought to be criticized.

I do believe the House ought to take a good, long, hard look at appropriations procedures so that Members will have a fuller opportunity to know what is in these very important bills before they are actually brought to the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, as has been said here, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee announced on March 17 what the schedule would be for the remainder of this year. I had hoped he would be here on the floor, because I was going to commend him, since he is ahead of schedule now. In fact, we are ahead of the schedule set out for this particular bill, which was May 18, since here we are on May 14 considering it.

I want to commend also the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) for getting his work done in such proper time, and so well done, as normally it is well done.

I do want to register the objection, Mr. Speaker, to the very accelerated way we are considering this. My staff advises me that we were not able to get the committee report until yesterday, and the hearings until Tuesday. There are some 4,000 pages, as the gentleman from Iowa pointed out, a very detailed questioning of the witnesses.

This is a very important matter. I know the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York, and his subcommittees, did a workmanlike job on it. I do hope in the future we can have a greater amount of time.

Again I wish to commend the gentleman from Texas for keeping his committee on the ball and being 4 days ahead of time.

Mr. Chairman, give us a little more time to read that wonderful prose that you get out over there so perhaps we can participate more meaningfully in the discussion of this most important matter.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Will the distinguished gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think the gentleman from Florida will find that these printed hearings will be good reading from now to the end of the year.

Mr. GIBBONS. I am sure they will, but I would like to have the opportunity and I am sure all of the other 434 Members of the House would like to read it before we vote on the bill rather than after.

Mr. MADDEN. 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. ROONEY of New York. 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. 17575) 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; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between and controlled by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair designates as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and requests the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PRICE) to temporarily assume the chair.

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. 17575, with Mr. PRICE of Illinois (Chairman pro tempore) 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 pro tempore. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, this bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1971 contains a total in new obligatory authority of \$3,106,956,500, which is a reduction of \$136,948,500 in the total amount of the budget estimates. The amount allowed is an increase, however, of \$574,087,800 over the total appropriated to date for the current fiscal year. The following table is a résumé of the committee's action:

Department or agency (1)	New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) (2)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (3)	New budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill (4)	Bill compared with—	
				New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970 (enacted to date) (5)	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (6)
Department of State.....	\$404,132,100	\$452,534,000	\$447,381,800	+\$43,249,700	-\$5,152,200
Department of Justice.....	809,738,000	1,127,510,000	1,117,223,000	+\$307,485,000	-10,287,000
Department of Commerce.....	779,726,000	1,007,170,000	949,203,000	+\$169,477,000	-57,967,000
The Judiciary.....	121,026,200	134,341,600	132,956,300	+\$11,930,100	-1,385,300
Related agencies.....	418,246,400	522,349,400	460,192,400	+\$41,946,000	-62,157,000
Total.....	2,532,868,700	3,243,905,000	3,106,956,500	+\$574,087,800	-136,948,500

Titles I and II of the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1970 as passed by the House contained an additional \$119,013,200 for the various departments and agencies covered by the bill for the current fiscal year, thus making the actual increase \$455,074,600.

The largest increase in this bill is for the Department of Justice. There is included an additional \$267,326,000 over the comparable amount provided for the current fiscal year. This is recommended by the committee to combat crime, violence, drug addiction, racial discrimination, unlawful exploitation of the consumer, and unconscionable pollution of our natural resources.

The next largest increase in the bill is for the Maritime Administration. We have an increase of \$194,292,000 in new obligatory authority which we recommend.

Now, to proceed to the first of the Departments concerned, to wit, the Department of State. The total amount recommended in the bill for the Department of State is \$447,381,000. This is a decrease of \$5,152,200 below the total amount of the budget estimates. However, it is an increase of \$43,249,700 in new obligatory authority over the amount appropriated to date for the current

fiscal year and is an increase of \$26,678,700 when the increases included in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1970 as passed by the House are taken into consideration.

The first of the items and the largest for the Department of State is that entitled "Salaries and expenses." There is included in the bill the amount of \$220.1 million to provide the necessary funds for the formulation and execution of the foreign policy of the United States, including the conduct of diplomatic and consular relations with foreign countries, the conduct of diplomatic relations with international organizations, public information and related activities.

The amount recommended by the committee is a decrease of \$395,600 below the appropriation for the current fiscal year when the proposed Pay Act supplemental is taken into consideration and is a decrease of \$300,000 below the amount of the budget estimates.

The decrease below the appropriation for the current fiscal year is due to employment reductions ordered by the present and previous administrations.

In order to clear some of the misleading information disseminated concerning the Passport Office, detailed testimony was taken in respect to its staffing.

This testimony appears at pages 249 through 263 of part II of the printed hearings. This testimony discloses that in the past 4 fiscal years the Passport Office not only received every position which was requested of the Congress by the Department for that Office, but also was granted 24 positions over and above such request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield now or at a later time?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I shall be glad to now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How did the State Department come out on its representation allowances—the wining and dining fund this year?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Exactly the same as it has for the last 6 years. Mr. GROSS. A sum of \$993,000?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is the amount.

Mr. GROSS. The price of food and drink did not go up?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa and I should be among the first to know that it has gone up, but we have enough in the appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I just want to be sure that the State Department is well taken care of in what the gentleman has described in the past as "the tools of the trade."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We like for them to soberly pursue their duties as we do here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. This is part of foreign policy?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, yes.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Now, I note that under the educational exchange program, it states, "not to exceed \$10,000 for representation expenses; not to exceed \$1,000 for official entertainment." What is the difference between representation allowance and official entertainment?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. One is in the United States, the other is abroad. The representation allowance is for activities abroad, and the entertainment money is for use in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. It takes then, \$11,000 to provide for the wining and dining for those in the educational program?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No. As I have previously explained to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, this is the Coca-Cola and cracker fund.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, it is?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. These are exchange students, you know, and we do not wine and dine them.

Mr. GROSS. But it will provide Coca-Cola and crumpets, or crackers?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, I do not believe we need to go into those details.

Mr. GROSS. I see. But the \$11,000 is for entertainment of one kind or another?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is.

Mr. GROSS. Does not this contribute to our deficit balance of payments to spend this kind of money abroad?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Hardly.

Mr. GROSS. Hardly?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we will be getting down to the balance-of-payments business later in this bill. I thought that it was deemed necessary to spend \$4 million a year to promote tourism in the United States, because of the outflow of money and this seems to run rather somewhat counter to that.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No. This is only \$11,000. This would not raise a ripple on the pond.

Mr. GROSS. Even so, it is \$11,000.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, I will have to concede that.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, in regard to that \$11,000, we have authorized more than that today out of the Committee on House Administration to print booklets, including some for the former Chief Justice. I do not think the items we have been talking about will have much effect on our balance of payments.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will not lose sight of the fact that the taxpayer has been well looked after in this bill to the extent of a reduction of \$136,948,500.

The next item I would like to make reference to is the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico. Here we have a construction item, and included therein is a very important \$3,800,000 for the lower Rio Grande flood control improvement program recommended by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA) and \$400,000 for the Tijuana River flood control.

With regard to the International Fisheries Commissions, the committee has allowed the sum of \$2,505,800, which includes \$1,352,000 recommended by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

Now, to get to the Department of Justice, assuming there are no further questions with regard to what we have covered up to now, the total amount contained in the bill for the Department of Justice is \$1,117,223,000, which is an increase of \$267,326,000 over the total appropriations for this Department for the current fiscal year, including the funds contained in titles I and II of the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1970, as passed by the House.

The largest increase is for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration for which a total of \$480 million is provided in the bill, an increase of \$212 million over the current year's appropriation.

The committee has again recommended the appropriation of the full amount of the budget estimates for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

The full amount of the budget estimate has been provided for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, with the single exception of funds requested for some

fence construction at \$1.14 an inch, which the committee denied.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. Is it not true that the administration requested \$19 million for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice in effect to apply science and technology to improve our criminal justice system? Is it not also true that in the committee report it was mandated that additional funds requested for research and development should be used for increases in the action grant programs, which in effect denies those funds to the National Institute of Criminal Justice?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The committee felt that the action grant programs are far more important.

We need policemen to keep law and order—and not professors writing books and creating expensive nonproductive studies—I have a list of them here if the gentleman wants to discuss them later on.

Mr. SCHEUER. Yes, I would be very happy to.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The committee, mind you, has allowed the entire amount for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, to wit, \$480 million.

Mr. SCHEUER. I just want to make it clear to my colleague that while the committee provides the amount requested for Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, it does not provide the amount requested by the Attorney General for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I feel confident that the Attorney General and the Department of Justice will be satisfied with the action of the committee regarding this \$480 million.

Mr. SCHEUER. May I simply point out to my colleague that the Attorney General on March 31 said that he could see the day when the Institute would receive 10 percent of the funds of LEAA, which would be in the area of \$48 million.

His request was only for \$19 million and this was reduced by the action of the committee to \$7 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No, \$7.5 million. Perhaps some of us speak to different people and get different impressions.

Mr. SCHEUER. This is a quote of something from the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, I am not denying the quote—and I think the gentleman would not deliberately misquote the Attorney General.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Now we shall proceed to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, before doing that will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would the distinguished gentleman from New York comment—since this present subject is dealing with

Federal prisons—would the gentleman comment on the attempt to get money from the Federal Government for the construction of prison facilities at a cost of what was it?—\$64,000 per inmate.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct—and there is no money in this bill for that construction.

Mr. GROSS. I want to commend the gentleman for stopping it, for any such figure is ludicrous.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The details of this, I may say, if the gentleman will permit me, are to be found in the printed hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I had the opportunity to glance at the printed hearings. I did not have the chance to read as much as I would have liked to, but I want to again commend the committee, and especially the chairman, for denying this kind of expenditure for this purpose.

I also noted in the hearings that they asked for—what was it—three-quarters of a pound of meat per day for every inmate in a federal prison.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well it appears that, we must have our penal prisoners better fed than the poor citizens who believe in obeying the law who are not in prison. That, apparently, is the theory.

Mr. GROSS. I trust that the committee denied them the increase they asked for this purpose, because this morning I took the time to call the Department of Agriculture and found that the average daily trimmed meat consumption in the United States is less than half a pound. As I understand it, the request for the additional funds to provide three-quarters of a pound of meat for every Federal prisoner would provide meat that was less the bone, less the gristle, and less the fat. I say again that the average consumption of meat in this country by our citizens, the daily per capita input of meat, is slightly less than a half pound each. I certainly want to again commend the committee for the denial of funds for purposes of that kind. If Federal prisoners were to be better fed than the citizens of this country, particularly those in the lower income brackets, it would be a pretty sad day.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The colloquy with regard to this subject is to be found at pages 1054 and 1055 of the printed hearings.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I wondered whether my distinguished friend from Iowa found in the hearings also, in addition to the fresh meat that we were asked to provide for the prisoners, the fact that funds were requested in this bill to provide prisoners with fresh orange juice instead of canned. I wonder if the gentleman also noticed that they requested two gymnasiums. If we give them better than the national average in food, including fresh orange juice, we may find that when they get out of prison, things will not be as good and they will break the law again just to get back in.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That information is astounding. It means that I am going to have to continue reading these hearings in preparation, I guess, for next year.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have said they would make good reading for the rest of this year.

Mr. GROSS. I found some good reading up to this point. I assume the gymnasiums account for some of the \$64,000 per inmate that was requested in the construction of new facilities.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sorry but the \$64,000 is for new buildings. This does not include the gymnasiums. These were requested from other areas. No, the \$64,000 suite with fresh orange juice and fresh meat above the national average does not include the 2 gymnasiums.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, without any gristle, bone or fat. Again I commend the committee for the action they took.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the budget request for the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 1971 totals \$1,007,170,000 in new budget obligational authority, for which the committee recommends a total of \$949,203,000 in this bill. In addition, \$194,348,000, the amount of the budget estimate, is included for liquidation of contract authority. The total recommended is \$57,967,000 less than the requested appropriation. But there is a net increase of \$129,923,000 over the total appropriated for the current fiscal year, including funds in titles I and II of the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1970 that was passed by the House. This increase is largely attributable to funds included to support the new maritime program.

As to the Economic Development Administration, the total request for fiscal year 1971 comes to \$263,000,000. The amount recommended in the bill is \$251,300,000, a reduction of \$11,700,000 from the total requested. It is an increase of \$2,818,000 over the 1970 appropriation, including funds for increased pay costs included in title II of the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1970, as passed by the House.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if I understand exactly what the report indicates in regard to EDA. Is it not true that funds were transferred from the Economic Development Administration to regional development programs?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. To the regional action planning commissions, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. To the regional planning commissions?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes.

Mr. KYL. In other words, then, the appropriation here, if we included those planning commissions, would result in a substantially larger increase for this area of spending from that the gentleman indicated?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There is \$29 million included in this bill for the regional action planning commissions.

Mr. KYL. Yes. And this actually could be considered a part of the EDA as it was originally constituted.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. As it was up until this time, yes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, for the Office of Minority Business Enterprise in the Department of Commerce, Salaries and Expenses, the sum of \$1,850,000 is included in the bill. This amount is to provide for expenses of carrying out Executive Order 11458, dated March 5, 1969, which established the Office of Minority Business Enterprise. This sum is the full amount of the revised budget request and is \$556,000 more than the appropriation for the current fiscal year, including funds in title II of the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1970, as passed by the House.

There is included the amount of \$4,500,000 for the U.S. Travel Service.

There is also included the sum of \$196,750,000 in the four appropriation items which make up in the Environmental Science Services Administration.

Included therein, the committee has provided—and I am brought to say this by the very recent tragedy in Lubbock, Tex.—for a program which will give the highest priority to the Nationwide Natural Disaster Warning System.

To proceed to the Maritime Administration, the funds provided in the bill will provide for approximately 19 new ships by way of construction subsidies. It will also provide funds to keep the nuclear ship *Savannah* sailing rather than to lay it up.

If there are no questions with regard to the judiciary, I shall proceed to the "Related agencies."

There is included \$460,192,400 in new operational authority for these 13 agencies. This is a reduction of \$62,157,000 from the budget estimates, and an increase of \$27,464,000 over the total appropriated for the current fiscal year.

As to the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, it might be interesting to read the third paragraph on page 23 of the report:

The Committee is at a distinct loss to understand how color television sets and new electric refrigerators purchased with the American taxpayers dollars, and installed in the private offices of those in the upper echelons of this agency, will materially contribute to arms control and disarmament activities. The discussion in connection therewith is set forth on pages 20 and 28 of Part IV of the printed hearings.

When we got to that and inquired as to why they would want \$400 apiece brandnew color television sets, we were informed that they wanted them to hear President Nixon at his press conferences, and at that point President Nixon had not had a press conference since last January.

We did not inquire as to what they were going to put in the brand new refrigerators. I thought they were pretty highbanded in doing what they did and

using the taxpayers' money for such purposes.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Would they come back down to their offices at night to see those night press conferences on television?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Now the gentleman is asking me a question I cannot answer.

Mr. GROSS. It is incongruous to think they would have to have a color television set in their offices downtown in order to see a night Presidential press conference.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They could have gotten a \$12 radio and heard it over the radio.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; they certainly could.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. But color television is highly interesting.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman would admit there are some things to be seen on color television sets, and some things which could be taken from the refrigerator, which could be disarming.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The horse racing, I am told, is very good on Saturday afternoon in color.

Mr. GROSS. In living color.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Also included in this bill is \$3.2 million, the amount of the budget estimates, for the Commission on Civil Rights.

I do not agree as to the action of the majority of the committee in every respect, so far as this bill is concerned, and I am entitled to that privilege. They have taken some actions which did not follow my recommendations. That is the privilege of the members of the subcommittee. This is a democratic subcommittee. I supported the full amount for the anti-trust division, Community Relations Service, Civil Rights Education, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and for funds necessary to carry out the provisions of section 406 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 as requested by the Small Business Administration.

Now we get to the Small Business Administration, where we have provided \$220,290,000 which is an increase of \$26,225,000 over the total appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that point, as to the SBA?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman in the hearings before his subcommittee get into any of the manipulations that have been going on in connection with the Maine sugar industries and the attempt to go down to Norfolk, Va.?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The Maine sugar refinery business was the doing of the Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce, whereas the Old Dominion Sugar business in Vir-

ginia is the doing or the attempted doing—let me put it that way—of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee get into that to any extent?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes. I am not sure but I have a sneaky idea they are not going ahead with the lease guarantee for that one in Virginia. Would the gentleman from Ohio more or less agree with me on that?

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield, I agree with my chairman. They probably will not.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They did not know of the fiasco with the taxpayers' money in Maine over the building of the sugar refinery.

Mr. GROSS. And especially so when there are privately operated sugar refineries excess to needs now.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have a couple of big ones in my congressional district. There are sugar refineries in Boston. There is no reason to go into Maine to wean those down Easterns away from growing Maine potatoes, to grow sugar beets in competition with I do not know how many States of the Union.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. I notice the talk is about something beyond the point I was particularly interested in. On page 25 there is a listing of the Subversive Activities Control Board. Did they justify their continued existence before the committee? I understand their jurisdiction has been greatly hampered. I wonder what their jurisdiction now is?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They have practically no jurisdiction at the present time. As I said to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) in the full committee, they are in a standby position.

We have been told by administration officials, that they wanted us to go ahead with this appropriation because they were going to find new duties for the Board. I do not know what duties they will find for them. But I do not think it is a function of this committee to cut their appropriation out completely. We have them down to bare bones, and we do have to pay salaries to the Presidential appointees.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. At the top of page 44 there is an item which has to do with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. There is a total of \$14,313,000 involved there. It is my understanding that this Commission having to do with employment opportunities has been holding some hearings, the third of which is scheduled for Houston, Tex., on or about June 1.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think they are down in Houston, Tex., right now, because the chairman tried to get me from Houston and I tried to call him back in Houston only yesterday and last night.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. They are probably down there getting several floors of one of the hotels in order to house the people who will be there for this hearing.

It is my understanding under the 1964 Civil Rights Act that the Commission is authorized to hold hearings, and they have subpoena powers to do so, on the basis of charges preferred. In these hearings no charges are preferred, but they have a letter of "invitation" out to some 27, as I recall it, businesses and labor unions to come into these hearings and to bring their records, as it is a public hearing, and to divulge their inner operations under inquiry and investigation. I am wondering where the authority comes to this Commission to be holding such hearings. It is an ultra vires proceeding.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This was one of the items I was referring to when I said that the committee would not follow my judgment insofar as the amount recommended was concerned. I recommended the full amount requested for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission rather than the \$14,313,000 included in this bill. I think they are a necessary Commission and that they produce a lot of good insofar as our minority people in the United States are concerned.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. I am not complaining, if the gentleman will yield further, about the existence of the Commission. I am complaining about their operation. I think they are indulging in an illegal operation. These people who have been invited to these hearings have not asked for my advice, and as I said the other morning in the happy hour, in a 1-minute speech, I have never been in contact with those people, I ended up my remarks by saying that the only way this sort of an ultra vires proceeding will be stopped is for people to ignore their invitation and not appear. As far as I can determine the law, they have no authority to hold this kind of hearing.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They have done a lot of good, I must say. Under my friend Cliff Alexander as chairman of this Commission, they held hearings in New York and found out that the great New York Times, that ultraliberal newspaper, had all of about three Negro reporters out of over two hundred reporters. And no Puerto Rican reporters at all.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the point I am making is that if they have a complaint filed against any business or any labor organization or any individual and his employment practices, that is one thing. They do have then—there is no question about it—the right to hold hearings and the subpoena powers, duces tecum powers, to produce records, and make a proper investigation.

But where no complaint has been filed, to call people in to open up their records at a public hearing mind you, they do not as far as I can determine, have any such authority. To spend taxpayers' money to conduct this sort of investigation is to me totally unreasonable.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished gentleman from New York yield to me at this point?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

Mr. BOW. I am delighted that the distinguished gentleman from Texas has raised this question. This is one of those items in the bill with which, I am afraid, my distinguished chairman does not agree. He has very strongly supported the items concerned with civil rights and our committee has overruled him at times. But let me tell you something about this Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, if you will yield further, the 1965 appropriation was \$2,250,000. That is a lot of money. But in this pending bill there is \$14,313,000. Yet they are complaining that we did not give them enough. In other words, in a 6-year period this outfit has grown by 6½ times its original size. Their authorized strength has increased from 314 positions in 1967 to 780 positions in 1970, and this will continue to increase. Yet, in April of this year they had 98 vacancies. And, they are still complaining that we did not give them enough money. Perhaps we have given them a little too much money.

The gentleman raised some question as to what they accomplish. I would like to read a recent item concerning this Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I am reading from the Wall Street Journal, a reputable newspaper, of March 10, 1970:

Telling Polish Jokes about fellow employees may be illegal. An employer who tolerated ridicule of a Polish steelworker's national origin violated the Federal ban on job discrimination, the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission rules. The joke-tellers said the Polish worker was hypersensitive.

So, this Commission has done an outstanding job in that they have found that telling Polish jokes is a violation of the law.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I thoroughly agree with that decision. I have read a copy of that alleged joke and I resent it very, very much on behalf of my constituents of Polish birth and descent.

Mr. BOW. I knew the gentleman from New York would because he has a great many constituents of Polish origin in his district and has good reason to feel the way he does about it.

Mr. BURLESON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am not complaining about this Commission alone. However, this operation is most repugnant and most flagrant. I am not complaining about whether it is a precedent or not, it is certainly an example of a Federal agency encroaching—and there is already enough encroachment legally—on the people of this country—by Federal agencies. But here is an invitation to every Federal agency to go out over this country and hold ultra vires proceedings without any authority to do so.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be governed by fiat in this country, we might as well adjourn this Congress and

turn it over to them, something we have already done to a very great degree.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the gentleman that the bill makes available to the Subversive Activities Control Board approximately \$400,000 to carry on its activities. What activities does the Subversive Activities Control Board carry on now that the courts have stripped it of all its functions?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Well, I explained that to the gentleman from Illinois thoroughly, I thought, before the full committee, and I again referred to it just a while ago.

I am told they have to be kept in a standby status.

Mr. YATES. They are now in mothballs?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes, mothballs, or something like mothballs.

Mr. YATES. But the White House has asked for these funds?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I sought to get an OK from the White House to eliminate the request.

Mr. YATES. Well, the gentleman is correct. The Board has nothing to do. It should be abolished.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak briefly in support of this bill.

My distinguished friend from New York, our chairman, has again given us a fine explanation of the details of this bill. He chairs the committee carefully, and is thoroughly familiar with the programs supported by funds provided in it. There is little more to say except to highlight one or two points.

The report indicates, as the Members will notice, that the agencies included have been reduced by \$136,948,500. I believe this is a responsible reduction, and this committee has generally recommended a substantial reduction from the budget request. We have tried to balance priorities in this bill, and it represents a compromise. We are not all in agreement on each amount contained herein, but we are in agreement that this is a good bill. The bill should be passed without amendment, although I am sure the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, would have preferred higher amounts for the several items in the bill concerned with civil rights.

Mr. Chairman, the State Department's budget is particularly interesting. This bill provides for the third consecutive reduction in employment. By the end of fiscal year 1971 a total of 1,675 employees will have been removed from the rolls of this agency. It is to credit of this committee that we have been able to reduce this agency within the budget requirements that we have. And, it is to State's credit that they have been able to continue to meet their responsibilities with this substantial reduction in staff.

The bill also provides an increase of \$5 million for educational exchange.

In the Department of Justice we have provided an increase of \$212 million for Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and the full amount requested by the FBI.

This bill also contains a substantial increase, the full amount requested, for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. These funds should improve and strengthen our national effort against the continued increase in crime throughout the country.

We have also provided, except for the fence mentioned by the gentleman from New York, the full amount requested by the Department of Immigration and Naturalization. They do an excellent job. It may be of interest to note that the committee heard testimony that there is a 17-percent increase in the number of persons that arrived at air and sea-ports last year. And, we now have 80,000 Cuban refugees in the United States, who will become eligible for citizenship during the next 2 years. This is representative of the increasing workload of this Agency.

In the Department of Commerce we have increased the appropriation for ship construction.

The distinguished gentleman from New York increased the amount for this purpose last year, but it was deleted on a point of order because at that time, they were not authorized.

I am pleased to say that the President has signed the bill yesterday. The ships are now authorized and we can now build them.

On this question of ships, I again point out what I believe is a sad state of affairs—that the American flag is no longer flying in the Atlantic and on many of the seas of the world on passenger ships.

We have beautiful passenger ships tied up in storage and I hope that in next year's bill we can provide the necessary funds to assist in returning these passenger ships to active service. There is no justifiable reason why one can see Soviet passenger ships, but no American vessels in the Port of Montreal or many other ports in the world. The *United States* is tied up—the *Argentine* and *Brazil* are tied up. The *Constitution*, the *Independence* and the *Atlantic* are tied up, and I could name others.

We have only two ships on the Pacific that I know are still in operation—the *Cleveland* and the *Wilson*. It is indeed unfortunate for this country that most of our passenger ships are no longer in service.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I notice in the hearings on Business and Defense Service Administration, Department of Commerce, you had before you one William D. Lee, who wanted eight new positions and a \$100,000 increase, apparently, to "develop a unique base of information on U.S. consumption and trade of manufactured goods."

Now just what does that mean?

Mr. BOW. I am sorry that I cannot tell the gentleman what it means. But I can tell the gentleman this—they got abso-

lutely nothing. Does that help to answer your question?

Mr. GROSS. This and other requests from this gentleman indicate the committee was completely justified in giving him nothing.

Mr. BOW. That is what he got. Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, while it is somewhat unclear from the Appropriation Committee report, it appears that the committee has refused to approve any increase in funding for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, the research and development arm of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

In fiscal year 1970, the House-Senate conference approved \$7.5 million for the Institute. This was considerably less than was requested, and I opposed that action. For fiscal year 1971, the Department of Justice requested \$19 million for the third year of operation of the Institute. The Appropriations Committee, while approving the full amount of the budget request for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, said:

The additional funds requested for research and development shall be used for an increase in the action grant program.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the committee is saying, although we approve of a huge increase in funds to fight crime, we will not provide 1 cent more than last year's amount for criminal research and development.

Attorney General Mitchell appeared before the House Judiciary Subcommittee that was considering the authorization for LEAA and in answer to a question about the National Institute, he stated:

To a great extent, the field of criminal justice is an uncharted field. Hopefully, the Institute will provide us with the beacon and the way.

He added, and I am paraphrasing:

One of the functions that the Institute can be most hopeful with is to evaluate how LEAA's money is being spent to insure that their programs are worth the money and to insure that they produce the results that we expect. . . . In the field of probation and parole, especially, we need additional statistics and study. It is through appropriate studies . . . that the Institute, if it is properly funded and properly directed, can go a long way in this total overall program.

The Institute's research program for the present fiscal year, through June 1970, encompasses the following areas of inquiry: First, the development of new equipment and hardware such as burglary alarm systems; improved personal radios for foot patrolmen; equipment to provide improved night vision; and equipment to allow for the remote detection of the presence of narcotics; second, the development of improved communications for reporting crime; third, the development of improved criminal identification procedures such as voice prints, and advanced techniques in the field of fingerprints; fourth, the study of recidivism; fifth, studies in the fields of corrections,

riot control, and civil disorders; organized crime; narcotics; and white collar crime.

These are only a partial listing of the kinds of things the Institute has been doing, and, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that we in the Congress will be making a serious mistake if we add funds for action grants to the States and cities without providing the research and development necessary to support intelligent expenditure of the action money.

I just want to inquire whether or not in your opinion there is in the \$480 million appropriation an intention to limit the National Institute so that none of these funds would be available to it?

Mr. BOW. This question was brought up by the gentleman from New York with our chairman, and someone was speaking at the table so that I did not hear what my chairman had to say on this issue. I would, therefore, prefer to yield to my chairman to answer your question.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There is more than enough carried in this bill, within the \$480 million, to provide for this so-called Institute.

There is \$7.5 million included and they not entitled to a nickel more.

Mr. BOW. Does that answer the gentleman's question—there is \$7.5 million provided in the bill.

Mr. McCLODY. In my opinion, that would not be enough.

The Attorney General gave very emphatic testimony in behalf of the Institute. The administration did request \$19 million. I would hope that that amount might be available out of the \$480 million.

Mr. BOW. I would prefer to yield again to my chairman on this issue.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to refer to page 915 of the printed hearings. As printed at that page, the following colloquy took place:

Mr. ROONEY. I will ask once again, with regard to the Institute, just what have you developed to date of any significant value?

This is after spending \$10 million—

Mr. ROGOVIN. As to something which can be presented in its physical form and operational, sir, there is no such item or no such device. What there is, is promise.

Mr. ROONEY. Thank you, gentlemen.

So the committee decided that we would turn over the \$480 million for the purpose of real law enforcement to meet the problem of crime in the streets in this country.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further for another brief statement, then I shall close—

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

Mr. McCLODY. It seems to me we are very deficient in authorizing funds for research in the extremely volatile and critical area of crime. I should like to point out, if I may, that on the agenda for the work of the National Institute just this year, the current year, there is the development of new equipment and hardware, such as burglar alarm systems, improved personal radios for foot patrolmen, equipment to provide im-

proved night vision, equipment to detect the presence of narcotics, and a great many other subjects.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman may insert this information in the RECORD. I have no objection to his doing this. What we have done is to provide money to fight crime in the streets. That is the important thing. I do not know how long we are going to continue to research these things. We have spent, and are continuing to spend, a substantial amount on research. The question is how much.

I believe we also cannot lose sight of the extent of crime on the streets that exists today. This is also important. We have already spent significant amounts of moneys on research.

There is one other point I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House. At times my distinguished chairman has been accused of not recommending enough money for the Community Relations Service—a Department of Justice program concerned with racial problems. As a matter of record, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY), has worked to obtain as much for the Community Relations Service as he possibly could. He was for approving the full request. But some people have still complained that he does not do enough. One of those who has attacked him on this subject is the former Attorney General of the United States, Ramsey Clark. This is much to my surprise, because whenever Mr. Clark appeared before the committee he was treated very well by the gentleman from New York. So we were surprised to find Mr. Ramsey Clark complaining about the chairman not providing enough for the Community Relations Service. We therefore took a close look at their request and our committee reduced the request over the objections of Mr. ROONEY.

Now a very interesting thing has developed. Although Mr. Clark may have been very interested in full funding of the Community Relations Service, \$5,200 was used from that fund to paint his portrait to hang in the Justice Department halls. Instead of being used to resolve and prevent racial disorder that he was so interested in, \$5,200 was used to paint his portrait. I believe this should be called to the attention of the House. He has attacked our chairman, and I point out that these funds were not used for the purpose for which they were appropriated, but for the purpose of painting Ramsey Clark's portrait.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. On page 25 of the report the statement is made that—

The sum of \$550,000 is included in the bill for the necessary expenses of the Special Representatives for Trade Negotiations.

Then later down on the same page we find that \$3,845,000 is provided for the carrying out of the responsibilities of the Tariff Commission and also the trade negotiator.

The major responsibility of this Commission is to assess the impact of foreign trade policies of the United States and of other countries on domestic industries and to provide reports to the President, the Congress, and the public on these matters.

I was wondering if in the hearings either the trade negotiators or the Tariff Commission indicated why they have not been able to do something about the terrific drop in our trade balance. In 1965, we had a trade surplus of over \$7 billion, and in the year 1969, the trade surplus will be \$1,300,000,000. If that continues going down at the present rate, in 1975 we will have a trade minus balance of about \$5 billion. What are they doing with the money we are giving them?

Mr. BOW. The committee was very concerned about this issue and went into it in great detail, just as I am sure the gentleman's Committee on Ways and Means has also studied this problem. We have expressed our concern and provided funds to study the problem. I am not convinced these organizations have done as much as they should, and I believe they ought to be doing more on this issue. Let me assure the gentleman that they have had sufficient funds. Funds have not been the problem.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one observation. On the textile trade there is an imbalance of \$200 million, and in the shoe industry an imbalance of \$1,400,000,000, for a total imbalance of \$1,600,000,000 in these two industries, so I would hope that the committee would have these Tariff Commission and trade negotiation people come forward with some testimony about actually what they really are doing with the money we are giving them.

Mr. BOW. I know the gentleman is concerned about the textile and shoe industries. I am concerned about the bearing industry, the steel industry, and the ceramic industry. Ceramic wall tile is a very important industry in my area and they have been having trouble. The other day the World Bank provided a loan to the Philippines to expand their tile industry. Little of this is sold in the Philippines; most of it is shipped here. What we are doing is establishing plants around the world through the assistance of international banks, so that foreign countries can manufacture articles to send back here, compete with our industry, and put our people out of work. I believe it is also happening in the shoe and textile industries.

It is time we became alert to this problem and exercise our responsibility in the House. I quite agree with the concern of the gentleman, and we will ask the Commission about it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, it should be realized that the first of these two items, the Special Representatives for Trade Negotiations, is a

creature of the President of the United States, whereas the Tariff Commission is a creature not only of the President of the United States, but also of the Congress. I am afraid they are just waiting until the Ways and Means Committee of the House does something about the problems of the textile and shoe industries. I am now confident we are going to have some needed legislation out of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I may say I asked the question to find out if they are carrying out their responsibilities, and so far, according to the reports and the testimony we are getting this week before the Ways and Means Committee, there seems to be some laxity on the part of some of them.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am confident that this problem of textiles and shoe manufacture is in good hands when it is in the hands of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I agree this problem is in good hands in the Ways and Means Committee. I agree also that, under the Constitution, the Tariff Commission is a creature of the Congress. The Congress sets import duties and tariffs. This is our responsibility. We established the Tariff Commission, but over the years much of their authority has been taken away and given to the executive department. I think this is wrong. There should be a strong Tariff Commission assigned this responsibility. The Congress has the responsibility of setting tariffs. I hope the gentleman's committee will do that.

I hope our committee will go into the question of what the Tariff Commission is doing and why.

I am concerned that there appears to be an overlapping between the Department of Commerce and the Tariff Commission making the same studies and along the same lines.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am pleased to yield to my colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As long as we are discussing the balance of payments, I believe we might briefly discuss the problem of cutting off exports of nonstrategic materials. Our committee has steadfastly opposed this type of activity. For the last few years I thought the Department was in full agreement with us.

You may recall that 4 or 5 years ago they cut off exports of walnut logs and hides. We have never completely regained that market. But, only about a week ago, they announced another suspension of exports of hides. Apparently they are starting another drive to cut off the export of nonstrategic material.

I believe the members of our committee are pretty well agreed that cutting off exports also very drastically affect the balance of payments and is, under the present circumstances, inexcusable.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. ZWACH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I know this bill funds the regional development programs. I am particularly concerned with the upper Great Lakes regional program, and I know of their fine work. I want to commend the ranking minority Member, the chairman, and the subcommittee for funding of this regional program.

In this day of environmental problems, I commend the committee for its foresight.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

(Mr. CELLER (at the request of Mr. ROONEY of New York) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I understand that this appropriations bill provides \$480 million in appropriations for fiscal year 1971 for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in the Department of Justice.

The Law Enforcement Assistance program was authorized in enabling legislation approved by the Congress in 1968. Under the terms of that legislation, funding authority is limited in amount and duration. As a matter of fact, the continuation of this grant-in-aid program to the States and cities requires statutory authority for fiscal 1971 and succeeding years.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary has held 12 days of hearings concerning the administrative structure of this grant-in-aid program as well as the amount needed for future funding. This subcommittee now has under executive consideration the formulation of its legislative recommendations.

I am hopeful that this subcommittee, and subsequently the Committee on the Judiciary, will favorably report legislation authorizing fiscal 1971 appropriations on the order of \$750 million in place of the \$480 million which is contained in the appropriations bill before us. If this greater amount of Federal appropriations is ultimately approved by the Congress—and such an increase in Federal financial commitment today appears essential if we are effectively to control and curb crime in our streets—I know that the Appropriations Committee will lend a sympathetic ear to a request for additional funds.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) for yielding and I commend him and his distinguished colleagues on the committee for their work on H.R. 17575—especially the appropriation under title III for the Maritime Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I support this measure which appropriates \$199.5 million for ship construction in fiscal year 1971. This is an important and necessary step in the right direction.

Last year, we authorized \$145 million for this program, yet, we actually spent only \$15 million. This was hardly enough to sustain, much less upgrade, our sagging Merchant Marine.

Congress must insure that the United States regains its position of maritime preeminence. There can be no doubt that this position has declined. Our merchant fleet has deteriorated to a degree shocking for a nation so dependent on the seas as we are for national security and economic prosperity. Two-thirds of the fleet is over 20 years old. The average age of the entire U.S. fleet—including Government-owned ships in the reserve fleet—is 22 years.

With this bill, we are signaling a movement toward revitalizing our shipbuilding industry. Nineteen new ships will be constructed in U.S. yards. The effects on the U.S. economy when ships are constructed abroad is well illustrated by a report recently published by the American Council of Shipbuilders. This report shows what happens every time a \$20 million ship is built abroad, instead of in an American shipyard. According to the council, American industry loses at least \$60 million worth of business; \$14.4 million tax dollars are lost; American workers lose \$9.7 million in wages.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased with this bill; however, we must proceed at a more rapid pace if we intend to regain our position of maritime preeminence. In the next few years, we will witness the deactivation of many of our older, obsolete ships. These ships must be replaced with the most modern and efficient in the world.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to answer the distinguished gentleman by saying that so far as I am concerned I would furnish a subsidy to build at the rate of 30 ships a year rather than the 19 ships provided for in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I agree with the gentleman from New York. Our goal for the next 10 years is the construction of 300 ships and, like the gentleman from New York, I was hoping for 30 new ships in fiscal year 1971. However, I feel that this bill is a constructive step in the right direction and I commend the gentleman for his diligence and hard work.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment later on which would in effect reinstate the intent of the administration, expressed by the Attorney General, that of the \$480 million allocated to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, \$19 million be applied to research and development and to the application of existing technology to our criminal justice system. Let me say, in quotes, "The transfer

of technology and other scientific developments to applications within the criminal justice system."

Our good colleague on the Republican side, Mr. Bow, said he thinks we have wasted a lot of money on law enforcement research. The fact is we have not even started yet.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. If you understood me to say that I thought we had wasted the money, I should like to correct this impression. My point is that I believe we are supporting enough research in 1971 at the level recommended by the committee. A substantial amount of this kind of research has been done. Certainly not all of it was wasted.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

I do not know where it has been done, but the fact is it has not been done.

The fact is that our law enforcement systems are still operating in the quill pen era. We have not begun to apply the science technology we have developed for our space and military efforts and our industrial plants to the business of law enforcement. We heard some snide remarks made that law enforcement should be run by cops and not by professors. Of course, it should be run by police professionals, but the people in our country who are most eager for improved law enforcement equipment and techniques are the law enforcement professionals themselves. They are crying for help and deluging the National Institute for Criminal Justice for research projects that will help them to do the job better. I suggest to the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that it was these so-called professors working for IDA, the Institute for Defense Analysis, who developed the atomic bomb and the fantastically sophisticated science technology that we use in the military. It was these so-called professors who developed our space travel, and it is the same so-called professors, in quotation marks, again who can apply our fantastic science and technology to the business of making the policeman's job easier, safer, and more effective. We are in the gas light era of law enforcement, and we ought to give our police professionals, 400,000 of them in this country, the benefits of every kind of science technology in our power so they can do their job the way they and we want them to do it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLODY).

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

I too want to speak on the subject of funds for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. As the author of the amendment which resulted in this Institute, I want to remind the Members that this was indeed the action of the Congress. This was an amendment which we in the House put into the omnibus crime bill of 1968. We did it because we wanted

to provide the leadership, the guidance and the direction to State and local law enforcement officials around the country. We were convinced then that this was an appropriate Federal role. Certainly we do not want a Federal police force. However, the Federal Government should encourage the best talents to devote time and study to the solution of problems connected with criminal justice and then disseminate the results of the studies among State and local law enforcement officials. Also, we must recognize that law enforcement and criminal justice are, in the words of the Attorney General, an uncharted field. If we did not have the great research facilities we have with regard to health, science and defense we would not have the capability that we have in those fields. Yet in the field of criminal justice we are operating, for the most part, in the dark. If we want to act responsibly and meet our responsibilities as the national lawmaking body, we should devote our principal emphasis to the support of the National Institute.

May I say this, also: One of the key recommendations, of the Association of Chiefs of Police is for support for the National Institute. In other words, local law enforcement officials recognize that in the performance of their jobs they need this kind of a Federal facility. I cannot see any logic or reason why in appropriating funds for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, we should restrict the Attorney General in his use of the funds.

I believe he should be allowed to use the funds in a manner which can best serve the needs of the Nation in enforcing the criminal laws and in reducing crime.

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

Mr. McCLODY. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thought one of the best contributions to law and order which has been made in a good many days and made the other day by the construction workers in New York.

Mr. McCLODY. I am sure that a lot of people would disagree with the statement made by the gentleman. I would say this: I think the National Institute can perform a great service in providing ways and means through which disorders and disruptive acts such as have occurred in New York and elsewhere can be avoided. In addition, the institute can provide instruction in the handling of riots and community relations, positive steps to bring about law enforcement, not simply repression which seems to be on the minds of some. It is a broad field requiring careful, intelligent and scientific study and development. That is the reason why I think that this Federal agency has a wonderful opportunity to provide a great national service.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that this course will be followed. In other words, in my own case I want it known that when I vote for this bill and the \$480 million for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, I am voting with the expectation that they will have the right to use the funds as they see best,

including the \$19 million the Department of Justice and the President have requested for the National Institute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) for his generous remarks. In addition, I want to pay tribute to the gentleman for his support of the National Institute principle and for the leadership which he has shown in this area. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very useful and well-written volume which he prepared on the overall subject of improved law enforcement—and particularly on those chapters dealing with the subject of the National Institute.

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

Mr. McCLODY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, it should be obvious to all of us that the atmosphere in this Nation today is right for the passage of any type of legislation that will assist crime-fighting agencies. The crime rates across this country are increasing at a phenomenal rate, and I think you will agree that the most effective ingredient for suppressing crime is the local law enforcement agency.

Federal funding to State and local law enforcement in the past has been used in a very responsible manner by the police departments in North Carolina. Our cities face the same economic problems that are plaguing most all metropolitan areas across the country, and money from local sources is not available to train, equip, and man the police departments so that they might make an effective dent in the rising crime rate.

The \$480 million included within this bill that is earmarked for State and local law enforcement, is vitally needed.

This Congress, to date, has failed to pass an effective anticrime bill, and crime is one of the tragic and major issues of the day. While we are awaiting strong and effective anticrime legislation, the least we can do, as Representatives of the people, is give some financial assistance to out-of-State and local police agencies.

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

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I would simply like to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. McCLODY), for the great leadership that he has shown in supporting this legislation at the outset. I think the gentleman has earned the gratitude of all of us and indeed of the country.

I would like to quote a sentence or two of the testimony of the Attorney General when he appeared before the House Judiciary Committee on March 12 of this year in which he said:

The National Institute is funding a broad range of research projects. These involve law enforcement, the courts and corrections. Most of these projects relate to the type of crime problems most prevalent in the cities.

Now, it is quite true that many of these projects have not reached the stage of fulfillment. But, I have not noticed on

the floor of this House anyone criticizing research and development on jet aircraft or space travel or any of the other sophisticated research programs carried on by our space and military agencies just because that at any one particular point in time they are not completed. They are funded until completed. We do not cut off their funds in the early stages of development because they only show promise.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WIGGINS).

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Michigan for yielding to me.

I have a few words I would like to express to my colleagues in the House concerning this bill. I think, by and large, the subcommittee and its chairman have done a workmanlike job in bringing to the floor a reasonable appropriation request to fund the activities covered under the bill.

My remarks, however, are going to be critical of one aspect of it and they are intended only to be constructive. I hope they will be supported by those who can hear my voice.

I wish to direct the attention of my colleagues to that portion of the bill dealing with funds for the activities of the Department of Justice and more particularly to those sections dealing with the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. A careful or even a cursory review of the bill indicates that the total sum requested by the Department of Justice to fund its activities has been recommended in the bill. But I think everyone here should be aware of the fact that within this total fund there has been some shuffling of priorities, that the committee did not recommend some of the things requested by the Department of Justice, but increased other items that were not requested by the Department of Justice.

The large increase provided this year is to fund the activities of LEAA.

A part of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is a product of the Judiciary Committee and many of my friends here on the floor today participated in the development of that act.

Many will recall that we felt in the committee, and it was later ratified and confirmed here on the floor, that there was a need for some separate agency to help the units of law enforcement develop techniques to do their job. If we are going to pump hundreds of millions of dollars into the States on a grant block basis someone must give guidance to the States to see that their efforts are not duplicated; to see that money is not wasted on needless projects, and to give them guidance on new techniques, new technologies, new weaponry, new ways in which to enforce the law. We all agree with that. The agency to perform that function is the National Institute of Criminal Justice. It requested \$19 million to carry on its activities. The Attorney General requested \$19 million to carry

on the activities of that agency. Mr. Rogovin, Director of LEAA, requested \$19 million to carry on the activities of that agency.

Mr. Ruth, Director of the National Institute, requested \$19 million. Everybody agrees. But the subcommittee did not agree. The testimony of the subcommittee dealing with this subject covers only a page or two, and I question whether or not the subcommittee has considered the matter in the depth. They have cut it back to \$7.5 million.

Let me tell you what they have denied. Refer if you will to page 874 of the hearings, and let me tell you what the subcommittee feels this agency should not do. It should not conduct additional research to the tune of \$3 million on the development of weapons systems. Have not the tragic incidents of the last few days indicated that the police need an innovative and more appropriate weapons system for riot control? They have indicated the money should not be spent to develop voice print techniques, vehicle sensors, narcotics sensors. All of these things are needed.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is only part. I ask you to refer to pages 874 and 875 to indicate what this subcommittee has indicated should not be spent.

Well, what to do about it? Our colleague, the gentleman from New York, will at the appropriate time offer an amendment. The amendment deserves support. It does not increase the total spending in this bill, it merely indicates that of the \$480 million, \$19 million of it, the amount requested by the Attorney General and the Director of LEAA, and the Director of the National Institute, be allocated for these research functions. It is an entirely reasonable amendment, and deserves your support.

If, however, for one reason or another, this amendment fails, I hope that the chairman of the subcommittee, when this matter goes to conference, will review his position on this subject and will give serious consideration to removing the restrictive language contained in the report which prohibits additional spending for necessary research in this field.

I urge my colleagues, when the time comes, to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) for the good of law enforcement in this country.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I noticed a picture in a Washington newspaper of one of the Justices of the Supreme Court, William O. Douglas, who was pictured in the driveway of his home beside an automobile with a license plate indicating it was a Government-owned vehicle. I called the General Services Administration and ascertained that Mr. Douglas apparently has on call a Government-owned automobile, and driver, to transport him from home to work, and from work—if you can call it that—to his home again.

I just wondered what sort of practice is going on—if it has come to the attention of the committee—whether au-

tomobiles are being supplied to Justices of the Supreme Court who, at \$60,000 a year, it seems to me, ought to be able to furnish their own transportation just as Members of Congress and most of the other Government employees have to do.

Is there anything in this bill—and I ask either the chairman or the ranking member of the committee—is there anything in this bill to provide automobiles for Justices of the Supreme Court, other than the Chief Justice, who I know, is furnished an automobile.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There was a request for \$600 a year per automobile to lease eight automobiles and that item is not included in this bill. That has been denied.

Mr. GROSS. I again thank and commend the chairman and the committee for turning down this request. I say again that the Justices of the Supreme Court are paid sufficiently to provide their own transportation. I hope that the General Services Administration will see to it that the vehicles which they operate are not used for the purpose for which at least that one has been, and apparently is being used.

I note under Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange, for which the cookie pushers wanted \$40 million—and I do not know exactly what the committee gave to them—that there are some outstanding examples of expenditure. For example, an assistant professor of history at the University of Minnesota went to Kiev University in Russia last fall to study and I quote "Dneiper River Trade, Seventh to Fourth Centuries B.C."

I note we are paying the freight for a University of Minnesota professor to spend 6 weeks at the Leningrad University making recordings of "eye movements," whatever that is.

Then there is an assistant professor of linguistics at the Inter-American University of Puerto Rico who has been paid to study "intonation among Soviet linguists" at Leningrad University.

Then there is also a Cornell University associate history professor who was sent to Leningrad University this year to study the "characteristics of Russian civil servants from 1750 to 1860."

Now what in the world are we doing raiding the taxpayers to send these people to Russia, and why are we sending them over there for purposes of this kind?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think, if the gentleman will yield, this entire program has been looked at by our subcommittee very hard. We cut them in past years. We think the new administrator is doing a very, very good job and so this year we went along with an increase.

As to these specific instances, I am not sufficiently acquainted with them to know of their importance to the academic community or to the students who may be studying under these professors.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will yield, I think the principal reason for the increase in the funds for this mutual education exchange pro-

gram is the fact that we have a new Assistant Secretary of State in charge of the program named John Richardson.

Mr. Richardson seems like a down-to-earth sort of gentleman. We are expressing, by increasing this appropriation, our confidence in Mr. Richardson, that he is going to do a good, sensible, worthwhile job. I do not believe we will have to worry about any more obscene or pornographic plays being sent abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I would say to the gentleman, I am not particularly concerned in the likes and dislikes of Mr. Richardson. This sounds to me like a nice vacation trip to Russia—a foreign junket of some kind.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They are nice trips, of course they are.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know about the down-to-earthness of Mr. Richardson, but I do know this kind of business costs money.

I do know that this is taxpayers' money that is being spent, and I am a little surprised that the committee would increase the appropriation in view of the uses for some of the money apparently will be wasted.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I think that there were much nicer trips when we had the *United States*, the *America*, the *Constitution*, and the *Independence* on the North Atlantic.

Mr. GROSS. Well, apparently these are not a hardship assignment.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Oh, no.

Mr. GROSS. Or else they would not be taking off in the numbers they are, and I have read only a few of these from the hearings.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is first class.

Mr. GROSS. The committee has increased contributions for various international organizations, including the U.N.; is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Yes. I am sorry the gentleman reminds me of that, but we are confronted with a situation in which all we could do by denying funds would be to become arrears in our dues to these organizations, and I do not think we should do that. If the legislative committee, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, or the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, decided to discontinue our membership in these organizations, that would be one thing, but I do not think that is the prerogative of this committee.

Mr. GROSS. Would it be bad if we should be in arrears in our contributions to some of these high-flying outfit?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I believe that it probably would.

Mr. GROSS. I assume the gentleman knows that other countries are about \$200 million in arrears in their contributions and assessments to the United Nations and its so-called specialized agencies. The \$200 million is no inconsequential amount of money. I do not know that it would be any crime or shame if we were to become delinquent. Perhaps it would get some of them in a mood to pay what they owe.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I am surprised my distinguished friend from Iowa does not agree with me that we should keep our credit in good shape.

Mr. GROSS. Our credit is not in very good shape and with this appropriation of \$144 million—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is only part of it.

Mr. GROSS. I know it is only part of it.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There is plenty more in the foreign aid bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, my friend is exactly right, there is plenty more. That is what I am concerned about. I do not know that our credit is so good, and it is going to get worse if we continue to spew out our money in this fashion. If we do not get our long nose out of every activity in foreign countries our credit is going to be a whole lot worse. Our Treasury is strapped. It is busted, and we are borrowing money hand over fist at high interest rates. I just do not understand why we have to continue when other foreign countries are not underwriting their share of the expenses of the United Nations and its various agencies. Why should we increase our contribution in light of that situation?

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I think this would be a good subject for him to take up with his committee.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa has raised that issue repeatedly in the Foreign Affairs Committee but, of course, I am only one vote in that committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I just want the gentleman to know that I agree with the chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York, that there is not much we can do about it, but I think if the gentleman from Iowa persists in his committee, he might just some day get some results.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know how the authorizing legislation is worded, but it probably says "not to exceed" a certain amount, and, if so, that means your committee could use the pruning knife. That is my hope. I cannot entertain any hope with respect to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think the gentleman will find that that is not the language—

Mr. GROSS. I beg your pardon?

Mr. CEDERBERG. That it does not state, as you stated, "not to exceed" a certain amount.

Mr. GROSS. I said that I do not know, but most of them say "not to exceed" a certain amount. This is the only place I can repose any hope, that is, in the Appropriations Committee. I have little or no hope that the House Foreign Affairs Committee will cut anything dealing with handouts to foreign countries.

Mr. CEDERBERG. When your committee decided we had to be a member of the club, then we had to pay the dues. That is part of our obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 17575 contains \$400,000 for continuing design and engineering studies for

the proposed Tijuana River flood control project.

I understand that \$200,000 of the \$800,000 previously appropriated for this purpose has been, or is being, diverted to make up a deficit in the international sanitation project to jointly serve Nogales, Ariz., and Nogales, Mexico.

The Appropriations Committees of both House and Senate have been advised of this action and have given their approval.

I, too, support this transfer of funds, since I understand that in itself it will cause no delay in the Tijuana River project, which will benefit an extensive area in my own district.

The International Boundary and Water Commission, in charge of the U.S. portion of the project, advises me that the amounts previously appropriated could not have been spent on schedule in any event, because of the current limitation on expenditures for public works.

Congress will, however, have to make up the \$200,000 deficiency that now exists in the Tijuana River account, and I am confident this will be done at the earliest possible moment to assure timely completion of preconstruction activity and an early start on actual construction, which must be carefully coordinated with work to be undertaken on the Mexican side of the border.

I am happy to add my vote for passage of H.R. 17575.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, the community of Bondsville in the town of Palmer, Mass., lost some 500 jobs during the windy night of October 4, 1968, when a devastating fire wiped out the Bondsville mill complex and its six industries, valued at \$10 million, including machinery.

I joined with Senators EDWARD M. KENNEDY and EDWARD W. BROOKE, and then Gov. John A. Volpe, in requesting the Economic Development Agency in the Department of Commerce to investigate the sudden rise in unemployment in the area because of this tragic fire. Subsequently, the town of Palmer was declared eligible for EDA assistance because of its high unemployment.

At our request, the EDA Portland, Maine, regional office team, headed by Arthur Doyle and including Ed Glead, economic planning assistant and Tom Markham, Massachusetts contact representative, met with the Palmer Board of Selectmen in Palmer and Boston, and with the members of the Palmer Overall Economic Development Committee. These men, and personnel in the EDA Washington office, have been most cooperative and helpful in assisting town officials prepare the Palmer overall economic development plan and considering the town's application for technical assistance.

The Hon. Robert A. Podesta, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, advised me on November 3, 1969, that EDA had approved a \$16,000 technical assistance planning grant to Palmer so it could help plan for industrial growth. The study for the Palmer Overall Economic Development Committee recommended the development of an industrial park in Bondsville to attract industry and replace the 500 jobs lost in the October 4, 1968, fire.

The committee has filed for public works grants with EDA so that the Bondsville industrial park can be developed. It is my understanding that the Portland regional EDA office is completing its review of the Palmer application. However, the Portland office is now being phased out, and its function is in the process of being transferred to a newly established Northeast EDA regional office in Philadelphia. I do hope that this transfer of EDA functions from a New England office to the Mid-Atlantic States area will not cause unnecessary delay in the processing of the Palmer EDA public works grant application.

Mr. Chairman, I express this concern now because it has been some 20 months since the disastrous Bondsville fire and 500-job loss, and the town of Palmer will lose its EDA eligibility designation next June 30. I hope that EDA will complete its Washington review of the Palmer application before the designation expires, and that approval and funding for the urgently needed public works grants to Palmer will be made in this fiscal year.

I include, at this point in the RECORD, correspondence and telegrams concerning Palmer's EDA applications for the technical assistance study and public works grants:

TOWN OF PALMER,
May 9, 1969.

Congressman EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. BOLAND: On behalf of the residents of Palmer, we wish to express appreciation of your efforts in trying to solve the problems which resulted from the October 4, 1968, Bondsville mill fire.

The Overall Economic Development Program Committee formed by the Selectmen of the Town of Palmer to seek Federal assistance has been concerned thus far with E.D.A. help. Our technical assistance application will be filed on or about May 10, 1969, in connection with this.

We believe that although not directly the concern of our O.E.D.P. functions, the problem of what to do about the ruins left standing in Bondsville, with their attendant health and safety hazards to say nothing of the depressing appearance to the people of this community, is our next logical area of concern.

We would appreciate your putting us in touch with the appropriate governmental agencies that might approve of assistance in resolving this situation.

Respectfully yours,

OEDP COMMITTEE,
MITCHELL DOBEK,
Chairman.

AUGUST 1, 1969.

Hon. ROBERT A. PODESTA,
Assistant Secretary for Economic Development,
Department of Commerce.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing on behalf of the Overall Economic Development Program Committee for the Town of Palmer, Massachusetts, which has applied for a technical assistance grant. It is my understanding that the application has been processed in the Portland, Maine, Regional Office and is now in the Technical Assistance Section of EDA in Washington.

As you know, the community of Bondsville in the Town of Palmer experienced a sudden rise in unemployment last October due to the tragic Bondsville fire which de-

stroyed an industrial complex in the village. Subsequently, the Town of Palmer was declared eligible for EDA assistance because of its high unemployment. Your Economic Development Team in Massachusetts and in the Portland Regional Office have been most cooperative and helpful in meetings with the Palmer Board of Selectmen and with members of the Overall Economic Development Committee.

It became clear last November at the first of these meetings that the Town of Palmer would need technical assistance for long range economic planning in the community. I cannot stress how important this technical assistance grant means to the future economic health of the area. I am sure that if the proper study is made that some of the old industries will rebuild and new job creating industries can be directed to Palmer.

I urge favorable consideration of the application filed by the Town of Palmer and I will appreciate your advising me the present status of this application.

Thanking you for your consideration and with every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., August 13, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: Thank you for your letter of August 1 concerning the Overall Economic Development Program Committee for the Town of Palmer, Massachusetts, which has applied for a technical assistance grant.

The request for technical assistance is now being evaluated by the Office of Technical Assistance and we are making every effort to reach an early decision.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. PODESTA,
Assistant Secretary for Economic Development.

PALMER, MASS., October 16, 1969.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLAND: We have had no progress on our E.D.A. application for a technical assistance grant.

Kindly employ resources of your office to insure earliest possible acceptance.

Copies sent to Senator Kennedy and Senator Brooke.

THOMAS W. HALEY,
Board of Selectmen.

Hon. THOMAS W. HALEY,
Palmer Board of Selectmen, Town Administration Building, Palmer, Mass.:

Have checked EDA again concerning Palmer's Technical Assistant grant. Understand application cleared for approval. Formal announcement should come soon.

EDWARD P. BOLAND,
Member of Congress.

EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate.

THE ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
November 3, 1970.

Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BOLAND: We are pleased to inform you that the Economic Development Administration has approved a \$16,000 grant to help plan for industrial growth at Palmer, Massachusetts.

The Overall Economic Development Planning Committee for the town of Palmer is the applicant for the Federal funds.

They will be used to help the Committee draw up a long-range plan to stimulate growth and create new jobs in the community. Palmer lost 500 jobs in October 1968 when a fire destroyed a complex housing the community's six industries.

The first phase of the project will include an evaluation of potential industrial sites in the community and a consideration of industries likely to locate at Palmer if one of the sites were developed as an industrial park.

If the first phase of the study determines that an industrial park is economically feasible, a master plan for the development of the park will be prepared as phase two of the project.

Palmer will carry out the industrial development study in connection with long-range planning aimed at commercial, residential and recreational growth.

The community will provide \$2,500 to complete the \$18,500 total cost of the project announced today.

We will continue to work with the Palmer Overall Economic Development Planning Committee to help assure that this program brings the maximum benefit to the residents of the area.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. PODESTA,
Assistant Secretary for Economic Development.

OFFICE OF THE
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1970.

Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: This is in response to the inquiry of February 12 from yourself and Congressman Boland concerning the Town of Palmer, Massachusetts, and their Economic Development Administration Technical Assistance application.

We are making every effort to have this study under contract and completed prior to the Town's possible redesignation by EDA. Hopefully, the results of this feasibility study will provide the necessary information to assist the Town in the preparation of a Public Works application.

Your continued interest in EDA's program is appreciated; and if we may be of further assistance, please contact us.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. SINNOTT,
Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Economic Development.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE
ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For grants, contracts, loans, and other law enforcement assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, including departmental salaries and other expenses in connection therewith, \$480,000,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHEUER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHEUER: Page 19, line 19, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", of which not less than \$19,000,000 is to be allocated to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice."

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment to implement the request of the administration as expressed by the Attorney General in his budget published on page 869 of the House hearings, to allocate to the National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice \$19 million out of the \$480 million that is being appropriated for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

The Attorney General in his testimony before the committee, in describing the National Institute, said:

There are two other programs in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration which should offer direct benefit to the cities: our academic assistance program, and the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

The National Institute is funding a broad range of research projects involving law enforcement, the courts, and corrections. Most of these projects relate to the type of criminal problems most prevalent in our cities.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to describe for a moment some activities in which the National Institute is engaged.

First. Stranger-to-stranger street crime, particularly robbery, assault, and vandalism in the cities.

Second. Burglary, particularly in the home and small business establishment.

Third. Control of the narcotic addict and the traffic in narcotics.

Fourth. Those kinds of violent disorder which prevent a necessary level of orderly functioning within our communities and our major social and government institutions.

Fifth. Organized crime, particularly those aspects that foster violence, drug addiction, corruption, and loss of confidence in government processes.

In addition to these areas, the Institute is endeavoring to define needs that only a national organization could address. This important role will lead to Institute programs based upon the following concepts:

First. Development of defined policies and coordinated activity of the various Federal agencies engaged in research in crime and criminal justice.

Second. Development of criminal law revision processes that include broader inquiries into goals, needs, and costs.

Third. Establishment of a national criminal justice reference service.

Fourth. Establishment of a standards and evaluation service for law-enforcement equipment and facilities.

Fifth. The transfer of technology and other scientific developments to applications within the criminal justice system.

Sixth. Continuous evaluation of Institute and other LEAA programs.

Seventh. Development of research activity by State criminal justice planning agencies, and by private research organizations working closely with operating criminal justice agencies in the larger urban areas.

Eighth. Development of an expanded research community in the areas of crime, crime prevention, and criminal justice.

At the present time the Justice Department is the only Federal agency without a research and development center.

Is it not extraordinary that in this day and age they still have young ladies sitting around comparing and identifying fingerprints? They have not yet applied the computer to instantaneously identify fingerprints, when any worthwhile scientist will tell us the necessary techniques are easily within our reach.

Is it not extraordinary that the 40,000 police jurisdictions in this country still do not have a national police communications network? The airwaves are so overloaded with competitive and duplicating police bands that police communication between towns and villages in the same State, not to mention the same region, is difficult or even impossible.

Let us also consider the police vehicle. We have developed specialized land vehicles for each branch of the military. But what have we given our police professionals, the 400,000 men who are responsible for maintaining the harmony of our society? We give them a family car with a two-way radio and a blinker on top that is vulnerable to any hoodlum who has an icepick to deflate the tires, who has a match to set it on fire, who has a baseball bat to smash in the windshield, or who, if he has two or three or four friends, can turn it over entirely.

Why do we not fund General Motors or one of the other automobile companies, in cooperation with an outstanding law enforcement agency, to design a police vehicle that does justice to the 400,000 men in our country who are trying to carry out perhaps the most agonizingly difficult and frustrating job in the world in our tension-laden cities.

I find it difficult to understand how the chairman of the subcommittee, who comes from my city, the most troubled city in the country, can fail to understand how desperately we need to have the insight of our social scientists and the application of every bit of science and technology to the problem of law enforcement and crime prevention.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Perhaps it is because the gentleman from New York now in the well has had no experience whatever in law enforcement, whereas the gentleman from New York presently at the microphone has had four and a half years of experience as assistant district attorney of Kings County.

Mr. SCHEUER. Let me mention that, No. 1, I am a lawyer, and, No. 2, I have been thinking about this National Institute since I first came to the Congress in 1965. I wrote a book on law enforcement which was reviewed very favorably by the International Association of Police Chiefs, by the Attorney General of the United States, and by the International Association of Police Law Professors. I am considered by some to have a rudimentary understanding of some of the problems facing our law-enforcement officials.

It is not surprising to me that the law-enforcement agency representing

the "cops," the International Association of Police Chiefs, is enthusiastic about the Institute.

Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Police Chiefs, has testified on innumerable occasions for the Institute. Prof. Robert Sheehan, president of the National Association of Police Professors, has testified repeatedly on the necessity for more knowledge. The Attorney General himself said that we definitely need more knowledge about crime and how to deal with it more effectively. The President's adviser, Pat Moynihan, said that we urgently need to know more about crime.

I do not think there is a thinking individual in the United States who is satisfied with the present state of our knowledge about crime—how to deter it; and if we cannot deter it, how to prevent it; and if we cannot prevent it how we can apprehend the criminal more readily; and after that how we can prove his guilt or innocence, as the case may be, far more expeditiously than we are now.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGINS. I, of course, support the gentleman's amendment for the reasons stated during general debate. Let me add that the select committee of this House appointed to investigate crime certainly concurs in the judgments expressed by the gentleman from New York. One of the clear findings of the committee is that there is a need for additional research. We fully support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUDE. I would like to commend the gentleman for his amendment and offer my full support.

Mr. SCHEUER. Perhaps the most significant expression of distaste for the Institute came in debate a few moments ago when the chairman of the subcommittee said that law enforcement should be run by the police officers and not by professors. Of course it should be, but it is the police officers themselves who are most urgently searching for help. They have come to the National Institute from all parts of the country for help, wanting also to participate in the development programs of the National Institute. The way the Institute works is to set up consortiums which involve an effective local police agency and a competent private sector group. It grants to such a consortium a contract to develop the anticrime devices and techniques that we urgently need.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to support his amendment. It seems to me with the research and development that the Department of Justice is asking for this Institute it might be very possible that breakthroughs are very near which could save

the police departments of the country and the people of this country a great deal of money in this war on crime.

Mr. SCHEUER. Let me give my distinguished colleague from New York my thanks and appreciation for those kind words and give him an example of the kinds of things which we are looking for.

The Institute is now working on improving the apprehension of criminals.

Through the development of hardware and other equipment, the Institute can assist police efforts to apprehend persons engaged in street crime. Such innovations will be carefully evaluated to assure effectiveness in achieving goals at reasonable economic and social cost. Examples are: the development of robbery and burglary alarm systems linked directly to police communications centers; improved and coordinated aerial and ground mobility systems for police; improved portable personal transceiver radio for the patrolman; provision of performance information for police use in acquiring night vision equipment; improved police weapons system including incapacitation without lethal danger, and so forth.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it was the consensus of this committee which has dealt with the Department of Justice and law enforcement for many, many years that more funds should be furnished for action grants, for police departments, particularly in the gentleman's State of New York, rather than for increased research studies.

The committee is not opposed to research and development. A total of \$7.5 million was provided in the current year and another \$7.5 million is included in the present bill. That can and should provide for considerable research and development.

I can readily understand the interest of the gentlemen from New York in this particular baby. Let me assure the gentleman that we have not reflected upon its paternity nor even hinted that it may have been born out of wedlock. But it is a problem child. It has not been undernourished. In fact, it has been well fed to the tune of over \$10 million so far without the \$7.5 million included in this bill. But what has it accomplished? I have already read you the printed testimony of Mr. Rogovin on this subject.

Nothing concrete or of value has resulted. We do feel this baby should learn to walk before giving it a plane to pilot. There has been study after study and report after report. Now, for instance, we have a study of the social psychology of architectural design for defensible space, a feasibility study of the exclusionary rule, the ex-offender as a parole officer—

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Not at this time.

We have a study of the mentally abnormal offender. Where? In Sweden. We have an attempt to enhance the accu-

racy of classification of sex offenders through measuring pupillary and other autonomic mediated responses; augmentation of moral judgment in the adolescent juvenile delinquent, and so on and so on ad infinitum, page after page of these sort of studies made at the expense of the taxpayers.

So your committee felt that instead of using money for this sort of thing, we should use the money to help law enforcement by furnishing equipment to the police officers in the various States of the Union.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I oppose the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) in which he says not less than \$19 million is to be allocated for the National Institute.

Now, I believe \$7.5 million was provided for the current year and there may have been some carryover from that. But let us assume that under the language of this amendment the Department of Justice determined they could not use \$19 million in this National Institute—

Mr. ROONEY of New York. And I have a definite idea, if the gentleman will permit, that they might not use all of it.

Mr. BOW. Well, I say that if they do not use it, then they are reducing the \$480 million that we are providing for safe streets.

What this amendment would actually do is reduce the funds available for safe streets by whatever amount the Department of Justice could not use.

I think this amendment should be defeated, because I very much doubt that they could use the \$19 million.

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

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

I said to my distinguished chairman, that in my opinion this amendment should be defeated. This amendment could circumvent the will of our committee and the will of this Congress by making it possible to reduce the amount that can be used to make the streets of America safe.

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

Mr. BOW. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I would simply state on the point of giving the administration and the Attorney General the flexibility that they wanted that they asked for our consent to use up to \$19 million of that \$480 million for the National Institute. If they do not use it, then they do not use it, but the National Institute would be permitted—

Mr. BOW. No. Your amendment states that \$19 million is to be allocated to the National Institute. If the National Institute did not use this amount you would have then reduced the \$480 million available by whatever amount was not used.

Mr. SCHEUER. Would my colleague support this amendment if I added language to incorporate that?

Mr. BOW. No, I could not, but the effect of your amendment, as now worded, must be considered.

Mr. SCHEUER. That problem can be solved if we simply add that a specified portion should be available for the LEAA. We are talking about only 4 percent of the appropriations for LEAA. So if it would seem appropriate to my colleague, I would be very happy to insert words stating that any unexpended balance shall be yielded back by the National Institute.

Mr. BOW. We have provided \$480 million, and it should be used for the purpose for which the committee determined necessary and appropriate, not used for this national institute.

Mr. SCHEUER. This is a simple example of imprudently tying the hands of the Attorney General.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the full 5 minutes, but since the question of flexibility has arisen I think we all ought to be aware that the language of the report induces rigidity into this bill, and takes away the flexibility that should be available to the Attorney General.

I refer specifically to the language on page 13 of the report in the second major paragraph, which says:

The additional funds requested (for the Institute) for research and development shall be used for an increase in the action grant program.

In other words, the funds shall not be used for research and development. This is to deny to the Attorney General the right to use any part of this proposed \$19 million in excess of \$7.5 million for anything except action grants.

I am quite sure the gentleman from New York would be happy to leave the Attorney General with complete flexibility, and to have this sentence stricken from the report, but it is there. We have to deal with it, and his amendment is in response to it.

Frankly, no one here wants greater flexibility in the Attorney General in spending the \$480 million than I do, but it has been the committee in its report that has taken away that flexibility from him, and that has occasioned the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

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

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to thank my colleague for discussing specifically the problem to which this amendment is addressed; namely, to give the Attorney General and the administration the discretion to use up to the \$19 million which they requested from this Congress for the work of the National Institute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) several questions:

First, is the \$480 million included in this item the total amount requested by the President for the so-called Safe Streets Act?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If the distinguished gentleman from Michigan will yield, it is every penny of the request of the Attorney General and the President.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The \$19 million for this particular earmarking was requested by the Department of Justice?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is true.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The committee has allocated, by committee report action, \$7.5 million?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER) wants to earmark out of the \$480 million, \$19 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. If the \$19 million earmarking becomes law, and during the fiscal year the Attorney General wants to spend only \$12 million out of the \$19 million, then the remaining \$7 million cannot be used for any other purpose?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Under the committee procedure, when you recommend a total amount of \$480 million and in the committee report suggest that only \$7.5 million be used for this purpose—if there is a change and the Attorney General wants to spend more than \$7.5 million, is it possible for the Attorney General to come to the subcommittee or to the committee and get authority to spend more than \$7.5 million?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Of course, that sort of thing is done frequently.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. So the committee procedure gives more flexibility and it gives every dollar to the Attorney General for that purpose?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Exactly so, and the committee feels confident that this action being proposed by the committee of providing \$7.5 million for this Institute will be satisfactory to the Attorney General.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It primarily does give flexibility and at the same time expresses the view of the committee to the Attorney General. But if there is a change of circumstances, the committee can remove the \$7.5 million limitation?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Exactly so.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. May I ask our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York, how an informal act of the committee can overrule the express will of the Congress? If they pass this bill and approve the committee report, what would be the procedure by which in the course of the upcoming fis-

cal year the Attorney General could be enabled to spend \$19 million.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I can only say to my friend that the answer is obvious.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I can say to the gentleman from New York, having served on the Committee on Appropriations for 14 years, that I have had some experience with the precise question raised by the gentleman from New York.

A committee recommendation in a committee report does not have the authority of law. A committee recommendation in a report is subject to reprogramming, with the concurrence of the committee.

Mr. SCHEUER. And what would the procedure be?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The procedure is for the Bureau of the Budget or the Department of Justice to send a written request to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations who refers it to the chairman of the subcommittee. The subcommittee may request testimony from individuals in the Department who want to make a change. My experience is, and has been, that in the main if a good case can be made, the committee's recommendation in the committee report is revised under a reprogramming procedure. This is a much more flexible procedure than that recommended by the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. May I respond briefly by saying that one of the problems that the National Institute has is recruiting top experts from the private sector and law enforcement schools to develop this consortium.

If all it has is a level of \$7.5 million of funding, it cannot gear up to spend \$19 million and cannot create the programs. Nobody is going to work with them. They cannot even hire the kind of sophisticated planning and capability that they need to put such a \$19 million program in effect. In essence, it becomes an exercise in futility.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. This is the point. The Department of Justice requested \$19 million and in the total of \$480 million, the \$19 million is there.

If the Department of Justice finds that they can pursue programs and employ personnel over and above the amount of \$7.5 million, I am sure the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) and the subcommittee will be responsive. They will listen to the testimony, and I am sure they will make adjustments if necessary.

The gentleman's amendment takes away all of the flexibility and it says if you do not spend \$19 million, then the differential cannot be used for any other purpose.

SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW YORK FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHEUER

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of New York as a substitute for the amendment of-

ferred by Mr. SCHEUER: Page 19, line 19, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of which not more than \$19,000,000 may be allocated to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes. The purpose of the substitute amendment is to restore flexibility in this matter of allocating funds for research and development in the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to the Department of Justice, according to the Department's request for funds, and would make it then unnecessary for the Department of Justice and for the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to come back to the committee if they found that they could indeed spend the \$19 million or any part thereof over and above the \$7½ million. They would not then be required to come back to the committee because the funds are there, and this would restore to the Department of Justice the entire flexibility in the use of this whole \$19 million.

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

Mr. SMITH of New York. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I think the amendment is excellent and I am very happy to accept it.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH) for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$3,200,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, under title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Office of Education carries out a vital program of technical assistance and grants to school districts which are desegregating voluntarily or according to law.

Through the years, the title IV program has helped hundreds of school districts throughout the country meet their constitutional obligation.

For the fiscal year 1971, the administration requested \$24 million for the title IV program. The House Appropriations Committee reduced that request to \$19 million.

Manifestly, this is not the time to cut back on the availability of Federal assistance to school districts which are obliged to desegregate under Federal court orders. The problems incident to the desegregation process are too difficult and complex. Unless sufficient Federal aid is provided, so as to encourage school districts to get on with the job, we may find that much of the local impetus behind the desegregation effort dries up.

The Office of Education title IV program is being besieged by hundreds of requests from school districts to provide needed grant funds and technical assistance in this area. A pattern has developed where the Federal courts, in ordering desegregation, are directing that school districts apply for title IV assistance in drafting and implementing desegregation plans which are educationally sound and meet the requirements of the law. The Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare testified that during the calendar year 1970, requests for assistance from school districts are expected to double.

The law requires an end to discrimination. And from an educational point of view, school districts should be encouraged to reduce and end the racial isolation which prevails in public education. Under these circumstances it is crucial that the Federal Government provide the necessary expertise and support, to permit school districts to fulfill their responsibilities.

I am advised that the \$5 million cut-back in the pending legislation would reduce the number of local school staff trained through university desegregation assistance centers by 10,000; it would reduce by 23 the number of Federal staff prepared to render direct technical assistance; and technical assistance would not be available through four State education agencies originally anticipated.

The committee testimony presented by the Health, Education, and Welfare Under Secretary on this appropriation is included at this point in the RECORD.

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it has just been a short time since I appeared before you regarding our request for a 1970 supplemental for Title IV of the Civil Rights Act. That request is aimed specifically at the special problems facing the more than 1,350 school districts either now or expected to be under court order to desegregate by next fall. The 1971 budget for Title IV which we are now discussing has a much broader purpose. It deals with the total program on the National basis for fiscal year 1971, and will include—

Additional school districts, North and South, will be seeking Federal assistance in their efforts to initiate desegregation action during 1971.

And further assistance to school districts which, although they may have completed the initial phases of desegregation in earlier years, have residual problems involving curriculum, teacher training, student-faculty relations, or other problems.

By 1971 we expect an increase in the number of de facto school districts who, on their own initiative will be making an effort to eliminate desegregation.

INCREASES IN REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE

Let me attempt to give you some very specific actions which you have a right to

expect from us about what has been done with your support in the past and what we expect will be the demands upon us in the coming fiscal year.

In calendar year 1967, all direct assistance services funded under this appropriation received about 1,400 requests for help. In calendar year 1968, this number of requests from all sources almost tripled to 4,000; and, a total of 6,223 requests were received during the calendar year 1969. We anticipate that the calls for help from the school districts of our country will almost double again in 1970. This growth in the number of total school districts seeking Federal assistance results first from a steady growth in the number of school districts initiating desegregation actions and, within that number, more and more of them have been turning to the Federal Government for advice and assistance. It is quite clear to us that the growth in the number requesting help has been because the word has spread that such assistance does help them in the solution of their problems. This is evident in the number of desegregation plans developed by our technical assistance specialists at the request of local school districts. In 1968, 411 such plans were developed compared to 864 this past year. This kind of operation obviously is not the typical kind of Federal grants program. The creation of these plans require direct personal service to each requesting district from collecting data and preparing attendance zone maps to presenting recommendations at public hearings. Such personalized service requires several days of staff time and, in larger districts, sometimes requires weeks at a time. Assistance is not limited to a plan simply for the reassignment of students and teachers. School districts are concerned about what should be done after desegregation as well as during. Such concerns include:

How to prepare the community, students, teachers, administrators, and service staffs, and

How to assure that the quality of education will be maintained at a high level by improving instructional practices, curriculum, grouping procedures, extracurricular activities, and instructional materials.

Assistance resources

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is committed to a local State-Federal partnership in resolving difficult human problems such as school desegregation. Accordingly, this appropriation request includes funds to support 19 local university centers and 36 State department of education assistance units and 140 grants to local school boards. These various assistance resources offer options to the local school district in its search for help and assures that the assistance role in school desegregation will not be reserved to the Federal Government alone.

University centers

University assistance centers are located at institutions of higher education. They provide a year-round, non-government source of consultation and training expertise to districts in the university service area. In addition to direct assistance with desegregation planning, these centers conduct short-term training programs for school personnel. In 1969, over 50,000 school employees from 661 districts received such training.

State units

State departments of education assistance units generally include a small staff of two or three specialists who offer direct assistance in desegregation to school districts, and, equally important, attempt to muster other State resources to aid local districts with desegregation. Six additional State departments units are planned for fiscal year 1971.

Local grants

Grants are available directly to local school boards to enable them to initiate inservice training programs for school personnel and to employ advisory assistance in planning and implementing desegregation. An additional 30 local grants are planned for fiscal year 1971. The assistance made possible by the Title IV program can have a profound effect on the improvement of educational opportunities for large numbers of America's youth. It is a positive program—The kind which we increasingly plan to emphasize in Federal efforts to cope with complex and difficult problems of our society. I have asked for this privilege of appearing before you today to emphasize the increased importance the Administration is placing on this program of assistance to school districts facing desegregation.

Summary of request

In summary, Mr. Chairman, this appropriation request totals \$24 million for fiscal year 1971 to be used as follows:

\$10 million for approximately 140 grants to local school boards;

\$4,740,000 for 19 university desegregation assistance centers;

\$3,060,000 for 36 State department of education assistance units;

\$500,000 for approximately 10 university training institutes; and

\$5,750,000 for technical assistance and administration. This concludes my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman. We will be glad to try to answer any questions that you or Committee members wish to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY SALARY AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act (75 Stat. 527), and the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.), to carry out international information activities, including employment, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, of (1) persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed \$20,000), (2) aliens within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Director of the Agency and the Attorney General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States and their dependents to and from the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801-1158); entertainment within the United States not to exceed \$500; hire of passenger motor vehicles; insurance on official motor vehicles in foreign countries; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; advance of funds not withstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens, by contract, for service abroad; purchase of ice and drinking water abroad; payment of excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; purchase of uniforms for not to exceed fifteen guards; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United

States Government employees who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor; narration, scriptwriting, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries; fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad; rental or lease for periods not exceeding five years of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for officers and employees engaged in informational activities abroad; travel expenses for employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under 5 U.S.C. 5701-5708, but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; \$165,433,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$110,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the current year: *Provided further*, That passenger motor vehicles used abroad exclusively for the purposes of this appropriation may be exchanged or sold pursuant to section 201(c) of the Act of June 30, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 481(c)), and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance of each such replacement, shall not exceed such amounts as may be otherwise provided by law: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the United States Information Agency is authorized, in making contracts for the use of international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from New York, I note, among other things, that five of the nine so-called culture centers in India that are under the administration or control of the U.S. Information Agency are being closed next Monday, and that ought to provide a saving.

I note, too, that the USIA lost \$9 million in the circulation of a magazine in Russia, and another \$6.5 million in circulation of a magazine in Poland.

I also note that somebody in USIA has given a set of the Encyclopaedia Britannica to somebody in Hong Kong. I do not know who got it, or who gave it, but it is under the administration of the USIA.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Is it the gentleman's point that they should have given the Encyclopaedia Americana in Hong Kong rather than the Encyclopaedia Britannica?

Mr. GROSS. That would have been helpful.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It is a far better encyclopedia.

Mr. GROSS. But I do not understand why American taxpayers should give anybody a set of encyclopedia in Hong Kong, a British colony.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I would have to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. It is suggested by another member that a copy of Evergreen magazine might have been sent.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman knows why the New York Times continually knocks my brains out, does he not? It is because I reduced their sales over the years. At one time the New York Times sold \$225,000, I believe, worth of giveaway subscriptions to the overseas edition of the New York Times each year. That is now down to about \$5,000 a year. If one takes that \$200,000 plus and spreads it over a period of 10 or 15 years, they have all the reason in the world to be angry with the gentleman from New York. That is the reason why I cannot get my name in that newspaper.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the fight the gentleman has made and I would hope he could also get the distribution of these yatching magazines stopped, if he has not already done so. I do not know why we should be distributing publications concerning yatching to people all over the world.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I can tell the gentleman, having served on this subcommittee all the years I have, there was a time when the Slick magazine which is somewhat similar to Life, called Amerika, in the Russian language, was produced and sold at a profit. Now and for many years past it has cost the taxpayers of this country very substantial sums of money.

Mr. GROSS. I must say to my friend from New York, that I am disappointed that this particular appropriation has been increased by about \$1.5 million. It would be my hope that next year, if they do not show improvement in the administration of the U.S. Information Agency, the committee would give them a good healthy cut. Perhaps that would get them started along the right course.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. There are no additional employees in this appropriation for salaries and expenses. These increases come about mostly because of our having voted pay raises for our Federal employees.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman means that he and others voted for the pay increases.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. And I also went along over the years with the gentleman from Iowa when it came to the letter carriers and postal workers. Is my memory incorrect?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am afraid it is, up to this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like at this time, at the culmination of months of work, hard work, 5 days a week, to thank the members of my subcommittee and my staff, Mr. Howe and Mr. Mizelle, for their help and patience with me in getting this bill ready for the consideration of the House today.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DENT, 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. 17575) 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, had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 321, nays 14, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 120]
YEAS—321

Abbott	Bolling	Chappell
Adair	Bow	Clancy
Adams	Bray	Clawson, Del
Addabbo	Brinkley	Clay
Alexander	Brook	Cleveland
Anderson, Calif.	Broomfield	Collins
Anderson, Ill.	Brozman	Conable
Andrews, Ala.	Brown, Mich.	Conte
Andrews, N. Dak.	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
Annunzio	Broyhill, N.C.	Corman
Arends	Broyhill, Va.	Coughlin
Aspinall	Buchanan	Cowger
Ayres	Burke, Fla.	Cramer
Beall, Md.	Burke, Mass.	Crane
Belcher	Burleson, Tex.	Daniel, Va.
Bell, Calif.	Burlison, Mo.	Daniels, N.J.
Bennett	Burton, Calif.	Davis, Ga.
Berry	Burton, Utah	de la Garza
Bevill	Byrnes, Wis.	Delaney
Blester	Cabell	Dellenback
Blackburn	Caffery	Denney
Blanton	Carter	Dennis
Boggs	Casey	Dent
Boland	Cederberg	Devine
	Celler	Diggs
	Chamberlain	Dingell

Donohue	King	Reifel
Downing	Kleppe	Reuss
Dulski	Koch	Rhodes
Duncan	Kyl	Riegle
Dwyer	Landgrebe	Roberts
Eckhardt	Landrum	Robison
Edmondson	Langen	Rodino
Edwards, Ala.	Latta	Roe
Edwards, Calif.	Leggett	Rogers, Colo.
Edwards, La.	Lloyd	Rogers, Fla.
Ellberg	Long, Md.	Rooney, N.Y.
Erlenborn	Lowenstein	Rooney, Pa.
Eshleman	Lujan	Rosenthal
Evans, Colo.	Lukens	Rostenkowski
Evins, Tenn.	McClory	Roth
Fascell	McCulloch	Roudebush
Feighan	McDade	Roybal
Findley	McDonald,	Ruppe
Fish	Mich.	Ruth
Flood	McEwen	Ryan
Flowers	McKneally	Sandman
Foley	Macdonald,	Satterfield
Ford, Gerald R.	Mass.	Saylor
Foreman	MacGregor	Scherle
Fountain	Madden	Scheuer
Friedel	Mahon	Scott
Fulton, Pa.	Mailliard	Sebelius
Fulton, Tenn.	Marsh	Shipley
Galifianakis	Martin	Shriver
Gallagher	Mathias	Sisk
Garmatz	Matsunaga	Skubitz
Gaydos	May	Slack
Gialmo	Mayne	Smith, Calif.
Gibbons	Meeds	Smith, Iowa
Gilbert	Melcher	Smith, N.Y.
Goldwater	Michel	Snyder
Gonzalez	Mikva	Springer
Goodling	Miller, Calif.	Stafford
Green, Pa.	Miller, Ohio	Staggers
Griffin	Mills	Stanton
Grover	Minish	Steed
Gude	Mink	Steiger, Ariz.
Hagan	Mize	Stevens
Haley	Mizell	Stuckey
Halpern	Monagan	Sullivan
Hamilton	Moss	Symington
Hammer-	Murphy, Ill.	Taft
schmidt	Murphy, N.Y.	Taylor
Hanley	Myers	Teague, Calif.
Hanna	Natcher	Teague, Tex.
Hansen, Wash.	Nedzi	Thompson, Ga.
Harrington	Nelsen	Tieman
Harsha	Nichols	Udall
Hastings	Nix	Ullman
Hathaway	Obey	Van Derlin
Hawkins	O'Hara	Vander Jagt
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Neill, Mass.	Vanik
Heckler, Mass.	Passman	Waggonner
Helstoski	Patten	Wampler
Henderson	Pelly	Watkins
Hicks	Pepper	Watson
Hogan	Perkins	Watts
Holifield	Pettis	Weicker
Hosmer	Philbin	Whalley
Howard	Pickle	White
Hull	Pike	Whitehurst
Hungate	Pirnie	Whitten
Hunt	Poage	Widnall
Hutchinson	Podell	Wiggins
Ichord	Poff	Williams
Jacobs	Pollock	Wilson,
Jarman	Powell	Charles H.
Johnson, Calif.	Preyer, N.C.	Wold
Johnson, Pa.	Price, Ill.	Wolf
Jonas	Price, Tex.	Wright
Jones, Ala.	Fryor, Ark.	Wyatt
Jones, N.C.	Pucinski	Wyder
Jones, Tenn.	Purcell	Wyllie
Karh	Quile	Wyman
Kastenmeier	Quillen	Yates
Kazen	Randall	Young
Kee	Rees	Zablocki
Keith	Reid, Ill.	Zion

NAYS—14

Abernethy	Fisher	Montgomery
Camp	Fuqua	O'Konski
Colmer	Gettys	Patman
Dorn	Gross	Rarick
Dowdy	Hansen, Idaho	

NOT VOTING—94

Albert	Bush	Dawson
Anderson,	Button	Derwinski
Tenn.	Byrne, Pa.	Dickinson
Ashbrook	Carey	Esch
Ashley	Chisholm	Fallon
Baring	Clark	Farbstein
Barrett	Clausen	Flynt
Bette	Don H.	Ford,
Blaggi	Cobelan	William D.
Bingham	Collier	Fraser
Blatnik	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Brademas	Culver	Frey
Brasco	Cunningham	Gray
Brooks	Daddario	Green, Oreg.
Brown, Calif.	Davis, Wis.	Griffiths

Gubser	Meskill	Sikes
Hall	Minshall	Steiger, Wis.
Harvey	Mollohan	Stokes
Hays	Moorhead	Stratton
Hébert	Morgan	Stubblefield
Horton	Morse	Talcott
Kirwan	Morton	Thompson, N.J.
Kluczynski	Mosher	Thompson, Wis.
Kuykendall	Olsen	Tunney
Kyros	O'Neal, Ga.	Vigorito
Lennon	Ottinger	Waldie
Long, La.	Railsback	Whalen
McCarthy	Reid, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
McCloskey	Rivers	Winn
McClure	St Germain	Yatron
McFall	Schadeberg	Zwack
McMillan	Schneebell	
Mann	Schwengel	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Button.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Frey.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Gray with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Bush.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Schneebell.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Whalen.
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Derwinski.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Winn.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Zwack.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. Mann with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Waldie with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Bingham with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Brademas.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Yatron.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Ottinger.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I made today during consideration of the bill just passed and include therewith tables and miscellaneous matter.

I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 1010) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1010

Resolved, That Charles H. Griffin, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MAY 18

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the acting majority leader, the gentleman from Louisiana, if he will kindly advise us as to the legislative program for the balance of this week and next week.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. At the conclusion of consideration of the International Travel Act of 1971, it is my intention to go over until Monday.

The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday the Consent Calendar followed by three suspensions:

S. 2624, the Customs Courts Act of 1970;

S. 1508, relating to the retirement of justices and judges; and

H.R. 3328, Soboda Indian Reservation water supply.

There is also S. 2315, to restore the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

On Tuesday there will be the call of the Private Calendar to be followed by H.R. 17619, Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971; and H.R. 17405, the Atomic Energy Commission authorization under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

On Wednesday there is scheduled for the consideration of the House H.R. 17604, the military construction authorization for fiscal year 1971, subject to a rule being granted.

And H.R. 15073, bank records and foreign transactions, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

For Thursday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

H.R. 17550, the Social Security Amendments of 1970, subject to a rule being granted.

H.R. 15424, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, subject to a rule being granted.

And, House Resolution 796, amending the Rules of the House of Representa-

tives relating to financial disclosure, to be considered under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Of course, conference reports may be brought at any time and any further program may be announced later.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of six bills that have been reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. The chairman of that committee, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), has indicated that one day next week he may seek to call up these bills by unanimous consent.

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

There was no objection.

The bills referred to follow:

H.R. 6854, free entry of peal of bells for Smith College;

H.R. 8512, suspension of duty on L-Dopa;

H.R. 14720, suspension of duty on manganese ore;

H.R. 16199, working capital fund for the Treasury;

H.R. 16940, suspension of duty on electrodes for use in producing aluminum; and

H.R. 17241, suspension of duty on copper.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for this information with reference to the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. I would like to say to the gentleman that in light of the very heavy schedule for next week there is a possibility of a session on Friday next.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

AUTHORITY FOR THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bill and joint resolution duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL ACT OF 1961

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 939 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 939

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to 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. 14685) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, in order to improve the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the United States, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed on page 4, line 4 through page 7, line 8 of the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto for final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLEN) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 939 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 14685. It also waives points of order against the amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed on page 4, line 4 through page 7, line 8 of the bill because this amendment is not germane to the bill as originally introduced.

The purpose of H.R. 14685, as amended, is to increase the appropriation authorization for the U.S. Travel Service, to grant new authority to the Service, and to create a National Tourism Resources Review Commission.

The appropriation authorization would be increased from the existing \$4.7 million per fiscal year to \$15 million for each of fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973.

New authority would be given to the Secretary of Commerce to allow him to make matching grants to States, cities, and regional groupings of States or any public or private nonprofit groups for the purpose of the act. He would be authorized to enter into contracts with profitmaking organizations for joint projects with the Government; make awards of merchandise manufactured and purchased in the United States to

foreign travel agents and tour operators as an incentive for their promoting travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries.

A Commission would be established which would be charged with the responsibility of determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other countries at the present time and to the year 1980; determining the travel resources of the United States available to satisfy such needs now and to the year 1980; determining policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately and efficiently met; determining a recommended program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities presently performed by different existing agencies of the Government.

The Commission would be composed of 15 members—eight from various Government agencies and seven to be appointed by the President from private life. The Commission would report its findings and recommendations within 2 years of the enactment of this legislation and would cease to exist 60 days after the submission of its report. The appropriation authorized for the Commission would be \$250,000.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 939 in order that H.R. 14685 may be considered.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman to what does the waiver apply? Does it apply to all the committee amendments, or to specific ones, would the gentleman say?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The waiver applies just to those sections appearing in italics on page 4. If the gentleman will look at the bill, he will find on page 4, line 4, the sections in italics, through page 7, line 6 of the bill.

This was a part of a bill which I had introduced separately, and which was made a part of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. But the waiver of points of order does not go to section 6 to be found on page 3, beginning on line 14?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. No; it does not, because this is considered germane to the original bill as it was introduced.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 939 makes in order for consideration of H.R. 14685, as amended, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the authorizations of the U.S. Travel Service, which is charged with promoting foreign travel to the United States, to grant new authority to the Travel Service, and to create a National Tourism Resources Review Commission.

Under the International Travel Act of 1961, the U.S. Travel Service is charged with the responsibility of developing and carrying out a program to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by foreign nationals as a means of promoting good will, and also to help alleviate our balance-of-payments situation, caused to some degree by the number of Americans traveling abroad each year. The Travel Service has been carrying out this responsibility. In addition to its Washington headquarters, it operates offices in London, Paris, Frankfurt, Tokyo, Sydney, Sao Paulo, and Mexico City.

The committee believes an expanded program is needed in this field. Presently, \$4,700,000 is being spent annually. The Travel Service suggests a \$15 million a year program, and on page 5 of the report projects its plans under such an appropriation. The committee has recommended this scope in its reported bill.

The bill authorizes appropriations of \$15 million for fiscal 1971, 1972, and 1973, in line with the expanded program outlined by the U.S. Travel Service.

The bill also grants additional authority to the Secretary of Commerce to enable him to: First, make matching grants—of up to 50 percent of the cost—to local, State, or regional groups promoting tourism to their area; second, make awards to foreign travel agents and tour operators as an incentive to promoting travel to the United States by foreign nationals; and, third, enter into contracts with profitmaking organizations for joint projects of travel promotion.

Finally, the bill creates a National Tourism Resources Review Commission of 15 members, eight from executive departments involved in the field, plus seven members, appointed by the President, from private life who are knowledgeable in the field. The Commission is required to report to the President and the Congress within 2 years and then cease to exist. The authorization for the Commission is \$250,000.

The Commission is to: first, determine the domestic travel needs of citizens and visitors from abroad now and up to the year 1980; second, determine what travel resources the United States has available to meet these needs, now and up to 1980; third, determine what policies and programs are needed to insure travel needs will be met; fourth, determine a recommended Federal program of assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and, fifth, determine whether a new agency should be established to coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities which are now carried out by several agencies within the executive.

The bill has administration support. There are no minority views.

I have no further request for time but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. 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. STAGGERS. 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. 14685) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, in order to improve the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

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. 14685, with Mr. SLACK 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 rule, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14685 would amend the International Travel Act of 1961 and would create a National Tourism Resources Review Commission.

The amendments to the International Travel Act are designed, first, to increase the appropriation authorization from the present level of \$4.7 million a year to \$15 million for each of the fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973; and, second, to grant new authority to the Secretary of Commerce. The new authority would allow the Secretary, first, to make matching fund grants to States, cities, and regional groupings of States, for the purposes of the Act; second, to enter into contracts with profitmaking organizations for joint projects with the Government; and, third, to make token awards of U.S. merchandise to foreign travel agents and tour operators.

The U.S. Travel Service, established by the International Travel Act of 1961, is charged with developing, planning, and carrying out a comprehensive program to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries. In the past decade tourism has developed into one of the most dynamic forces in the world economy. In 1961, there were 6.3 million international tourist arrivals in the United States. In 1968, the number of world tourist arrivals in the United States had increased to almost 11 million—a change of 74.6 percent in the space of 7 years. This represents an average annual rate of growth of 10.9 percent.

Visits to the United States by international visitors not only promotes friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States, but also helps to reduce the travel deficit in our international balance of payments. International tourism receipts, not only account for the largest single item in world trade; they are

growing at a faster rate than the value of total world exports. In 1968, we earned more money and received more visitors than any other travel destination. In that year, the 10.9 million foreign visitors to our country spent an estimated \$2.030 billion. Yet, at the same time, the more than 18 million U.S. citizens who traveled abroad spent \$3.907 billion. This resulted in a travel deficit of \$1.877 billion in our international balance of payments. As the current Director of the U.S. Travel Service, C. Langhorne Washburn, testified in our hearings, the funds spent on these travel promotion programs are really an investment in promoting good will and improving our balance of payments.

H.R. 14685 also would create a National Tourism Resources Review Commission composed of 15 members—eight of them representatives from eight different Federal agencies and departments with interest in travel promotion, and seven of them public members appointed by the President. The Commission would be charged with making a thorough study of our existing programs to promote travel to and within the United States and would make recommendations for changes in those programs and coordination of our Government's travel promotion efforts. An appropriation of sums not to exceed \$250,000 is authorized by the bill, and the Commission would be required to submit its report together with recommendations to the President and the Congress not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the amendments to the International Travel Act of 1961 have been requested by the Department of Commerce. The creation of a National Tourism Resources Review Commission has been supported by the private and governmental witnesses who appeared or filed statements in our hearings. No objections to the bill have been received by the committee. I urge passage of H.R. 14685.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Over what period of time did the gentleman say there was a deficit in the balance of trade attributable to tourism in foreign countries? Over what period of time?

Mr. STAGGERS. The figures I gave were for 1968.

Mr. GROSS. One year?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. How long does the gentleman think it would take, with an expenditure of \$15 million a year or less, to reverse that deficit with the grandiose setup that he proposes here?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am not proposing this. The administration has proposed this to us. I think it is a good proposal. The small amount that we would spend, if it does anything to promote travel in the United States, would help. In the last 7 years, from 1961 to 1968, we have found that the amount spent is a very small part of the amount which came into this country. We have a deficit, as I have said, of almost \$2 billion in the balance-of-

payments for travel. If we could get any part of that \$2 billion back, this would be a small outlay.

Mr. GROSS. You would at least hope to recover the \$15 million; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; I think we could expect that and many times more in the first and second years and in the years to come.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not prepared to say when we could wipe out the deficit. The gentleman really does not think that we could wipe out the deficit with travel agencies, with a superduper travel agency in this country, does he? You do not think that will wipe it out, do you?

Mr. STAGGERS. No; I have no expectations that it will. I will say this to my colleague from Iowa, the fact is that if we do something in the direction proposed, we will not only help to reduce the deficit, but we will create good will across the world.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman used the word "token"—

Mr. STAGGERS. Token award.

Mr. GROSS. Token award. What is a token award?

Mr. STAGGERS. Oftentimes in the United States we have given to industries a flag, an "E" for effort, or something like that. That is something we hope to do with travel agencies abroad. We would give them something that has been made in this country for their effort in helping to get people to travel to this country.

Mr. GROSS. You do not, then, intend to hold raffles in connection with plane rides or bus rides for foreigners visiting this country?

Mr. STAGGERS. No.

Mr. GROSS. Or bingo games?

Mr. STAGGERS. No.

Mr. GROSS. You do not intend to give away automobiles or maybe some Kentucky bourbon or something of that kind?

Mr. STAGGERS. No.

Mr. GROSS. A token is a flag?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. It would be a U.S. flag, I take it.

Mr. STAGGERS. It would be something made in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. We have spent a considerable amount of money on this travel agency, have we not, and what have been the results up to this point for the money we have already spent?

Mr. STAGGERS. I just gave them a moment ago. I cannot attribute all of the results to the money spent. This agency started in 1961. Since 1961 tourists coming into this country have increased in number. In 1961 international tourists in this country numbered 6.3 million, and in 1968—and that is the period for which we have the statistics—they numbered almost 11 million. That is an increase of 74.6 percent. However, we do not attribute it all to this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Did they exclude from those tourist figures all the foreigners that have been brought to this country at our expense to teach, student exchange programs, and so forth? Do all the foreigners who come in go into that list?

Mr. STAGGERS. This is international tourists, so I would assume they would be excluded.

Mr. GROSS. They would be excluded? Mr. STAGGERS. I would think so, under this definition.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has \$15 million in this bill. The gentleman is aware, is he not, that we just passed a bill about 30 minutes ago which provided \$4.5 million for this purpose?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am.

Mr. GROSS. How can the House now give approval to \$15 million instead of \$4.5 million?

Mr. STAGGERS. The present bill is only on the question of authorization. This is only my speculation, but I have understood that if this bill passes, the administration hopes to go before the other body and get the appropriation at a little higher rate.

Mr. GROSS. I waited with bated breath for someone who supports this bill to get up and offer an amendment to push the appropriation bill up from \$4.5 million to \$15 million. If no one else does, I will offer an amendment for \$4.5 million, to make it conform to what the House did a few minutes ago. I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment, because he voted for the bill, and he was surely aware of the amount he was approving in that bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. As I said to the gentleman from Iowa, it is my understanding that when this bill passes, the administration will go before the other body and ask for more money.

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

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

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, on page 2, line 15, it says:

May enter into contracts with private profit-making individuals, businesses, and organizations for projects designed to carry out the purposes of this Act . . .

How are those contracts to be entered into? Are they to be by competitive bid?

Mr. STAGGERS. In my opinion it would be subject to the requirements of the law, just as any other contracts entered into by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. WOLFF. These are, in fact, promotional contracts?

Mr. STAGGERS. They would have to be, and certainly they would have to be entered into as contracts with someone who would carry out the purposes of the act itself.

Mr. WOLFF. What I am concerned about is the fact that there would be more than one firm that is committed to bid on these contracts.

Mr. STAGGERS. I am certain that it would be open for anyone to bid. It would be under the existing laws as to contracts entered into by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the International Travel Act has been with us since 1961. Its purpose has been to promote travel to and within the United States by foreign nationals. As part of a larger trade liberalization package it was meant to

improve or even equalize the balance of payments in the field of tourism. Americans love to travel, and our country has consequently suffered badly in the exchange. We have spent many more times the money abroad than has come to us from the same source.

Aside from this economic consideration it has always been desirable that we promote the attractions of our country and encourage citizens of other lands to visit and appreciate them.

Under the Travel Act the United States Travel Service has attempted to do this with modified success. Material has been produced and distributed. Offices have been maintained in a few countries. The effort, however, has suffered from the beginning from underemphasis. It has been like telling an airplane pilot to fly low and slow. It cannot be done. Industry would spend more to promote a new mouthwash than we have seen fit to spend to promote our entire Nation to people around the world.

The time has come when we should expand the effort into a fullscale, meaningful campaign. If it does not pay off and show rather dramatic results, then it should be ditched entirely, not just left limping along. Since 1961, and except for the first year—at \$3 million—the program has had a level authorization of \$4.7 million. With this money seven very modest regional offices have been maintained in various countries. The bill under consideration today would change this level of effort by raising the authorization to \$15 million per year for the next 3 years. No doubt some of the same things done in the past will be continued but they will be improved and expanded.

In addition to firing up old efforts the bill makes provision for entirely new activities which should aid in creating the kind of promotion we hope for. USTS will be permitted to make matching grants to States, cities, and regional groups and other public and private nonprofit groups with good ideas for promotion of their particular areas. It may also enter into contracts with private concerns for the carrying out of promotional projects or materials. In addition, merchandise can be used as incentives to foreign travel agents for pushing U.S. travel.

The whole idea behind this additional authority is to make it possible to find new ideas and capitalize upon them. I am sure that anyone here can, without difficulty, think of some organization in his area which would have something to offer in attracting visitors. Most areas have done a fine job in attracting our own citizens. To do the same kind of thing for foreign travelers will take an extra effort, a somewhat different approach and the cooperation of the Federal Establishment through the Travel Service. It is the intention of this legislation to give foreign traveler promotion the old college try.

Since we have not tried this all-out approach before, it behooves us to observe closely what happens as a guide to future action. There undoubtedly is still much we do not know about tourism as it applies to foreign visitors. For this reason the bill also provides for a Na-

tional Tourism Review Commission. While our increased effort goes forward this body will study all aspects of tourism. It will look to see just what we have to offer and how best to offer it. It will make recommendations for programs at all levels. Consideration can also be given to the desirability of creating a separate agency within the Government to deal with the broad subject of tourism.

The Commission I have mentioned will consist of 15 members. Seven will be appointed by the President and eight will represent agencies of the Federal Government. The Department of Commerce will supply the logistic support and no more than \$250,000 may be used in appropriations. The Commission will report in 2 years, and this will give the Congress time to determine what kind of effort is needed to realize the most from tourism.

I am personally enthusiastic about the increase in effort being made here and now through the Travel Service, and I am equally enthusiastic about the study which should help us define, refine and possibly reorganize our activities in the very important field of tourism. I recommend the legislation.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. And, of course, no small part of what the foreigners get from U.S. tourists comes from junketing Members of Congress and their staffs and families and so on and so forth; is that not true?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my colleague from Iowa I have noted that there have been Members traveling from my own committee. I do not know what words the gentleman uses and I do not use the word "junketing." The members of our committee who have traveled have been working committees. I have watched many from others—

Mr. GROSS. About all of them?

Mr. SPRINGER. Just a moment. Let me finish this because I do not want any misunderstanding. I have watched other subcommittees and members from other committees in the same city that I happen to be on another matter and they worked 8 hours a day. I do not know whether the gentleman wants to term that junketing or not. There may be others doing what the gentleman likes to term junketing but I have not had that experience. But, if the gentleman wishes to term it that, that is certainly his prerogative.

Mr. GROSS. When they go over there they spend money, do they not?

This Government has been in and out and around about on this issue of Americans spending money traveling abroad as well as Americans not spending their own money.

We had a President preceding the present President who tried to put the lid on foreign tourism by Americans, but the first thing we knew the members of his own family had broken the ranks. They were over there touring and shopping, and that was the end of that.

So, I do not know where we stand in this business. I do not know how much

money it is going to take to subsidize foreign visitors to get them to this country. It is a cinch no great mass of foreigners will come here and pay the high hotel rates and high transportation costs. I do not know what it is going to take, how many hundreds of millions of dollars to prepare some kind of subsidized program to entice them to come over here.

Does the gentleman have any idea what this will involve in the end?

Mr. SPRINGER. No; I am saying to you what they are asking for is \$15 million for a 3-year period.

Mr. GROSS. \$15 million a year for 3 years?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. That is \$45 million in total, with no assurance that we will get anything back.

Mr. SPRINGER. In cases where we have invested the money in such a program we have realized a return. I was just telling the gentleman that there are more Scandinavians who fly from that area to Chicago, Ill.; to Indiana, to Michigan, and other States in that area because they are settled by people from Scandinavia. There is also the State of Iowa, where these people visit.

In other words, 60,000 people year before last came over here from those countries and a large part of it was the result of the promotion of the SAS program, because that is the airline with the Scandinavian countries. But I still say they are simply starving to death with reference to a promotional program and I agree with them. When I talked with them I had to agree with them and when I saw what kind of exhibition we had in the new travel tourist building in Stockholm and saw this little bitty spot up there, I felt very badly about it.

I said to my distinguished colleague from Iowa and I say it again, let us either do this program right or let us abolish it. If the gentleman wants to take the position of abolishing the program, that is his privilege. I do not think it ought to be abolished. I think it ought to be promoted and we are trying to do it on a reasonable basis. We are trying to do a good job.

In the Department of Commerce they are struggling to come up with a good program. We went down there and saw the efforts which they were making and I thought it represented an excellent start.

However, if the gentleman insists that there is not any benefit to be obtained from such a program, he is entitled to his own opinion. But I do say let us either do it right or not at all.

Mr. GROSS. I am unable to understand why foreigners cannot come under their own power to see this country.

Mr. SPRINGER. For the same reason, may I say, that my daughters and their friends go through the Sunday New York Times to look for the bargains in travel. They try to pick out the bargains in these other countries. They certainly do not pick out the ones in this country. There is no such advertising program to attract their attention. They are looking for those places they would like to go.

The same thing has to be built up in the minds of people who live in other

countries if you are going to do any good with it.

Mr. GROSS. The Lord knows we have spent enough money wet-nursing foreigners all over the world. They ought to know where the United States is located; they have heard something about us, or else we have spent billions—untold billions of dollars around the world for very little purpose.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let me say I do not think the gentleman meets the question at all. This is strictly a promotion of travel in an effort to reverse our imbalance of payments. I think that if we are going to do it this is about the minimum program that I could think of. Our committee went over it extensively, carefully, and in every single way we could, and we finally came up with this kind of budget, and may I say the budget is worked out as carefully as anything could be done. But I do want to say that I respect the gentleman for his opinion about it, and I am sure he is entitled to it.

(Mr. KEITH (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, one of the fastest growing items in world trade is international tourism. Astonishingly, in 1968, tourism accounted for almost 15 percent of the total value of world trade.

In light of this growth, every nation in the world has come to recognize the importance of tourism to its national economy and its balance-of-payments positions. Many nations, including most of our European friends, have conducted vigorous and competitive programs to attract a greater share of the international travel market.

Unfortunately, our Nation is relatively new to this activity. It was only in 1961 that we first established an international travel promotion bureau in the Commerce Department. And, that agency has since remained one of the most underfunded of any major national effort to attract foreign tourists. As a result, the United States ranks 26th in terms of national support for travel development programs.

However, despite this serious underfunding, the U.S. Travel Service in the Commerce Department has managed to establish a basic, working partnership between the Government and the American travel industry. Nevertheless, much needs to be done in terms of enhancing this partnership and enlisting the resources of the States and cities to bring more foreign visitors to the United States. The need for an increased effort is clear: In 1969, our travel deficit was \$2 billion. Such a deficit can only worsen our overall balance-of-payments position.

Of course, we could always adopt a restrictive international travel and trade policy. Such a development, though, would undo all we have tried to accomplish since World War II in the area of more liberalized international trade. On a more positive note, we can increase our earnings of foreign exchange by promoting exports and by encouraging foreign tourists to select the United States as a travel destination.

In my view, the legislation before us today is such a positive step in the direction of rectifying our international payments position. This bill provides the USTS with the necessary tools to increase our earnings of foreign exchange. It will involve the States, cities, and regions in foreign travel promotion through a new grant-in-aid program, and it will develop a more active participation by private industry, allowing the Travel Service to enter into joint industry contracts. Finally, this legislation will establish a joint industry-Government travel resources review commission to recommend new approaches in the field of travel promotion.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 14685, at a minimum additional cost, promises to put this Nation at last on an equal competitive footing with other countries in the international effort to attract tourist dollars. This bill is a needed one and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting its passage.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14685 which would amend the International Travel Act of 1951 in certain particulars in order to improve our balance-of-payment position by further promoting travel to the United States. I wish at the outset to commend the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) and the committee which he chairs, for the expeditious reporting of this important legislation.

I am pleased to report that the provisions relating to the establishment of a 15-member National Tourism Resources Review Commission were adapted from my bill, H.R. 12646, which was designed to strengthen our tourism program as it relates to both international travel and domestic travel. The Commission would be composed of one representative from each of eight departments and agencies of the Federal Government plus seven individuals appointed by the President from the private sector who are experts in tourism. The Commission would probe existing travel resources, determine the travel needs of our own citizens and of visitors from abroad in the decade ahead, and recommend policies and programs which would best meet such needs.

This is a big order and the proposed Commission would require considerable time to do an adequate job. Accordingly, the bill we are considering allows 2 full years for the study to be completed.

The main thrust of H.R. 14685 clearly is to make tourism a major industry in the entire United States. The most attractive feature of this objective is that tourism can be built up as a major industry with the least investment for the greatest return. We learned this in Hawaii some years ago.

In 1958, less than 12 years ago, only 171,588 tourists visited Hawaii. This represented an increase of only 2 percent over the preceding year. The total visitor dollar expenditure in the Islands amounted to an estimated \$82 million.

Also in 1958, the territorial legislature appropriated \$500,000 for use by the Hawaii Tourist Bureau, a quasi-public

agency, in promoting Hawaii's tourist industry. As a consequence, in the course of 1 short year the number of tourists to Hawaii jumped to 243,216, an increase of 42 percent. These visitors spent an estimated \$109 million in Hawaii. This meant that by an expenditure of one-half million dollars the Territory of Hawaii increased its income from visitors by \$27 million, a net gain of \$26½ million, all in the course of 1 year—a wise and profitable investment, indeed.

In 1960, the State legislature increased its annual appropriation to \$750,000, and the number of visitors to Hawaii rose in 1961 to 319,422. They spent \$137,000,000.

By 1968, the State legislature had increased its appropriation for the promotion of tourism to \$1,478,500, and the number of visitors to the Aloha State had climbed to a phenomenal 1,364,228 persons who spent over \$460,000,000. The visitor increase in 1969 over 1968 was 13 percent.

If this type of tourist development could be conducted on a national scale, whereby visitors to this country from foreign lands could be increased in proportion to the increase enjoyed over the past decade by the State of Hawaii, we would have no need to be concerned over the deficit in our balance of payments.

A notable fact is that about 200,000 of Hawaii's 1969 visitors came from Oceania and Asia. About 60,000 came from Japan alone. Another significant fact is that 30 percent, or nearly one-third of the 1,364,228 visitors, were members of organized groups. This points to the promotional aspects of developing the full potentialities of tourism as a new national industry.

Tourism lends itself to a dual classification, international and domestic. International tourism is important to the United States for several reasons. In the first place, it helps to improve our balance-of-payment position. Foreign visitors in 1968 spent a total of \$2 billion in the United States, including \$260 million paid to U.S.-flag carriers. The 1969 figures are expected to exceed this total.

There is also the intangible benefit to be gained from foreign tourism. This is the international goodwill which is fostered when foreign visitors come to see how we live and get to know us better. Recent Government surveys, one of which was conducted at the Honolulu International Airport, reveal that departing foreign visitors are most favorably impressed with the warmth and friendliness of the American people. We may safely conclude on the basis of these findings that international understanding could be greatly improved by having greater numbers of ordinary citizens from all parts of the world visit our country.

Finally, there is the incalculable benefit to be derived from having foreign visitors exposed to American-made goods, particularly as an aid to the marketing of our goods abroad.

These benefits were recognized by Congress when it enacted the "International Travel Act of 1961." This landmark legislation created the U.S. Travel Service in the Department of Commerce and constituted the first step toward the establishment of an effective tourism pro-

gram. The time has come for Congress to expand and strengthen the 1961 law in order that tourism would mean not only the stimulation and encouragement of travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, but also the stimulation and encouragement of travel within the United States by our own citizens who would otherwise travel abroad.

Mr. Chairman, we are all deeply concerned about the deficit in our balance of payments. If Hawaii's experience is to be taken as an indication of what will happen here in the United States if we should pass this bill today, I can almost guarantee to you that we will have no more concern over our deficit in our balance of payments.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this, that the gentleman who just preceded me has presented a number of arguments which are quite valid. You know, there is a product called Coca-Cola that is made in my hometown. It is a good product. But that product has been made by one thing, and one thing alone, and that is advertising.

We in this country have some mighty fine States and we have some mighty good products, but if we do not tell the rest of the world about these products, they are going to believe these headlines that they may see about student disorders and about all the riots on the campuses or whatever it may be.

Hawaii is ideally situated to draw people from Japan. The per capita income in Japan is increasing each and every year so that more and more people have money to travel. Jet airplanes make it very feasible for the people to travel, not only to Hawaii from Japan, but on to the United States. The \$1¼ billion deficit we have in travel certainly can be reduced, but it can be reduced only by promotion.

What does this bill do? It provides an incentive for the States themselves to get into the act. If they are willing to put up as much money as the Federal Government is, we can provide some grants to some of the State agencies, and then they can advertise in foreign countries for tourists to come to their particular State. If other States in our union do not like that advertising, then they can advertise and put up some of their money to try to get tourists to their State. By so doing, we will be helping the balance of payments.

There is one statement that the gentleman from Hawaii made that I think should be impressed upon the minds of all, and that is this point. When visitors from foreign lands visit the United States, they normally go away with a very good feeling in the pits of their stomachs, and it helps our foreign affairs and our foreign relations. We need to have more exchange of visitors in the United States. We need to have people from foreign countries come and see what we are like first-hand. This program is designed to encourage that kind of activity.

But there is another part of this bill which is new. It was the original idea

of the gentleman from Hawaii. That is the creation of the Commission known as the National Tourist Resources Review Commission. What is this Commission going to do? They are going to evaluate not only our international travel, our trying to get people into this country, but they are also going to evaluate means of keeping people at home, means of keeping our dollars in our own country to promote, within the United States, the advantages of the United States. So when a person who might otherwise decide that he wants to go to Pango-Pango, Australia, or elsewhere, it may be that he might be convinced that there is something he would like to visit in the United States more, and the dollars would stay in this country. I think that is a very useful part of this particular bill.

I had occasion to take a trip to Mexico City at the taxpayers' expense. I guess perhaps you could call it a junket. It was a working trip. I visited the Tourist Bureau in Mexico City and I talked to the people a little about what they were doing. They showed me some information that they were putting into the glove compartments of automobiles that were being sold in Mexico City. The new car dealers were inserting a packet about the United States, encouraging automobile trips to the United States.

I said, "This is great. How many are you getting up?"

They said, "Unfortunately, we have only \$172,000 a year and we are not able to have enough printed to go into all the automobiles." But there are many places in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and the States all the way to Chicago that these people would like to visit, and by putting that little incentive in the glove compartments of automobiles, the owners are inspired to think, "Well, I can make a trip to the United States. I can make it in my automobile." Money will be made available in here for advertising and promotion, items that are needed such as this.

There is another factor which may not be considered. Europe, of course, is competing for the tourist dollar with us in South America. A South American has the choice of either coming here or going to Europe. European countries are spending millions and millions of dollars trying to promote tourist travel to Europe. Why? Because they want the money of the tourists.

Well, it is time that we started wanting some of this money and started doing something about it.

But, as with anything in the business world, it takes money to create the market. Just as the Coca-Cola Co. cannot tell us specifically what Coca-Cola they may sell because they put a sign over Joe's Drive-In saying "Drink Coca-Cola," they also know if they did not have that sign over Joe's Drive-In and many other signs in other places, they would not be selling as many Coca-Colas as they now sell.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE).

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, some of us had reservations when this bill was before the committee, not so much with respect to the funds that might be appropriated, because if we are going to have an effective program, we have to have a sufficient amount of money, but we were concerned about the new sections that were being added to the International Travel Act. In the first instance, in clause 5, it says a State or political subdivision may enter into these contracts with the agency on a matching grant basis, and then the Secretary is authorized to establish such policies and standards as he may need to carry out the provisions of the act.

When we go to clause 6, it says that if he does not think it is sufficient to carry out the provisions of clause 5, he can then enter into an agreement with private profitmaking organizations.

I wonder why that section in the bill, on page 2, which reads:

The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the administration of this clause,

is not also provided for in clause 6? It seems to me it would give the Secretary very broad authority and discretion if he wanted to enter into agreements with private profitmaking organizations. Am I to assume that the reason that was not included in clause 6 is that the Secretary would be bound by certain rules in the granting of contracts?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; the gentleman is correct. The Secretary is bound by the present law in making any contract. Where there is any appropriated money involved, he must first advertise and then seek competitive bids. The Secretary must do that.

Mr. PICKLE. Then if he enters into any agreement or contract with a private profitmaking organization, he must follow rigid rules; that is, competitive bids and competitive contracts?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right. He must first advertise and then have competitive bids.

Mr. PICKLE. I think that should be understood by everybody, that he cannot summarily enter into contracts.

I wonder if we have not left too broad the provision in clause 6 that says he may enter into contracts with private profitmaking individuals and businesses and organizations. This bothered many of us on the committee, because we felt that was too broad. I wonder how we might have an understanding as to what kind of organization this would refer to. Would it just mean anybody or any kind of organization the Secretary wanted to make a contract with?

Mr. STAGGERS. I do not see how the Secretary can exclude anyone who has a legitimate business and can do the job. Of course, they would have to show they could do the job first. That would have to be part of the contract.

Mr. PICKLE. Is the chairman saying it would be assumed that any organization which the Secretary might enter into an agreement with would have to have some affinity or some association with the travel business, and that it would not be just wide open, but it would

be those organizations which were related to the promotion of travel?

Mr. STAGGERS. I do not know how anyone could bid on this unless he is experienced in this line, and the Secretary could say whether he could do the job.

I am sure that by existing law the Secretary would be prohibited from going out and getting somebody who was not qualified. I am sure that the notice for bids and the contract itself would require qualifications.

Mr. PICKLE. I doubt it is made plain that an organization would have to qualify; I do not believe it is made plain in the bill. I believe they ought to have to qualify. This is one of the things which concerned me. Perhaps by legislative history or at some amendment we can make it plain that those private organizations involved ought to be those which would be familiar with and associated with the promotion of travel, and not just leave it as wide open as the open skies. I hope such an amendment may be offered.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I am, of course, very strongly in favor of this measure because I come from what we like to believe is one of the leading tourist areas in the United States. This will mean much to my part of the country.

It is my opinion it is no less significant to the country than it is to any particular part of the country. Members do not always appreciate that the travel deficit of the United States in 1968, the last year for which we have complete figures, as given a minute ago by the distinguished chairman, was almost \$2 billion. That means Americans traveling abroad spent almost \$2 billion more than people from abroad spent in the United States.

Heretofore we have been limited to a little more than \$4 million a year for funds which might be expended by the travel service. We are coming now to a more rational realization of what this travel service and funds expended wisely under its direction can mean toward diminishing the balance-of-payments deficit of our country. That is very important to the economy of America.

This I believe is a measure which will contribute far and much toward reducing our balance-of-payments deficit and toward stimulating the economy and the progress of our country.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, it is particularly relevant that we should be discussing today the expansion of our international travel promotion program. This morning's papers carried the disturbing report that an official announcement would soon be made disclosing a sizable balance-of-payments deficit in the first quarter of 1970. The deficit is apparently in the liquidity balance.

Anyone familiar with the factors in our balance-of-payments deficit realizes one of the most serious is our negative tourist dollar posture. And it is precisely the tourist dollar that weighs heavily in

the liquidity factor. Foreign tourists visiting America, using American carriers provide the United States with substantial liquid exchange. However, foreign tourist expenditures in the United States do not come close to equaling American tourist expenditures in foreign countries. As a result, the tourist component in our balance-of-payments posture continually is in the negative. For the specific details on this matter, I refer my colleagues to the hearings on H.R. 14685. The U.S. Travel Service has provided detailed material on how the tourist dollar significantly affects the balance-of-payments picture.

In light of this, our discussion today is most important. For when the softening balance of payments is put into the perspective of our worsening domestic economy, we begin to realize that positive and dramatic action is required on a large number of fronts.

Promoting foreign travel to the United States, while it will not solve our complex and deepseated economic problems, can nevertheless help. I have already pointed out the serious impact of the tourist dollar on our balance-of-payments position. Another factor is the demonstrated velocity of the tourist dollar. Each dollar spent by a visiting foreign tourist has an impressive turnover rate. These dollars generate productivity and expansion.

Given these two factors, it is extremely important that the House give its approval to the amendments to the International Travel Act. The measure before us represents a substantial breakthrough in our thinking. Since its inception in the early 1960's, our travel promotion program has virtually been hobbled by inadequate funds, inattention from public leaders, and restrictive guidelines.

During 1964, it was my privilege to serve on the Select Subcommittee on Tourism. During that time, our investigations led us to the same conclusions that are finally reflected in the measure now before us. The conclusions we reached 6 years ago emphasized the need to intensify and intimately involve private enterprise in travel promotion. We, at that time, pointed out the necessity of developing new and imaginative programs designed to attract foreign tourists to the United States.

These ideas are incorporated in the bill we are now considering. For the first time, USTS will be able to enter into contracts with private companies. In its report, the committee emphasized "the necessity of mobilizing private resources in a truly coordinated national effort to increase our foreign exchange earnings from tourism."

It said:

To a great extent, the motivation on the part of U.S. industry is present. What is hindering the efforts in this area are technical difficulties that prohibit the Department of Commerce from undertaking joint projects with industry because it lacks direct authority for such undertakings.

This bill would solve the problems of mobilizing private resources.

The committee report also noted that it "believes that the Federal Govern-

ment's role in travel promotion should be one of innovation, planning, direction, coordination and evaluation." I consider this to be a most important and encouraging point of view. The committee backs up its concern with a virtual tripling of the USTS funding authorization.

Following the thinking of the committee, and based upon my earlier experience with the Select Subcommittee on Tourism, I believe I can suggest one course which definitely would be in line with current opinion.

Over the past 8 years I have served as a director on the board of the nonprofit American Host Foundation. The program has brought a large number of European teachers to the United States. The teachers have been entertained by families throughout America. The success of this program has given birth to a new and very innovative idea that is now being developed, on a nonprofit basis, by the director of the American Host Foundation. He is proposing, and I firmly share his confidence, that a nationwide host program of foreign visitors would substantially stimulate tourism. He is calling the program "Meet the Americans."

This new program, already in the initial development stages, offers the kind of innovative and imaginative prospects emphasized in the Commerce Committee report. It offers an opportunity for a positive Government-private enterprise cooperative effort that can stimulate an increase in the number of foreign visitors to the United States.

Some private companies have already indicated an interest in helping move the program along to the takeoff point. Limited Government support with these private companies could make the Meet the Americans concept a reality much more quickly than provided for in the present schedule.

Let me at this point present a few of the details on the Meet the Americans approach toward stimulating tourism and meaningful contacts between Americans and visitors from foreign lands.

There is at the moment no Government agency nor private organization to which a foreigner may write in order to arrange to have a home stay with an American family during a visit to our country. Through the experiences of the American host program, which provides for month-long stays with American families for visiting European teachers, we have learned that the possibility of spending a few days as the guest of an American family provides a great incentive for Europeans to make a trip to our country.

The Meet the Americans program will maintain a central file which will contain the names and addresses and other pertinent information regarding any American family in the United States who is willing to have any visiting foreigner as a guest in their home for a period of 1 or 2 weeks.

Foreigners who wish to arrange to spend some time with an American family will make application to the Meet the Americans headquarters; the applicant will be interviewed by staff volunteers; the applicant will be matched with a family that would be compatible; ap-

plicant and host family will then correspond for a minimum period of 3 months prior to the visit of the foreigner. The mechanics as outlined here have proven to be effective during the 8 successful years of operation of the American host program.

During the past 8 years, many national organizations have endorsed the American host program and have adopted it as an international relations program recommended to local chapters. The finest example of this type of national cooperation is the United States Jaycees, whose 6,000 local chapters throughout the United States are all encouraged by their national organization to be active participants in the program. In addition, American Host relies strongly upon the following organizations: Kiwanis International; Junior Women's Clubs of California; and the Church Women United of New York State.

The realistic expectation of the Meet the Americans program is to have a central file of more than 100,000 families within 12 months of the time the program is launched. There is also every reason to believe that an eventual registration of 1 to 2 million host families is not unrealistic.

During the last 8 years, there have been many discussions with Europeans in order to learn why they choose to spend their vacation periods in areas other than the United States. The overriding consideration governing their decision against a visit to the United States appears to be a "fear of the unknown." This fear of the unknown revolves primarily around monetary considerations. Regardless of the strenuous efforts made by the U.S. Travel Service and the U.S. travel industry, most Europeans still think of accommodations in the United States as being far too expensive for their pocketbooks.

The Meet the Americans program will solve this problem through the relationship established by correspondence between the prospective foreign visitor and the American family with whom 1 week will be spent during the visit to the United States.

The Meet the Americans program will be tied in primarily with 3-week excursion visits to the United States during periods other than the peak travel months of the summer. The visiting foreigner will spend 1 week with his American host family and the other 2 weeks he or she will be following the usual tourist itinerary.

The experience in the American Host program during the past 8 years has illustrated very vividly that visitors to our country who spend time living with American host families return to their homelands with many of their previous misconceptions dispelled and, even more importantly, with the feeling that they have established a warm and meaningful friendship with many Americans.

Over a period of years we can probably expect at least 1 percent of the 40,000,000 American families to respond to and enroll in our Meet the Americans program. Conservatively speaking, this provides 400,000 host families that we can expect to be active in our program. When each of these host families entertains one for-

sign couple for 1 week each year, we are speaking in terms of 400,000 visitors per year who will be given the incentive to come to our country. Once again a conservative estimate would tell us that each visitor will spend a minimum of \$1,000 for transportation and accommodations in the United States which gives us a \$400,000,000 per year foreign traveler expenditure in the United States.

These are, of course, just preliminary estimates. The point is this is the type of new program that can address itself to the economic issues I raised earlier. This program effectively reflects the new thinking suggested by the measure today. Meet the Americans has the real potential of promoting understanding and the American culture on a massive scale. And finally, but most important, it provides an avenue for effective private-Government cooperation, although its character should remain private and nonprofit, in achieving a wide variety of important goals.

I am most encouraged by the measure before us. It represents a policy I have been advocating since entering Congress. I am confident that the bill will serve as a catalyst to both private enterprise and the USTS to jointly develop the kind of programming and promotion that I have described in my report on Meet the Americans.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 14685, legislation to promote travel to the United States and to establish a National Tourism Resources Review Commission.

This legislation increases the authorized funding of the U.S. Travel Service from the existing \$4.7 million per fiscal year to \$15 million for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973, and grants the Secretary of Commerce new authority to promote our travel industry.

In addition, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with wisdom acted to accept the proposal offered by my distinguished colleague from Hawaii, the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, for the creation of the National Tourism Commission.

The Commission among other duties would fill the much-needed role of determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other countries at the present time and to the year 1980, and to make recommendations.

I am sure that the Commission will perform invaluable service in stimulating and developing travel for the benefit of all of our States. The experience of Hawaii has shown just how effective promotional efforts can be in developing a productive tourist industry.

In 1960 Hawaii spent \$750,000 in public funds to promote tourism and the number of visitors rose in the following year to 319,422 persons who spent \$137 million. By 1968 we had increased our appropriation for this to \$1.4 million, and this drew 1,364,228 persons who spent more than \$460 million.

Thus, a relatively small investment can play immense dividends. It is important that our Nation make this effort, for currently our citizens are contributing to the adverse U.S. position on balance of

payments. Figures show that last year our country took in \$2 billion from foreign visitors while U.S. tourists spent \$4.7 billion abroad.

Potentially, the world travel market is about \$20 billion. We need to increase our percentage of this and encourage our own people to see their country with its many great attractions and historical points. This legislation before us today will help on both needs.

I believe this bill will be of great benefit to Hawaii and to our other States by launching a great promotional campaign over the years ahead for United States travel. Many will be coming to see the fabled profile of Diamond Head and our storybook chain of islands in Hawaii, while others will be traveling to places of interest all across our land from coast to coast.

Let us act now to take this important step forward in the travel field, a move that will pay immense dividends. I recommend the adoption of H.R. 14685.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I find the \$2 billion travel gap and the fact that 25 nations outspend us in tourist promotion to be compelling arguments for support of H.R. 14685.

However, I believe there is another imperative, which gained additional force with the selection yesterday of Denver and Montreal as the 1976 Olympic cities.

In 1976 the United States is planning to celebrate its 200th birthday. While the scope of the observance has yet to be defined by the President, it can be expected that it will be the biggest foreign visitor attraction ever created by the United States. Prior to yesterday's action by the International Olympic Committee, it had been estimated foreign visitors to the United States in 1976 might reach as high as 30 million, which would be a 141-percent increase over last year. The traffic to Denver and Montreal for the Winter and Summer Olympic Games can be expected to add significantly to earlier projections.

Canada was faced with a similar situation in preparation for the highly successful Expo for '67 and one of the first actions taken by the Government was increasing the annual appropriation for the Canadian Government Travel Bureau—the USTS counterpart—from \$3 million to \$10 million several years prior to the exposition.

We know from Canada's experience that our preparation for attracting and facilitating the visits of citizens from abroad in 1976 should be underway now.

We have talked of the inevitability of a U.S. travel deficit. However, I believe 1976 offers us the real potential of putting the U.S. travel account in the black. Approval of H.R. 14685 will make achievement of that goal possible.

This measure also includes a most important section, drafted and guided to this floor by my good friend and colleague, Mr. SPARK MATSUNAGA of that beautiful tourist mecca, Hawaii. I speak of his National Tourism Review Commission which would be charged with reporting its findings to Congress within 2 years after the date of enactment. This vital 15-member Commission is a needed step if we are to promote and enhance

travel, and alleviate our balance-of-payments problem. I wish to thank Mr. MATSUNAGA personally for his contribution to this valuable piece of legislation.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my enthusiastic support to H.R. 14685, which would strengthen the Federal Government's program to promote travel to the United States from foreign countries.

My State, Florida, is well aware of the tremendous economic importance of tourism. Indeed, it is one of our most important industries, and in 1968 accounted for expenditures within Florida of \$5.5 billion. When 1969 data are all reported and analyzed, it will surely be even more.

H.R. 14685 would increase the present authorization of \$4.7 million a year for the encouragement and promotion of tourism to the United States from foreign countries. This authorization was established in the International Travel Act of 1961, and has never been increased.

Now, we are being asked to increase this amount to \$15 million. I heartily endorse this increase for a number of reasons.

First of all, tourism is big business. I have already noted the extent of tourist spending in Florida. Throughout the United States, it is estimated to total \$30 billion or more a year.

The International Union of Official Travel Organizations, headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland, has just released data on worldwide travel for pleasure. The International Travel Union estimates that in 1969, a total of 153 million persons participated in foreign travel, representing an increase of 8 percent over 1968. Their combined expenditures were estimated at \$15.3 billion, or a rise over 1968 of 9 percent. This represents a record level of spending for international tourism.

This rise in international tourism and spending came about, according to the International Travel Union, as a result of the general growth in world economic activity; plus a generally more stable political climate in Europe; and renewed foreign travel by Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I think the third reason for the growth of international tourism—the renewed foreign travel by Americans—should give us pause for some reflection.

American travel and expenditure in foreign countries contributes significantly to the total and to our balance-of-payments deficit. By this token alone, we should do everything we can to promote a reverse flow of international travelers and travel dollars to the United States.

For many years we have suffered a so-called travel gap—the difference between what Americans spend abroad, plus what they spend on foreign air and steamship lines getting there, and what foreign visitors spend here, plus the fares they pay U.S.-flag carriers to get here. Back in 1961, when the U.S. Travel Service was established in accordance with the International Travel Act, the travel gap was just over a billion dollars. It has nearly doubled to \$2 billion. At this level,

the travel imbalance aggravates our entire balance-of-payments problem.

It seems to me that it is good common-sense to spend dollars in an effort to reverse this trend and bring the U.S. travel balance into a better position.

And, it is good business sense to effect a vigorous program toward tapping that \$15 billion plus international travel market. These travelers are going some place. We have a large, attractive, marvelously varied country which has appeal to nearly all international travelers. It follows that we should be promoting the United States as strongly as practicable.

There is another factor also. This involves that most illusive and intangible of all elements in this day and age—international good will. I can think of no better way of earning international good will among foreign nationals than to have their rank and file come to our shores and rub shoulders with our rank and file, learning how we really live and work and think. It does work. In survey after survey, our visitors from abroad have indicated that the most pleasant part of their visit was getting to know the "friendly" American people.

Mr. Chairman, these are the reasons why we should increase the authorization for our international travel promotion effort—to redress our large and growing travel payments gap; to tap a significantly large travel market; and to generate a considerable amount of international good will, and I might add, at no extra direct expense to the Government.

The key to the success of such a program is promotion—alert, imaginative promotion.

Florida is no stranger to promoting its tourist attractions abroad. Our promotion has run alongside that of the U.S. Travel Service in European media.

This bill, H.R. 14685, provides for a matching program to encourage all the States to participate more fully in this worthwhile promotional effort. I agree with the Commerce Committee that in a country so large and diverse, each State, region, and city knows best its attractions and features, and that to best coordinate this knowledge with the Federal effort, a matching grant program as provided here is in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, let me add just a few further statistics to indicate what tourism means to Florida. In 1968, some 20 million tourists visited my State, plus an additional 6.3 million not classified as tourists because they came on business, or were en route to points outside the United States. It was the 20 million tourists who spent a total of \$5.5 billion, a figure I had mentioned earlier.

Of the 20 million tourists, 539,367 came from Canada. Accordingly, we are happy that the expanded program includes promotion in Canada.

Equally significant, a total of 171,000 of the tourists to Florida came from foreign countries other than Canada.

These totals of visitors from Canada and from other foreign countries are impressive. But, by no means are they to be considered a ceiling above which we cannot climb. Because with the accelerated promotion which the proposed author-

ization provides for, plus the additional effort to be generated among the States, we can and should enjoy a surge of visits from foreign travelers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of H.R. 14685 as a sound investment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us presents us with an opportunity to acknowledge the need for Federal assistance in the promotion of tourism. Being from an area which depends so greatly on tourists for its very existence, I am especially aware of the significance of this measure. The proposals are, however, so far reaching that all parts of this Nation will benefit economically and socially, and I believe this bill deserves the support of all parts of our country.

The direct economic benefit of the foreign tourist and the alleviation of our balance-of-payments deficit is matched only by the good will and understanding that these projects will promote. With the enactment of this legislation we will have come one step further in realizing the potential of the vast natural and human resources of our country. It is to our own benefit that we share them with the world.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14684

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the International Travel Act of 1961 (75 Stat. 129; 22 U.S.C. 2121-2126) is amended by changing the period at the end of clause 4 of subsection (a) to a semicolon, and by inserting after such clause the following:

"(5) upon the application of any State or political subdivision or combination thereof, or private or public nonprofit organization or association, may make grants for projects designed to carry out the purposes of this Act if he finds that such projects will facilitate and encourage travel to any State or political subdivision or combination thereof by residents of foreign countries. No financial assistance will be made available under this clause unless the Secretary determines that matching funds will be available from State or other non-Federal sources and in no event will the amount of any grant under this clause for any project exceed 50 per centum of the cost of such project. The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures and to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the administration of this clause;

"(6) may enter into contracts with private profitmaking individuals, businesses, and organizations for projects designed to carry out the purposes of this Act whenever he determines that such projects cannot be accomplished under the authority of clause (5) of this subsection;

"(7) may make awards of merchandise manufactured and purchased in the United States to travel agents and tour operators in foreign countries as an incentive for their promotion of travel in the United States by residents of foreign countries. The Secretary is authorized to establish such policies, standards, criteria, and procedures as he may deem necessary or appropriate for the administration of this clause."

Sec. 2. Section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary

to carry out the purposes of this Act, which shall be available without regard to the provisions of law set forth in sections 501 and 3702 of title 44 of the United States Code. When so specified in Appropriation Acts, amounts for printing of travel promotion materials are hereby authorized to be made available for two full fiscal years."

Sec. 3. Section 7 of such Act is renumbered "Sec. 8." and a new section 7 is inserted to read as follows:

"Sec. 7. As used in this Act, the term 'United States' and the term 'State' are defined to include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa."

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, strike out lines 8 through 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$15,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973. Funds appropriated under this section shall be available without regard to the provisions of sections 501 and 3702 of title 44 of the United States Code. Funds appropriated under this section for printing of travel promotion materials are authorized to be made available for two fiscal years."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross to the committee amendment: On page 3, line 16, strike out the figure \$15,000,000 and insert "\$4,500,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) lived in Hawaii when he was at home, but apparently he lives in a dreamland, because he said that the enactment of this bill would wipe out the deficit in the balance of payments. Well, the deficit in our balance of payments will amount to about \$9 billion this year, and at the present rate the deficit next year will probably be about \$8 billion. Not even the most starry-eyed optimist would expect to wipe out more than a fraction of that amount with foreign tourists.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I have heard of Hawaii being spoken of as the "Paradise of the Pacific." I am glad that the gentleman thinks Hawaii, where I live, is dreamland. I assure you that men who have dreams and men who pursue those dreams will accomplish the dreams.

We can make tourism in the United States as great an industry on a nation-

wide scale as we in Hawaii have made tourism an industry in Hawaii.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman from Georgia spoke of the foreigners who have come to this country and have had joy in the pits of their stomachs when they leave. Well, they ought to, because many of those have come for the purpose of obtaining more foreign aid in one way or another. I remember only recently when we discovered that 10 persons were brought here from a foreign country where we are going to send our Peace Corps. The 10 are to teach 27 American Peace Corps-ites to speak their language when the English language is in common usage in that country. Those 10 came to this country financed out of Peace Corps funds.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment because less than an hour ago nearly all of you voted for the State, Justice, Commerce, judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, and no one got up—not a soul—and offered an amendment to raise the \$4,500,000 in that bill to \$15 million. You all voted for \$4,500,000 and you all had the opportunity to offer an amendment to bring it up to \$15 million, knowing that this bill was coming on immediately behind it. All I am asking you to do is to put this bill back to what you approved a few minutes ago for the very same program. That is all.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman knows that the appropriation measure which was considered on this floor a little while ago was brought up on a waiver of points of order by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Hawaii knows that all he had to do was get up on the floor and offer an amendment to the \$4.5 million in the bill that he voted for. All he had to do was to offer an amendment to triple it to \$15 million.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. It would have been subject to a point of order if I had done that.

Mr. GROSS. No; it would not have been.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Without the authorization measure.

Mr. GROSS. The point of order went only to the protection of the bill itself. That is all. It was so that the appropriation bill could be considered. You could have offered an amendment had you wanted to do so.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman certainly knows that without the authorization and without the passage of this bill which authorizes the increase an amendment certainly would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. GROSS. That is the way we considered the bill. The rule was adopted and protected that provision in the bill providing for all appropriations. That is all. The gentleman could have offered an amendment to increase or decrease the money figure. Amendments were offered to various provisions in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I say again that it will be incredible if the House, which voted only an hour or so ago for \$4,500,000 for this very same program now turns around and voted to triple it to \$15,000,000 a year, and a total of \$45,000,000 for the next 3 years.

My amendment holds this spending to \$4,500,000—the figure you just approved in the appropriation bill. I urge that the amendment be adopted.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa mentioned the previous appropriation bill which was just passed and the fact that an appropriation of \$4.7 million was approved. However, that was made under the existing authorization of \$4.7 million. An amendment to increase the appropriation over \$4.7 would have been subject to a point of order because there was no authorization for it, and you could not put it in without an authorization. We are bringing in the authorization now. I am sorry we are late. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that we have tried to get it on the floor for a couple of weeks but we have been unable to do so. I am satisfied that the administration will want the appropriation increased when it goes to the other body.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that there are some additional points which are of significance and which I think we ought to take into consideration. I have reference to the remarks which were made by the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Hawaii started with a simple budget of \$500,000 in 1958 and its tourism brought in about \$82 million. They have increased their budget since that time. Last year they had a budget of \$1.4 million, and their income from tourism was \$460 million.

Mr. Chairman, I would hate to cut this request. I would hate to cut off my potential of developing income from tourism. I would hate to be accused of cutting off some of the income that might come into this country as a result of this program.

I do believe this program has great potential or I would not be for it. I believe the administration is justified in asking for it. I believe we ought to advertise our country and the things we have to the rest of the world.

I support the committee amendment.

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

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will receive a message from the Senate.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 1232. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL PROMOTION

The Committee resumed its sitting.

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

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

I am not sure what the budget for the State of Hawaii is, but I will wager that if they are spending \$1 million out of their budget that what we are requesting here, percentagewise, is infinitesimal out of our own budget in comparison to what the State of Hawaii has been doing to promote tourism in that State.

May I say that all of this is not going to be done by the Federal Government. We think our program is good. However, a part of it involves the State of Hawaii, the State of Florida, the States of New York and California which also have sizable amounts in their budgets for the promotion of tourism and people coming into this country.

What we are doing here with \$15 million is really a very small payment if you compare it with those four or five States.

If you take the portion which is allotted for the promotion of tourism in comparison with their total budgets, our figure here is indeed small. But if we are going to go along in the same old way we have been with \$2 million, \$3 million, or \$4 million, then I say let us quit the whole thing; let us abandon it completely because we would not be accomplishing anything.

If we are going to do this job, let us get it on the right track and do it right.

I said the last time when this matter was up for the consideration of the House that I was not coming in here again to support a program that would not do the job.

Mr. Chairman, we have gone into this matter thoroughly. We think this is the beginning. But if you are going to go backward in this program, then as far as I am concerned I want to abandon it; I think we are wasting our money if we do it as it has been conducted in the past. I thought, based upon the debate in our committee, that we had done a pretty good job of digging into the facts.

It looked to me as if, from all the information that we could get as a committee, from all that our staff told us, that it was simply being starved to death. I do not see any hope for the program unless we can start putting it at some figure which we consider to be a very minimal and a very reasonable figure to go ahead with it. And although I do respect my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa—and I know how deeply the gentleman feels about the question of public expenditures—I believe that the amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not usually get up for proposals, "Coca-Cola proposals" such as this, or other amendments to the bill, but I want to make a few observations. We have, in almost every country in the world, U.S. Information Centers. Could

we not just give them a few cards describing our tourist attractions, and let them hand them out over there?

I am one who believes that this Nation had better start taking a little time to breathe, and to reflect.

When I was just a boy, I traveled a great deal. We did not have much time to go to school, so I was out on the highways and on the seaways of this world when I was 12 years of age. I used to see things that I thought I would never come to encompass in my time in the United States as a Member of the legislature, or the Congress. Tourism is a great business, but usually tourism as such is in many instances the mainstay of certain types of countries.

When we started to discuss this matter, we began by saying that we were going to at least let the world know that we have a Boulder Dam, and that we have a few other great things like the Grand Canyon. We started out, if I remember correctly, with \$450,000—I may be wrong in my figure—and we are now up to \$15 million. I want to tell you that tourism in its best time in history will never take the place of the jobs we are losing each day by the actions of this Congress and the actions of our Government all over the world.

Are we sitting here thinking that we are going to build this country into a new paradise like Hawaii, our great State? Hawaii is a—I was going to say a natural tourist trap, but I will not—Hawaii is a natural tourist attraction, and people go there. Why, I was in Hawaii before they ever thought of tourism for the United States as an industry. Are we ready to replace our great industrial complex with not even 1 minute's thought and believe that tourism is going to do for the whole of the United States what it has done for Hawaii or Miami? And Miami—all it ever was was a tourist attraction.

These are places that are natural attractions. You do not have to tell people about Hawaii. They used to go there from all over the world; I was there when I was 12 or 13 years old, and I could hardly read or spell the word "Hawaii." I was not attracted there by any advertising. You could advertise certain sections of Appalachia with all the money you have, and you will never get a tourist there. What we have got to do is quit this fooling around, and start getting down to brass knuckles and recognize there is nothing more valuable than production, service, and jobs in this country.

In view of the vast number of citizens who are on public assistance, we have the greatest unearning population that there ever was in any country on the face of the earth. Now you are going to have a few more unemployed because another plant is being shut down.

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

Mr. DENT. I would prefer the gentleman wait until I am through. I know that Baltimore likes tourism too, because they have got a few boats coming in every now and then.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is confused on why I wanted him to yield.

Mr. DENT. I believe, and I want it thoroughly understood, that \$15 million

is not anything. \$15 million is nothing when you spread it out and spend a little, wee bit for Miami and a little bit for Harrisburg—and, incidentally, we have the Susquehanna River there, a beautiful place; we even have a couple of bridges going across it.

Pittsburgh is a city of bridges. Have you ever been there? You ought to go there. Go up on Lookout Top there and you can see the most beautiful scene you have ever seen in your life. There are beautiful hotels and dancing girls—not quite as good as in San Francisco because we dress them a little more in our county and in our State. But, nevertheless, what I am trying to say to you is that next year or the year after the request will be for \$25 million.

This is exactly what will happen. You are saying we are going to spend this money and these tourists are going to come here and they will make the expenditure worthwhile.

Let me tell you something. About 50 percent of the tourist money that comes here will go to European foreign airlines. To begin with, foreigners do not have our airline tickets, unless they have them before the flight, because they have every advantage of the foreign airline. When foreigners want to get a passport to come to the United States, they cannot get one until they show their airplane tickets. The traveler must have foreign airline tickets or he will not get a passport, unless he knows somebody. I know because I have tried it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. (Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, it is all right to spend \$15 million, but do not come around here and tell me how we are going to make billions of dollars from this expenditure. Do not ever get that idea that this country can get rich on tourism.

What you had better start thinking about is our industrialism. What you had better start thinking about is that every dime we spend to bring in tourists, and all the money that tourists brings in, will be sent right back out of the United States when the next shipload of Scotch whisky or Volkswagens or the Yamaha motorcycles arrive.

I want you to understand that I am deeply moved on this question because I have watched this country of ours deteriorate in its industrialization and in its industrial strength since I have been a Member of the Congress. For the last 12 or 13 years I have been on this floor speaking on the subject of imports and our declining industrialization once or twice or three times every month, and many times I am only a lonely voice. But now you tell me that the shoe is pinching. In Massachusetts the shoe was pinching their foot so badly that they got 170 Members to put in a bill to set voluntary quotas for textiles and shoes. I put it in, too. I put in every bill that will do something to bring trade out into the open.

But let me ask you a question. Do you think I am going to stand on this floor and allow you, without fighting with every ounce of strength in my body, to

pass a bill to protect textiles and shoes and, yet, leave out my people who work in the glass industry and the mushroom industry and the steel industry and the aluminum industry?

The people in Hawaii are hoping that in some way they are going to get tourists to come in and make their tourist trade pay. Certainly, so far as Hawaii is concerned, I would vote for the \$15 million in a minute because Hawaii has the tourist attractions and the people who know how to handle tourists. But not all States are so well endowed. We are not, so they take us.

Believe me, when I say to you Members of this Congress that there are not many more days left for any of us to talk about our industrial complex because the strength that we talk about so boldly does not exist here at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross), there were—ayes 12, noes 28.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 4. (a) There is established a commission to be known as the National Tourism Resources Review Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Commission") composed of fifteen members as follows:

- (1) One representative of the Department of Agriculture designated by the Secretary of Agriculture.
- (2) One representative of the Department of Commerce designated by the Secretary of Commerce.
- (3) One representative of the Department of the Interior designated by the Secretary of the Interior.
- (4) One representative of the Department of State designated by the Secretary of State.
- (5) One representative of the Department of Transportation designated by the Secretary of Transportation.
- (6) One representative of the Civil Aeronautics Board designated by the Chairman of the Board.
- (7) One representative of the Federal Maritime Commission designated by the Chairman of the Commission.
- (8) One representative of the Interstate Commerce Commission designated by the Chairman of the Commission.
- (9) Seven individuals appointed by the President from private life who are informed about and concerned with the improvement, development, and promotion of United States tourism resources and opportunities or who are otherwise experienced in tourism research, promotion, or planning. The President shall designate one of the individuals appointed by him to serve as Chairman of the Commission.

(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of—

- (1) determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other countries at the present time and to the year 1980;

(2) determining the travel resources of the United States available to satisfy such needs now and to the year 1980;

(3) determining policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately and efficiently met;

(4) determining a recommended program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and

(5) determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities presently performed by different existing agencies of the Government.

The Commission shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations with respect thereto, to the President and to the Congress not later than two years after the date of enactment of this section. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days after the date of the submission of its comprehensive report. The comprehensive report of the Commission shall propose such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

(c) The Secretary of Commerce shall make available to the Commission such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance as the Commission may require to carry out its functions under this section. 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 section; 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 its Chairman.

(d) (1) A member of the Commission who is an officer or employee of the United States shall serve without additional compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(2) A member of the Commission from private life shall receive \$100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of such duties.

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed \$250,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today we have the opportunity to take significant steps toward a goal urged by every sector of the U.S. travel industry—a national tourist office worthy of this country's potential in international tourism and equal to the challenge of an ever-growing deficit in foreign travel exchange.

International travel today is the single largest item in world trade—estimated at \$15.3 billion.

As usual, the U.S. tourists made the biggest contribution to that figure and the result in 1969 was more than a \$2 billion deficit in international exchange.

That deficit has been with us for a long time but I am not prepared to accept it as a permanent condition. I believe the potential of the United States as an international tourist destination is such that this deficit can be cut—without any more attempts by government to interfere with the free movement of American citizens.

I share the view of the U.S. travel industry, as expressed in hearings on H.R. 14685, that these proposed amendments to the International Travel Act of 1961 are a necessary and overdue step. I am satisfied these proposed changes will contribute to a betterment of the U.S. position in international tourism.

Any reluctance I may have felt in earlier years to expand the budget and programs of the U.S. Travel Service has been overcome by the strong performance of USTS under the direction of C. Langhorne Washburn.

It is Director Washburn's theory, and one with which I strongly concur, that the promotion and facilitation of international tourists are primarily the responsibilities of private industry, the cities and States and that the role of Federal Government is to act as a catalyst and a coordinator.

I am confident the recent performance of USTS is assurance that we can look upon passage of H.R. 14685 as a good investment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATSUNAGA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATSUNAGA: On page 2, line 16, after the word "organizations" add the following: ", engaged in the travel or travel-promotion business,"

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Hawaii is recognized.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the distinguished Chairman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii. I know of no objection on this side to the amendment. I think it is a clarifying amendment and I would be in favor of it.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. We have no objection to the amendment. We believe it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Hawaii.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Page 3, immediately after line 3, insert the following:

SEC. 2. Section 3 of such Act (22 U.S.C.

2123) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Each recipient of assistance under clause (5) of subsection (a) of this section shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(d) 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 recipients that are pertinent to the assistance received under clause (5) of subsection (a) of this section."

And renumber the following sections accordingly.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD. It is a simple amendment and I will attempt to explain it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would require grant recipients to maintain accounting records. The amendment would also make those records available to the Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States for the purpose of audit and examination. This is a usual provision. We have had it in other bills of this type—such as the Clean Air Act. I think it was an oversight that we did not include it in this bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I will try not to take the 5 minutes. But as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations charged with the responsibility of funds for the U.S. Travel Agency, I can only say this, that they must have done a much better job before the legislative committee in justifying an authorization increase three times above what it is now to \$15 million than they did when they came before us to justify their expenditure of money.

I appear here not as one who is opposed to the Travel Agency. I think the Travel Agency has a function it can perform. But I will say this: Over the past number of years we on our subcommittee have had some serious reservations regarding appropriating the funds, and we have not been giving up to the authorization. Just this afternoon we passed a bill that would provide \$4.5 million for the Travel Agency. And I believe that is what it was last year. But we have looked with some concern regarding these expenditures, and I just do not believe, with the fiscal condition the country is in now, we can justify going forward with a three-times increase in the authorization for this travel service.

I have been around and visited a few of these travel places around the world, too. I recall going into our visa section

in Rome and checking with them over there and finding out just who the people were who were coming over here. Really what you have is a large number of people who are business travelers or of that type who come over anyway. But you would be most amazed at the number of other people who come over from other countries who have relatives in the United States. What happens is that a large number of these people who are coming over under this kind of situation cannot afford to come. So some American relative sends them the good, hard American dollars to come over, and then they use those dollars to buy tickets on a foreign airline to come here.

But if we think that this travel agency is doing anything for the balance-of-payments program, we are just plain wrong, because the facts just will not justify it.

I would even go along with some increase in the authorization, maybe to \$7 million, but I tell Members right now I am going to vote against this bill if I am given a chance, because I do not believe we can justify a threefold increase in the authorization.

If it is any comfort to Members, if this bill passes, I doubt very, very much that our subcommittee is going to give anywhere near the appropriation that is going to be authorized in this bill. That does not mean that we are not for promoting travel, but travel is being promoted anyway, not only by the Government, but by private organizations as well. But how could this authorizing committee increase this three times? It is beyond my comprehension.

I intend to vote against this bill, because I think it has gone way beyond what this authorization ought to be.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I agree, especially since within the last hour or hour and a half we passed an appropriation for only \$4.5 million.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I suppose if this bill had been passed first, we would have been pressed more in the subcommittee to increase it. I am not sure they justified it up to \$4.5 million when they came before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair (Mr. SLACK), 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. 14685) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, in order to improve the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to the House Resolution 939, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? 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, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. KYL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Iowa opposed to the bill?

Mr. KYL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KYL moves to recommit the bill H.R. 14685 to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KYL) there were—ayes 23, noes 29.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 88, not voting 168, as follows:

[Roll No. 121]

YEAS—173

Abbott	Evans, Colo.	Jones, Ala.
Alexander	Feighan	Jones, N.C.
Anderson, Calif.	Findley	Kastenmeier
Anderson, Ill.	Fish	Kazen
Annunzio	Fisher	Kleppe
Arend	Flood	Long, Md.
Aspinall	Foley	Lowenstein
Ayres	Ford, Gerald R.	Lukens
Belcher	Fountain	McClure
Bennett	Friedel	McCulloch
Boggs	Fulton, Pa.	McDade
Bolling	Gallagher	McDonald
Brinkley	Garmatz	Mich.
Brown, Ohio	Gialmo	McEwen
Broyhill, Va.	Gonzalez	McKneally
Burke, Mass.	Gray	Madden
Cabell	Halpern	Mahon
Carter	Hamilton	Mailliard
Casey	Hammer	Marsh
Chamberlain	schmidt	Matsunaga
Clausen	Hanley	Meeds
Don H.	Hanna	Melcher
Cleveland	Hansen, Idaho	Mikva
Colmer	Hansen, Wash.	Miller, Calif.
Conte	Harrington	Minish
Cowger	Harsha	Monagan
Cramer	Hathaway	Moss
Daniel, Va.	Hawkins	Murphy, Ill.
Daniels, N.J.	Heckler, Mass.	Natcher
Davis, Ga.	Helstoski	Nedzi
de la Garza	Henderson	Neisen
Dingell	Hicks	O'Harra
Donohue	Hogan	O'Neill, Mass.
Dorn	Holifield	Patman
Downing	Hosmer	Patten
Dwyer	Howard	Pelly
Eckhardt	Hungate	Pepper
Edmondson	Hutchinson	Perkins
Edwards, Ala.	Ichord	Philbin
Ellberg	Johnson, Calif.	Pickle
Erlenborn	Johnson, Pa.	

Pike	Rogers, Fla.	Taylor
Poage	Rooney, Pa.	Teague, Calif.
Powell	Roth	Teague, Tex.
Preyer, N.C.	Roybal	Thompson, Ga.
Price, Ill.	Ryan	Vander Jagt
Pryor, Ark.	Satterfield	Waggonner
Quile	Saylor	Watts
Rees	Shriver	White
Reid, Ill.	Sisk	Whitehurst
Reifel	Skubitz	Widnall
Reuss	Smith, Calif.	Wiggins
Rhodes	Springer	Wright
Roberts	Staggers	Wyatt
Robison	Stanton	Wyman
Rodino	Stuckey	Young
Roe	Sullivan	Zablocki
Rogers, Colo.	Symington	Zwach

NAYS—88

Adair	Griffin	Nichols
Andrews, Ala.	Gross	O'Konski
Beall, Md.	Grover	Passman
Bevill	Gude	Pettis
Biester	Hagan	Pirnie
Blackburn	Haley	Poff
Bow	Hechler, W. Va.	Pollock
Bray	Hull	Price, Tex.
Brown, Mich.	Hunt	Pucinski
Buchanan	Jacobs	Randall
Burleson, Tex.	Jonas	Rarick
Burlison, Mo.	Jones, Tenn.	Roudebush
Byrnes, Wis.	Kee	Ruth
Caffery	Kyl	Scott
Camp	Landgrebe	Sebelius
Cederberg	Langen	Slack
Clawson, Del.	Latta	Snyder
Collins	Lloyd	Steed
Conable	Lujan	Stephens
Crane	Macdonald,	Vanik
Dellenback	Mass.	Wampler
Dennis	Martin	Watson
Dent	Mathias	Whalley
Duncan	May	Wold
Eshleman	Michel	Wolff
Flowers	Miller, Ohio	Wydler
Foreman	Mills	Yates
Goldwater	Mize	Zion
Goodling	Montgomery	
	Myers	

NOT VOTING—168

Abernethy	Devine	Minshall
Adams	Dickinson	Mizell
Addabbo	Diggs	Mollohan
Albert	Dowdy	Moorhead
Anderson, Tenn.	Dulski	Morgan
Andrews, N. Dak.	Edwards, Calif.	Morse
Ashbrook	Edwards, La.	Morton
Ashley	Esch	Mosher
Baring	Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.
Barrett	Fallon	Nix
Bell, Calif.	Farbstein	Olsen
Berry	Fascell	O'Neal, Ga.
Betts	Flynt	Ottlinger
Blaggi	Ford	Podell
Bingham	William D.	Purcell
Blanton	Fraser	Quillen
Blatnik	Frelinghuysen	Railsback
Boland	Frey	Reid, N.Y.
Brademas	Fulton, Tenn.	Riegle
Brasco	Fuqua	Rivers
Brock	Gaydos	Rosenthal
Brooks	Gibbons	Rostenkowski
Broomfield	Gilbert	Ruppe
Brown, Calif.	Green, Oreg.	St Germain
Broyhill, N.C.	Green, Pa.	Sandman
Burke, Fla.	Griffiths	Schadeberg
Burton, Calif.	Gubser	Scherle
Burton, Utah	Hall	Scheuer
Bush	Harvey	Schneebeli
Button	Hastings	Schwengel
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Shipley
Carey	Hébert	Sikes
Celler	Horton	Smith, Iowa
Chappell	Jarman	Smith, N.Y.
Chisholm	Karh	Stafford
Clancy	Keith	Steiger, Ariz.
Clark	King	Steiger, Wis.
Clay	Kirwan	Stokes
Cohelan	Kluczynski	Stratton
Collier	Koch	Stubblefield
Conyers	Kuykendall	Taft
Corbett	Kyros	Talcott
Corman	Landrum	Thompson, N.J.
Coughlin	Leggett	Thomson, Wis.
Culver	Lennon	Tierman
Cunningham	Long, La.	Tunney
Daddario	McCarthy	Udall
Davis, Wis.	McClary	Ullman
Dawson	McCloskey	Van Deerlin
Delaney	McFall	Vigorito
Denney	McMillan	Walde
Derwinski	MacGregor	Watkins
	Mann	Weicker
	Mayne	Whalen
	Meskill	Whitten

Williams Winn
Wilson, Bob Wylie
Wilson, Yatron
Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Ashbrook against.
Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Berry against.
Mr. Morse for, with Mr. Denney against.
Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Minshall against.
Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Clancy against.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Schneebell against.

Mr. Kluczynski for, with Mr. Watkins against.

Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Mr. Blatnik for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Frelinghuysen for, with Mr. Burton of Utah against.

Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Broomfield against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Quillen against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Scherle against.

Mr. Olsen for, with Mr. Kuykendall against.

Mr. Button for, with Mr. Schadeberg against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Wylie against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Mayne against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Brown of California against.

Mr. Reid of New York for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Frey.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Sandman.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Bell of California.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Meskill.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Coughlin.

Mr. Karth with Mr. Railsback.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Adams with Mr. Esch.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Burke of Florida.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Taft.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Bingham with Mr. Riegle.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Kyros with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. McCloskey.

Mr. Blanton with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Ruppe.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Mizell.

Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Brotzman.

Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Brasco with Mr. McClory.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Lennor with Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Boland with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.

Mr. Dulski with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Leggett with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Bob Wilson.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Talcott.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Winn.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Podell with Mr. Welcker.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Whalen.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Stokes.

Mr. Sikes with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Fuqua.

Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. William D. Ford.
Mr. McCarthy with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Burton of California with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. McFall with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Cormann with Mr. Molloyhan.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Gaydos.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Yatron.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Ullman.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Koch.

Mr. Mann with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. Waldie with Mr. Scheuer.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 1289) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, in order to improve the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the United States, and for other purposes, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. GROSS, Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

SENATOR EDMUND MUSKIE, LEADER AND FIGHTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

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

Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. Speaker, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE's record as a sincere, perspicacious, and effective leader in the fight for environmental quality is so well established that it needs no defense, either in Congress or out.

The juvenile, gratuitous, and fulsome flutter of personal criticism launched against the Senator yesterday by a group of self-appointed overseers was mildly amusing to those of us who for years have watched the Senator at close range as he has led the often thankless fight for clean air, pure water, and a wholesome environment.

All recruits are welcome to the cause. It would be helpful, however, if they first learned to recognize who is on what side.

The verbose fulmination against Senator MUSKIE's truly unassailable efforts

is about as smart as a football rookie who thinks the way to win games is to tackle his own quarterback.

For years I have participated with Senator MUSKIE in Senate-House conference committees on various environmental bills, particularly bills relating to water quality. Anybody who described Ed MUSKIE as a man who "avoids conflict and unfavorable odds" might as well refer to heavyweight champion Joe Frazier as "a 97-pound weakling."

On occasion after occasion, year in and year out—sometimes to my own exasperation—I have watched Ed MUSKIE doggedly and determinedly hold the line for what he regarded as a principle when everyone else was ready to compromise for an easier solution.

In matters of environmental quality, Senator MUSKIE has invariably championed the cause of the strongest possible bills with the most stringent penalties against those who would pollute the water or the air of the United States. On occasion, quite frankly, I have felt that he was almost too tough.

Instead of blaming the deficiencies of the Air Quality Act of 1967 on him, the eager detractors might reflect that, except for Senator MUSKIE, there might not even be an Air Quality Act.

No doubt some good can arise from any citizen's analysis of the deficiencies of legislation. But to blame the very people who are doing the most to strengthen our legislative safeguards is utterly stupid, counter-productive, and self-defeating.

On the water pollution amendments passed earlier this year, Ed MUSKIE kept the conference committee in session for a matter of months—not weeks, but months—because of his absolute insistence upon the strongest possible penalties for those who pollute the waters by oil.

To characterize Senator MUSKIE, or the Senate Public Works Committee chairman, Senator RANDOLPH, as men devoted to the so-called "corporate viewpoint" is simply to talk through one's hat, obviously without knowledge of or reference to the facts.

Along with our own able and hard-working colleagues, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK and Congressman BOB JONES, Senators MUSKIE and RANDOLPH have been real leaders in the continuing struggle for environmental quality in America. Time and again, these men have seen the need for action long before it was publicly realized and have pioneered in this vital legislative struggle.

Because of such leadership, we now authorize \$1.25 billion annually for the water pollution abatement program—25 times the annual figure at which we launched this program in 1956.

Let us welcome all new recruits to the continuing war against pollution, but let them avoid firing small arms against our own generals who have been directing and winning the battles.

If they actually want to make a positive contribution, their harassment might be better directed at polluters, or at those who have done nothing to help.

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

Mr. WRIGHT, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Texas on his

very excellent statement and associate myself with his remarks.

I, too, deplore the unjustified charges made against Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, in the Nader Task Force Report on Air Pollution.

Senator MUSKIE is a well-respected Member of this Congress. For nearly a decade he has addressed this Congress and this Nation in his inimitable and soft "down East" voice on the perils of water and air pollution. Many of us here in this body have joined with Senator MUSKIE in that fight.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind the country that Senator MUSKIE's voice has been heard.

Look at the record: the Clean Air Act of 1963 and the Air Quality Act of 1967. These laws were produced in the Senate by the subcommittee Senator MUSKIE chairs, the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, established in 1963.

This was pioneer legislation, and the American people owe a debt of gratitude to Senator MUSKIE for his effective, aggressive, and constant fight in environmental pollution control.

On behalf of the people of the Second Congressional District of Massachusetts, which Senator MUSKIE has visited many times as Governor and Senator, I want to take this opportunity to commend him for his valiant and never-ending campaign to write more effective laws for the abatement and complete control of water and air pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD with my remarks Senator MUSKIE's statement of yesterday, and his fact sheet answering points raised by the Nader Task Force Report on Air Pollution:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE AT A NEWS CONFERENCE, MAY 13, 1970

Yesterday I made a brief statement on the Nader report.

Since then my staff has made available to me a more complete analysis of that report.

Inasmuch as the report focusses on the Air Quality Act of 1967, it may be useful to briefly review the history of that legislation and then invite your questions.

The Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution was established in 1963. Our initial activity involved the Clean Air Act of 1963, and the Water Quality Act, which passed the Senate that year.

In the seven years that have passed, we have been constantly and continually involved in the hard, and often frustrating work of producing ever tougher and, hopefully, more effective public policy to deal with environmental pollution.

We have produced staff reports which have been widely hailed for their quality. We have held public hearings in all corners of the country, to call attention to the problem, to invite wide discussion of legislative proposals, and to stimulate public interest and concern.

We have had to fight public apathy, industry resistance, and Presidential and Congressional reluctance to appropriate the necessary funds.

Our method has been to press ahead with legislation as rapidly as we could develop viable legislative approaches which could command the necessary public and legislative support. We have made progress.

We need to make more progress. The current surge of public interest has encouraged us to introduce a wide range of proposals

to strengthen our laws—those dealing with air, water, and solid waste.

It may be useful to include at this point a chronological catalog of the Subcommittee's efforts over the past seven years: See accompanying chronology.—

These efforts have had the consistent support of conservation groups as well as conservation-minded public and civic leaders across the country. Our hearing records are replete with their testimony and expressions of approval.

It would be well to point out that much of this legislation was pioneering legislation.

Ideas were constantly solicited and offered for new legislative techniques, new kinds of planning and control mechanisms and institutions, to enable us to come to grips with the problems effectively. Many of these ideas were necessarily experimental and untried. The objective, however, was always clear—to do a better and more effective job.

The Air Quality Act of 1967 involved many such ideas.

The central issue with which we grappled in writing that law had to do with two different approaches to the achievement of air quality: National emissions standards, or rational ambient air quality standards tied to national criteria defining the health and welfare effects of specific pollutants.

The issue is complex and technical. There is, to this day, disagreement between knowledgeable people who agree on the objective of clean air, as to which would be the most effective approach.

The committee chose the second approach—not for the dark, secret, conspiratorial reasons suggested by the Nader report—but for the following reasons:

1. National emissions standards were described as *minimal* standards, which we feared might tend to find acceptance as *maximum* controls, and result in inadequate standards.

2. Such standards would apply only to industries which could be regarded as "national" polluters. They would not apply to other sources which contribute to degradation of the air in our real problem areas.

3. Certain control techniques are not available on a nationwide scale. For example, low-sulfur fuels are not available in sufficient supply for use everywhere in the country. As we press forward with research to deal with sulfur oxides, the low-sulfur fuels ought to be made available to the severe problem areas.

4. The national emissions standards approach would take as much time to implement as the second approach.

There was long discussion of these approaches in committee and with representatives of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

When the decision was finally taken, there was not universal agreement.

Implementation of the Air Quality Act has not proceeded as rapidly as possible. Designation of control areas has been slow. The agency has been understaffed and under-funded for this purpose. These conditions would have impeded the other approach as well.

We intend to strengthen the law this year. Hearings have been held and completed. We are in the process of marking up the bills. We welcome constructive suggestions from any source, including the Nader report.

We have learned a great deal about this problem and about the ways to deal with it over the last seven years.

Experience has disclosed shortcomings in the legislation we have enacted.

An aroused public finally gives us the support to move even more rapidly and effectively.

And so we are in a better position to write better laws. We will do so, and we welcome Mr. Nader's interest.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION ON AIR POLLUTION LEGISLATION SINCE 1963

The following lists the activities of the Subcommittee on air pollution legislation from 1963 to the present:

1963: The Subcommittee considered 7 air pollution bills, held 9 days of hearings, 3 Executive Sessions and published one Committee report (S. Rept. 638). In this year the Clean Air Act was passed.

1964: The Subcommittee heard 125 witnesses during 11 days of hearings. In October 1964 "Steps Toward Clean Air" was published.

1965: The Subcommittee considered 2 bills, heard 37 witnesses during 7 days of hearings, held 2 Executive Sessions and published 2 Committee reports (S. Reports 128, 192). During this year the first amendments to the Clean Air Act were passed.

1966: The Subcommittee considered 3 air pollution bills, heard 16 witnesses during 5 days of hearings, held 2 Executive Sessions and published one report (S. Rept. 1361). The Clean Air Act was further amended.

1967: 3 bills were considered. The Subcommittee heard from 113 witnesses during a total of 23 days of hearings—5 days of these were held jointly with the Commerce Committee. 2 Executive Sessions were held and one report (S. Rept. 403) was published. The Air Quality Act was passed.

1968: The Subcommittee considered one bill (S. 3031) and held 2 days of joint hearings on external combustion engines with the Commerce Committee with 12 witnesses testifying.

1969: This year was spent on oil pollution legislation. No hearings or Executive Sessions. Section 104 of the Clean Air Act was extended and S. 3229 proposed.

1970: This year the Subcommittee has heard from a total of 51 witnesses during 12 days of hearings—3 of which were joint hearings with the Commerce Committee.

FACT SHEET ON THE NADER TASK FORCE REPORT ON AIR POLLUTION MAY 13, 1970

Report: "Point by point the Air Quality Act of 1967 follows the path spelled out by the MCA pamphlet. Three techniques, each designed to buy precious time cheaply, merit special discussion. They explain why the Air Quality Act sits well with business..." (X-2)

Fact: Neither Senator Muskie nor any member of his staff recalls the "MCA pamphlet." Industry witnesses in 1970 have objected to the regional approach and have called for national ambient air quality standards.

Report: "Congress in 1967... shifted the heavy burden of proof to the breathing public... Congress made operation of the federal law contingent upon the issuance of air quality criteria..." (X-6)

Fact: The criteria are scientific descriptions for the purpose of informing the public. They have nothing to do with any "burden of proof."

Report: "Senator Muskie's speech must have heartened industry, despite lip service which indicated a great impatience..." (X-21)

Fact: From that speech: "We need to set a national clean air goal which says that, as far as it is within our control, no emissions will be permitted which cause the quality of air to deteriorate below acceptable health standards. What this suggests is that we no longer limit our efforts by trying simply to set emissions standards on a plant-by-plant basis, hoping that the net result will be reduced air pollution... (We) need to include considerations of subtle, long-term effects of pollutants on our health and well-being."

Report: "Johnson, Middleton and others from NAPCA and CPEHS were summoned to a meeting with Senator Muskie and his aides." (X-42)

Fact: Senator Muskie was not present at that meeting, nor were they "summoned."

Report: "In April . . . the 'private hearings' were held. A series of informal meetings to scrutinize the bill with industry representatives was arranged by the staff . . . The debates in these private conferences, therefore, thrashed out details of the issues raised in Muskie's speech . . ." (X-25)

Fact: Meetings were held before, during and after the hearings on S. 780—with representatives of industry, conservation groups, other public interest groups and Federal, State and local government agencies. No decisions were made in these meetings, and no deals were consummated. Questions raised in the hearings were explored in greater depth. Technical information not provided in the hearing was discussed. A frank exchange of views between members of the majority and minority staff and representatives of interested organizations took place.

Report: "The sense of urgency and definitiveness for which Johnson had been striving was drained from the reports (the criteria document). Middleton, with a tremendous boost from Senator Muskie, succeeded in toning down the report." (X-44)

Fact: The focus on a single number (80 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ for particulates,) in the documents as producing adverse health effects would have, in fact, become a floor below which industry could prevent standards from being set. It would have effectively created a uniform national standard. Because there is no single-number focus, regions have submitted proposed standards as low as 65 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$.

Report: "Legislation must be founded on the principle of reducing atmospheric contamination to the greatest extent technologically possible." (XI-13)

Fact: This is the basic philosophical difference between the Nader Task Force and Senator Muskie. Senator Muskie believes that public health, not what is technological feasibility, should determine what people must breathe. Even if a maximum application of technology is achieved, not all sources will be controlled to a point where the public health and welfare is adequately protected. The Air Quality Act is based on the conviction that the important goals are the preservation and enhancement of the quality of the air and a guarantee that the ambient air quality will protect the public. This will mean more than emission controls that are technologically feasible. It will mean plant shutdowns, fuel substitution, land-use planning and careful site location in addition to emission controls. But it will mean that the quality of the air is safe.

Report: "The new legislative scheme, sired originally by the Manufacturing Chemists Association and later adopted by Senators Muskie (D-Maine) and Randolph (D-W. Va.) breathed a fresh breath of stale air into a declaration of purpose repeated in almost every piece of federal pollution legislation passed in the last decade: that the prevention and control of air pollution at its source is the primary responsibility of the States and local governments . . ." (VI-49).

Fact: This language, which the Task Force Report indicates came from a booklet published by the Manufacturing Chemists in 1952 first appeared in Federal pollution law in 1948 when the Congress first acted on water pollution. Similar language appeared in 1955 air pollution legislation. Also, the above language is in the statement of findings of the Clean Air Act, the purpose of which is "to protect and enhance the quality of the Nation's air . . ."

Report: "The (air) carriers were told that unless agreement was reached with the state to develop a retrofitting schedule by February 9, 1970, the case would proceed to trial. Despite the assist from the FAA, the airlines suffered a substantial setback . . . Then Senator Muskie, in a speech on the Senate floor, denounced the efforts of the FAA to protect the airlines from state law."

Fact: Senator Muskie's Senate floor speech

was on December 10, 1969, at which time he introduced legislation to require control of jet aircraft emissions.

Report: "Such pressures would tend inevitably to drive an entire industry in the direction of its most responsible member, and could lead to uniform pollution control standards, the bete noire of American industry. (IV-23).

Fact: On Wednesday, March 18, 1970 Mr. Fred Tucker—testifying on behalf of a majority of the steel industry—told the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution: "We support in principle the provisions of Senate bill 3466, section 107, for the establishment of National Air Quality Standards."

On Friday, March 20, 1970 Mr. Samuel Lerner—testifying for Du Pont—stated: ". . . we endorse the concept of national ambient air quality standards proposed in Section 107 of S. 3466."

Report: "The national ethic against air pollution must be translated into a policy of 'maximum use of technology down to zero profits.'" (p. 4-5).

Fact: Past experience has shown that pollution control costs, as well as costs of business, have been passed directly to the consumer.

Report: "The Philadelphia Zoo is bounded on one side by the Schuylkill Expressway and on the other by busy Girard Avenue. In 1964 Senator Edward S. Muskie's Subcommittee was told of . . . deaths at the zoo." (p. I-21)

Fact: This evidence and other information provided the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution during hearings in 1964 were the basis for the motor vehicle emission control legislation introduced by Senator Muskie in 1965 and enacted that year.

Report: "Suffice to say at this point, however, that the problem has not been solved. Despite a large, though still inadequate, increase in funding for air pollution activities from a few million dollars in the 1950's to a projected \$112 million dollars in 1970, the Federal presence and the federal leadership have been minimal" (I-36)

Fact: It is correct that the problem of air pollution has not been solved—nor did the Subcommittee expect that it would be in 2 and one-half years. Inadequate manpower (NAPCA has fewer people today than in 1968) and inadequate funding have limited effective implementation of the program. Appropriations have lagged behind authorizations by nearly \$350 million over three years, including this year's budget request.

Report: "Federal (auto emission) standards are consequently at least two years behind those of California." (II-28)

Fact: The 1970 Federal standards for motor vehicles are identical to California's standards for carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons emissions. California is one year ahead of the Federal government in the control of evaporative emissions and three years ahead in the control of oxides of nitrogen.

Report: "Certification (of compliance with auto emission standards) is not mandatory under Federal law, but it has obvious advantages for the manufacturer and that is why it is in the law." (III-8)

Fact: The "obvious advantage" to the manufacturer is simply that no car can be sold without certification.

Report: "But NAPCA has no authority to inspect production line vehicles. . . ." (III-9)

Fact: Sec. 206 of the Clean Air Act provides that the "Secretary shall test, or require to be tested, in such manner as he deems appropriate any new motor vehicle . . ." (Emphasis added.)

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am appealing to the 50 Congressmen who represent the districts in the Nation receiving the largest amount of Federal farm program payments to help break a legislative impasse by supporting a responsible limit on farm payments.

My district is one of the 50.

Here is the text of a letter I sent today to the other 49 Congressmen:

I intrude upon your time with this letter because I firmly believe you are in a select group of Congressmen which can save American agriculture from a serious legislative impasse. I hope you can give thought to this appeal.

Like myself you represent one of the 50 Congressional districts in the nation where farm payments reach the largest total. Details (based on 1969 information) are attached showing the facts about these districts including yours and mine.

As you know, big payments to farmers of substantial means—more than any other factor—have put farm programs in disrepute with almost all citizens urban and rural alike.

This disrepute hurts rural America:

First, it restricts to a trickle funds for pressing legitimate rural needs, like grants for village water-sewer systems, loans to co-operatives, aid to housing, economic development, research, watershed, and other conservation programs. With farmers getting nearly \$4 billion a year in direct payments much of it in scandalously large portions, enthusiasm for other rural programs is naturally blunted.

Second, it puts in serious question the enactment of any farm bill this year. The no-bill prospect is unappealing to anyone genuinely concerned for the welfare of American agriculture. Nevertheless, sentiment is such that I believe the House will not pass a farm bill at all unless it contains a responsible limit on payments.

If you and your colleagues in the select group of Congressmen to which this appeal is directed will use your influence in behalf of a reasonable payment limit the impasse can be broken.

Although several, like myself, are hardly in the agricultural policy power structure of the House, the group otherwise is formidable.

It includes the chairman and nine of the other 50 members of the Appropriations Committee; the chairman and five of the other seven members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture; and a total of sixteen of the 35 members of the Committee on Agriculture.

Each of us can fully justify support for a payment limit in terms of the wishes of our own constituency. Close examination will show, I believe, strong support for a responsible payment limit even in the districts where average payments are the highest. Even there farmers collecting more than \$20,000 a year in payments are but a fraction of the total. A farm-magazine survey last year in the cotton belt showed 71 per cent of the farmers want a payment limit. Of these, 79 per cent wanted an annual payment limit of \$20,000 or less.

It's interesting to note that in the district where the payment total was the greatest—(\$152,277,201) the money, evenly divided, would provide \$1,472 for each family of four in the entire population of the district, or \$12,045 per census farm if divided evenly among all the farmers in the district.

Of the 50 House members whose districts are included in the attached listings, 13 voted affirmative on the most recent record vote for a payment limit. This was a help, but not enough.

DISTRICTS WHERE BIG FARM PAYMENTS GO

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

I hope others will add their support. In so doing we will not only help to bring about a needed reform in farm legislation but do much to create a more favorable climate for other programs necessary and vital to rural America."

Mr. Speaker, the top 50 districts received \$2,296,173,063 in 1969 which is 62.2 percent of all payments made in all 435 congressional districts. In addition, 61.3 percent of all feed grain payments, 73.2 percent of all wheat program payments, and 64.2 percent of all cotton program payments went to these 50 districts.

Of the members representing the top 50 districts in volume of payments received, 27 voted against establishing a limit on farm program payments in the vote on the USDA appropriations bill in 1969. Thirteen voted yes, four were paired no, and six did not vote.

While 16 members of the House Committee on Agriculture are among the top 50 districts, 10 of those members are in the top 25 districts. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee are also both in the top 25 listing.

Surprisingly the largest average cotton

payments were not made to farmers in the traditional Southern cotton-producing States. The top three average cotton program payment districts were Arizona's Second District with an average payment of \$25,105; California's 18th District with an average payment of \$11,502; and California's 16th District with an average of \$11,501. Both California districts are represented on the House Agriculture Committee.

At the same time, the largest average feed grain program payments are not in the Midwest, the Nation's traditional feed-grain-producing area, but are in the same districts as the largest average cotton program payment districts. Arizona's Second District feed grains payments averaged \$5,335; California's 16th District averaged \$4,491; and California's 18th District averaged \$4,273. Fourth and fifth average ranked feed grains program payment districts were Texas' 18th District with an average of \$4,031 and New Mexico's Second District with an average payment of \$3,956. Typical Midwest districts averaged around \$2,000 or less. The 20th District of Illinois which I represent had an average feed grain program payment of \$1,661.

The top three wheat program districts, likewise, are not in the heart of the Great Plains. The top three average districts in wheat program payments in 1969 were Washington's Fourth District with an average payment of \$5,613; New Mexico's Second District with an average payment of \$4,184 and California's 18th District with an average wheat program payment of \$3,647.

I am continuing research into the location and distribution of large payments.

I recently announced my intention to introduce again a payment limit amendment to the farm bill. The bill is expected to be approved soon by the House Committee on Agriculture. My amendment would limit the maximum payment any person can receive to \$20,000 annually.

I have sought to have a limit placed on maximum farm program payments since 1967. Twice in 1969 the House of Representatives approved by wide margins an amendment to limit farm payments to a reasonable size only to have the plan defeated by the Senate and in the conference.

I place below three tables:

1969 ASCS TOTAL AND INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM PAYMENTS BY SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Congressional district	Total ASCS payments ¹	Total 1964 census farms ²	1969 feed grain program		1969 wheat program		1969 cotton program		Other payments
			Payments	Farms	Payments	Farms	Payments	Farms	
Texas—18	\$152,277,201	12,642	\$66,723,381	16,654	\$38,379,659	14,085	\$41,697,283	12,167	\$5,476,878
Kansas—1	139,800,357	32,214	40,419,288	45,341	94,457,152	51,402			4,923,917
Texas—19	110,374,230	9,782	19,628,217	9,341	2,778,268	2,919	85,990,155	15,174	1,977,590
Nebraska—3	108,724,670	41,705	68,965,664	38,253	32,098,710	31,813			7,660,296
North Dakota—2	84,761,347	24,560	13,884,999	25,689	63,198,023	30,606			7,678,325
North Dakota—1	76,642,448	24,276	19,313,449	25,929	49,856,763	30,048			7,472,236
Nebraska—1	76,282,795	33,727	61,254,953	34,530	12,729,761	23,155			2,298,081
Montana—2	61,096,497	16,470	3,901,354	7,218	48,959,408	13,460			8,235,735
Oklahoma—6	59,950,180	26,116	6,962,742	17,669	46,477,108	31,149	4,068,596	4,361	2,447,734
Iowa—7	57,939,938	28,287	55,382,632	25,086	517,588	1,433			2,039,684
Minnesota—2	55,988,140	29,202	53,854,581	25,525	821,982	4,785			1,311,577
Iowa—6	55,266,876	28,187	51,929,133	24,954	26,075	309			3,311,668
Arkansas—1	52,825,857	19,248	49,876,219	2,538	978,742	2,666	50,243,496	21,075	564,313
Iowa—3	50,922,316	24,679	49,429,026	21,986	4,158	158			1,489,132
South Dakota—2	49,538,359	22,468	16,080,016	16,284	26,640,859	16,655			6,817,484
Minnesota—6	47,225,607	33,043	38,600,255	27,107	1,535,514	7,865			7,089,838
Mississippi—2	39,868,000	29,492	4,555,903	10,959	332,897	299	41,471,627	20,187	1,087,661
Mississippi—1	44,821,756	19,387	2,370,386	5,865	177,895	317	41,374,387	11,009	448,546
South Dakota—1	43,186,240	27,235	32,161,031	24,796	6,396,049	12,427			4,629,160
Texas—17	41,243,352	23,315	1,572,037	9,883	3,721,857	7,558	23,927,751	10,825	12,021,707
Missouri—6	40,352,572	27,845	33,729,180	22,465	4,852,933	12,756			1,770,459
Colorado—3	39,455,904	10,677	15,171,657	9,883	20,543,810	9,820			3,740,437
Washington—4	39,225,062	14,535	1,577,750	3,259	33,009,162	5,881			4,638,150
Missouri—10	38,873,642	27,845	12,693,486	13,723	4,715,359	13,311	16,083,709	11,973	5,381,088
California—18	37,979,717	7,100	1,576,742	369	991,856	272	32,632,407	2,837	2,776,712
Iowa—4	35,490,620	27,488	33,746,053	19,933	60,905	460			3,387,459
Minnesota—7	35,434,278	31,989	15,686,725	22,639	11,778,685	18,160			7,968,868
Kansas—5	34,411,600	29,434	9,441,818	16,203	17,334,271	23,373	387	1	7,635,124
Oklahoma—4	34,040,168	16,031	4,041,200	10,162	15,375,815	12,494	13,269,201	11,322	1,353,952
New Mexico—2	33,719,012	8,000	10,250,898	2,591	6,037,225	1,443	12,631,472	3,874	4,799,417
Illinois—22	29,572,319	13,472	24,136,313	14,799	4,726,169	11,438			709,837
Illinois—23	29,042,316	21,977	19,251,545	16,410	8,660,110	17,101			67,892
Tennessee—8	28,955,466	21,807	6,836,469	11,387	173,267	964	21,016,863	19,352	928,867
Idaho—2	28,649,227	16,395	1,426,258	2,513	19,306,044	11,744			7,916,915
California—16	27,857,260	10,455	2,088,417	465	448,339	196	22,886,517	1,990	2,433,987
Arizona—2	27,795,731	2,477	2,347,572	440	641,272	281	23,423,361	933	1,383,526
Kansas—2	27,198,280	19,402	14,178,880	13,810	12,342,377	16,711			820,095
Mississippi—4	26,924,781	28,912	4,037,647	10,624	71,250	159	22,310,331	12,271	1,063,613
Texas—15	26,032,457	6,470	1,311,300	1,235			23,848,668	11,157	872,489
Minnesota—1	25,577,992	17,793	23,753,168	15,333	475,258	3,219			1,349,566
Indiana—2	25,143,961	10,300	21,609,227	10,311	2,615,775	6,103			918,959
Missouri—9	25,051,691	24,189	18,837,563	17,245	5,786,988	13,930			1,251,548
Missouri—4	24,550,328	19,097	17,584,279	14,977	4,735,324	12,013	65	1	2,230,660
Texas—13	23,810,010	12,088	2,690,226	5,203	5,315,745	7,654	12,234,686	6,900	3,569,353
Iowa—2	23,394,158	16,076	21,958,420	12,616	1,913	28			1,433,825
Louisiana—5	23,120,016	14,605	798,319	1,914	366,513	252	21,504,790	9,247	743,470
Alabama—8	22,607,507	13,584	4,964,889	11,131	461,058	1,950	16,614,373	13,169	146,016
Illinois—21	22,464,121	20,195	14,914,399	13,418	5,794,631	10,454	132,834	89	1,622,257
Illinois—20	22,386,900	16,103	17,121,894	10,310	3,924,941	8,044			1,340,065
Iowa—1	21,318,801	14,613	21,752,691	10,811	160,181	746			1,506,276
Total	2,296,173,063	1,026,989	987,486,261	731,786	620,795,644	504,066	527,362,959	199,911	140,521,770

¹ Total ASCS 1969 program payments for counties and States as provided by USDA county listing sheets.

² A "census farm" is all land owned and/or operated by a single operator. A "program farm" is a unit historically recorded and numbered as a farm even though it may be only part of a larger operation.

³ A negative figure under "Other payments" indicates that the sum of individual program payments—feed grain, wheat, cotton, and ACP—are greater than the indicated total payments made in the respective counties within the district. There is no immediately available information as to the discrepancy.

AVERAGE PAYMENTS PER PROGRAM FARM FOR 1969 ASCS FEED GRAIN, WHEAT, AND COTTON PROGRAMS IN SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

Congressional district	1969 feed grain program		1969 wheat program		1969 cotton program		Congressional district	1969 feed grain program		1969 wheat program		1969 cotton program	
	Average payment	Farms	Average payment	Farms	Average payment	Farms		Average payment	Farms	Average payment	Farms	Average payment	Farms
Texas—18	\$4,031	16,654	\$2,725	14,085	\$3,427	12,167	Minnesota—7	\$466	\$22,639	\$649	18,160		
Kansas—1	891	45,341	1,838	51,402			Kansas—5	583	16,203	742	23,373		
Texas—19	2,101	9,341	952	2,919	5,667	15,174	Oklahoma—4	398	10,162	1,223	12,494	1,171	11,322
Nebraska—3	1,803	38,253	1,009	31,813			New Mexico—2	3,956	2,591	4,184	1,443	3,261	3,874
North Dakota—2	541	25,689	2,065	30,606			Illinois—22	1,631	14,799	413	11,438		
North Dakota—1	745	25,929	1,659	30,048			Illinois—23	1,173	16,410	506	17,101		
Nebraska—1	1,774	34,530	550	23,155			Tennessee—8	600	11,387	180	964	1,086	19,352
Montana—2	541	7,218	3,637	13,460			Idaho—2	568	2,513	1,644	11,744		
Oklahoma—6	394	17,669	1,492	31,149	933	4,361	California—16	4,491	465	2,287	196	11,501	1,990
Iowa—7	2,208	25,086	361	1,433			Arizona—2	5,335	440	2,282	281	25,105	933
Minnesota—2	2,110	25,525	172	4,785			Kansas—2	1,027	13,810	739	16,711		
Iowa—6	2,081	24,954	844	309			Mississippi—4	320	10,624	448	159	1,818	12,271
Arkansas—1	385	2,538	367	2,666	2,384	21,075	Texas—15	1,062	1,235			2,138	11,157
Iowa—3	2,248	21,986	263	158			Minnesota—1	1,549	15,333	148	3,219		
South Dakota—2	987	16,284	1,600	16,655			Indiana—2	2,096	10,311	429	6,103		
Minnesota—6	1,424	27,107	195	7,865			Missouri—9	1,092	17,245	415	13,930		
Mississippi—2	416	10,959	1,113	299	2,054	20,187	Missouri—4	1,174	14,977	394	12,013	65	1
Mississippi—1	404	5,865	561	317	3,758	11,009	Texas—13	513	5,203	695	7,654	1,773	6,900
South Dakota—1	1,297	24,796	515	12,427			Iowa—2	1,741	12,616	68	28		
Texas—17	159	9,883	492	7,558	2,210	10,825	Louisiana—5	417	1,914	1,454	252	2,326	9,247
Missouri—6	1,501	22,465	380	12,756			Alabama—8	446	11,131	236	1,950	1,262	13,169
Colorado—3	1,535	9,883	2,092	9,820			Illinois—21	1,112	13,418	554	10,454	1,493	89
Washington—4	484	3,259	5,613	5,881			Illinois—20	1,661	10,310	488	8,044		
Missouri—10	925	13,723	354	13,311	1,343	11,973	Iowa—1	2,012	10,811	215	746		
California—18	4,273	369	3,647	272	11,502	2,837	Top 50 districts	1,349	731,786	1,232	504,066	2,638	199,914
Iowa—4	1,693	19,933	132	460									

Source: U.S. Representative Paul Findley (R-Ill.) from data supplied by the Departments of Agriculture and Commerce.

TABLE 3. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD FARM PAYMENTS INFORMATION

March 24, 1970—Page 9177—Rep. Findley statement regarding intention to offer amendment to limit payments for farm programs.

March 24, 1970—Page 9129—The listing of payments by volume as entered by Rep. Conte.

March 26, 1970—Page 9632—Rep. Findley statement and list by state and county of payment recipients who received \$25,000 or more in 1969.

April 13, 1970—Page 11306—Rep. Findley statement, table, and listing by state and county of payment recipients who received between \$15,000 and \$24,999 in payments in 1969.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 8, p. 10867—Study by Dr. John Schnitker regarding economic savings by implementation of a payment limitation.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 10, p. 13287—The names of the nation's farmers by state and county which received \$25,000 or more in federal farm program payments in 1968.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 10, p. 13720—Debate on the Appropriations Bill and a \$20,000 limit.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 11, p. 14039—Debate on a limit of \$20,000, continued.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 12, p. 15321—The results of a Louisiana State University study showing Southern farmers, without a cotton program, would not switch to soybeans.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 12, p. 15865—Statement of Dr. John Schnitker that he favors a \$5,000 payment limitation.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 13, p. 17462—Rep. Findley placed the number of farmers by state and county in the Record who had received \$5,000 and over in 1968, total paid to farmers, and participation in food aid programs by people with less than \$3,000 income annually.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 21, p. 27953—Placed results of a poll by Southern Farmer magazine showing that Cotton Belt farmers favor a payment limit.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 21, p. 28180—Arguments for and against the payment limit.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 15, pt. 23, p. 31965—Contents of a letter and tables sent to Sec'y Hardin pointing out beneficial results of a payment limit for both farmers and taxpayers.

POPULATION-MIGRATION PROBLEM CONFRONTING RURAL AND SMALLTOWN AMERICA

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

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, for some time now it has become obvious that the pressing problems of urban America are directly related to the population-migration problem that is confronting rural and smalltown America. In order to provide long-range solutions to the problems of our cities, we obviously need a more even distribution of our population throughout our country.

President Nixon has stated:

The population of our country is likely to grow by 50 per cent in the next 30 years. After an era in which people have moved steadily from our rural areas to our now overcrowded cities, we must do what we can to encourage a more even distribution of our population.

Today, I am introducing legislation that in the short run would provide better transportation, urgently needed economic benefits and increased employment in our rural areas in the Midwest. In the long run, this legislation would encourage a reversal of our current population migration and help to provide relief to our overcrowded cities.

This legislation specifies the following highways shall be designated under the provisions of section 103(d) of title 23 of the United States Code as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways:

First, U.S. Highway 36 from its intersection with National Interstate Highway Bypass 465 by Indianapolis, Ind., to Strasburg, Colo., paralleling U.S. Highway 36;

Second, U.S. Highway 81 from Interstate 35W at Salina, Kans., north to its intersection with Interstate 90;

Third, U.S. Highway 54 from its intersection with Interstate 235 at Wichita, Kans., to the intersection with Interstate 40 at Tucumcari, N. Mex.;

Fourth, U.S. Highway 50 from its intersection with U.S. Highway 81 by New-

ton, Kans., to the intersection with Interstate 25 at Pueblo, Colo.; and Fifth, U.S. Highway 83 from McAllen, Tex., to the intersection with Interstate 94 east of Bismarck, N. Dak.

This legislation would be of great help in offsetting the current farm income crisis through increased employment opportunity, jobs in roadbuilding and economic benefits to supporting industries such as steel, aggregates, cement, bituminous materials, and construction equipment and machines.

Long-range benefits would involve economic development and revitalization of our rural and smalltown areas. Modern transportation inspires economic growth.

The most obvious benefits of this highway improvement and expansion of course involve transportation. Deliveries will be faster, truck operation more productive. Industry will be encouraged to locate in spacious, clean-air country where modern routes would provide production, assembly, and distribution lines. Business and vacation travel will take much less time and there will be greater comfort and less strain in driving in that part of our country where long-distance driving is a daily occurrence.

Perhaps most important, modern highways in our rural areas would mean expanded economic opportunity in areas where people prefer to live—our Nation's countryside. Given adequate economic opportunity and a favorable living environment, large numbers of families will leave our crowded cities and choose to rear their families in rural and smalltown America.

ACTIVITIES ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a well-thought-out letter from a constituent with regard to activities on our college campuses and to also insert in the Record part of an assortment of material de-

livered to my office by another constituent as having been distributed to his son at American University.

There is no doubt that a student or any other American should be able to express himself to his elected Representative and we all agree with the constitutional right of peaceable assembly. However, the literature which I am submitting for the RECORD indicates that our students are being used as tools by Communists and anarchists. Of course, this is a strong statement but I would urge that you read the material being distributed on the campuses. It speaks for itself.

Many students have come to my office and I want them to continue to come when they have something to say, but I am going to attempt to counsel them regarding the dangers of their activities. It seems reasonable that when there is carnival-like atmosphere or mob psychology existing on campuses, the danger exists that the average student, with his natural desire for adventure, will be drawn into that activity and may unintentionally become a participant in unlawful action.

Therefore, I believe we, as the national Representatives of these students, should counsel with them, their faculties, and administrators in an effort to put the overall picture of student activity in proper perspective.

Colleges and universities should be seats of learning and places where students can acquire knowledge necessary to become good citizens and leaders in this complex world. We have a responsibility to guide and counsel them against permitting themselves to be unwittingly used by those who would destroy this Nation which provides them with the greatest opportunity any individual has been offered by any other nation in the history of the world.

The material is inserted below and I urge each Member to see what is being distributed on our college campuses:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
May 8, 1970.

HON. WILLIAM L. SCOTT,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: Regarding the latest "student protest," I, one of the millions of American adults who work to support this nation, now address my very strong protest to you, my congressman.

I protest that it is time to expose the myths and mis-statements on the part of political figures and the news media regarding these "student protesters."

David Dellinger, Jerry Rubin, Kuntzler, and their ilk are not students; they are not children; they are agitators whose purpose is to use student dupes to accomplish the overthrow of our form of government. Far from being the most intelligent young people in the history of our country, these students who are making a career into their thirties and forties of creating situations to excuse violent eruptions are among the most ignorant, undisciplined, and un-idealistic "young" people in the history of our country. That they should be allowed to use terrorist tactics to try to direct the policies and actions of our elected government bodies is intolerable.

Many of these protesters do not belong in college because they do not have the self-discipline necessary to acquire an education. Further, a part of their ignorance is due to

the calculated misteaching of leftist professors who have deliberately brainwashed them. And their lack of personal discipline is due to parents who have glutted them with material goods and neglected their spiritual and emotional nurture. They are dedicated only to having their own way, as in this latest maneuver of closing the universities across the country indefinitely, a punitive measure devised with the help of leftist professors and administrators and directed at the majority of students who have refused to cooperate in their irresponsible activities.

These student protesters have caused injuries to numerous policemen and national guardsmen who are asked by their government to lay their lives on the line to protect others' lives and property. No concern has been expressed for these men; instead they and their families have been treated with contempt and vilification.

The "frustrated" protesters have caused millions of dollars of damage to private property, which is the basis of our system of economy and government: including the lifework of professors and research groups. No sympathy is expressed for these men either!

These so-called idealists have interfered with the right of a majority of students across the country to attend classes. They have denied freedom of speech to speakers, classmates, and professors who disagree with their views. They have committed physical violence on faculty members who refused to support their actions, and threatened their families and homes.

Such students are not children. They are claiming adult privileges when they try to tell other people how to act and what to think. Let them then be prepared to take the consequences of the violence they instigate. (Instead of running crying to the nearest television cameraman when some of them get hurt.) And let their parent sadly come to realize that while they may have been thrilled when junior and his sister ran their families to suit their whims, there are a great many adults throughout this country who are not charmed by the danger of having these immature and arrogant students destroy our country.

I have talked with refugees from countries that have suffered the overthrow of their governments through student revolutions. They watch in horror and prayerful disbelief as they see the same thing happening here, while public figures abet the violence with weak excuses for the "frustrated children."

Enough is enough.

When David Dellinger states that their purpose is to force a strike of all segments of our economy in conjunction with the protest activities of the "students" in the manner that was done in Paris, the time is long past due for responsible members of congress to put a stop to this whole campaign of the destruction of our form of government.

It is time for responsible public men, men in government, men in congress, to speak plainly to the students, to their professors, and to campus administrators and tell them positively that any further acts of violence will not be tolerated.

The so-called generation gap is the worst of the myths, a handy excuse for being unwilling to stop the protests that always end up in violence. What is the reality is a deliberate stoppage of communication by the students and their cunning leaders who assert that no one may be heard except themselves.

A complete investigation should be made of what has been going on in our universities during the past twenty years. Where students have legitimate grievances against university rules channels of two-way communication should be set up.

But the continued use of students by political adventurers both on and off the campus must be stopped at once.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. G. F. MORRIS.

[From the Challenge, May 6, 1970]

DEFEAT U.S. BOSSES AT HOME AND IN ASIA;
NIXON, KENNEDY, ROCKEFELLER, FULBRIGHT,
AGNEW AND LINDSAY—TWO SIDES OF THE
SAME IMPERIALIST COIN

It is obvious U.S. bosses never had any intentions of getting out of Vietnam. The reason for this is simple—profits! Experience has shown bosses will fight to the last drop of workers' blood to maintain and expand profits. We have learned the hard way that bosses will kill many of us right here if we try to interfere in their profit grabs, just as they murdered four students in Ohio. These murders can be laid right at the feet of the Nixon-Agnew axis. Only a few days ago Nixon gave the green light to his killers when he called students who opposed the war "bums."

We have seen all Presidents—whether liberal or conservative—wipe out even more people when they fought the system. Remember how the troops were called out to slaughter hundreds of black workers when they rebelled? Did any of the bleeding heart liberals protest? They O.K'd it in the name of "law and order." When workers strike militantly against bosses and their maximum profits, workers are attacked by troops, cops, and all sorts of company finks. During the General Electric strike bosses had their agents drive trucks right into the picket lines in Schenectady and called out the National Guard in several states. In the postal strike troops were used to help bust the strike.

Has anyone ever heard their own boss say, "let's give up our profits"? Does anyone seriously believe a bosses' politics—liberal as opposed to conservative—indicate he would give you more than the right time? If we want the U.S. to get out of Vietnam and out of our lives we can't rely on any section of them. The Fulbrights, Kennedys, Lindsays are all bosses' agents. If they differ in tactics with the Nixons, it's only about how to screw the people more. In a strike some bosses rely more on goons, others on bribes. Most use all types of coercion.

You can't talk the bosses out of profits. Negotiations, whether in Paris or Washington, are illusory. Only the power of the working class and its allies can win anything.

By relying on our own efforts we can win! This year strikes among electrical workers, teachers, teamsters, and in the Post Office system have shown the bosses to have feet of clay. The postal strike just about brought the system to a dead stop in a few days. Now bosses are sweating out a possible massive auto strike at the end of the summer. An auto strike could beat the stock market into the computer machines. Workers can buck the system, and only they have the power to win.

Another example of bosses' weakness is the need to push dope like bubble gum among G.I.s to get them to go into battle. One major G.I. rebellion in Vietnam would just about topple the U.S. war machine. G.I. rebellions are occurring in a small way. Bigger ones could come, and the bosses are relying on dope and coercion to head them off.

Students and intellectuals must learn to unite with workers to win. By relying on liberals at home and various kinds of opportunists abroad they will never win (One recent example is Prince Sihanouk. He has now become the darling of the "left." Only months ago he was killing communists and guerrilla fighters in Cambodia, while he was demanding the NLF respect Cambodia's neu-

trality. At that point he was demanding the NLF get out of Cambodia. Now he would like to use all progressive people around the world to help restore him to power. Why should we be made suckers for him or the liberals who always oppress the people? How come in Lindsay's N.Y.C. garment workers are just about the lowest-paid workers in the country? Most garment workers are black and Puerto Rican. Every time they fight to improve their conditions the bosses call in the cops, and Lindsay sends them!

Another example of the opportunist liberal is Cordier, head of Columbia University. His background is one of faithful service to the bosses. While mouthing platitudes against Nixon's war tactics he is busy oppressing thousands of black, Puerto Rican and white workers at Columbia. Recently, a black worker, Mr. Johnson, was murdered by boss neglect, when he was decapitated in an accident. The board of trustees at Columbia, headed by Cordier, are busy cheating Mr. Johnson's widow and five children out of legitimate compensation. Do you really believe him when he mouths off about oppression in Vietnam while he is screwing and killing workers at Columbia?

The answer to all this isn't a mystery. Instead of us supporting this boss as opposed to that boss, lets get rid of all bosses, and their system. There can be no negotiations with murderers and aggressors. It's the profit system which means endless exploitation. Socialism means the dictatorship of workers over bosses. It means an end to imperialism and racism. At the moment we are calling for:

1. Unity of workers and students in opposition to the bosses' war in southeast Asia.

2. Unified support for the striking teamsters, auto workers, postal workers and all workers.

3. A national student strike against the war in southeast Asia and the murder of the Kent State students. We must guarantee this strike ourselves and not be fooled by moratoriums called by "liberal" college administrators. Militant picket lines must be maintained to shut the schools down until all demands are met.

4. A general strike to support the postal workers if they strike again or a general strike if the auto workers hit the bricks.

ROBERT KENNEDY

"Nearly all Americans share with us the determination to remain in Vietnam until we have fulfilled our commitments . . . (no division) will erode American will and compel American withdrawal." (Robt. F. Kennedy, New York Times, 3/3/67) (Our emphasis)

SENATOR MC CARTHY

McCarthy's stand was identical: He said at Fond du Lac that U.S. troops probably would remain in Vietnam for a "long, long time" even if there is an armistice in the fighting. "I would expect there would be formal arrangements to say who would be there and in how many numbers." (Boston Herald Traveller, 3/26/68)

AGREE WITH "OLD," 54, AND "NEW" NIXON

"... If the French withdrew, Indochina would become Communist-dominated within a month. . . . It is hoped that the United States will not have to send troops there, but if this government cannot avoid it, the Administration must face up to the situation and dispatch forces." (V.-P. Richard Nixon, New York Times, 4/17/54)

AND THE LIBERAL NEW YORK TIMES

"Government must be extended to the villages where all too often . . . Communism obtains. And the time is short. Geneva fixed July, 1956, as the date for all-Vietnam elections. These really will never be held . . . the noncommunist south cannot afford the slightest risk of defeat." (New York Times, our emphasis, 3/12/65.)

The same Ohio National Guard that shot three striking teamsters in Cleveland was sent to murder the students at Kent State. Workers and students: unite to defeat the class enemy!

WAR FOLLOWS THE S

"Late in the 1940's—and with increasing speed all through the 1950's and up to the present— . . . In industry after industry U.S. companies found that their overseas earnings were soaring, and that their return on investment abroad was frequently much higher than in the U.S. As earnings (abroad) began to rise, profit margins from domestic operations started to shrink; costs in the U.S. climbed faster than prices, competition stiffened as markets neared their saturation points." (Business Week, April 20, 1963, p. 70.)

" . . . America is today the leader of a world-wide anti-revolutionary movement in defence of vested interests. She now stands for what Rome stood for. Rome consistently supported the rich against the poor in all foreign communities that fell under her sway; and, since the poor always and everywhere have been far more numerous than the rich, Rome's policy made for inequality, for injustice, and for the least happiness of the greatest number. America's decision to adopt Rome's role has been deliberate. . . ." (Arnold Toynbee, America and the World Revolution.)

And Senator McGee of Wyoming summed it up:

"That empire in Southeast Asia is the last major resource area outside the control of any one of the major powers on the globe." (Speech in U.S. Senate, 2/17/65.)

[From the Student Mobilizers, May 9, 1970]

THE ANTIWAR UNIVERSITY STRIKE

WHAT TO DO NEXT

At a Student Mobilization Committee press conference on May 7, 1970 student strike leaders from all parts of the country presented the following proposal for adoption and action by the student strike committees in every city and on every campus. The purpose of this proposal is to provide a focus for the next steps forward in the national student strike. Take this proposal up in all strike committees! Act on it now!

The past week has seen the beginning of a campus strike of proportions unprecedented in the country's history. Originally a spontaneous response to the Nixon administration's extension of the U.S. ground war in Southeast Asia into Cambodia, the strike wave attained its present scope and intensity after four of our fellow students at Kent State University were killed by the Ohio National Guard.

The strikes on the campuses have been accompanied by a revulsion of incalculable intensity among the people of the country as a whole at the escalation of the war and at the Kent massacre. This revulsion offers us the possibility of reaching out to build an antiwar movement vastly greater in numbers and in power than any yet seen.

On a growing number of campuses the strike has advanced from "shut it down" to "open it up" as the antiwar university. The campus facilities have begun passing into the hands of the campus community—students, faculty members and campus workers. They are using these facilities as centers from which to organize and mobilize in effective action this daily mounting antiwar sentiment of the population as a whole. This is a revitalization of the colleges and the beginning of their reconstruction in accordance with the proclaimed humanistic goals of higher education.

The established ruling authorities of some campuses now on strike have declared "their campuses closed." They hope thereby to split the campus community into a "responsible" part that will meekly do their bidding and

go home, and the "bums" which they hope to turn into targets of government violence. This attempt to divide the campus community must be defeated.

1. We call on the campus communities now in control of campus facilities to maintain that control and to preserve the broadest student-faculty unity in the face of all attempts to divide them.

2. We call on the campus communities that have not yet taken control of their campus facilities to do so and to join with their sisters and brothers across the country in utilizing the facilities to mobilize non-campus communities against the war.

3. We call on the united campus communities to reach out into all communities—into the neighborhoods, the labor unions, the Afro-American and other third world organizations, the churches and synagogues, the women's groups, the political associations, the military installations—and organize the new united antiwar movement that will have the power to actually compel an end to the killing abroad as well as at home.

4. In particular, we call on the students, faculty members and other campus workers to utilize all campus facilities to build mass street demonstrations throughout the country on May 30. These can be the mightiest active expressions of popular opposition to a war in the Nation's history. Spread the strike! Establish the antiwar university! Take the antiwar message to the American people! Make May 30th the most massive actions in our history! No more victims—Vietnam, Cambodia or Kent! Bring all the GI's home from Indochina now!

Stay on strike! Open it up! Create antiwar universities as organizing centers for the movement!

Reach out to the people! From an immense majority of students to the power of immense masses in action!

Into the streets! Strike! Demonstrate! Rally! Build toward the next crescendo—May 30.

To SMC from VNUS-Hanoi: Text of a telegram received by the SMC from the Vietnam national union of students:

May first, second, third, fourth more than 100 U.S. planes bombed populated areas of Nghan Quangbinh provinces killing, wounding many civilians including children. Those new violations of DRV sovereignty and recent invasion of Cambodia by U.S.-Saigonese troops are intensifying spreading war in whole Indochina. Please develop mass actions opposing Nixon's war escalation urging immediate withdrawal all U.S. troops.

WE NEED YOUR HELP

Antiwar universities lack one thing that is available to ordinary schools: There are no rich alumni giving us money.

— Please send me more information about the SMC and its projects.

— I want to organize an SMC at my school.

— Enclosed is a donation of \$_____.

1029 Vermont Ave. N.W. #907

Washington, D.C. 20005

We need your help to continue building the strike movement and expanding the antiwar movement. Please send us a donation today.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Zip _____ Phone _____

School and/or Org. _____

ALLISON KRAUSE, JEFFREY MILLER, SANDRA LEE SCHEUER, AND WILLIAM SCHROEDER

Arthur Krause, the day after his daughter Allison was killed at Kent State: "She resented being called a bum because she disagreed with someone else's opinion. She felt war in Cambodia was wrong. Is this dissent a crime? Is this a reason for killing her? Have we come to such a state in this country that a young girl has to be shot because she disagrees deeply with the government?"

EYEWITNESSES COMMITTEE FORMED

Students at Kent State University who were present at the scene of the national guard massacre have formed a Committee of the Kent State Massacre Eyewitnesses. The committee is sending witnesses of the shooting to meetings all over the country to tell exactly what happened and to help build support for the student strikes and further the work of the national student antiwar movement.

While Kent State is still closed down and evacuated, the committee will be based in Cleveland. For information or speakers, write or call:

Committee of the Kent State Massacre Eyewitnesses,
c/o Cleveland Area Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam,
2102 Euclid Avenue,
Cleveland, Ohio 44115,
Phone: (216) 621-6516.

HOW TO DO IT

The student antiwar movement has reached a new peak. On campuses across the country it has won an immense majority to its views, not only in words, but in action, in the most massive student strikes in American history.

Where do we go from here? How can we keep up and accelerate the momentum that has been generated so far?

The task before us now is to expand out from our campus base, to use the campuses to reach out into the rest of the community and build the same kind of massive actions by the whole population. We can do this, not by abandoning the universities, but by utilizing them: using the facilities, the resources, the prestige of the university.

We have a right to demand all the facilities of the university because we and our faculty allies are the university. In comparison to the traditional resources of the antiwar movement, the university facilities now available seem almost limitless. These include everything from office space and telephones to printing facilities, the campus newspapers and radio stations, and the talents of all sectors of the university. There is no reason to overlook any department or building if it can be of use to the movement in any way.

In Chicago the Art Institute became the design center for the city-wide strike. At Wayne State the school paper became the strike paper. At Antioch the school radio became the strike broadcasting center for the region. At campuses everywhere the university phones opened up a vastly expanded national communications network.

In transforming the university into an organizing center for the antiwar movement, it is inevitable that the traditional role of the university also be transformed. At Wayne State University in Detroit, as many as fifty new strike classes were set up—on subjects like Black studies and the real history of Southeast Asia. This is a valuable educational tool for the movement and a proper way for the university to discharge its function.

An obvious goal is the elimination of all forms of campus complicity with the war effort. The administration must be forced to give its binding agreement to the complete elimination of ROTC, war and counter-insurgency research, etc. This can be enforced by committees of students looking into the contracts and records of research carried out in all the departments. Get the facts. Open up the books. No war research can go on at an antiwar university.

At Wayne State, the university facilities have been used to print hundreds of thousands of leaflets for distribution to the population as a whole, including special leaflets at factories. Teachers unions have been won over to supporting the student strikes in places such as the University of Florida and Washington, D.C. In Massachusetts, the student strikers are mobilizing to

place a statewide antiwar referendum on the ballot to let the people vote on the war and make it clear that the majority of the population is totally against it.

The university must be opened up to the community. Leaflets should invite factory and office workers to join us in discussions on campus; and if they will not come to us, we should go to them, by offering to have strike representatives speak to union meetings, for example. Similarly, GIs can be informed that the campus is completely open to them and invited to make use of it to print their own leaflets, consult with law students or faculty about problems with the brass, or simply enjoy a non-military atmosphere during their off-duty time. Black and Third World people should be encouraged to come to the campus, join in our antiwar activities, and organize their own.

To move beyond the campuses successfully means that our words and actions will have to be clear, precise, and aimed at *convincing* and mobilizing the masses of people. This is hardly a time to isolate the movement by engaging in individualistic thrashing actions which allow the media to portray us as mindless vandals. If we are to draw in new layers of the population we need massive demonstrations, rallies, and educational efforts, both on the campuses and in the streets.

A movement such as this clearly cannot function according to any individual's dictation. At Wayne State, daily mass meetings make all the decisions. It is this participation in decision-making that keeps thousands of students involved and feeling, correctly, that they have a real stake in the continuation of the movement. And it is this massive, visible, democratic procedure that gives the movement the authority to demand the use of all university facilities.

The wave of strikes on campus has demonstrated clearly the tremendous power of student masses in action. By utilizing the universities we have won, we can now unleash the much greater power of the mass of the entire people. As we continue our action in the coming days, a major goal should be to transform Memorial Day, May 30, from a glorification of war to a day of the most massive protest ever against the war in Indo-China.

RULERS INVADE CAMBODIA, MASSACRE U.S. STUDENTS: BLOOD AND NIXON

The Nixon administration's criminal adventurist imperialist aggression into Cambodia and the new brutal bombings of North Vietnam are a final outrage in America's war against the just struggle of the Vietnamese working people for the liberation of their country. The slaughter at Kent State University in Ohio is a declaration of war upon students as the most outspoken dissenters against American foreign policy. This outrage shows that when provoked, the Administration will treat those at home who would oppose its imperialist aggression with the same callous brutality as it has shown the Vietnamese. The reality of the violence of American capitalism abroad and in the ghettos at home has been harshly and dramatically brought home to all students.

This violence does not come from the evil or mistaken notions of a few politicians, as the liberals would have us believe—rather it is a violence politically motivated, directed against political dissent—it is the violence of capitalism which feels its power is threatened. For many students have begun to realize that the war in Vietnam is no "mistake" in U.S. foreign policy but is part of the need of American capitalism, as the backbone of world imperialism, to prevent social revolutions throughout the world.

The working class must lead the struggle! The Spartacist League has long insisted on the need for labor strikes against the war. We have raised the demand for a general antiwar strike of workers and students, and have

struggled to see this demand adopted within the labor and radical student movements. It is crucial now for the masses of students to seek to link up their strike with workers, and it is crucial now for rank and file militants to raise the anti-war strike demand in their unions!

The reason for this should be clear. American capitalism's life blood is the profits made by exploiting the labor of the working class. This was sharply dramatized in the recent brief postal strike which severely threatened the economy's stability and forced Nixon to resort to troops to demoralize the strikers and intimidate popular support. Economic power lies in the hands of industrial, transportation and communications workers. And in the final analysis economic power is political power.

The student movement, isolated from the working class, will either shatter into frustrated, demoralized and adventurist fragments and, like the Panthers, face savage repression by a government which feels it can attack them with impunity. The deepening political radicalization of students can be clearly seen in the cogent demands raised in many of the university strikes—demands for the freeing of all political prisoners, an end to war research and ROTC on campus, and an end to political intimidation, along with the demand for the immediate unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. troops and "advisers" from Southeast Asia.

Only the working class, because of its economic power, can lead an effective anti-war struggle. Only the class-conscious workers can lead the struggle to defeat capitalism. The unprecedented national student strike now under way is extremely important. The students' unity and militancy themselves pose a threat to the Administration, but it is its potential for sparking the working class into revolutionary motion (as happened in France in May 1968) which is its greatest importance.

Workers whose job conditions and falling real wages force them continually into conflict with the bosses must see as essential to their own interests the fight to end the bosses' imperialist war and to break from the bosses' warmonger political parties to form a party of labor. These struggles—like struggles for militant economic demands—will necessitate the replacement of the treacherous union bureaucracies which seek at every turn to tie the workers to the status quo (like "labor statesman" George Meany, who completely endorses Nixon's war policy, and his more devious, left-talking counterparts like Reuther) by rank and file workers' control. A working class which joins the political combativeness of the radical student protesters with their own tremendous militancy is the only force which can decisively defeat the imperialists.

SINO-SOVIET SELLOUT

Faced with the U.S. invasion of Cambodia, the Soviet Union and China satisfied themselves with a few threats to increase their half-hearted military aid to the NLF forces. Where, we ask, is the massive military support to repel the vicious imperialist aggressor in Indochina? Why instead have the Russians sent enormous military aid to the corrupt incompetent capitalist government of Egypt? The Maoist rush to hail Sihanouk, former "neutralist" liberal prince, betrays the anxiety to avoid the urgent demands of the Indochinese situation and return to petty border quarrels and "national priorities." The North Vietnamese government's cowardly and vague threats about postponing negotiations in Paris also show their hypocrisy as Communist "internationalists." In face of the invasion into Cambodia and renewed bombings of the North, what possible excuse could be found for remaining in Paris to negotiate?

All the Stalinist leaderships have once again demonstrated that their primary con-

CXVI—984—Part 12

as we are aware, are not in any way confidential. However, to the extent specific pages in the proposal contain proprietary data properly identified and marked as such, these pages may be omitted. Moreover, the requested NASA internal documents are those falling into a category which would be the subject of discovery in the course of litigation with NASA or the United States Government.

In view of the urgency of this request, please call me at (301) 948-9600 as soon as your decision can be made.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. DEALY,
Vice President—General Counsel.

The information requested in this letter of May 1 had been orally requested of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration through the GAO on April 22.

In spite of the fact that the last paragraph in this letter states the urgency of a reply, no acknowledgement had been received as of May 12 and Fairchild Hiller wrote another letter which I am including at this point in the RECORD:

FAIRCHILD HILLER CORP.,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
May 12, 1970.

Dr. THOMAS O. PAINE,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. PAYNE: Reference my letter to you dated May 1, 1970 (and hand carried to your office that day) requesting access to certain information pertinent to Fairchild's protest against the award of the ATS procurement to General Electric Corporation. In that letter reference is made to the fact that Fairchild's initial request for pertinent ATS documentation was made to GAO on April 21, 1970 and forwarded to your organization by GAO on April 22, 1970. My letter of May 1, 1970 emphasizes the urgency of Fairchild's request and asks that my office be contacted by telephone once your decision is made.

I am deeply disturbed both as a lawyer and as a businessman that our requests for documentation have gone unanswered through today's date—a period of approximately 20 days. The items Fairchild is requesting are those to which it is entitled access under the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, 5 USC 552 and NASA's own implementing regulations, 14 CFR 1206.100. I cannot understand the reluctance of your organization even to reply to our request.

Prior to selection of GE for the ATS award and immediately after the award, Fairchild executives sought a meeting with you in order to discuss the serious irregularities and inadequate source selection procedures we believe had occurred in the program. Both these requests were turned down, thereby leaving us no recourse but to protest formally to the Comptroller General of the United States. Concurrently with our protest you also requested GAO to investigate this procurement and to analyze the procedures utilized.

For there to be any objective evaluation of the issues raised by Fairchild Hiller in this protest, it is imperative that the pertinent documentation relating to the procurement (GE's and Fairchild Hiller's September, December and February/March proposals; the formal Report of the SEB required by NASA regulations; the decision of the Contracting Officer to accept GE's late proposal as required by NASA regulations) be subjected to objective scrutiny by all interested parties. As we have told GAO, Fairchild Hiller has no objection to GE reviewing all the documentation Fairchild is permitted to review, including Fairchild's proposal. Consistent with your request to GAO

that a full review be conducted of NASA's procurement procedures on this program, it is inconceivable to me why NASA has not released the appropriate documentation for review, particularly when Fairchild is entitled to access pursuant to a recently enacted Federal statute.

In this connection it is also pertinent to reemphasize that the information contained in both contractors' ATS proposals was paid for by the United States Government as part of the Phase B/C effort and, consequently, does not involve any of the proprietary and confidential issues associated with a proposal prepared at the contractor's own expense. Moreover, if GE's proposal does contain specific proprietary data properly identified as such, we have stated our position that such data may be excluded from that made available for review. Finally, the selection of GE as contractor for the ATS procurement has already been announced by your office; as a consequence, a refusal to release GE's proposal on the ground it might impair NASA's negotiations would not have merit.

With regard to the internal NASA documentation requested—the SEB formal Report and the findings of the Contracting Officer on acceptance of the late proposal—these are formal documents required to be prepared by NASA regulations and are discoverable at law. Accordingly, under the Freedom of Information Act, they should be made available to Fairchild.

I also wish to restate that we will pay any reasonable fees required by NASA for duplication or other expenses associated with review of these documents.

NASA's decision on the ATS has been challenged on what we believe to be meritorious grounds. The specific language of the Freedom of Information Act, the public policy underlying that statute and the implementing NASA regulations as well as basic concepts of fundamental fairness mandate that the documentation requested in our May 1, 1970 letter be made available for review. Moreover, the data must be made available for review promptly so the results of that review can mesh in with GAO's timetable.

For the aerospace industry and the public at large to have faith in the public servants who administer the substantial procurement funds appropriated by Congress, it is imperative that a cloak of secrecy not be thrown over a procurement whenever the procedures of an executive department are questioned. If NASA's selection were proper and Fairchild's position erroneous, the best way to discover this is through a review of the pertinent documentation by the contending parties. NASA has had that opportunity; all we are asking is a similar opportunity for Fairchild.

I request again that you have your office contact me by phone at (301) 948-9600 as soon as you have made your decision.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. DEALY,
Vice President—General Counsel.

The final paragraph of this letter again stresses the urgency for a reply, and on May 13, by telephone, the Fairchild Hiller Corp. was advised that the request had been denied.

Mr. Speaker, one can only draw two conclusions from this action. First, there is a deliberate effort on the part of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to delay; or, second, this is an effort to cover up the alleged irregularities. I think it is a shocking thing when a public agency throws the cloak of secrecy over its own records which, under a preexisting law, not only a protester but any member of the public is guaranteed the right of examination.

In order to maintain the integrity of the appeal procedure in the award of

Federal contracts, I would hope that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration would see fit to make information available and cooperate in any way to assure a fair hearing on a matter involving the commitment of \$50 million of taxpayers' money.

LETTER FROM VIETNAM SERVICEMAN

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, each of us has received letters from constituents which, like a searchlight in the dark, clearly illuminated issues being debated before this body and stated the question more logically than any Member during hours of debate and colloquy. I have received such a letter from the mother of a serviceman now serving in Vietnam. Her son's words, quoted in her letter, should answer any question raised by antiwar protestors, students, academicians, and Members of this and the other body. He wrote as follows:

Mother, please write our Congressman, our Senators and our President and let them know that I and many, many other servicemen in Viet Nam are behind him in his decision to go into Cambodia. It will shorten the war and could save Southeast Asia from Communism. You don't know how it's been to fight someone who, when he gets tired or starts getting beat runs across some line and laughs at you because you can't come after him. He can come back anytime he wants to, and you have to wait for him. Now, we're the cat and he's the mouse. By crushing them in Cambodia, it means that a lot more Americans will come back alive from Southeast Asia.

Further, this young man said that the Cambodian operation means that—

A lot more people in Southeast Asia can sleep without the fear of losing a child or an oldest son unwillingly, or to watch their family shot for not wanting to be Viet Cong. It means not having to sleep with the fear of being waked up by a mortar or rocket attack.

Oh, God bless our President, and I pray that our country will back him. But my country is full of selfish and close-minded people. They've never tasted war, or had to live with the threat of being shot or having to do what they're told at gunpoint. Maybe our people have too much freedom, for they seem to abuse it. Today it's what you want that's right, not what's right is what you want. May God forgive our self-minded country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not eloquent enough to comment further on this fine young man's words. I think it is enough to say that he makes me proud to be his Congressman and proud that I, too, am standing behind the President.

WALTER F. REUTHER

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

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, to the free world's troubles last week was added the sorrow of the tragic passing of Walter Philip Reuther and his wife, May.

Many who had not ever met him are mourning the death of Walter Reuther because they knew him as the champion in humanity's struggle for equality, economic justice, but above all, personal dignity.

As one active in the labor movement and politics, I was inspired by his dedication to the service of his fellow man and awed by his many restless visionary plans for progress which stimulated public discussion and eventually action to meet problems. Among the more celebrated, germinal "Reuther plans" were those for the production of bombers at the beginning of World War II, the construction after the war of prefabricated houses in idle airplane plants, and foreign economic development. At his death he was engaged in drafting, with others, a whole new concept in national health care.

The scope of his vision was truly global. In the unsettled period after World War II, he devoted serious attention to helping European labor organizations throw off the shackles of political parties so that they could bargain freely and better serve the economic needs of European workers. History attests to the importance of the contribution which a strong labor movement made to the reconstruction of postwar Europe. Walter Reuther knew well that strong and vigorous trade unions are the most effective weapon yet devised to combat totalitarianism. So through the years Walter Reuther, with his brother Victor, continued their efforts to encourage trade unionism in Asia, Africa, and South America—wherever bands of workers needed the touch of their organizing genius.

Broad and visionary as were his interests, Walter Reuther never forgot that the source of his strength was the United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America. He, together with his brothers, Roy and Victor, dedicated their lives to building this union. In turn, the Reuther brothers, spurred by the greatness of this dynamic, if sometimes obstreperous, organization, provided inspired leadership.

It was Walter Reuther who led the union negotiating teams in bargaining with certainly the most obdurate corporation managements in the world. Marshaling his immense store of economic data and his incisive logic, Walter Reuther through the years helped bring, not only to the automobile industry but also to the workers in the mass production enterprises of America, such benefits as higher wages, better working conditions, improved vacations, company-paid health insurance, pensions, profitsharing, supplementary unemployment compensation benefits, guaranteed annual wage and productivity and cost of living increases.

But more important, the UAW, under Walter Reuther, brought the brotherhood of man to the automobile factories. This union, not without internal rumblings, not only abolished job discrimination because of race or sex, but had vigorously promoted the concept of integration not only in its industry but for the community as a whole.

In these important efforts, Walter Reuther was long associated with such leaders as Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, A.

Philip Randolph, Roy Wilkins, Thurgood Marshall, and Martin Luther King in "building bridges" of understanding between people.

It was Walter Reuther's social idealism which set the UAW policy of making union progress with the community and not at the expense of the community. It was not in Walter Reuther to take a "public be damned" attitude. Observers remember that in yet another inflationary period auto union negotiators offered to scale down their wage and benefit demands if the auto companies would reduce prices, but to no avail.

Walter Reuther not only participated in the public discussion of political, social, and economic issues, but insisted that the union at every level involve itself in community affairs. The UAW's citizenship and legislative program stands as a monument to enlightened union activity in this country.

There is so much that needs improvement in our society and Walter Reuther was restless to get at the job. He was impatient with the established labor movement because it has failed to organize the unskilled in the cities and on the farms. The Alliance for Labor Action, which he was in the process of building with the Brotherhood of Teamsters, was his attempt to stimulate the organization of the unorganized.

The crash near Pellston last Saturday ended a flight which was to further the building of the UAW family education camp at Black Lake, Mich. It was the cherished hope of Walter Reuther that the center recruit and educate young people for union responsibilities so that the UAW can continue to grow in spirit and to pace the American labor movement as a force for social and economic progress in America. The Center is a living monument to Walter Reuther's irrepressible optimism that through education and his type of idealism the world can be made a better place in which to live.

Humanity is better for Walter Reuther's having lived. What greater tribute can one man pay to another?

INCREASING STABILITY IN THE MEKONG DELTA

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of the House to an article by Joseph Alsop concerning the progress that is being made by the Saigon government in the Mekong Delta. Today I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak entitled, "Increasing Stability in Mekong Delta Is Cheering Development for Saigon." They point out the following:

The single greatest reason to hope that South Vietnam may ultimately be kept from Communist domination is the vital Mekong Delta, where the Vietcong have been losing the guerrilla war for over a year and may well have lost it entirely by the end of 1970.

In this former Communist stronghold, it is reassuring to know that such prog-

ress as this is being made. This is a great new successful development in our struggle for peace in Vietnam and for freedom and self-determination there.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record the entire article by Mr. Evans and Mr. Novak:

INCREASING STABILITY IN MEKONG DELTA IS CHEERING DEVELOPMENT FOR SAIGON

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

KIEN HOA PROVINCE, SOUTH VIETNAM.—The single greatest reason to hope that South Vietnam may ultimately be kept from Communist domination is the vital Mekong River delta, where the Vietcong have been losing the guerrilla war for over a year and may well have lost it entirely by the end of 1970.

This remarkable turnabout is not reflected by the small-unit battles fought daily throughout the delta and has nothing to do with body counts of enemy dead, still regarded by too many U.S. officers as the measure of success. Rather, the prospect of victory in the delta stems from the fact that the Vietcong are being systematically pushed out of populated regions into the wilderness. The vast majority of the delta's hamlets belong to the Saigon government, even at night.

Such control exactly reverses the situation prevailing from 1963 to the 1968 Tet offensive, when three-fourths of the delta's hamlets were Communist-controlled. This heavily populated, lushly fertile rice basket of Indochina provided the Vietcong recruits (occasionally whole battalions) with food and a secure rear area for the rest of South Vietnam.

Thus, deterioration in the delta affects the whole Communist war plan. Without the delta, the war becomes increasingly an external matter—Northern men and supplies infiltrated through Laos and (until the present U.S. offensive) Cambodia. Though the Northerners effectively use guerrilla tactics, this is not the true guerrilla war in the Mao formula where support of the population is essential.

The Vietcong's loss of population control is damagingly pronounced here in Kienhoa Province, whose half-million people and rice fields once bulwarked insurgency. The Saigon government has extended its presence through new outposts manned by territorial forces so that only 15 per cent of Kienhoa's population is under Communist control—and that number is being whittled down.

More important, there are signs the South Vietnamese and their Americans finally are learning about guerrilla war. Recently in Kienhoa, Communists launched a mortar barrage against a government outpost from a firing position in the middle of the adjoining hamlet. Two years ago, this would have invited immediate air and artillery retaliation wrecking the hamlet—precisely the Vietcong's intention. This time, however, the government forces held their fire, realizing population support outweighs body count.

The result has been an inarticulate, glacially slow change in the people of the delta. Where once there was overwhelming support of the Vietcong, there is now little enthusiasm for either side but a growing feeling that life may be safer and more prosperous under government control.

A striking example is Mocay district in Kienhoa Province. Reputed to be the birthplace of the Vietcong and still dangerous country, Mocay district seethes with some 935 Communist troops and contains the delta's last heavily populated area run by the Vietcong (comprising more than half the district's population).

Nevertheless, Mocay is not what it once was. The district (including a trading center called "VC Market" by the Americans) for years was a Communist rest and recuperation spa, logistical center and general headquarters for the province. Government forces

moved into VC Market last October as hostile villagers, long ruled by the Vietcong, looked on sullenly.

Since then, however, schools, health clinics and other social welfare programs have scaled that hostility at least down to passivity.

Against this optimistic picture is the nagging feeling that the exposed outposts may be hit by a coordinated Communist offensive, in one stroke running two laborious years of pacification. The numbers are against it. The 44,000 Communist troops in the delta are outnumbered 10 to 1 by government forces (there have been no American units since the 9th Division moved out in 1969). With local recruiting down, infiltration barely maintains Communist forces at that level. Of course, any degree of success enjoyed by the current U.S.-South Vietnamese operations in Cambodia will reduce this external Communist danger to the delta.

This effective end to the delta guerrilla war scarcely means peace. Hanoi can and probably will maintain pressure indefinitely through infiltration, and the Vietcong infrastructure—the secret guerrilla government—maintains itself underground. But, especially when compared with the economic and political fragility we have reported from Saigon, the Mekong delta is one of growing stability.

DEATH OF POLISH GEN. WLADYSLAV ANDERS

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of the Members of the House received with great sadness the news of the death of Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, wartime commander of Poland's Armed Forces who fought with the Allies in World War II. General Anders died in England Tuesday. I am sure that this news comes to us with great sadness for, indeed, General Anders was one of the truly great champions of freedom and liberty. He led the heroic Polish troops throughout World War II. He will be always known for his great leadership during the terrific battle at Monte Cassino in 1944 during the Allied offensive in Italy when crack German units were entrenched in the mountain, and in the monastery crowning the mountain, and were barring the way toward Rome.

General Anders' 2d Corps, was given the task of capturing the stronghold. After days of bombardment and bombing the attack was started on May 11, 1944. A week later General Anders and his men stormed the last battlement to hoist the Union Jack and the Polish flag side by side on the summit.

It is ironic that he died exactly 26 years after leading the battle at Monte Cassino.

He was a great help to the Congress in 1952 when, under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) who was chairman of the Select Committee on the Katyn Forest Massacre, an investigation was conducted to determine the guilt for the murder of the Polish Army officers.

General Anders provided us with some of the most important testimony and evidence showing that it was the Soviet Union that cruelly massacred more than

14,000 Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest in Smolensk, Russia.

I am sure that the whole world mourns the death of this great champion of freedom and liberty and pays him special tribute because of the great contribution he and his soldiers made to the cause of freedom and liberty during World War II.

It is ironic that General Anders, after his heroic battle throughout World War II and the great contribution that he made to allied victory, he and his soldiers were not permitted by the Communists to return to their native Poland and live the rest of their lives in their native land.

So I am calling the attention of this House today with a heavy heart to the loss of this great soldier and son of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the following news article which appeared in today's New York Times about General Anders death:

GENERAL ANDERS, POLISH WAR HERO—EXILE COMMANDER IN CHIEF DIES—TOOK MONTE CASSINO

LONDON.—Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, who commanded Polish troops who fought with the Allies in World War II, died in a hospital here Tuesday after suffering an apparent heart attack. He was 77 years old.

The tall, lean, veterans of many campaigns, eight times decorated, led the Polish second corps in World War II. After the war ended he chose exile in Britain with thousands of other Poles rather than return to a Communist-ruled Poland.

Born of Polish parents in Lithuania, then a Russian province, in August 1892, he was the son of a high official in the Russian Government. After studying mechanical engineering at Riga, he entered the Czar's Army and commanded a cavalry squadron at the outbreak of World War I, in which he was wounded five times.

After the war and Polish independence, he led a Polish cavalry squadron in the Polish-Russian fighting of 1919-20.

When Germany invaded Poland in 1939, he commanded a cavalry brigade. Nearly trapped in East Prussia, he was wounded once more in fighting his way out. Then, as Russian troops entered eastern Poland, he received his seventh and eighth wounds as his brigade tried to reach Hungary.

Captured, he spent 20 months in solitary confinement in prison in Moscow. In 1941, after the German invasion of the Soviet Union, he was freed and appointed commander of the Polish forces in the Soviet.

He organized Polish prisoners of war freed from Soviet camps into units making up more than five divisions. Then he went to the Middle East with them.

(As he recruited his army, General Anders and his staff also compiled evidence of the conditions under which the Polish prisoners of war had been held, including the massacre of several thousand Polish soldiers in Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, by Soviet soldiers, which had been attributed to German troops by the Soviet Union.)

General Anders' "Free Polish" Army was strongly anti-Soviet, and a second, pro-Soviet army of Polish emigres was formed by Moscow, which then disowned General Anders' corps. After the war, he continued to hold the title of Commander in Chief of the Polish Forces in Exile.)

General Anders' name will long be linked with the bitter struggle for Monte Cassino during the 1944 Allied offensive in Italy, when crack German units entrenched on the mountain and in the monastery crowning it were barring the way to Rome.

His Polish second corps was given the task

of capturing the stronghold. After days of bombardment and bombing the attack was started May 11, 1944. A week later, General Anders and his men stormed the last battlement to hoist the Union Jack and the Polish flag side by side on the summit.

DEATH OF GEN. WLADYSLAV ANDERS

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI, in paying tribute to a great soldier and statesman who passed away in London on Monday of this week.

General Wladyslaw Anders fought in World War I as a young soldier in the Polish Army side by side with the Allied armies including our own soldiers. He has been a leader and a fighter for Polish freedom, self-government, and against tyranny of the Communist tyrants during his adult years.

I first met General Anders as chairman of the Special Congressional Committee which held hearings in this country, London, and Europe in 1952. The Communist massacred over 14,000 of the Polish intelligentsia in the winter of 1939-40 at the time of the enslavement of Warsaw by the Communist.

At the time of the Katyn Forest Massacre, General Anders was incarcerated in solitary confinement, in a Moscow prison where he had spent 20 months. He was freed after the German invasion in 1941 and became the commander of Polish forces for the remainder of the war.

General Anders organized an army of freed Polish war prisoners. The Polish 2d Corps, as the army was called, fought alongside the Allies in Africa and Italy.

General Anders was honored by the American, English, and French Governments for his service.

In 1946 the Polish Communist government stripped General Anders of his nationality, accusing him of "activities detrimental to the state."

Mr. Speaker, General Anders devoted his life to the cause of Poland and he was a great aid to our committee when we held hearings in London and Europe exposing the true facts regarding the Katyn Forest Massacre.

Not only the people of Polish extraction but all people who believe in freedom and self-government can be, indeed, thankful that we have had such fighters for freedom as General Anders and his name will go down in history for generations to come and revered by all people who love freedom and liberty.

CRAMER PROPOSES LONG-RANGE PROGRAM IN FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1970, H.R. 17620

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

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, today myself and 14 of my colleagues introduced H.R. 17620, which is a bill for enactment

of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970. Legislation must be enacted this year to provide authorizations for the Federal-aid ABC program and for public domain roads for fiscal years 1972 and 1973. Legislation must also be enacted to approve the 1970 Interstate System cost estimate. This has to be done before any funds can be apportioned to the States this year for construction of the Interstate System. The 1970 Interstate System cost estimate shows that completion of the 42,500-mile system will cost \$13.37 billion more than that indicated by the 1968 cost estimate, of which the Federal share is \$11.86 billion. The 1970 estimate is based upon 1968 unit prices, and if the present average unit price escalation of 5 percent per year continues until the system is completed the Federal share of the cost of the system will be increased about \$5.26 billion, for a total additional cost of \$17.12 billion in excess of sums now authorized to be appropriated. This bill authorizes the appropriation of such additional \$17.12 billion over the 5-year period from 1972 through 1976.

When the current Federal-aid highway program was commenced in 1956, the Congress intended that the Interstate System be completed as nearly as practicable over a 13-year period. However, because of increasing costs, adding miles to the system, and other reasons, approximately 70 percent of the system has been completed during the past 14 years. Although the Interstate System constitutes only a small part of the approximately 900,000 miles of the Federal-aid highway systems and constitutes still a lesser portion of the 3.7 million miles of public highways, roads, and streets of the Nation, it is the backbone of the entire highway network of this country, and its early completion is essential to meet our transportation and national defense requirements and to support the economy and development of the Nation. For these reasons, the bill provides for only 2 additional years of authorizations beyond that provided by existing law, rather than stretching out authorizations over a longer period of time. Since the Interstate System is now about 70 percent completed, I believe that we should make every effort to finish the system as early as possible and thereafter give major attention to other highways that are in critical need of improvement.

The 1970 National Highway Needs Report, submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Transportation on January 30, 1970, shows that approximately \$320 billion worth of improvements need to be made on all the public highways, roads, and streets of the Nation during the next 15 years, of which sum \$195 billion is needed for improvement of the Federal-aid systems alone. Improvement of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their extensions within urban areas have not kept pace with the improvement of the Interstate System over the past 14 years. A substantial backlog of highway improvement, which is essential to meet the growing demands of the highway system for safe, efficient, and economical transportation, has accumulated during this time, and we should direct our energies to correcting these de-

ficiencies just as soon as the Interstate System can be completed. There is also need for a new Federal-aid urban system and for more comprehensive treatment of the total urban highway transportation requirements, including highway oriented mass transportation. Emphasis should be given to solving these urban problems as the Interstate System is completed.

I had hoped that the Congress would pass this year a comprehensive "after 1975" highway program, so that necessary planning could be undertaken timely, and costly stops and starts avoided in the transition from the current highway program to the one that will follow. However, reports and information furnished to the committee are not presently adequate to serve as the basis for enactment of a detailed program.

The bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to develop, in cooperation with State highway departments and local governments, and to report to Congress in January of 1972, specific criteria for the functional realignment of the Federal-aid systems and detailed recommendations for a continuing Federal-aid highway program for the 15 year period from 1976 through 1990, together with estimates of the costs of such a program and recommendations for its financing.

In recognition of the urgent need to enlarge the ABC program and to solve critical urban transportation problems, even in advance of completion of the Interstate System, my bill would commence certain programs now. An additional annual authorization of \$100 million is provided for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their extensions within urban areas for a spot improvement program to eliminate, on a priority basis, safety hazards at those high accident locations which have been so identified under the highway safety program. The bill also directs the establishment of a new Federal-aid urban system within standard metropolitan statistical areas and, in addition to authorizing the use of certain ABC program funds on this system, authorizes the annual appropriation of an additional \$100 million for the improvement of such system.

In further recognition of the need to treat urban highway transportation requirements in a comprehensive fashion, I believe it is essential to promote the improvement and use of urban highway public transportation systems. If comfortable, convenient, attractive, and safe buses operate over well-planned routes and on schedules that meet the needs of the people, many persons in metropolitan areas who drive their automobiles to work and to shop may be induced to use public transportation. To the extent that highway mass transportation vehicles actually replace automobiles, highway capacity is increased, the same as if additional highway traffic lanes were built to accommodate more cars. In my opinion the Federal-aid highway program should be made more flexible and adaptable to meet the needs of individual communities, whether it involves construction of conventional highways or highways of new and innovative design

or by providing the assistance needed to make urban transportation systems really effective. My bill authorizes States to utilize apportioned Federal-aid highway funds to finance the Federal share of the cost of projects for the construction of exclusive or preferential bus lanes, highway traffic control devices, bus passenger loading areas and facilities, including shelters, fringe and transportation corridor parking facilities to serve bus and other public mass transportation passengers, bus terminals, bus storage and parking areas and facilities.

Federal-aid highway funds could be used for such purposes only when such use avoids the construction of highway projects, when the capacity thereby created for the movement of people is at least equal to that which would be provided by the avoided highway projects, and when the actual amount of Federal funds to be so expended for highway public transportation does not exceed the actual amount of the Federal share of the cost of the avoided highway construction projects. Thus, to the extent that the needed additional capacity can be provided by public mass transportation, rather than through the construction of additional highway facilities for use by motor vehicles generally, the expenditure of a limited amount of highway funds would be authorized.

In the interest of highway safety and in an effort to reduce the intolerable loss of life which we are now experiencing on the highways of the Nation, the bill provides for a mandatory program for the reconstruction and replacement of unsafe bridges and for the mandatory elimination of railway-highway grade crossing hazards. It is essential that greater emphasis be given to safety considerations in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the highway systems of the Nation. Highway accidents are now one of the major causes of death and injury in this country. More young people, 35 years of age and under, are killed by highway accidents than from any other cause.

In 1969, highway accidents accounted for 56,400 fatalities, 2 million injuries, and \$13 billion in economic losses. We suffered more fatalities on the highways of this Nation just last year than our Armed Forces have suffered in combat in Vietnam during the past 10 years. I hope that these two provisions, along with the additional authorizations for a spot improvement program and an upgrading of the highway safety program, will help reduce this highway carnage.

The Committee on Public Works commenced hearings on April 21 on legislation for enactment of a Federal-Aid Highway Act, and these hearings will probably continue through the first week of June. It is my hope that this bill will provide a basis for enlarging the scope of these hearings and will serve as the focal point for testimony on the new provisions contained in this bill.

A section-by-section analysis of the bill follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 17620 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE

Provides that the Act may be cited as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1970.

SECTION 2. REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM

Authorizes the appropriation of an additional \$17.12 billion for completion of construction of the Interstate System. The 1970 Interstate System Cost Estimate shows that, based upon 1968 unit prices the total estimated cost of the Interstate System is \$69.87 billion, which is an increase of \$13.37 billion over the 1968 Interstate System Cost Estimate. Of this increase, the Federal share is \$11.86 billion and the States' share is \$1.51 billion.

If construction costs continue to escalate at approximately 5% per year, the total cost of the Interstate System will be approximately \$75.72 billion, which is a total increase over the 1968 cost estimate of \$19.22 billion of which the Federal share is \$17.12 billion and the States' share is \$2.1 billion. Existing law authorizes the appropriation of funds consistent with the 1968 cost estimate.

The \$17.12 billion additional authorization contained in this bill is spread over a five-year period as follows:

(In billions)

Fiscal year	Authorizations in existing law	Authorizations in this bill	Authorization increases in this bill over existing law
1972-----	\$4	\$5	\$1
1973-----	4	6	2
1974-----	2.225	6	3.775
1975-----	0	6	6
1976-----	0	4.345	4.345
Total-----			17.120

Note: The Highway Revenue Act of 1956, as amended, will have to be amended this year to extend the Oct. 1, 1972, termination date on revenues to the highway trust fund, otherwise all of the Federal-aid highway funds authorized for fiscal year 1972 cannot be apportioned this year, as required by law. If this bill is enacted into law, consideration should also be given by the appropriate committees of the House to providing additional revenues to the highway trust fund to meet expenditures that will result from the apportionment of funds authorized by this section.

SECTION 3. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF COST ESTIMATE FOR APPORTIONMENT OF INTERSTATE FUNDS

Approves the use of the apportionment factors contained in the 1970 Interstate System Cost Estimate (House Document 317, 91st Congress) for the apportionment of Interstate funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

SECTION 4. EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF SYSTEM

This is a conforming amendment made necessary by authorizing the appropriation of Interstate funds for two additional fiscal years and to direct the Secretary to make two additional Interstate System cost estimates: one to be submitted to the Congress in January of 1972 and the other in January of 1974.

SECTION 5. HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATIONS

Authorizes the appropriation of funds for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973, in the same amounts as authorized by existing law for fiscal year 1971, for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their extensions within urban areas (the ABC program) and for public domain roads, except that the authorization for the ABC program for each of the fiscal years has been increased from \$1.1 billion to \$1.2 billion. This additional \$100 million will be apportioned to the States in the same manner as ABC program funds are now apportioned and will be available to the States only for projects to eliminate or reduce the hazards to safety at specific locations or sections of highways on the Federal-aid primary or secondary systems or their urban extensions which have high accident experiences or high accident potentials. These

additional funds are to assist the States in taking corrective action at high accident locations which are so identified through implementation of the highway safety program standard for identification and surveillance of accident locations.

This section would also authorize the appropriation of \$100 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973, for the Federal-aid urban system, which is a new system to be established pursuant to section 7 of the bill. This is a \$100 million increase over the authorizations contained in existing law for fiscal year 1971.

SECTION 6. HIGHWAY SAFETY

The provisions of this section recognize the administrative reorganization of the Federal Highway Administration which occurred on March 22, 1970, and provides the statutory authority necessary to establish a new Federal Highway Traffic Safety Administration, with an Administrator, at the same organizational level as the other Administrations within the Department of Transportation.

Responsibilities for carrying out the provisions of the Highway Safety Act of 1966 are divided between the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the same as has already been accomplished administratively by the Secretary.

The Highway Safety Act of 1966 provides that the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969 for State and local highway safety programs be apportioned among the States 75 per centum on the basis of population and 25 per centum as the Secretary in his administrative discretion deems appropriate, and that thereafter funds for such safety programs shall be apportioned as Congress shall subsequently provide by law. This section authorizes the apportionment of funds to the States, 75 per centum on the basis of population and 25 per centum on the basis of public road mileage.

After December 31, 1970, the Secretary shall not promulgate any standards for State and local highway safety programs that do not relate to safety program elements for which standards have been previously promulgated, unless specifically authorized to do so by statute hereafter enacted.

The appropriation of funds for carrying out the Highway Safety Act of 1966 are authorized separately for those functions to be administered through the Federal Highway Administration and through the Federal Highway Traffic Safety Administration as follows:

For highway safety programs administered by the Federal Highway Traffic Safety Administration, \$75 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973; and for highway safety programs administered by the Federal Highway Administration, \$30 million for each of such fiscal years, of which \$15 million is authorized to be appropriated from the Highway Trust Fund. (This total annual authorization of \$105 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 is an increase of \$5 million over that authorized by existing law for fiscal year 1971.)

For highway safety research and development administered by the Federal Highway Traffic Safety Administration, \$30 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973; and for that administered by the Federal Highway Administration, \$10 million for each of the fiscal years. (This total annual authorization of \$40 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 compares with \$37.5 million authorized by existing law for fiscal year 1971.)

Authorization for appropriations for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 is repealed, for no appropriations have been made, and none are planned to be made, under this authority.

SECTION 7. FEDERAL-AID URBAN SYSTEM

This section directs the establishment of a new Federal-aid urban system in each standard metropolitan statistical area and provides that routes on this system and projects for the improvement of such routes shall be selected, and proposed specifications for such projects shall be determined, by the State highway department and local officials in cooperation with each other.

In addition to the \$100 million authorized to be appropriated for the Federal-aid urban system by section 5 of this bill, not to exceed 50% of the amounts apportioned to each State for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems within urban areas may be expended for projects on the Federal-aid urban system.

As a part of the future highway needs report that is required by existing law to be submitted to the Congress in January of 1972, the Secretary is directed to report to the Congress the Federal-aid urban system as designated, and, in cooperation with the State highway departments and local road officials, prepare and submit to Congress a detailed estimate of the cost of constructing all Federal-aid systems.

The apportionment of funds authorized to be appropriated for the Federal-aid urban system is to be made on the basis of the population in standard metropolitan statistical areas. The Federal share of the cost of projects on the Federal-aid urban system is the same as that for the ABC program, i.e. 50%, plus the sliding scale in public lands States.

SECTION 8. URBAN HIGHWAY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

This section authorizes the use of funds that are apportioned to each State for extensions of the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems within urban areas and for the new Federal-aid urban system to finance the Federal share of the cost of projects for the construction of exclusive or preferential bus lanes, highway traffic control devices, bus passenger loading areas and facilities, including shelters, fringe and transportation corridor parking facilities, bus terminals, bus storage and parking areas and facilities, if such projects will avoid Federal-aid highway construction and will provide capacity for movement of persons at least equal to that which otherwise would be provided by the avoided highway construction, and if the actual amount of the Federal share of the cost of such project does not exceed the actual amount of the Federal share of the cost of the avoided highway construction.

The Federal share of the cost of urban highway public transportation projects is the same as that for the ABC program, i.e. 50%, plus the sliding scale in public lands states.

Routes and schedules of public mass transportation systems receiving assistance under the provisions of this section shall be based upon a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on in accordance with section 134 of title 23, United States Code.

SECTION 9. BRIDGE RECONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT

Each State is authorized to use not more than 10% and is required to use at least 5% (unless the Secretary determines that 5% exceeds the needs of the State) of all sums apportioned for the ABC program for fiscal year 1972 and each subsequent fiscal year to pay the Federal share of the cost of reconstruction or replacement of bridges that cross waterways and are on either the Federal-aid primary or secondary system, if the existing bridge is unsafe because of structural deficiencies, physical deterioration, or functional obsolescence. It is estimated that this section will apply to approximately 465

bridges, the reconstruction or replacement of which will cost approximately \$2 billion.

The Federal share of the cost of any project for the reconstruction or replacement of a bridge under this section is 90%, or that applicable to the ABC program, whichever is the larger.

The Secretary is required to report annually to the Congress on projects approved under this section together with his recommendations relating to bridge reconstruction and replacement.

SECTION 10. ELIMINATION OF RAILWAY-HIGHWAY GRADE HAZARDS

Existing law authorizes the use of up to 10% of all Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to each State to be used to pay the entire cost of the elimination of railway-highway grade hazards. The amendment contained in this section would not change the provision of existing law but would add thereto the requirement that not less than 5% of all sums apportioned to each State for the ABC program (unless the Secretary determines that a lesser amount will meet the needs of the State) shall be used for the elimination of railway-highway grade hazards.

SECTION 11. CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING

The Secretary is authorized to approve as a part of the cost of highway construction projects the construction of new housing and the acquisition and rehabilitation of existing housing to serve as replacement housing for individuals and families displaced by the highway construction, when no replacement housing is available and cannot otherwise be made available (either by public housing agencies or private enterprise) and when the highway construction cannot be undertaken unless replacement housing is made available.

Whenever practicable, State highway departments shall utilize the services of State or local governmental housing agencies in such construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of replacement housing.

SECTION 12. ELIMINATION OF SEGMENTS OF INTERSTATE SYSTEM NOT TO BE CONSTRUCTED

The Secretary, on July 1, 1972, would be required to remove from the Interstate System any segment for which the State has not established a construction schedule, within the period of availability of funds authorized to be appropriated, and with respect to which the State has not provided the Secretary with assurances satisfactory to him that such schedule will be met. Several segments of the presently designated Interstate System located within metropolitan areas have become controversial in recent years, and final decisions have not been made by State and local officials either to construct such segments or to request their removal from designation as a part of the Interstate System. In the meantime, these segments are included in the Interstate System cost estimates. As the time for completion of the Interstate System becomes shorter, the necessity for making such determinations becomes more critical, and this section is intended to require that final decisions be made within the next two years as to whether or not to build such segments.

SECTION 13. VIRGIN ISLANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM

This section authorizes the appropriation of \$2 million for each of the fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973 to pay up to 50% of the cost of construction of a system of arterial highways in the Virgin Islands. 3% of the sums authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure by the Virgin Islands only for research, investigations, studies, and development, and an additional 2% of the sums authorized to be appropriated may be used for such purposes.

The Secretary of Transportation is also authorized to provide technical assistance to the Virgin Islands in the establishment of a highway department.

Although the Virgin Islands' highway system is not being made a part of any Federal-aid system and is not a part of a Federal-aid highway program financed by the Highway Trust Fund, all of the provisions of law relating to Federal-aid highways (other than those relating to apportionment formulas and limiting the expenditures of funds to the Federal-aid system) shall apply.

SECTION 14. TRAINING PROGRAMS

Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the States for the ABC program and for the Federal-aid urban system would be made available by this section to finance the Federal share of the cost of training programs to provide equal employment opportunities during periods of the year when on-the-job training cannot be carried on because highway construction work is shut down. The training under this section is supplementary to on-the-job training conducted by contractors during the construction season.

The Federal share of such training is the same as that provided for the ABC program, i.e. 50%, plus the sliding scale in public lands states.

SECTION 15. FUTURE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Requires the Secretary of Transportation to develop, in cooperation with State highway departments and local governments and to include in the 1972 Highway Needs Report, specific criteria for the functional realignment of the Federal-aid systems and detailed recommendations for a continuing Federal-aid highway program for the 15-year period from 1976 through 1990, together with estimates of the costs of such a program and recommendations for its financing.

NATION PAYS DESERVED TRIBUTE TO WEST ROXBURY, MASS., MEDAL OF HONOR RECIPIENT—LT. COMDR. THOMAS KELLEY

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today the highest award which a grateful nation can bestow upon one of its citizens, the Congressional Medal of Honor, was presented to Lt. Comdr. Thomas G. Kelley, of West Roxbury, Mass., at a White House ceremony.

Lt. Comdr. Thomas G. Kelley has distinguished himself by his dedication and bravery.

At this point I insert for the RECORD the following news items detailing the courageous acts of Lieutenant Commander Kelley.

I further include the citation and other biographical data and a summary of service and other decorations and medals awarded to Lt. Comdr. Thomas G. Kelley in the RECORD:

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, May 14, 1970]

WEST ROXBURY NAVY HERO IN VIET GETS MEDAL OF HONOR TODAY

WASHINGTON.—President Nixon today will present the Medal of Honor to the second Massachusetts Navy man to be honored with the nation's highest tribute for heroism in Vietnam.

Lt. Comdr. Thomas Kelley, son of Mrs. Elizabeth Kelley of 20 Meredith St., West Roxbury, was officially notified yesterday that he would be the recipient of the award.

But Comdr. Kelley, a 1960 graduate of Boston College, reflected little upon the action on June 15, 1969, which brought him the honor.

Helping his mother pack for the trip to Washington he told newsmen, "I wish there's one thing you'd put in any story. My father, the late John Basil Kelley, was the principal of the William Blackstone School in the West End and the James Chittick School in Mattapan. It would please my mother."

Comdr. Kelley, a Boston native, and graduate of Boston College High School, was cited "For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life and beyond the call of duty" when he directed his eight assault craft of River Assault Division 152 in repelling a strong enemy attack.

The citation reads that despite "sustaining serious head wounds," Comdr. Kelley ordered seven of his craft to provide protection for one of the flotilla which was disabled.

Kelley, unable to move or speak into a radio, gave commands through one of his men and remained exposed on the deck of his craft until the battle had ended.

A Navy officer since 1960 after his graduation from Officer Candidate School at Newport, R.I., Comdr. Kelley, his wife and three daughters have been living in Kaneohe, Hawaii, since his return from Vietnam.

But yesterday, as the Kelleys packed to go to Washington for today's ceremonies, another ceremony may have been temporarily set aside, but not forgotten.

Comdr. Thomas Kelley, U.S. Navy, Medal of Honor winner, also celebrated his 31st birthday.

[From the Boston Globe, May 14, 1970]

HUB MAN WINS MEDAL OF HONOR

The afternoon was warm, too warm as usual and not at all pleasant on a river in Vietnam. It was the afternoon of June 15, 1969.

Lt. Comdr. Thomas Kelley of West Roxbury had reached his 30th birthday just a month earlier and just a week ago had been given command of River Assault Division 152.

One of the eight assault craft under his command broke down and then the shells began to fly from the brush and jungle around them. It was an ambush.

In the next few minutes Kelley's actions would win him the Congressional Medal of Honor which President Nixon will present to him today on the White House lawn.

He ordered the remaining seven boats to form a protective circle around the disabled boat, as wagon trains did a century ago crossing America.

An enemy rocket made a direct hit on Kelley's little ship, seriously wounding him in the head and knocking him to the deck.

He was bleeding badly and unable to get up or speak clearly into the radio but he managed to relay his orders through another man, direct fire until his men silenced the enemy guns.

Kelley became the eighth Navy man and the second from Massachusetts to win the Congressional Medal for action in Vietnam.

He is a 1956 graduate of Boston College High School and a 1960 graduate of Holy Cross, the same year in which he received his commission in the Navy.

Kelley's father, the late John Basil Kelley was principal of the William Blackstone School in the West End and the James J. Chittick School in Mattapan.

Kelley's mother, Mrs. Elizabeth Kelley of 20 Meredith St., West Roxbury will be at her son's side today when he receives the medal.

The officer is married to the former Gwen Qualey of Charleston, S.C. The couple have three daughters and have been living in Kaneohe, Hawaii.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE NAME OF THE CONGRESS TAKES PLEASURE IN PRESENTING THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO LT. COMDR. THOMAS G. KELLEY, U.S. NAVY, FOR SERVICE AS SET FORTH IN THE FOLLOWING CITATION

For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty on the afternoon of 15 June 1969 while serving as Commander River Assault Division 152 during combat operations against enemy aggressor forces in the Republic of Vietnam. Lieutenant Commander (then Lieutenant) Kelley was in charge of a column of eight river assault craft which were extracting one company of United States Army infantry troops on the east bank of the Ong Muong Canal in Kien Hoa Province, when one of the armored troop carriers reported a mechanical failure of a loading ramp. At approximately the same time, Viet Cong forces opened fire from the opposite bank of the canal. After issuing orders for the crippled troop carrier to raise its ramp manually, and for the remaining boats to form a protective cordon around the disabled craft, Lieutenant Commander Kelley, realizing the extreme danger to his column and its inability to clear the ambush site until the crippled unit was repaired, boldly maneuvered the monitor in which he was embarked to the exposed side of the protective cordon in direct line with the enemy's fire, and ordered the monitor to commence firing. Suddenly, an enemy rocket scored a direct hit on the coxswain's flat, the shell penetrating the thick armor plate, and the explosion spraying shrapnel in all directions. Sustaining serious head wounds from the blast, which hurled him to the deck of the monitor, Lieutenant Commander Kelley disregarded his severe injuries and attempted to continue directing the other boats. Although unable to move from the deck or to speak clearly into the radio, he succeeded in relaying his commands through one of his men until the enemy attack was silenced and the boats were able to move to an area of safety. Lieutenant Commander Kelley's brilliant leadership, bold initiative, and resolute determination served to inspire his men and provided the impetus needed to carry out the mission after he was medically evacuated by helicopter. His extraordinary courage under fire, and his selfless devotion to duty sustain and enhance the finest traditions of the United States Naval Service.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

LCDR Thomas Gunning Kelley, USN, 643569/1100.

Date of Birth, 13 May 1939.

Place of Birth, Boston, Massachusetts.

Religion, Roman Catholic.

Next of Kin: Wife, Gwen Qualey Kelley, 45-243A Kokokahi Place, Kaneohe, Hawaii 96744.

Children, Elizabeth M. Kelley (daughter) DOB 2 July 1963, Jame M. Kelley (daughter) DOB 11 April 1966, Catherine M. Kelley (daughter), DOB 22 Aug 1964, address same as wife's.

Mother, Elizabeth Kelley, 20 Meredith Street, West Roxbury, Massachusetts 02132. Brother, John B. Kelley, 18 Uplands Road, Winthrop, Massachusetts 02152.

Schools, Randall G. Morris Grammar School, September 1944-January 1949; Blessed Sacrament Grammar School, January 1949-June 1952; Boston College High School, September 1952-June 1956; Holy Cross College, September 1956-June 1960, Degree BS in Economics.

SUMMARY OF SERVICE

15 Jun 20, Enlisted in USNR at Boston, Mass. (for six years).

June 60-Oct 60, Officer Candidate School, Naval Base, Newport, Rhode Island.

14 Oct 60, Commission as Ensign.

18 Oct 60-19 Dec 60, Naval Communication School, Newport, Rhode Island.

20 Dec 60-8 Sep 63, USS *Pandemus* (ARL-18).

9 Sep 63-27 Sep 63, Staff, Commander Mine Squadron Four.

7 Oct 63-11 Mar 64, Naval Air Technical Training Center, Glynco, Georgia.

27 Mar 64-18 May 64, USS *Davis* (DD-937).

21 May 64-6 Jun 66, USS *Stickell* (DD-888).

14 Jul 66-16 Aug 68, Destroyer Development Group Two.

26 Sep 68-5 Nov 68, Naval Inshore Operations Training Center, Mare Island Vallejo, Calif.

15 Nov 68-8 June 69, River Assault Squadron Nine.

8 Jun 69-15 Jun 69, River Assault Squadron Fifteen.

Jun-26 Aug 69, Naval Medical Administrative Unit U.S. Army Tripler General Hospital (hospitalized outside CONUS).

26 Aug 69-present, Staff, CINCPACFLT.

DECORATIONS AND MEDALS

Navy Commendation Medal with two gold stars and Combat "V" Purple Heart, Combat Action Ribbon, Navy Unit Commendation (River Assault Flotilla One), National Defense Service Medal, Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal (Dominican Republic), Vietnam Service Medal with two bronze stars and Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

SECRETARY STANS AND MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 18, the Secretary of Commerce, Maurice H. Stans, will meet with Baltimore industrial, financial, and minority community leaders to explain the programs and policies of the Office of Minority Business Enterprise and urge their cooperation in exploiting to the fullest the opportunities created by that office.

That such a meeting is scheduled is in itself not startling because since the Office of Minority Business Enterprise was created the Secretary has made similar visits to nine cities across the Nation—with three repeats in New York—and has discussed the program in 65 addresses before meetings and seminars in an effort to enlist the cooperation and win the understanding of industry and minority groups.

These activities, I believe, are demonstrative of the Secretary's full commitment to planning and implementing a program which will encourage and assist blacks, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Indians, and others to become members of our Nation's business and industrial community. He has won the admiration and respect of many groups and individuals in these meetings and deserves our praise for his active efforts to bring these programs to the local level.

The impact of his presence and the effectiveness of his work is reflected in some of the newspaper reports which I now am introducing:

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 10, 1970]
UNITED STATES AND 23 FIRMS WILL OPEN D.C. BLACK CAPITALISM DRIVE

(By Philip Shandler)

A major program to increase business ownership among blacks in Washington has been initiated by the federal government.

The effort was announced today by Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans. It includes:

Establishment of four business investment corporations with total loan power of some \$2 million.

Commitments by 23 retail and service firms—mostly franchisers—to help launch 89 affiliates.

The depositing by the Post Office Department of a substantial sum in an interracial bank, the United Community Bank.

A \$550,000 grant to the National Business League, a Negro association headed by local businessman Berkeley Burrell, to expand its program of management and technical assistance.

A \$150,000 grant to the Mayor's Economic Development Committee for the continuation of its research and planning.

Opening an office at 1601 11th St. NW as a local outlet for the activities of the federal "black capitalism agency," the Office of Minority Business Enterprise.

It is the first such office in the country.

Stans, in whose department President Nixon put the office a year ago to stimulate and coordinate minority entrepreneurship, announced the local efforts at a conference the government was holding today with District community and business leaders at the Departmental Auditorium.

At a meeting this morning with about 50 neighborhood and black business leaders, Stans encountered strong skepticism about the ability of the government to deliver on its commitments. But he emphasized that now—regardless of past experience—no more is being committed than can be delivered.

Mayor Walter E. Washington, who spoke at the press conference with Stans, said he too has had to deal with frustrated hopes. But he said the program "seems realistic." He said he does not believe the government is "offering a pancea" and added:

"The important thing is to give hope with what you have."

The Washington meeting was the second in a series of local sessions to showcase the Minority Business Enterprise program.

The first was held last month in Boston; others are planned in Los Angeles, San Francisco, Dallas and New York.

The four business investment corporations are what the government has designated as the Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Corporations, patterned after small business investment corporations.

Each corporation puts up at least \$150,000, while the government provides \$300,000. The total is then used to lever substantially more money from banks, for a pool of funds to lend budding minority businesses.

The investment program and the efforts to stimulate commitments by franchisers comprise the two principal thrusts of the government's activity in creating minority ownership.

The 23 firms whose D.C. commitments were announced today included McDonald's, Rayco, Dunkin' Donuts, UniRoyal, Southland Corp. (7-Eleven stores), Penn-Jersey and H&R Block. Most of the new franchises would be in food and car service businesses but they also include enterprises in swimming pools, uniforms, paint and management assistance.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 1970]
MINORITY BUSINESS PROGRAM FACES TEST OF ITS SINCERITY

(By William Raspberry)

The black community's assessment of the administration's minority business program, if I read it correctly, is that the President talks a good game but has little intention of substantial delivery.

The evidence includes the departure, in apparent disgust, of some of the men who were supposed to help develop the program. It also includes the establishment of an Of-

Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE) without giving it any money to put minority members into business.

But OMBE officials say the program has more going for it than black detractors admit. They hope to prove it over the next several months in a number of cities, including Washington.

Locally, the first big pitch at moving from words to action will come next Tuesday when officials of OMBE, the Small Business Administration and other federal agencies meet with representatives of the black community.

The agenda, according to Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans, will include discussions of "resources, information and business opportunities, as well as innovative approaches to minority business development."

One of the points that officials will try to make is that while OMBE hasn't any money to put up for business ventures, that wasn't the agency's purpose in the first place.

OMBE's major role is to pull together whatever resources already exist, come up with ideas for generating new resources and provide the coordination that can bring the resources and aspiring minority businessmen together.

George Pantos, OMBE's deputy director and one of the organizers of Tuesday's session, thinks the agency is performing that job rather well.

He points out, for instance, that OMBE has had a good deal of success in getting commitments from major businesses and industries to help establish minority members in business. (Nearly 100 such opportunities—in franchising, service stations, auto dealerships and clothing stores—have been established in the Boston area alone.)

Pantos mentioned a popular restaurant chain that usually requires its franchise holders to put up at least \$20,000 "front-end money," a sort of down payment-entry fee.

The chain has agreed, through OMBE's urging, to make it possible for a minority businessman to acquire a franchise for as little as 2 per cent of the normal "front end" requirement—or even to waive it entirely under certain circumstances.

It is this kind of leverage with big business that gives OMBE its best chance for success, Pantos feels.

He also lays stress on some clever devices OMBE has coined for generating hard-to-come-by minority investment capital.

The major device is the Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Company (MESBIC). Under the MESBIC plan, a corporation can put up as little as \$150,000, have it matched two-for-one by SBA funds and thereby create a low-interest loan pool of \$450,000 for minority businessmen.

But it goes even beyond that. If the money is used in conjunction with SBA's program of 90 per cent loan guarantees, the original investment of \$150,000 could create capital resources of more than \$2 million, Pantos said.

But so far, Secretary Stans and OMBE officials are talking largely about plans.

The best test of the administration's sincerity and effectiveness will come when significant numbers of aspiring minority businessmen say "show me."

That could come soon after next Tuesday.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 3, 1970]
MINORITY BIZ PLAN UNVEILED
(By Chris Williams)

Secretary of Commerce Stans today unveiled a White House plan to give minority group businessmen here a healthy share of multimillion-dollar government contracts.

The program is designed to put black and Puerto Rican entrepreneurs on a firm footing by providing easy loans for enterprises and making federal contracts available with a minimum of red tape.

It is coupled with an effort by 28 local firms that have promised at least 300 "opportuni-

ties"—ranging from auto dealerships to food franchises—to members of minority groups.

SO FAR \$17.7 MILLION EARMARKED

In a press conference at the Upper Manhattan Branch of the YWCA, 361 W. 125th St., Stans said.

"This program is in accordance with President Nixon's order to all governmental agencies to increase the involvement of minority group contractors and suppliers in the federal procurement program.

"To date \$17.7 million has been earmarked for this purpose for the current fiscal year with a goal of \$100 million for 1971."

WILL MEET

"With teamwork, I am confident we will achieve the Administration's objective of providing methods through which members of the nation's minorities will participate productively in our American business and industrial economy."

Stans said he would meet with business leaders and representatives of minority groups here throughout the day to go over details.

He said the program was one of a series being instituted in major cities across the country.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 4, 1970]

STANS OUTLINES PLANS FOR MINORITY BUSINESS—COMMERCE SECRETARY LISTS A SERIES OF OBJECTIVES

(By Leonard Sloane)

Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans returned to Harlem yesterday to announce a series of Government and private programs designed to provide business opportunities to members of minority groups.

Exactly three months after he met with 25 black leaders in Harlem to outline Administration plans for fostering minority business, he held a larger meeting at the Uptown Branch of the Young Women's Christian Association on 125th Street to describe the accomplishment of specific programs that had been promised.

These programs—as outlined to the businessmen, to a news conference immediately thereafter and to a luncheon meeting with 50 top corporate officials at the 399 Park Avenue offices of the First National City Bank—included the following:

The agreement by 28 national franchising companies to provide 300 franchises to Negroes in the New York area. "If these 300 opportunities are taken up, I'm sure we'll get another 300 very quickly," he added.

The establishment of three, "and maybe four," minority-enterprise small-business investment companies here, as part of the Commerce Department's Office of Minority Business Enterprise's efforts to develop sources of venture capital for minorities. He said that the corporations sponsoring the new MESBICs are the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, the Pioneer Properties Company and B.L.E.D.C.O.

The forthcoming institution in New York of Small Business Administration action on minority loan applications within three days. This . . . procedures for funding applications has been tested successfully in Chicago, Mr. Stans said, and will substantially increase the activities of the administration's local office.

"This is an interim step to the evolution of a total program," said Mr. Stans. "I intend to devote a good part of my time as Secretary of Commerce to this program."

In an address prepared for delivery last night to the Economic Club of New York, the Commerce Secretary continued to express his belief that more blacks and Puerto Ricans must be brought into the nation's economic mainstream.

"So long as only 85 per cent of our people can participate in our system, we will never have full understanding of it, full respect for

it or full assurance that it will survive," he told the audience at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

He also announced that a procurement conference will be held here on April 6 to give minority group contractors and suppliers information about bidding for Federal contracts. The Administration has already earmarked \$17.8-million in the current fiscal year for government purchases from black and Puerto Rican companies, Mr. Stans observed, with \$100-million set as the goal for 1971.

Later, in a question-and-answer period, Mr. Stans said he believed the present level of the economy should be "sustained" and that he did not see any reason for it to go lower.

Mr. Stans said he thought the profit squeeze would continue a while longer but "should begin to ease later this year."

"You can believe the President when he said we are not going to permit a recession."

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 27, 1970]
MESBIC—KEY TO UNLOCKING \$250 MILLION FUND TO AID NON-WHITE BUSINESS
(By Thomas Ohphant)

You can now add MESBIC to the confusing mix of programs developed by the Federal government to tap the resources of business to aid the nation's ghettos.

The initials stand for Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies and, as the term implies, they are an application of the leveraging principles of SBICs to the needs of businesses owned by non-whites.

The MESBIC program, christened Project Enterprise, is one of the first major efforts of the Office of Minority Business Enterprise, a ten-month-old unit of the Commerce Department.

Of all the programs started since the government first became serious about aiding non-white businesses about two years ago, this one is easily the most innovative and promising.

To set up a MESBIC, a private group must put up a minimum of \$150,000. This figure is then matched on a two-for-one basis with a loan from the Small Business Administration, bringing the minimum initial MESBIC capitalization to \$450,000.

Since small business investment companies only put up the equity portion of a loan to an aspiring entrepreneur, their loans in turn make possible much larger loans from banks.

The early experience of the MESBICs has shown, according to the Commerce Dept., that banks will often lend about \$4 for every one dollar the MESBIC puts up. This means that each dollar the private MESBIC group raises can mean \$15 in loans in non-white businesses. In this year of tight money and tight Federal budgets, that kind of leverage effect is very nice to see.

So far, nearly 30 MESBICs have been formed around the country, four of them in Massachusetts, and Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans has set his sights on 100 by this June 30.

Using 15-for-one leveraging, the achievement of even this limited goal would make about \$225 million available eventually to help establish minority-owned businesses.

When the program began, Sec. Stans was able to set aside \$15 million at the S.B.A. for loans to get the first batch of 100 MESBICs funded. This was no small achievement, by the way, since at the time S.B.A. loans to regular SBICs had been frozen by the Budget Bureau as part of the anti-inflation effort.

Last week, however, it became clear that MESBICs may be getting even more money. This cheery development stems from a bill passed by Congress just before the Christmas recess at the behest of the SBIC industry, which will bring \$70 million in S.B.A. loan funds to SBICs of all kinds by the end of the current fiscal year.

The Budget Bureau is still keeping its plans for these precious funds secret, but a Commerce Department source told the *Globe* that MESBICS will be getting a "significant" share of the pie.

Despite its great promise, the MESBIC program is not without faults.

Perhaps the most glaring one is the requirement that a private group put up \$150,000 on its own. This makes it unlikely that black people will have control over very many MESBICS.

Sure enough, when one looks at the first list of these companies, he finds the sponsors are dominated by the likes of Phillips Petroleum, International Industries, and Prudential Insurance. There are exceptions, including one block-owned MESBIC here in Boston, but they likely will be few and far between.

The Commerce Department's stock in block communities around the country is thus not very high, but it could rise if a way could be found to place black businessmen in operating command of the MESBIC's.

Just such a plan surfaced in Boston during Sec. Stans' visit here two weeks ago. It was drafted in rough form by Samuel Tyler III, the urban affairs man for Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

Tyler's idea is designed ultimately to breathe life into one of the Boston business community's most conspicuous failures to date in the ghetto arena, the Boston Urban Foundation.

This organization was formed with a vast amount of publicity nearly two years ago to help form black business locally. Its announced goal was to raise \$2 million, but it has never approached that.

At last count, it had raised less than \$350,000, not all of which had even been lent. Last week, one local businessman described the foundation as "dead on its feet."

What's more, it is leaderless. It has no executive director, and its chairman up until a month ago was Robert Slater, who has since dropped out of sight after resigning as head of John Hancock.

Tyler's idea envisages a foundation with \$2 million and a board of trustees for general leadership composed of "downtown" financial and corporate executives.

However, his idea is to add an operating executive committee composed of black businessmen, overseeing the work of an executive director who would have to be comfortable both downtown and in Roxbury.

With aid from the S.B.A. and local groups like Action for Boston Community Development, the revived foundation would operate five MESBIC's, each capitalized at \$500,000, in the following fields—housing development firms, large retail establishments, manufacturing companies, small shops and service businesses, and construction companies.

Remembering the leverage effect, this \$1.5 million would mean more than \$20 million for local minority-owned businesses. In addition, there would be \$500,000 available as an emergency fund to help existing companies get through rough spots.

Tyler's excellent idea has already been picked up by other members of Boston's highly motivated "underground of corporate urban affairs specialists. However, to get anywhere it will need support at much higher levels of the city's business establishment.

Whatever happens, the bank presidents, brokerage house partners, and corporate executives had better move soon to raise the money any serious effort in this field requires. As things stand now, their reputation in Roxbury could hardly be more tarnished.

[From the Boston Herald-Traveler,
Jan. 14, 1970]

BOSTON-AREA FIRMS ASSURE COMMERCE CHIEF
OF MINORITY AID

(By Earl Marchand)

Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans spent a conference-filled day in Boston yes-

terday, drumming up "opportunities" in business for minority group members.

Then he reported that he already had been given "commitments which assure 99 minority business opportunities in franchising, gasoline service stations, automobile dealerships and menswear stores in the Boston metropolitan area."

The commitments, Stans said, came from 23 businesses and industries in the area.

The 61-year-old head of commerce told reporters that this was just a start by the Nixon administration in its attempt to put minorities into the mainstream of American economic life.

He said he would be making trips similar to yesterday's Boston visit "to 20 to 25 major cities in the next six months."

His activity here began Monday night when the secretary talked with about 50 persons from government agencies. Yesterday morning he discussed minority activity with about 100 business and financial leaders. Following a noon press conference he met with about 50 minority leaders.

His busy day precluded a scheduled walking tour of Roxbury. With Stans on the Boston visit were Under Secretary Rocco C. Siciliano and Abraham S. Venable, director of the Office of Minority Business Enterprise.

Stans is working on minority opportunity through the Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE), a division of the Commerce Department created by President Nixon last March.

OMBE, Stans said, faces this situation: While minority groups make up 15 per cent of the population, they own less than three per cent of the nation's businesses and only one-half of one per cent of the total assets of business.

OMBE, according to Stans, is operating on the premise that four factors will lead to successful minority business enterprises:

Realistic opportunities; adequate capital; assistance to management after the business is begun, and a qualified individual to run the business.

OMBE is providing the first three ingredients, and it is up to the minority communities to present their qualified individuals, Stans said.

A goal of \$301 million in federal government loans, grants and guarantees has been set for the current fiscal year to aid minority business, the Secretary said.

HE ASKED local financial and corporate organizations to create new sources of venture capital through the Small Business Administration (SBA) program. It was also reported that the SBA more than doubled its loans to minority businessmen in 1969 over 1968.

Under the plan to increase opportunity for minority businessmen, the federal government—as a consumer—expects to play a big role.

"We have established a goal of \$100 million in fiscal 1971 in federal contracts for minority businessmen for the purchase of supplies used by the government," Stans said.

Stans said that a successful program could help "relieve discontent" among the minorities.

"We cannot have 15 per cent of the American society left behind by the mainstream," he noted. "It is not enough that they have a regular job and a regular salary. There must be opportunity so they can have a chance to be an owner . . . a capitalist . . . a success story."

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Mar. 9, 1970]

STANS TELLS PLANS TO AID MINORITIES
(By Richard Curry)

Several developments aimed at providing opportunities and expanding sources of venture capital for potential minority businessmen in Dallas were revealed here Monday by Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans.

Dallas industrial, financial and minority community leaders meeting in an all-day

series of sessions with Stans and other federal officials were urged to utilize to the fullest the opportunities presented and to be prepared to apply others now in the planning stage.

Stans also announced that the Dallas Negro Chamber of Commerce has been designated as his department's first associate office. This means that the Dallas chamber will, in effect, act as a field office in providing information to minority groups.

Stans spoke briefly early Monday at the first meeting of a new organization called the Dallas Alliance for Minority Enterprise, comprised of businesses, individuals and organizations interested in promoting minority enterprise.

While in Dallas Stans announced these developments:

23 businesses and industries here have made commitments which assure 69 minority business opportunities in the Dallas area, ranging from automobile dealerships through a wide variety of franchises.

Four groups of Dallas business and community leaders have organized Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies. These are University Computing Co., Bonanza International, Daniel Investment Co. and the Business School of SMU.

Appointment of C. Carmon Stiles, deputy director of the Department of Commerce field office in Dallas, to offer assistance and advice to potential businessmen in contacting corporations, financial institutions and government agencies.

"We must make it possible for any individual to have his own business if he wants it," Stans told a press conference. "That kind of opportunity must be available to everyone regardless of background or ethnic origin."

Stans characterized the economy as being in a "controlled slowdown." He said he expects there will be evidence of a slow-down in the rate of inflation within the next few months.

[From the Dallas Morning News,
Mar. 10, 1970]

MINORITY PROGRAMS LAUNCHED
(By Al Altwegg)

"No city we have been in is as far advanced in its concepts of dealing with the problem (of helping develop more minority business enterprise) as is Dallas."

With that statement, Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans kicked off the first minority business workshop held on the SMU campus Monday as the first project of the new organization called DAME, the Dallas Alliance for Minority Enterprise.

During his day-long visit to Dallas to promote the government's minority enterprise programs, Secretary Stans also made around half-dozen announcements:

1. Twenty-three firms and industries have made specific commitments offering 60 minority business opportunities in the Dallas area most of them franchised operations ranging from auto dealerships to food shops.

2. Four groups have already taken steps to organize the new risk-capital firms called MESBICs (Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies). One, formed by Sam Wyly's University Computing Company, is already in business and has committed its first loan, it was announced Monday. (Hilary Sandoval Jr., highest ranking Mexican-American in the government and head of the Small Business Administration, accompanies Stans on his Dallas visit.)

3. A Dallas area procurement conference is going to be held here in May to let minority businessmen know what they can sell to various government agencies and how to go about doing it.

4. C. Carmon Stiles, deputy director of the U.S. Department of Commerce field office in Dallas, has been appointed specifically to give assistance and advice in that office to minority entrepreneurs seeking help.

5. The Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce has joined in funding Venture Advisors Inc. of Dallas, an organization founded by Wyly and dedicated to giving advisory help to small Dallas businesses run by black or Mexican-American entrepreneurs.

6. The Dallas Negro Chamber of Commerce, with offices at 2834 Forest Ave. and headed by Dallas black businessman Joe W. Kirven, has been designated as the Department of Commerce's first "associate office" to make it easier for minority groups to get Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE), the Commerce arm promoting minority enterprise for the Nixon administration.

Speaking at the Dame workshop at SMU Monday morning—a similar presentation was made to Dallas white businessmen Monday afternoon—Stans pointed out that the members of many minority groups in the United States—not just black, but the Mexican-Americans in Texas and California, the Puerto Ricans in other parts of the country, the Indians, the Eskimos, and some even smaller minorities—are far behind in the race.

"Our purpose is to see that they have at least an equal chance at the starting line," Stans said.

He stressed that the minorities constitute about 15 per cent of the U.S. population but own less than 3 per cent of the business enterprises and control less than one-half of one per cent of the business assets.

Speaking of the OMBE program, Stans said:

"This is not a welfare program. It's an opportunity program, to offer the minority members the same opportunities that whites have, the opportunity to succeed or fail."

Stans reminded his listeners that after two years, 50 per cent of white enterprises are no longer around, having been bought out or given up or having gone bankrupt.

"We have to recognize that there will be failures. But we can't just hand out money to everyone. We have to see that any individual has an equality of opportunity."

Addressing himself to the reasons why such a program should be undertaken and promoted, Stans noted three in particular:

1. The social reason: "It's just right, fair, equitable. It's the thing to do, to see that those people who have been left behind should be given a chance to catch up."

2. The economic reason: "As long as only 85 per cent of our people have opportunity, we will never develop the full potential of this nation's economy. Just the security of a job and a weekly paycheck is not enough. These people must have a chance to be owners."

3. "And another reason is the self-interest of the business community, of the entire society, which dictates this should be done. We will not be able to preserve our economic system unless we have understanding of it by all of the people. We must bring the 15 per cent in the minorities to a full understanding of the system, to have full confidence in the system, and that they cannot reach until they are owners."

Stans concluded in ringing tone, "We're trying to prove to everyone in this country that there is such a thing as the American dream, and that it's available to them as well as to anyone else."

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Feb. 17, 1970]

MINORITY BUSINESS AID SET

Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans has announced 110 minority business opportunities are available in Los Angeles through the Office of Minority Business Enterprise (OMBE).

Beginning two days of meetings with community and business leaders here, Stans met

with newsmen at the downtown Hilton Hotel yesterday to outline the OMBE program's local operation.

"At least 200 franchising companies have guaranteed us 5000 opportunities across the country," Stans said, "and we have 110 firm commitments right here in Metropolitan Los Angeles."

Created by President Nixon in March, 1969, OMBE has designed a four-point formula for minority business success.

"We've seen it takes a lot more than money," Stans said. "It takes first, a qualified individual; second, a realistic opportunity; third, adequate sums of money, and fourth, technical and managerial assistance."

OMBE will look to the local communities to screen individuals who might be qualified (trainable) and refer them to the program, he said.

"Then government programs will work with the community, local businesses and the individual," he explained, "and we figure our success should match the national average of 50 per cent for new businesses."

Approximately half, he said, would either fail, sell out or merge with other businesses within the first two years.

Various government and private funds will provide the "seed" money to get started, Stans said, and the balance will be borrowed from banks with 90 per cent Small Business Administration insurance.

Mexican-Americans and other minorities will be served by the program, as well as blacks, Stans said.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 17, 1970]
STANS DISCLOSES MINORITIES BUSINESS PLAN—
REPORTS 28 FIRMS OFFER AID

Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans brought word of the Nixon Administration's "minority enterprise" program here Monday with announcement of 110 business opportunities for local residents.

Stans told a press conference at the Statler that the offer of chances for members of minorities to get started in business had come from 28 firms, including franchise operations and oil and auto companies.

The commerce secretary explained that what was "black capitalism," one of Mr. Nixon's campaign promises, had been expanded to include all minorities under the Office of Minority Business Enterprise.

Stans came here for a two-day series of meetings and seminars with business representatives of the black, brown and white communities. He will meet today at the Western White House with more than 50 newspaper editors, then with the heads of local federal offices to explain the program.

His hope is to unite the resources of the federal government with representatives of the minority community and local business to find eligible persons, provide business opportunities, training—if necessary—and funding to start new businesses.

Stans said financing will be provided, in part, by local organizations called Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies.

So far there are four such groups here. They are Fluor Corp., International Industries, Freedom Diversified Investment Co., and San Fernando Investment Co.

Each of the organizations puts up money which is matched two to one by the federal government. This sum is used in turn to provide seed money for the new business and then money is borrowed from banks.

Thus, Stans said, the \$200,000 offered without profit by Fluor becomes \$600,000 when matched, then balloons into about \$3 million after bank loans.

According to the commerce secretary, there are 50 such groups nationwide. He expects 100 MESBICs by June 1 with a total of \$300 million to generate business among minorities.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Apr. 14, 1970]
MINORITY BUSINESS AID PRAISED

By David C. Smith

Detroit has advanced faster than any other U.S. city in developing minority business, Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans said here Monday.

Stans was in Detroit for a day long conference with black and white business leaders detailing federal programs for promoting black businesses.

He also addressed a joint meeting of the Economic Club of Detroit and the Society of Manufacturing Engineers (SME). The SME is conducting a week-long technical conference and tool show at Cobo Hall.

Stans departed from the main thrust of his Detroit appearances to rap the Teamsters strike. He said the walkout is "contradictory to the administration's program to hold down on inflation."

While deploring the Teamster action, Stans said, he didn't feel the administration should "get in any further" than it has at this point.

Stans said that Detroit's emphasis on developing minority business opportunities undoubtedly was spurred by the 1967 riot and subsequent formation of leadership organizations such as the Inner City Business Improvement Forum and New Detroit Inc.

[From the Detroit News, Apr. 11, 1970]

STANS TELLS OF PROGRESS OF MINORITY BUSINESSES

Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans, who is touring the nation to promote a program of aid to "minority" business enterprises, said Detroit appears to be "further advanced" in this type of activity than any of 10 major cities he has visited.

Stans met here yesterday with several groups of leading white and black business executives. James M. Roche, chairman of General Motors Corp., presided over one of the programs, held at the Engineering Society of Detroit.

Stans told of recent steps which have been taken by private business and the government to aid business ventures started by members of minority groups who have been "left behind" by the rest of the economy. He said these people include not only blacks, but also Indians, Spanish speaking Americans and Eskimos.

Stans particularly discussed a program, started by the Commerce Department last November, to establish what are called Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Companies, or MESBICs.

Under the program, an established business or other organization can form a MESBIC as a subsidiary company, contributing at least \$150,000 in initial capital. This starting capital is matched on a two-for-one basis by the Small Business Administration, thereby tripling the capital base.

In addition the SBA will guarantee up to 90 percent of additional financing in the form of bank loans. The effect of this, Stans said, is to make available \$15 in operating funds for every \$1 originally invested.

Nationally, Stans said, 82 MESBICs already have been formed, and he predicted that a goal of 100 by the end of the government's current fiscal year on June 30 will be easily reached.

Michigan has four MESBICs thus far, the largest being one previously announced by General Motors Corp. GM's contribution to get the project started was \$1 million. The SBA will add another \$2 million, and bank loans are expected to increase the total to \$15 million.

Other MESBICs in the state were started by Urban Development Development Corp., 415 Brainerd, Detroit; Michigan Franchise Systems Inc., 16000 West Nine Mile, Southfield; and Garrard & Co., Saginaw.

The MESBIC's will seek qualified persons in minority groups who need both financial and technical assistance and lend them the money and the management counseling needed to go into business. These enterprises won't necessarily be in the same field as the sponsoring company.

Thus, MESBIC firms sponsored by General Motors won't necessarily be connected with the automotive industry.

Roche said several MESBIC proposals had been made to General Motors and "now that we're in operation we are going to give it everything we've got." (The charter for GM's operation was presented to Roche by Stans at yesterday's meeting.)

Roche said General Motors actually is encouraging minority enterprise in other ways besides the MESBIC program.

"We have been attempting to work with minority interests who have the technical skills and the possibilities of becoming suppliers," Roche said. This represented "preferential treatment" for the minority businessmen, Roche said, but he pointed out that once they get the initial opportunity to do business with GM "they have to have the ability to be competitive in price and quality, and anyone who goes into business today has to recognize that."

Roche also said: "We have instructed all of our people in a written policy statement to look for products and services (from minority enterprises) that can be used in our plants."

Stans said that in addition to the four MESBIC's which have been formed in Michigan, these steps have been taken to help minority enterprises here:

Thirty-five companies with franchising operations "have made commitments which assure a minimum of 62 minority business enterprises in the Detroit area."

A program to provide management assistance to firms requiring it has been established by the Commerce Department in co-operation with a black organization, the Booker T. Washington Business Association.

A specialist from the Commerce Department, George R. Campbell, has been assigned full time to aid minority businessmen. His office will be in the Federal Building in Detroit.

A "procurement conference" will be held in Detroit in October, on a date yet to be announced, to explain how minority contractors and suppliers can do business with the government.

[From the San Francisco Examiner & Chronicle, Apr. 5, 1970]

MINORITIES WINNING FIGHT

(By Lindsay Arthur)

A snowstorm of paper work engulfs the Administration's efforts to find and help finance potential entrepreneurs among the minorities.

Actual new businesses are hard to locate. Maurice H. Stans, a Californian who is secretary of commerce, is the sparkplug for the effort to bring America's blacks, browns and yellows into the economic mainstream, raise their living standards and widen the doors of opportunity.

More than six weeks have elapsed since he came to San Francisco—one of many trips to major cities—to sell a three-part program of capital development, construction awards and procurement contracts.

The interviewing was assigned to the Commerce Department's San Francisco office.

Philip Creighton, regional manager, says 200 persons have been screened.

"We are the catalysts," he says. "We interview and refer these people to other agencies, organizations and businesses."

One is the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

David A. Marcelle, assistant manager, says his office functions as a clearing house, matching opportunities and talent.

BEFORE VISIT

The chamber's effort predates Stans' visit. "We try to persuade businessmen to grab a hold," says Marcelle.

"The federal government's direct endorsement gave the program a priority, a national label that makes easier the job of winning local commitments."

The Small Business Administration is a second point of referral. Asked for tangible results, Donald McLarnan, regional administrator, cites these:

A minority-owned company here has just received \$636,000 contract to manufacture export packaging.

A black proprietorship won a \$684,000 award to make leather mail bags.

A similar firm was awarded a \$296,000 contract to build metal hand trucks for the Post Office.

"These supply awards ordinarily go to large concerns," says McLarnan. "We went after them for the minority people."

Stans places great faith on the Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Company as a way of lifting social and economic levels.

There are a half dozen in formation but not one "Mesbic" has been licensed in the six weeks.

A third point is PACT (Plan for Action for Challenging Times.)

Mrs. Del Behrend, small business counselor, is on leave from Bank of America as PACT's director of business and economic development.

Asked the effect of Stan's visit, she says: "As go-between for the business and the minority communities we have been swamped. We have had twice the normal number of inquiries."

\$1 MILLION

This six-year-old business development organization since last August has "packaged" \$1 million in loan applications and is working on a similar volume.

A high priority has to be given now to keeping afloat the minority businesses already started.

Tight money, she explains, has created cash problems for all business—white, black and yellow.

"But the Stans visit did help," she adds. "The troops got the message in the government agencies."

PAPER PROJECT

Critics call the minority ownership idea a "paper project."

"The paper work is fantastic," says one insider. "As the word spreads there will be more people competing for available funds and more red tape."

But there is little discouragement. John Dukes, executive director of the Economic Opportunity Council, says he hears few complaints about the lack of "visible progress."

INTERNATIONAL TRADE LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have long been in favor of free international trade. But in trade, as in life, unbridled freedom often creates more problems than it solves.

In the past decade, this Nation has witnessed a dramatic increase in the inflow of certain foreign goods and products. Up to a point, these imports have

enhanced our standard of living. Unfortunately, however, they have reached such levels in certain classifications that they have burdened rather than benefited our economy.

Imported textiles and footwear are two areas which are of particular concern to me. In recent years, these inexpensively produced imports have become a glut on domestic markets. As a result, American textile and footwear industries are attempting to compete under extremely adverse competitive conditions. Foreign manufacturers typically have significantly lower production, labor, and marketing costs than do American manufacturers. In addition, importers can stagger their imports by volume and by time period, thereby greatly disrupting American markets and making it impossible for domestic businessmen to produce and market their own products on an orderly basis.

Beset with increasing pressures from foreign textile and footwear importers, some manufacturers have been forced to go out of business. This has added to rising unemployment rates, cut back domestic job markets, and lowered Federal tax revenues. While these effects are measured in purely economic terms, the real tragedies lie in the human misery created when a father or a husband finds himself displaced by the effects of unfair foreign competition, and as a result is unable to meet his personal and family obligations.

Mr. Speaker, foreign businessmen should simply not be allowed to continue using their lower production, wage, and marketing cost advantages as a bludgeon to add to the internal economic problems this country is already facing.

Ideally, this situation should be resolved through multinational trade agreements. Unfortunately, the lure of making a quick and easy profit at the expense of American merchants and workers has blinded certain foreign nations to the realities of international commerce.

In an effort to facilitate a solution to this problem, I am today joining other concerned Members in introducing legislation to provide for orderly trade in textile articles, articles of leather footwear, and to ease the economic import on domestic markets. Hopefully, this proposal will help set the stage for the consummation of appropriate multinational trade agreements. However, if the executive branch fails to promptly arrive at a set of international agreements reasonably designed to permit appropriate levels of imports to enter this country on a scheduled quota basis that will not disrupt domestic markets and will not harm our U.S. businessmen and workers, then I submit Congress has the responsibility to take strong decisive remedial action.

PROBLEMS OF FAMILIES OF MISSING AND CAPTURED SERVICEMEN MUST BE SOLVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, amid the current controversy over the Cambodian extension of the continuing conflict in Indochina all too little mention seems given to U.S. servicemen listed as missing in action or captured in Southeast Asia.

It was March 1964, when the first U.S. Army adviser was captured by the Vietcong. Today, 6 years, 2 months, and 328,119 total U.S. casualties later, the Department of Defense tells me the number of U.S. servicemen missing in action or captured in Southeast Asia stands at 1,579.

The Department of Defense also tells me 22 of these 1,579 men have been so listed for more than 5 years. It tells me that, because of the viciously sadistic attitude of the Communist enemy, it has actual knowledge of the capture of only 450 of these men, and, worse, that the enemy has openly acknowledged capturing only around 450.

If this is a dramatic indictment of the inhumanity of the Communists, it is, at once, dramatic suggestion of the suffering of the Americans they have captured. But it is also poignant indication of the anguish of the families of these same men missing or captured.

Even as the Communist enemy continues to choose to flagrantly violate the most basic human rights of these men whom it holds captive by pointily refusing to adhere to the Geneva Conventions of which the enemy is a signatory, so, too, does that enemy continue to choose to flagrantly violate the most basic human right of their families here at home: the very right to know whether their men are dead or alive.

Some of these men have children whom they have never seen. The children of others have been compelled to endure the formative years of their lives without remembering their fathers' voices or their faces.

Even as some of these children have moved from preschool to school age, others have moved from high school to college age. Like their mothers, all of these children carry a burden of which no one can truly relieve them; it is much too deep, too intimate. To these children, it is even innate.

We must, however, do whatever we can to lessen their hardship in at least through obvious areas: education, housing, and related family business affairs. It is toward this end that, today, I am introducing two bills.

The first bill would accomplish two things: It would extend to children of men listed as missing in action or captured in Southeast Asia the same educational benefits to which orphans of war veterans are now entitled; and it would extend to the wives of these men the right to a Government-guaranteed loan to which widows of men killed in service and of men who die of service-connected disabilities are now entitled.

The second bill would extend powers of attorneys which, otherwise, might have been terminated, in order to permit the wives or parents of these men to do things in the servicemen's behalf which, by powers of attorney, these men had granted them to do.

Many of these men signed powers of attorney which authorized their wives to take such actions necessary to manage real and personal family property and conduct such business affairs as may be required in their absence.

Many of these instruments, however, contained expiration dates which have expired during the period in which these men have become listed as missing or prisoners of war.

Consequently, their wives have been unable to obtain loans, sell houses, or conduct routine, but vital, family business transactions in their war-cast roles as both mother and head of family. Other wives will suffer this same totally unfair fate when their terms of powers of attorney expire.

This, quite obviously, is an inequity which begs loudly for the remedy which this bill would provide; this remedy which the Congress must hasten to provide to these people who, already, suffer more than their share of the awful hardship of this long-drawn out and controversial conflict.

I am introducing these bills in this body because I consider them instruments of utmost urgency toward the essential goal of giving relief to the problems suffered by these innocent victims of U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia and because it is imperative that this effort be coordinated and expedited via the combined full force and impact of the House and Senate.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO HON. EUGENE B. CROWE, FORMER MEMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to announce to the Members the death of the Honorable Eugene B. Crowe, who served in the House in the 72d and four succeeding Congresses.

Mr. Crowe came from the heart of America and he believed deeply in its values: Integrity, industry, and concern for his fellow man.

He was a politician in the finest sense of the word. He had a profound appreciation and respect for the democratic process. He understood it, used it, and enhanced it.

He served as Indiana's Ninth District Representative during 10 momentous years in this Nation's history, and he played a part in this country's desperate climb from the depths of depression to economic health. The impressions of those years never left him, and he never lost his concern for the welfare of the people.

He was honored in many ways during his lifetime, but no accolade could sum up the daily contributions he made to his community, his State, and his Nation.

I shall never forget how, at the age of 90, he was still pushing and cajoling and persuading others to support his favorite community projects: A new highway, better health facilities, or more water conservation and control projects.

I am grateful for the life of Eugene B.

Crowe. I am often asked in my trips around the Ninth District of Indiana, "How can I help my community or my State?" I do not know of a better answer than, "Be like Eugene B. Crowe."

I know the Members join with me in offering condolences to Mr. Crowe's family and friends.

INTRODUCING A BILL TO DEAL WITH INCREASINGLY CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF UNRESTRICTED ELECTRONIC IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, startling new increases in the importation of electronic products are threatening the jobs of hundreds of thousands of workers throughout the United States. Imports have reached genuinely alarming levels—levels unprecedented in this country's history. Each time importation inches upward, employment in the domestic electronics industry moves commensurately downward. An ample supply of cheap labor gives foreign manufacturers a staggering advantage over domestic ones, allowing them to take a larger and larger share of the U.S. market each year.

Working men and women across the country—just one example is the membership of Local 1500 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the union at General Instrument Corp.'s Sickles Division in Chicopee, Mass.—are losing their jobs because of this tide of imported electronic products.

They face a dual threat: The dramatic rise in the importation of foreign manufacturer's products, and an equally dramatic rise in the number of domestic manufacturers relocating abroad.

I and my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, SILVIO O. CONTE, are today introducing legislation to limit electronic imports.

I want to emphasize that the bill—supported by the International Union of Electrical Workers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and the International Association of Machinists—is not just another piece of shortsighted protectionist legislation.

Quite to the contrary, it provides for the orderly growth of electronic imports within a framework of fair competition.

It would allow domestic and foreign suppliers to compete for the consumer's dollar in a way that is eminently just to both.

The bill differs in two ways from legislation Mr. CONTE and I have introduced in the past. First, it updates the years cited in the enacting clauses of the earlier bills. Second, and far more significantly, it strikes a provision that would provide special preferences to foreign supply nations that encourage U.S. investment. These are precisely the nations that are luring away domestic electronic operations, jeopardizing workers here in the United States.

Plainly, Mr. Speaker, there are benefits to this country as well as to the importing countries in the development and

growth of foreign trade. To achieve such benefits certain domestic problems can be tolerated. What has happened in the electronics field, however, is that the growth of imports has been so substantial as to severely dislocate the domestic industry, putting many workers out of jobs and virtually eliminating domestic production of such basic consumer items as radios and black-and-white TV receivers. What makes this uncontrolled situation particularly undesirable is that the price advantage of the imported products largely rests upon the low labor costs involved in the foreign production.

Most of the electronic consumer products are finding expanding domestic markets. There is certainly room for an orderly growth in imports that will not continue the serious adverse domestic impact of the recent past. This bill will provide a framework for such an orderly growth of imports. American manufacturers who want to continue manufacturing electronic consumer goods in this country deserve such a bill. American workers whose livelihood is at stake need such a bill. Most of all, this country needs such a bill to avoid further aggravation of an already serious problem.

Section 1 of the bill provides that the total quantity and value of any consumer electronic product and accessories of foreign manufacture that may be imported—or released from storage—for domestic consumption in any calendar year shall not exceed the quantity or value in which that product was imported—or released from storage—for domestic consumption in 1966. The proviso specifies that if the domestic consumption of an article increases—or decreases—more than 5 percent from the 1966 level, then the ceiling on imports of that article will be adjusted in an amount proportionate to the change in domestic consumption.

Section 2 of the bill parallels section 1 with respect to electronic components of foreign manufacture of the types used in the manufacture of consumer electronic products. The base period here is the average for the 3 calendar years 1964–66 inclusive.

Section 3 of the bill provides that during the year in which the bill becomes effective the formulas utilized in sections 1 and 3 of the bill shall be applied but the amount of the base domestic production used to calculate the maximum on imports shall be reduced to the proportion of the base year or years consumption which corresponds to the proportion of the calendar year remaining in which this bill is enacted.

Section 4 of the bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall allocate to importing countries a share of the allowable imports of consumer electronic products and components of particular types based upon the amount of past imports of such products by such countries during a representative period. The Secretary is permitted in his allocation to give due account to special factors which have affected, or may affect, the trade in any types of electronic articles. The Secretary is to give special favorable weight in the allocation process to foreign countries which have no greater restrictions on imports into their countries from this

country of electronic consumer products and components than are imposed by this country upon their imports of such articles. The Secretary is to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the allocations made under this section.

Section 5 of the bill provides that the Secretary of Commerce, upon any interested party's application, determine whether domestic production of any article involved in this act in conjunction with imports allowed under this act is adequate to meet estimated annual consumption of the article. If a deficiency in domestic production is found, the Secretary is to determine the increase in imports that is required to eliminate the deficiency on the next calendar year, and to certify his determination to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 6 authorizes the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries to provide for orderly and equitable access to our domestic markets in accordance with this act. In accordance with any such agreements, the President may by proclamation adjust the amounts of imports allocated to foreign countries pursuant to this act.

Section 7 of the bill provides that the release into our domestic markets of imported articles covered by this act shall be regulated on a quarterly basis.

Section 8 of the bill provides that the determinations of the Secretary of Commerce and President under the act shall be final.

Section 9 provides that the bill is effective upon enactment.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my good friend and colleagues, EDWARD P. BOLAND in introducing a bill which deals with the increasingly critical problem of unrestricted electronics imports.

This bill is basically identical to H.R. 9274 which I introduced on March 20, 1969, with one major difference; we are deleting from section 4 of the earlier legislation language which would have authorized the Secretary of Commerce to give special preference to countries such as Taiwan because they have permitted unrestricted U.S. private investment in their countries. Such a provision makes no sense today.

As I said recently (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 25, 1970, p. 9373), the growing trend to build plants abroad in cheap labor markets poses a serious and intolerable threat to American jobs.

I am pleased that this new bill has the unqualified endorsement of three major unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO; the International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers—IUE; the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers—IBEW; and the International Association of Machinists—IAM.

In addition, I want to mention that there is also concern about the trend to build abroad among industry leaders. Prominent among them is Mr. Robert C. Sprague, chairman of the board of Sprague Electric Co., in North Adams, Mass. For some time Mr. Sprague has been working vigorously to discourage his colleagues in the electrical industry from going abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to testify in support of this legislation during the pend-

ing foreign trade hearings being held by the Ways and Means Committee. I am increasingly confident that, with the support of both labor and management, we will soon be in a position to deal effectively with this problem.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter on the special order today by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

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

There was no objection.

SCHWENGEL OFFERS AMENDMENTS TO IMPROVE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE CONSERVATION AND POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I stated yesterday that I would introduce a bill to amend legislation authorizing two of our most widely used and effective conservation programs: The Agricultural Conservation Program, which applies to farmland in the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and the watershed protection and flood prevention program—Public Law 566—which also is applicable in approved upstream watershed projects throughout the country.

These amendments, in the bill which I have introduced, will make these conservation programs even more effective public instruments for conserving our soil, water, woodland, and wildlife resources, reducing floods, stabilizing streamflows, beautifying the landscape, and of at least equal importance, abating agriculture-related pollution and otherwise protecting and enhancing the quality of our environment.

SITE ACQUISITION AND WATER QUALITY IN PUBLIC LAW 566 WATERSHEDS

Section 1 of this bill deals with two special needs which should be solved by amendments to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, or Public Law 566. The enactment of this section will authorize local organizations to use Federal funds available to them, other than those appropriated for the purpose of Public Law 566, to acquire land, easements, and rights-of-way needed in watershed projects. This is now denied, except for public recreation or fish and wildlife developments. Therefore, the local sponsoring organizations cannot use on such projects—and, so, must forfeit—any funds that may be available to them from other Federal programs, if they are to receive assistance under Public Law 566.

In addition, Federal cost sharing for water quality management is precluded in Public Law 566 watershed projects, even though aid for mainstream projects may be available under other Federal

programs. This limiting difference should be eliminated, and would be under this bill. Much is lost unless water quality begins as far upstream as possible. Omitting water quality maintenance from Public Law 566 projects—which can now help sponsoring organizations develop, manage, and utilize water and associated land resources in these watersheds—is a mistake which should be corrected without delay. Including such additional authority will lead to more significant benefits to downstream water quality as well.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Sections 2 and 3 of my bill deal with the grassroots agricultural conservation program, which is a most important and effective force for conservation in my State of Iowa. And throughout the Nation more farmers rely on it from year to year to help them install their conservation plans, than on any other farm program. Each year about a million American farmers use ACP resources to help them do more soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conservation work than they could or would otherwise do. This Congress broadened the ACP authority to permit using ACP funds for conservation practices primarily for pollution abatement, thus giving this program even greater potential for good.

The ACP was started early in 1936, as a successor to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration programs of 1933–35. Its crop adjustment provisions were a significant part of its contribution for the first 8 years of its existence. But since 1943 only the conservation-stimulating and cost-sharing provisions of the program have been authorized by the Congress.

Actually, the heart of this program's contribution was the adoption by the Congress in 1936 of the principle that farmers and the public have a joint responsibility for natural resources conservation on privately owned farmland. ACP became the vehicle through which all citizens—who are ultimately dependent upon our land and water resources—could join with farmers, ranchers, and woodland owners in actually doing something significant and concrete about the Nation's soil, water, woodland, and wildlife conservation problems.

Research had found certain conservation measures were effective; education and information had helped farmers know that conservation was important to them; and conservation technology had demonstrated that these measures could be adapted to and made to serve individual farm needs. It remained for the stimulus or incentive to be provided that would cause—and make it possible for—many individual farmers and farmer groups all across the Nation to move conservation from a "know-how" to an "applied-on-the-land" status. This has been and continues to be ACP's basic role.

All this time, from 1936 to 1970, the Congress has provided for this program on a year-to-year, or 1-year-at-a-time, commitment basis. A great percentage of the farmers, ranchers, and woodland owners across the country have developed conservation farm plans with their

soil and water conservation district. They know what they need to do—and want to do—over a period of years.

But generally, farmers have not had the assurance that the American public is fully committed to sharing with them in the planned conservation of the natural resources on which agriculture and many other industries ultimately depend. They have not had the assurance that the public wants the protection and enhancement of our environment that the ACP helps to provide. The time has come to give that assurance.

LONG TERM COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS

The enactment of this bill, specifically its section 2, would do this by a simple amendment to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. It would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into long-term ACP agreements with agricultural producers. He could share the cost, within congressional authorizations, of approved conservation measures carried out on their farms during a specified period of years.

The Department of Agriculture has stated that the planning and carrying out of comprehensive conservation programs on farms could be even more beneficial to our Nation if farmers could enter into agreements which would assure them assistance for installing conservation measures over a longer period of time than 1 year. Many farmers are willing and able to enter into such agreements if offered the opportunity to do so.

In the past, long-term agreements have been restricted to limited-area programs such as the Great Plains conservation program and the Appalachian land stabilization and conservation program, and special purpose programs such as the conservation reserve, cropland conversion, and cropland adjustment programs. Long-term agreements for conservation work would be made available, as they should be, throughout the country upon enactment of this bill.

The agreements would permit farmers in all areas to plan more effectively the application of needed practices, arrange for financing, and fit the proposed conservation measures into their farming systems. Effective conservation practices oftentimes consist of components or measures which must be carried out in sequence or in proper combination if they are to fulfill successfully their conservation function and to protect the public interest.

In some cases these components must be carried out in consecutive years, and long term agreements will permit the Secretary to commit funds for the entire project, giving the farmer an assurance that assistance will be available as needed until the planned project is completed. The resulting completion of the conservation work started will insure that the public will get more conservation returns per dollar expended.

This legislation would authorize the Secretary to enter into these long term agreements for a period not exceeding 10 years. Annual agreements would continue to be available to farmers who, by virtue of limited tenure or for other reasons, do not desire to enter into long-

term agreements. The level of expenditures in any one year, including those required for the first year of long term agreements and those required for the annual ACP payments, would be limited to the amount specified annually by the Congress in the appropriation act as the authorized size of the agricultural conservation program for the succeeding year.

In carrying out the provisions of this legislation, it is anticipated that the Secretary would issue such regulations as are necessary. In general these regulations should provide that: First, the agricultural stabilization and conservation elected county committee will negotiate an agreement with the farmer or rancher for the application of the conservation practices; second, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service will make the decision as to what practices will receive cost-sharing and in what amount; third, the Soil Conservation Service will assist the farmer or rancher in cooperation with his local soil and water conservation district to develop or update a conservation plan for his farm, including any sequence necessary to the successful functioning of the practices; fourth, the technical assistance needed for proper installation of practices will be performed by appropriate technical assistance agencies such as the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service; and fifth, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service will administer the agreement and make the payments due the farmer.

Mr. Speaker, this new and long-needed authorization for long-term agreements should be extended to the agricultural conservation program.

ADVANCING COST-SHARES WHEN EARNED

The final change that I am recommending, in section 3 of the bill, is another which will increase the effectiveness of the ACP.

Under section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, the Congress has given the Secretary of Agriculture authority to make payments: First, to vendors for conservation materials and services, and second, to agencies which supply technical assistance to farmers, ranchers, and woodland owners for carrying out ACP practices, in advance of the appropriation. Section 391 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 now permits the Secretary to borrow \$50,000,000 to make these advance payments. The total amount plus interest is repaid when appropriated funds become available.

The present \$50,000,000 is inadequate even for the original purpose intended. Since 1963, it has not been possible to pay all vendors who furnished conservation materials and services, when the Government commitment was due and otherwise payable. It has been necessary to establish a limit on the amount of such payments in each State. I have proposed to increase this amount to fully fund our obligation to the vendors, soon after our payments become due for their materials or services. In addition, and equally important, I propose that this fund be made adequate to provide these same pay-

ments—and the same treatment—to the farmers who earn cost-share payments before the appropriated ACP funds become available. I propose that a \$150,000,000 maximum be established to take care of this dual purpose. Of course, only the amount actually needed within the congressional authorization for such payments would be borrowed. This should not be done until the funds are actually needed, thus keeping interest charges to the very minimum.

This increase in authorization will allow the participating farmer who is willing to conserve the Nation's resources for present and future generations and abate pollution from runoff into our streams, lakes, and estuaries, to receive payment without delay under the cost-sharing agreement he has made with his Government. As it is now, he does not receive this money until it is appropriated the following year. Consequently, we have been asking our landowners and operators to make these investments on credit for up to a year or more.

The period in which practices may be carried out under a single year's program extends from July 1 to December 31 of the next succeeding year. This is a period of 18 months, and 12 or more of these pass before appropriated funds become available.

It is my sincere belief that the great progress our Nation has made in conserving our renewable natural resources could be made even greater by this amendment to allow us to pay farmers these public cost-shares promptly upon completion of the practices. This will not require earlier or greater appropriations than has been the practice in the past.

My bill will not only stop a discriminatory procedure of paying the vendor or Government agency, but not the farmer, soon after they incur their costs. It will also encourage more timely application of these sound soil and water conserving and pollution abating practices which protect and improve our environment. It makes very little economic or political sense to have to spend vast sums of tax dollars to clean up our rivers, harbors, and lakes, and not spend a small fraction of that amount—something like \$1 a year per person—to prevent this siltation and other pollution at their source. And simple fairness, as well as other considerations, demands that we meet these obligations to program participants when the obligations become due.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of the bill at this point in the Record:

H.R. 17631

A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended

Be it enacted in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (68 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), is further amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 4 is amended by inserting after "without cost to the Federal Government" the words "from funds appropriated for the purposes of this Act."

(2) Clause (A) of paragraph (2) of section 4 is amended by striking out "or recreational development" and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "recreational development, or water quality management, but the Secretary shall not bear any portion of the cost of works of improvement for water quality management in any case in which such works of improvement are to be provided as substitutes for adequate treatment or other methods of controlling waste at the source".

(3) Clause (B) of paragraph (2) of section 4 is amended by striking out the first proviso and all that follows thereafter, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That, in addition to and without limitation on the authority of the Secretary to make loans or advancements under section 8 of this Act, the Secretary may pay for any storage of water for anticipated future demands or needs for municipal or industrial water included in any reservoir structure constructed or modified under the provisions of this Act not to exceed 30 per centum of the total estimated cost of such reservoir structure where the local organization gives reasonable assurances, and there is evidence, that such demands for the use of such storage will be made within a period of time which will permit repayment within the life of the reservoir structure of that part of the cost of such water supply storage which is to be borne by the local organization: *Provided further*, That the local organization shall agree, prior to initiation of construction or modification of any reservoir structure including such water supply storage, to repay not less than 50 per centum of the cost of such water supply storage for anticipated future demands: *And provided further*, That the part of the cost to be borne by the local organization shall be repaid within the life of the reservoir structure but in no event to exceed fifty years after the reservoir structure is first used for the storage of water for water supply purposes, except that (1) no repayment of such cost need be made until such supply is first used, and (2) no interest shall be charged on such cost until such supply is first used, but in no case shall the interest-free period exceed ten years. The interest rate used for purposes of computing the interest on the unpaid balance shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 8 of this Act."

(4) Subsection (4) of section 5 is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Any plan for works of improvement involving an estimated Federal contribution to construction costs in excess of \$250,000 or including any structure having a total capacity in excess of twenty-five hundred acre-feet (a) which includes works of improvement for reclamation, irrigation, or the prevention, control, and abatement of water pollution, or which affects public or other lands or wildlife under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, (b) which includes Federal assistance for floodwater detention structures, or (c) which includes features which may affect the public health, shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively, for his views and recommendations at least thirty days prior to transmission of the plan to the Congress through the President. The views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army, or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the case may be, if received by the Secretary prior to the expiration of the above thirty-day period, shall accompany the plan transmitted by the Secretary to the Congress through the President."

Sec. 2. Subsection (b) of section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (49 Stat. 163; U.S.C. 590(h)),

is further amended by adding a new paragraph at the end thereof as follows:

"In carrying out the purpose of subsection (a) of section 7, the Secretary may enter into agreements with agricultural producers for periods not to exceed ten years creating obligations in advance of appropriations, not to exceed such amounts as may be specified in annual appropriation acts. Such agreements may be modified or terminated by mutual consent if the Secretary determines such action would be in the public interest. The Secretary also may terminate agreements if he determines such action to be in the national interest and gives public notice in ample time to give producers a reasonable opportunity to make arrangements for appropriate changes in use of their land."

Sec. 3. Subsection (c) of section 391 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 31; 7 U.S.C. 1391(c)) is amended as follows:

(1) by striking out "\$50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the word "pursuant" in the first sentence thereof the words "and payments".

ON STUDENT VISITS

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in recent days, I have had the opportunity, as have all the Members of Congress, to speak at length with college students on the question of American involvement in Southeast Asia, and on the broader issue of the responsiveness of American Government to the needs and wishes of students. By listening with avid interest, I found the students who visited my office, with a very few widely scattered exceptions, to be irreproachable both in terms of their demeanor and of their intelligence and concern. I have commended them all for wanting to do the right things in the right ways. I have observed to them that violence, disruption of school activities, and destruction of property is wrong.

I have always maintained, and I still do, that the vast majority of college students are political moderates. This feeling was most certainly backed up by those students who I talked to. Mr. Speaker, we in this arena must be more aware than we are that moderation is a virtue and we must therefore encourage moderation by working with the moderates in our society wherever they are. It was Pascal who said that "to go beyond the bounds of moderation is to abandon humanity" and St. Paul, according to King James version, said that "Every man that striveth for mastery is temperate in all things."

These young people were as aware, if not more so, of the goings-on here in Washington as their elders. In addition to their natural concern for their own part in the war, they also demonstrated a very real concern for the people of Southeast Asia, and for the cause of unifying our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat that I was greatly impressed by these students. Their sincerity was evident, and I appreciated it. But this same sincerity also worries me. For the students I talked to spoke of a radicalizing of the moderate students. They spoke of great frustration

on the campuses. They spoke of not being able to understand the ways of a huge Federal Government seemingly far removed from them. They were always willing to listen to reason, to hear explanations of the problems we, as legislators, face. But they were always worried about the continued unresponsiveness of Government.

I, too, was worried. Not because the Government is so totally unresponsive, though that criticism can be made. Not because I have been coerced by student violence, though a small minority perpetrate it constantly. Simply because a generation needs to have its faith revived. It is a well-intentioned generation, one with enormous power to do good or evil. I call on all Members of Congress to help direct the energies of this generation in the proper direction. We can help simply by sitting down and listening, explaining to them, and reasoning with them. This gives our young people a chance to be heard, which is all they ask, and a chance to learn. This to them is a great need. The students of America would thus soon learn that the system is responsive to correctly applied pressure, and that the duty as well as the prerogative of a citizen is to apply that pressure. Let us all join in this, the crusade to rebuild the faith of our young people, who are our future.

AFTER 5 YEARS IN VIETNAM

(Mrs. MINK asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have been steadfastly opposed to our ever-widening involvement in the war in Vietnam. I disagreed vehemently with President Johnson's escalation of the war. I urged the cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam. I pleaded for a negotiated settlement. I urged a ceasefire, and withdrawal of our troops by the end of 1970. I have voted against funds for any extension of the war. I vehemently opposed the invasion of Cambodia. I am anguished by the senseless killing of students. I have always supported the right of peaceful dissent. I am greatly encouraged by the many hundreds of letters I have received protesting this war.

The following are statements I have made on the floor of the House in the 91st Congress voicing my opposition to the war:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 26, 1969]

VIETNAM IN 1969: OUR MOST URGENT PROBLEM

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam war continues as the most urgent and pressing problem facing our country. That it must be ended and soon, there can be no doubt. The real question is the willingness of the American people to accept the realities of this war, and to acknowledge that indeed the political issues must be left to the people of South Vietnam to resolve by themselves. This is what President Johnson said when he reiterated so often the right of self-determination as belonging to the South Vietnamese. It appears still to be the position of the new Nixon administration. This I feel is the crux of the problem as well as the heart of the solution.

I am greatly encouraged to hear that despite all indications of a military escalation following the Tet observances, that private talks are now endorsed by both our Government and the Thieu-Ky Saigon regime. If indeed the military aspects can be resolved by the United States and North Vietnam, then it will fall upon the leaders of the NLF and the South Vietnamese Government to resolve the internal political issues concerning the future governance of South Vietnam. This is the prospect for peace that promises the greatest hope so that we shall be able as a nation to return to the real priorities of this century.

The peace conference in Paris must succeed. The military pressures within our country to escalate the war must be subdued. Instead we must use all our efforts to persuade our policymakers that indeed the people of this country are prepared to accept terms of settlement which will bring an end to our military commitment, by stages if necessary, and which will reserve to the people of South Vietnam the responsibility for determining the form and content of their future government. Once this determination is agreed upon, then I would hope that the United Nations would be called upon to preserve the stability of the settlement which has been achieved.

The formula for peace in Vietnam seems so obvious to me. I hope that it is as equally obvious to our new administration.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 14, 1969]

SUPPORT FOR MORATORIUM AND TROOP WITHDRAWAL

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, all of America is watching this moratorium. I join it as my witness to peace.

I have every confidence that this day will have a profound meaning for this Nation.

I know that the vast majority of the American people want the war to end. In 1965 our goal was a military victory. Our leaders could not see that a land war could not be won. They could not comprehend that a half million soldiers backed by a hundred billion dollars could not bring this enemy to his knees. They would not accept the fact that this was a civil war of divided peoples of one nation. Slowly we turned our national purpose to that of protecting the right of self-determination with a declaration that once the fighting stopped we would be prepared to accept the verdict of a free and open election.

This is still today the posture of America. Despite the denials and protestations of the President and his advisers, we have begun a deliberate withdrawal of our troops. Called by any other tactical name, it remains a staged withdrawal, albeit modest but nevertheless I believe if properly supported by the people of this country, it will herald the final act towards the end of our involvement of manpower in this tragic episode of our history.

President Thieu declared last week to his National Assembly that his country is prepared to accept the complete removal of American men by the end of December 1970. To make this withdrawal a byproduct of peace is the mission of the Paris talks. It is my hope that the President will call for a cease-fire, surely not any more unthinkable than the bombing halt which was called by President Johnson during the waning hours of his tenure. With a cease-fire and a programmed withdrawal of our troops, there can be affirmative steps taken to implement our pledge for free and open elections monitored by agreed upon third parties. Two years ago the suggestion of talks that included the Vietcong were viewed by those who made our policies as irresponsible defeatism. Today the Vietcong is part of the peace negotiations in Paris. Let us not close

our minds to the progress that we have made to recognize the realities of this conflict. Let us not by impatience and incontinence lose this continuing momentum for peace. Let us express with all our fervor our anxiety over this war, but never lose sight of the progress that has been made in yielding to the demands of the people when expressed in righteousness. Nothing is to be gained by defamation and desecration. Prod and prick the conscience of our leaders, and their actions will be sure and steady and we will at last have won this measured victory for peace and tranquility.

The President's statement that he will not be affected by this moratorium belies the truth. Much has already been affected; the stretch out of the October draft calls for November and December; the push on draft reform and Executive order affecting graduate students; the announcement of General Hershey's removal; the recall of Henry Cabot Lodge for new briefings for the peace conference; President Thieu's acceptance of a complete withdrawal by December 1970; the early announcement of an additional 40,000 troop withdrawal by Christmas.

Secretary of State Rogers went on television for the first time to proclaim that both sides are deescalating the war and that Mr. Nixon's policies are therefore making "tremendous progress." This claim was immediately refuted by Senator GOODELL of Mr. Nixon's own party, who candidly pointed out that token deescalation of the war at the present rate would leave American troops still in Vietnam 7 years from now.

President Thieu of South Vietnam has said he is willing to accept a complete withdrawal of American troops by December of 1970. December of 1970 should be the outside limit of our participation.

We must, as a people, begin to face certain facts regarding Vietnam. One, this war is one of the longest and costliest in our history, in terms of battlefield dead. We have been in Vietnam for 6 years. Forty thousand Americans have died. The monotonous promise our generals have repeated so often—that the "turning point" is "just around the corner"—has proven false, year after year. We must decide to accept the reality of Vietnam and insist upon its immediate resolution.

Despite massive American aid, the South Vietnamese have been unable to win physical control of their country. One may rationally ask, Why? If the people of South Vietnam themselves supported their Government, it seems that the war would have been won long ago. The fact that it has not been won indicates that the people do not support our effort. The new word "Vietnamization" of the war is no real answer to the problem which the people of Vietnam must face. Because our men are brought home and the conflict is "Vietnamized" does not mean an end to the killing and dying. To contribute to a lasting peace we must assure the people of South Vietnam a government which truly reflects their views.

I favor an immediate cease-fire, and an end to the fighting on both sides. The President has already taken the first step; unilateral withdrawal on a phased basis. The first stage of the President's withdrawal was the pullout of 25,000 men without any reciprocal action being sought or given by the other side. Next we will have an estimated 40,000 additional troops withdrawn by the end of the year.

Some military planners assume that the situation in Vietnam can be stabilized by continuing slow withdrawals for 2 years and then leave a continued American commitment of about 200,000 troops. General Gavin's enclave theory now begins to appear to be our goal. The view contemplates maintaining this huge garrison in South Vietnam permanently like Korea. We must not allow

this to occur again; the withdrawal should be complete and on a permanent basis.

In doing this we must press for a political solution to the war that will guarantee the right of the South Vietnamese people to self-determination through the ballot box. This means that we cannot support claims by any faction to the absolute right to govern. We must firmly declare ourselves as being for the people of South Vietnam and not one particular segment or regime.

A standstill cease-fire is an absolutely vital step. This would freeze control over the land as it now stands. An election could be called for all areas of South Vietnam with adequate supervision and a new government for the entire country could be quickly installed.

At this point we should call for the admission of both Vietnams into the United Nations so that the U.N. peacekeeping forces could be made responsible for the safety of the people from further interventions across each other's borders.

It is futile to talk on and on about the mistakes of the past. What we must do is to look to the future and that is what I believe that this moratorium is supposed to do. The villifying of our leaders leads to nothing. We must as well declare a moratorium on that. But there must never be a moratorium against honest dissent and disagreement against the policies of our own Government. We must continue by discussion and debate to arrive at a national policy which is supported by the American people.

There is no way that we can bring back the dead. What we can do to make their sacrifice a meaningful monument is to consecrate by our actions a rededication of our Nation's power and resources to the perfection of our way of life and to the determination that there shall never again be another Vietnam.

When we speak of what this Nation has lost as a result of 4 years of war, the dead buried beneath the grass of a solemn cemetery, is of course not only absolute but the greatest loss of all. It does not seem fair to me to talk about the problems of the living in the same breath. But to mourn the dead without a vision for the future is also to abdicate our duty to fight for the precious qualities of life yet to be realized by millions in our own country. It is to these pressing priorities that we must forcefully and determinedly direct our attention.

The needs of our decaying cities and poverty areas are starkly obvious to anyone who cares to look around at what is happening in the United States. Most of these problems are due to the fact that the Vietnam war is siphoning off about \$30 billion a year that could otherwise be used for helping our people at home.

This drag on our national resources is reflected in sharp budget cuts in nearly every domestic program this year. Our spending billions of dollars in the war in Vietnam has created a gap between what is needed for education, for health and housing, mass transportation, job training and welfare, eradication of poverty, food for the hungry, and our other human needs, as compared with the funds available. Congress authorized \$11 billion more in the last fiscal year for these programs than it was able to find the money for. In the current year, we have been considering an administration budget that is \$18.5 billion less than what was authorized. In these 2 years alone, the funding deficit will be more than \$30 billion. Ironically just the same as the cost of the war in Vietnam.

The American people are beginning to realize the size of the crisis situation created by this gross misallocation of national resources. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare budget was cut this year by \$1.2 billion.

The budget request for the Office of Education was \$5 billion less than the amount

which had previously been authorized by Congress. In other words, we had approved education programs at a level of \$7 billion, but our budget called for only \$2.1 billion expenditure.

I submit that we can no longer afford to allow our Nation's education needs to go unmet. The House was able to add \$1 billion to the education budget a few months ago when the bill came to the floor, but this still leaves us \$4 billion short. After our action the President issued a statement vowing not to spend the money even if Congress approves it. The American people must be alert to denounce this twisted concept of what is most urgent, and I hope that you as students concerned with our concepts of national priorities will take cognizance of whatever actions the President takes.

Last week the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development sent a report to the President expressing their deep concern over the absence of Federal initiative in the field of education. They reminded the President that while Commissioner Allen was pronouncing how every child had the "right to read," the Department he heads was being ordered to cut \$8 million of a meager \$13 million program to train teachers of reading. The Council admonished the President that it was concerned by not only a reduction in funds but by an absence of direction and planning. The Council said:

"In dramatic fashion, these decisions and actions add up to default on the proclaimed responsibility of the Federal government to act as a partner with the other levels of government in supporting the nation's educational enterprise. When the States in the last 2 years increased their expenditures for higher education by 38% and for elementary and secondary education by 28% . . . we find that Federal government is cutting back."

The Council continued:

"We sense a worsening climate in American schools and colleges . . . we assert that present national conditions are deleteriously affecting the studies, the hopes, and the convictions of a wide and responsible segment of the educational community. A new and ugly cynicism and anti-intellectualism is infecting American education. Repressive measures will not arrest this trend, and may even accelerate it; positive and affirmative leadership promptly to end the war and to address forthrightly our domestic problems can do so."

"Too many of our young are concerned by what they are against . . . the war, racism, poverty, corruption. . . . We feel that the growing dismay and cynicism of our youth could develop into a calamity of devastating proportions. It would be unfortunate if our political leadership were to take the position that a response to the dissatisfaction of the past—or the yearnings for a different kind of future—must await the ending of the war. . . . It is now we must plan. It is now we must act. . . . If politics is the art of the possible then our political leaders have a special opportunity to demonstrate to the young that the nation can envision a future of hope and that we can translate that vision to tangible policies and sensible priorities."

So much for education. The same thing can be said for the abortive effort to wage a war against poverty. Envisioned as a \$10 billion program it now struggles for survival with only \$2 billion. Over 50 Job Corps centers were closed down in June and behind these empty buildings lie the hopes and dreams of thousands of youth shattered because we lack the needed funds. Doubtless more programs will be discontinued under this agency as our war against poverty slows down to a near halt.

And what about our environment? Our rivers and streams are increasingly being clogged by pollution. And we do not have long to reverse this trend. The Federal Government has two major programs in this

field—one to set standards of clean water so that the various cities and States will have goals to shoot for, and another program to provide them with grants to construct pollution control facilities so that they can meet the standards.

As it has been working out, we have given the States and cities clean water standards but not the funds to meet them. In fact, the Government agency in charge of the program says that \$8.2 billion is needed over the next 5 years to avert a catastrophe. Last year some 1,500 of our small cities had no waste treatment plants whatever. Currently there is a backlog of 4,600 applications by municipalities for funds under the clean water program. This year's budget request was for only \$214 million for this vital program. Concerned Members of the House battled to approve the full \$1 billion which had been previously authorized, and while we were not entirely successful in this effort we did get the amount raised to \$600 million. This was a small victory in our fight to restore a rational sense of national priorities in the United States.

Recently information crossed my desk that the urban renewal program "pipeline" is jammed with some \$2 billion in unfunded requests from cities desperately trying to relieve urban blight. We are years behind schedule in this area even if we made these funds available now.

All across the board in our Federal programs we see retrenchment, cutback, and unfulfilled promises. Seventy-five percent of our public works projects are to be deferred. Medical and health research funds have been drastically cut. All new national parks programs have been delayed. Medicare is cut by \$65 million, housing and urban development by \$74 million, and model cities by \$75 million. This is how people are being deprived of vital programs as the war continues.

So we can agree on the monetary benefits that will come from termination of the war. Or can we? The President's military advisers have said that the Defense Department has a backlog of projects which need to be funded. If the Pentagon has its way, it will absorb all of the funds we are told that would become available once the war is ended. Our stockpile of munitions and new armaments of war will build up once again.

It will be up to us to mount a campaign to save the \$30 billion for our domestic programs. The ABM alone could cost up to \$50 billion, despite the fact that it will be obsolete before it is built. The Pentagon has begun corresponding escalation in the development of our MIRV system. Again, the American people will pay an extraordinary amount for maintaining this balance of terror. I hope you will continue to watch carefully the direction and emphasis of our national budget. Is it essential that we land on Mars before we feed our hungry and shelter our poor? Can we afford a supersonic aircraft priced at \$1 billion which is incapable of flying over land because of the sonic boom, before we have built our roads and airports on the ground?

Fortunately, the picture is not all bleak. In fact we have made significant inroads. This year's 29-day debate on the ABM was the longest military debate on record. Six Senators who voted for the ABM in 1968 switched in 1969.

Public opposition to the Pentagon policies caused Secretary of Defense Laird to initiate in August a reduction of more than \$1 billion himself in defense spending during the current fiscal year. Previously, \$1.1 billion had already been cut. And the Senate voted to cut back by another \$2 billion. And so \$4 billion have been saved.

When I think of all the programs which I would like to see funded and which could be funded with \$30 billion, the urgency of ending the war in Vietnam becomes even more pressing. We must spend our resources to feed the hungry, to provide adequate

housing and health care, to build better transportation systems so that the poor may live in suburbia as well and abandon the inner city hovels of filth and vermin, to expand the provisions of medicare, to increase the benefits of the elderly under social security to a realistic minimum which can assure them of a decent life, to expand the parks and recreational centers of our country, and to guarantee that all who seek education can have that opportunity without excessive financial burdens.

I have a dream like Dr. Martin Luther King, to build a newer world like Robert Kennedy. I seek a moratorium for peace in order that we may achieve the greatness that is this promised land. I believe that we have the capacity to create our society as a function of ethical and moral commitment. We must not therefore only pursue the single goal of the end of the war in Vietnam, but we must continue our efforts to improve the lives of our citizens.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,
Nov. 5, 1969]

CALL FOR A CEASE-FIRE AND WITHDRAWAL BY DECEMBER 1970

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman in the Well, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) for his distinguished leadership in calling the attention not only of this House, but the attention of the Nation to our very grave concern about the lack of clear enunciation on the part of the President of our policy in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great care and anticipation to the President's message to the Nation on his plan for peace in Vietnam. Like many who expected to hear the details of his plan I was sorely disappointed. I had hoped that after over 1 year's waiting the country would at last be told what his plan for peace would be.

President Thieu in October told his National Assembly that his country was prepared to accept the complete removal of American men by the end of December 1970. I had hoped that President Nixon would reaffirm this statement in his speech of November 3. He pledged withdrawal but without a timetable of hope for the American people. The argument that such a timetable would stifle negotiations in Paris is specious, because withdrawal is itself admitted. If the President had affirmatively stated the plan for withdrawal indeed it would have had the effect of focusing the Paris talks on the essential issues of how to implement the principle of self-determination which the President says is the only goal which is non-negotiable. Instead, with the veiled threat of more fighting implicit in the unwillingness of the President to announce his plans for troop withdrawal, I believe that we have moved further from the prospects for peace and effective self-determination in South Vietnam.

I take this time today to urge the President to call for a cease-fire, and a withdrawal of all American troops at least by December 1970 subject only to necessary safeguards for the safety of our men. The President has stated that he will not be persuaded by people who take to the streets to demonstrate their opposition to his policy. But he asks for the "silent" voices to respond. He is moved by the wires and letters he has received in support of his policy. I would therefore urge that all those who believe that this Nation is capable of greater initiatives for peace respond to the President's call, and immediately write him urging a cease-fire and a promise of withdrawal of all troops at least by the end of 1970. Indeed I am convinced that the "silent majority" is for an absolute plan for peace, now.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,
Dec. 1, 1969]

OPPOSING PRO-NIXON WAR RESOLUTION

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and urge this House to vote against it that we might have an opportunity to fully debate the matter of our policy in Vietnam. This is the first such resolution to come before the House since I have been privileged to serve as a Member. Yet it comes to us under a closed rule which prevents the offering of any amendments. The resolution itself was subject to only 90 minutes of discussion in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and no hearings were held. From the explanations that I have heard, and more particularly from the news articles that I have read about this resolution, it is being represented as an endorsement of President Nixon's policy as stated in his November 3 speech. President Nixon himself stated as much when he made his unprecedented appearance before the House on November 13.

On November 3 President Nixon told this Nation:

"We have offered the complete withdrawal of all outside forces within one year. We have proposed a cease-fire under international supervision."

But House Resolution 613 does not make a single mention of this offer of complete withdrawal; nor does it make any reference to the proposal of cease-fire under international supervision. By this glaring omission, does this House fail to support the President in this regard? I believe it does leave this impression, and therefore its adoption without these two important provisions contributes nothing materially toward our present drive for peace.

House Resolution 613 speaks only of supporting the President in his efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam, acknowledges our peaceful overtures, supports the principles of free elections by the people of South Vietnam and our willingness to abide by them, and urges the Government of North Vietnam to do the same.

President Johnson in the joint declaration of Honolulu on February 8, 1966, stated our "commitment to the search for just and stable peace." That declaration said:

"The United States is pledged to the principles of the self-determination of peoples, and of government by the consent of the governed. It therefore gives its full support to the purpose of free elections proclaimed by the Government of South Vietnam."

On September 29, 1967, in a speech before the National Legislative Conference at San Antonio, Tex., President Johnson reiterated his willingness to negotiate a settlement by saying:

"We and our South Vietnamese allies are wholly prepared to negotiate tonight. I am ready to talk with Ho Chi Minh, and other chiefs of state concerned, tomorrow. I am ready to have Secretary Rusk meet with their Foreign Minister tomorrow. I am ready to send a trusted representative of America to any spot on this earth to talk in public or private with a spokesman of Hanoi."

On March 31, 1968, President Johnson said:

"We are prepared to move immediately toward peace through negotiations. So, tonight, in the hope that this action will lead to early talks, I am taking the first step to de-escalate the conflict. We are reducing—substantially reducing—the present level of hostilities. And we are doing so unilaterally, and at once."

On October 31, 1968, President Johnson discussed the progress of talks in Paris, and said:

"Now, as a result of all of these developments, I have now ordered that all air, naval and artillery bombardment of North Vietnam cease as of 8 a.m. Washington time, Fri-

day morning. I have reached this decision on the basis of the developments in the Paris talks. And I have reached it in the belief that this action can lead to progress toward a peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese war."

My point in setting forth the statements of our policy by President Johnson is to show that House Resolution 613 which is now before us is nothing more than an affirmation of the policy of the former administration. Had the House had an opportunity to vote its approval of President Johnson's efforts on October 31, 1968, in a resolution identical to House Resolution 613, I would have welcomed the opportunity to vote for it.

But it comes now a year too late. It comes at a time when we have a new administration with new directions indicated by the very words of the President in his speech of November 3, 1969.

Words in a resolution which reflect only policies of the past administration serve no purpose and degrade the new steps which have been taken which, I believe, are important and which chart for us new initiatives for peace. We cannot fail in this opportunity to clearly state our support for a systematic withdrawal of all our troops. The President told us in his speech of November 3 that such an offer had been made. How can we say we support the President if we adopt a resolution which makes no mention of our support of the orderly withdrawal of our troops?

I hope this House will vote down the previous question so that amendments can be offered. Without the changes that I have suggested, without new substantive statements of our present policy, it reflects nothing of this new administration and is devoid of meaning. I hope this House does not demean its image as the greatest deliberative body in the world by refusing to allow for a meaningful debate which could lead to the formulation of a resolution which is supportive of our new initiatives for peace.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 2,
1969]

VIETNAMEZATION IS NOT WITHDRAWAL

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, President Nixon said on November 3 that he believed "that one of the reasons for the deep division about Vietnam is that many Americans have lost confidence in what their Government has told them about our policy." He went on to say:

"The American people cannot and should not be asked to support a policy which involves the overriding issues of war and peace unless they know the truth about that policy."

I wholeheartedly concur with this statement. This House should heed his admonition. It is precisely this reason which has forced me to conclude that it is equally illegitimate to expect this House to support a policy of such magnitude as the life or death of our American men unless we know the whole truth about that policy.

It is pretended that by the President's speech the Nixon policy regarding Vietnam became an established fact. Try to walk through its maze.

The President started by saying that, "The great question is: How can we win America's peace?"

Yet he offered the traditional challenge of why we should continue the war. He said: "A nation cannot remain great if it betrays its allies and lets down its friends. Our defeat and humiliation in South Vietnam would without question promote recklessness in the councils of those great powers who have not yet abandoned their goals of world conquest."

He said he was opposed to "immediate withdrawal of all American forces." He qualified this later in his speech by saying he was opposed to "the precipitate withdrawal of American forces."

But then he said:

"We have offered the complete withdrawal of all outside forces within one year."

So one concludes that he only opposes precipitate withdrawal, and that 1 year is not precipitate.

He said:

"I choose instead to change American policy on both the negotiating front and the battlefield."

But on the negotiating front he said that no progress whatever in the negotiation "has been made except agreement on the shape of the bargaining table." He stated:

"There can now be no longer any question that progress in negotiations depend only on Hanoi's deciding to negotiate."

He said that he has "put into effect another plan to bring peace—a plan which will bring the war to an end regardless of what happens on the negotiating front."

He described this plan which he called the Nixon Doctrine, and said that—

"When you are trying to assist another nation to defend its freedom, U.S. policy should be to help them fight the war but not fight the war for them."

This is his plan for the battlefield; not peace but more war, waged by the Vietnamese with our arms, our material and our money. He has evidently all but abandoned the negotiating table as futile; and his peace plan called "Vietnamization" only means more war, not peace.

The only remaining consolation is that his plan could mean the return of all American combat forces. He said he has a plan worked out "in cooperation with the South Vietnamese for the complete withdrawal of all U.S. combat ground forces and their replacement by South Vietnamese forces on an orderly scheduled timetable."

He stated that the "rate of withdrawal will depend on developments on three fronts. One—progress which can be, or might be made in the Paris talks, the other two factors—are the level of enemy activity and the progress of the training program of the South Vietnamese forces."

I hope you have all noted that none of these three factors which will determine our rate of withdrawal is in our control. Hanoi could decide this issue by continuing to stall the Paris talks, and by accelerating the level of enemy activity. Or South Vietnam could prevent our early withdrawal by falling down on the training program. I hardly call any of these prospects as positive affirmative action for peace on our part. Withdrawal on this basis is not our policy but someone else's.

The November 3 speech is full of so many contradictions in and of itself without even trying to compare it to the May 14 speech of the President, which others have done to their great consternation.

I take this time to analyze the President's speech because it has been noted as the justification for adopting House Resolution 613. A quick reading of House Resolution 613 will reveal that it contains nothing on the central issues discussed by the President in his November 3 speech as I have outlined.

House Resolution 613 states no new positions taken by President Nixon. It merely restates the Johnson policy in effect since 1966. What function is served to adopt a resolution which is purely historical, without any new steps for peace?

The President is correct when he says that American confidence is harmed when we do not speak the truth. The truth today is that withdrawal, like "stop the bombing of North Vietnam" of a few years ago, is controversial and therefore we are asked to blind ourselves to its reality.

I happen to support the President's offer of complete withdrawal of all outside forces within 1 year. I would vote for House Resolu-

tion 613 only if it embodied this principal of withdrawal. Such a resolution would be meaningful and would contribute to the unity which the President wants by confirming our new initiatives for peace. Without facing this truth House Resolution 613 is but an empty gesture and will further exacerbate our lack of specific national goals in our pursuit for peace.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,
May 6, 1970]

INVASION OF CAMBODIA IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

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

Mr. Chairman, four students died this week because we continue to believe that we can solve our problems with guns and bullets.

I do not support President Nixon's Vietnamization policy because it is obviously based upon a military plan still wedded to the belief that we can solve Vietnam's problems with guns and tanks and bombs.

Serious efforts at negotiations have been abandoned. Ambassador Lodge has not even been replaced since his resignation last fall.

We resumed the bombing last week without any announcement as to the reasons for this so-called retaliatory action. President Nixon on April 30 neglected to mention this important escalation which had at that time already been ordered to take place the following day.

It is almost forgotten that the talks began in Paris because we stopped the bombing of North Vietnam 18 months ago.

The bombing of North Vietnam together with the invasion of Cambodia can be no less than an escalation of the war designed to pursue more vigorously the military plan for total victory. There cannot be any other explanation or justification for this coordinated step-up of military activity.

The five sanctuaries which purportedly constituted the emergency which threatened our men in Vietnam have proven so far to be only rice-filled small weapon storage bunkers which would have remained no less through the monsoons while Congress could have exercised its constitutional duty to determine whether an invasion of Cambodia was consistent with our national interest.

The issue we must face today is whether we believe in the Constitution of the United States. Can we surrender our responsibility to exercise our judgment in these matters which affect the lives of our men overseas?

We can no longer rely upon the Tonkin Bay resolution to justify our failure to assume our constitutional duty.

We are faced with a new military adventure across the borders into another country. We must decide today whether we sanction this escalation. There can be no shirking of this responsibility. The Constitution states that the Congress alone has the power to declare war. We have the opportunity today to reinstitute this rightful responsibility in the House of Representatives.

Do we seek to wage more war or do we insist upon a negotiated settlement of this conflict?

I urge this House to support the Leggett amendment which firmly establishes the right of Congress to determine the issue of whether this war is to be extended into Laos, Thailand, or Cambodia.

Until April 30 it was the hope of all Americans that the announced withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam meant that the end was in sight. The only debate was on whether it was being done soon enough and for the right reasons.

On April 20 we were told that 150,000 more men would be withdrawn by May of 1971.

But 10 days later this announcement was shattered when the President told the Nation that in order for this withdrawal to be effectuated, it was necessary to invade Cambodia.

The President told us on April 30 that: "The American policy has been to scrupu-

lously respect the neutrality of the Cambodian people—and that for the past 5 years we have provided no military assistance whatever and no economic assistance to Cambodia."

He went on to further state that "for the past 5 years North Vietnam has occupied military sanctuaries along the Cambodian frontier."

He told us "that for 5 years neither the United States nor South Vietnam has moved against those enemy sanctuaries because we did not wish to violate the territory of a neutral nation."

It is my firm view that what has been the policy of our Nation for the past 5 years regarding Cambodia was a sound policy and that any change in such a long-standing policy should be the responsibility of the Congress of the United States.

Therefore, I urge the adoption of the Leggett amendment.

The following are bills and resolutions that I have sponsored:

H. CON. RES. 187

(Offered on March 26)

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam.

H. RES. 606

(Offered on Oct. 20, 1969)

Whereas we believe the time has come for those of us with differing views on the conflict in Vietnam to reach agreement as to the best method of terminating our involvement; and

Whereas there are those of us who have supported the American role in Vietnam not out of desire for territorial gain or international prestige but as a commitment to the people of South Vietnam that they might freely determine for themselves their own future. We believe that our purpose in going to Vietnam has been an honorable one. We are convinced that history will report our efforts as having served a noble cause in staving off the imposition of a government by hostile force of arms on a people unable to defend themselves. We believe, however, that we have accomplished the limited objectives for which we committed our troops, and that having accomplished these objectives, the time has come to end our combat presence; and

Whereas there are those of us who believe that our commitment to the South Vietnamese Government and our participation in the Vietnam war have been wrong and not in our national interest; that our military actions have endangered the world's security and have placed us all in perilous danger of a Third World War; that our country cannot be the policeman of the world; that the Vietnam war has caused great damage to our Nation's prestige around the world and created bitter division at home. We have been distressed by the continued deaths in a war in which we think the United States should never have become involved, and we have pressed in the past for a deescalation of hostilities and the pursuit of a policy of withdrawal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That irrespective of our positions, we are of one mind that the further expenditure of American lives in Vietnam is intolerable; and be it further

Resolved, That we therefore join in urging that the President:

1. Announce a date at which time United States forces will stop their firing, except when fired upon—bearing in mind that the safety of our men is of paramount importance;

2. Call on the Government of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front to reciprocate at the appointed time by discontinuing their own hostile activities; and

3. Undertake immediate steps for accelerated troop withdrawal, consistent with the safety of Americans troops; and be it further

Resolved, That we believe these combined steps would provide an opportunity for the beginning of a permanent cease-fire and an end to the killing in Vietnam. The opportunity is here for a peace initiative. Let us not lose it and more American lives. After so much has been risked in the pursuit of war, let us not be afraid to take a chance for peace.

H. RES. 704

(Offered on Nov. 13, 1969)

Resolved, That it is the sense of Congress that the United States Forces in South Vietnam should be systematically withdrawn on an orderly and fixed schedule—neither precipitate nor contingent on factors beyond our control—to extend only over such period of time as shall be necessary to (a) provide for the safety of United States Forces, (b) secure the release of American prisoners of war, (c) assist any Vietnamese desiring asylum, and (d) enable the United States to make an orderly disposition of its facilities in South Vietnam.

H. RES. 730

(Offered on Nov. 26, 1969)

Resolved, That the House of Representatives urges the President to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam, expresses the earnest hope of the people of the United States for such a peace, calls attention to the numerous peaceful overtures which the United States has made in good faith toward the Government of North Vietnam, approves and supports the principles that the people of South Vietnam are entitled to choose their own government by means of free elections open to all South Vietnamese and supervised by an impartial international body, and that the United States is willing to abide by the results of such elections, and urges the President to call upon the Government of North Vietnam to announce its willingness to honor such elections and to abide by such results and to allow the issues in controversy to be peacefully so resolved in order that the war may be ended and peace may be restored at last in Southeast Asia.

H. RES. 963

(Offered on Apr. 30, 1970)

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States refrain from any military action in Cambodia.

H. RES. 1008

(Offered on May 13, 1970)

Resolved, That in the absence of a declaration of war, it is the policy of the House of Representatives that fiscal year 1971 Defense expenditures in South Vietnam should be limited to only that amount required to carry out the safe and orderly withdrawal of all American combat and support troops from South Vietnam by the end of fiscal year 1971 (June 30, 1971). Be it further

Resolved, That no funds in the fiscal year 1971 Defense budget are to be used to finance the operation of any American combat or support troops in Cambodia or Laos.

Mr. Speaker, on May 6 and 7, 1970, I voted against the motion for the previous question in order to express my support for the Leggett, Reid, and Boland amendments which would have cut off all funds in fiscal year 1971 to finance the American invasion of Cambodia. I was joined by 145 of my colleagues in the House on May 6, 1970. We will continue to offer this amendment to all bills coming before the House which are germane.

Mr. Speaker, both houses of the State of Hawaii Legislature adopted resolutions opposing the invasion of Cambodia. The resolutions read as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 325

Requesting the President of the United States to withdraw military troops and arms commitments to Cambodia

Whereas, the military involvement of the United States in Vietnam has resulted in much tragedy and discord in the nation; and

Whereas, the frightful and disillusioning hostilities in Vietnam have torn families apart, brutally deprived young men, husbands, fathers, sons and brothers of their lives and future, and caused youth to resist the draft and suffer exile and prosecution; and

Whereas, the spread of warfare throughout Indochina and the commitment of the United States military troops and arms to Cambodia by President Nixon does not end the war but further subjects the Nation to continuing loss of life and human misery; and

Whereas, the military involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia is unwarranted world policing and contrary to our humanitarian ideals; now, therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate of the 5th Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1970, that the President and the Congress of the United States be and are hereby requested to immediately cease all military activities in Cambodia; and

Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Honorable Richard M. Nixon; the President of the United States Senate, the Honorable Spiro T. Agnew; and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Honorable John W. McCormack.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 377

Disapproval of the United States Presidential action of combat troop commitments to Cambodia

Whereas, the United States military involvement in Vietnam is a regrettable situation, causing much anguish, loss of lives, and dissension in the Nation; and

Whereas, the spread of hostilities throughout Indo-China and the commitment of several thousand United States combat troops to Cambodia by President Nixon will not only result in continuing American deaths and suffering but may also be a likely prelude to the involvement of the United States in a major war; and

Whereas, the commitment of combat troops to Cambodia, which did not request such assistance, is a misuse of power by the United States, which, through its President is erroneously and unwisely assuming the posture of world police; and

Whereas, the economic resources and manpower of the United States, already severely taxed by the Vietnam war, are not inexhaustible, and should not be thoughtlessly expended; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1970, that this body disagree with and disapprove of the commitment of the United States combat troops to Cambodia and respectfully requests the President to reconsider his action; and

Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Resolution be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States.

WASHINGTON POST REVEALS MASSIVE POLITICAL SLUSH FUNDS COLLECTED BY BANKS

(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, for a long time, many of us have been aware that the big banks around the Nation were gathering huge political slush funds as an adjunct to their lobbying campaigns.

This morning, the Washington Post, in a story bylined by Morton Mintz, details the growing activities of the commercial banking industry nationwide.

Bank campaign groups apparently are assessing the banks for political contributions based on their deposits. In other cases, according to Mr. Mintz' story, the banks are making direct assessments on their employees for campaign contributions.

The banks are apparently making no secret of the purposes behind these political solicitations. The Washington Post story makes it plain that these contributions are being used to promote special interest legislation and candidates who are willing to carry the banks' position forward.

It is no coincidence that this increased political activity comes at a time when the big banks are attempting to kill legislation which would provide effective regulation of one-bank holding companies. And it is no coincidence that these activities are surfacing at a time when the big banks are attempting to protect their swollen profits created by the highest interest rates in the history of the Nation.

It appears that a portion of these high interest rates being paid by the American public are actually going into political slush funds.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post story raises grave public questions. Should the banking industry—which has been given great powers by the Congress and the various States—be allowed to raise and manipulate huge political funds? This industry—through its banking powers—already asserts a tremendous influence across the land. Now they have moved into direct political action to augment their already awesome power.

Mr. Speaker, the activities contained in the Washington Post article also raise serious legal questions. The political fundraising seems to be occurring within the corporate structure of these banks. The Corrupt Practices Act, of course, prohibits corporations, including banks, from making political contributions and expenditures in behalf of political candidates. Someone should take a hard look at these activities and determine whether they are within the law governing political campaign contributions.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of this article with the headline "Banks Solicit Political Funds," and a second article with the headline "California Bankers Offer Tips for Handling Lawmakers":

[From the Washington Post, May 14, 1970]

BANKS SOLICIT POLITICAL FUNDS (By Morton Mintz)

Last April 3, 19 senior officers of the National Bank of Commerce in Seattle sent out a letter to their junior colleagues.

The message, under the letterhead of the "League for Good Government," cited the growing burden on a small number of of-

ficers in meeting the requests for financial support from "political parties, candidates and committees promoting special interest legislation . . ."

While reminding younger officers that political contributions by banks "are prohibited by law," the letter appealed:

"It now has become apparent that a wider degree of participation is imperative and we want to extend a cordial invitation to you to join us in this important civic responsibility."

The letter—and similar solicitations obtained by The Washington Post—is one of the rarely seen pieces of hard evidence that banks across the country have internal organizations which ask officers to contribute portions of their salaries to candidates for federal, state and local offices.

The solicitation letters come to light at a volatile point in the history of relationships between the banking and political communities.

Last week, a prestigious committee on congressional ethics, appointed by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, reported that at least 96 of the 435 members of the House are executives, directors or stockholders in banks or other financial institutions.

And on Tuesday, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee begins hearings on the most important piece of banking legislation since 1933, when Congress acted to bar commercial banking from all other lines of business.

The bill before the Senate committee, already passed by the House over the objection of the largest banks, is aimed at one-bank holding companies. Banks have used such holding companies in recent years to become conglomerate business enterprises.

The existence of organized fund-raising efforts within banks has been closely guarded information. Some executives were willing to discuss them in phone interviews. Other bankers, however, reacted to a reporter's questions first with astonishment, then, with questions of their own. How had the newsman learned about a particular organization? What was his purpose in inquiring?

"Why do you want to know?" asked E. L. Carpenter, chairman of Central National Bank of Cleveland, another billion-dollar institution which ranks 50th in deposits.

Central's fund-raising mechanism is also benignly named: the "Good Government Program." The Union Bank of California, which has \$1.7 billion in deposits and ranks 26th, calls its organization the "League for Good Government."

A neutral name, the "Robert C. Isban Special Account," is used by the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. of New York City, which with deposits of \$10.4 billion is the Nation's fourth largest. Isban is a deputy comptroller.

And a group of Texas bankers set up a "trust" and requested that checks be sent to "Mr. A. C. Verner, Trustee, P.O. Box 1241, Lubbock, Texas 79408."

Whatever the organizations are called, they usually specify precisely the amounts of money desired.

The Texas group, for example, set a sliding "contribution formula" that relates the total resources of a bank to the suggested combined donation of its officers.

For banks with resources totaling less than \$2.5 million, the recommended combined donation was "at least" \$50. For the largest banks, those with resources exceeding \$500 million, the suggested combined gift was "at least" \$2,000.

Sponsors of the trust say their hopes were disappointed. Had they been fulfilled, \$250,000 would have been the minimum donated in Texas.

Applied to all of the banks in the country, the same "contribution formula" would have

made at least \$6.3 million available to candidates.

California's Union Bank, which has 430 officers, suggests contributions of one-half of one percent of the portion of annual salary above \$10,000 and below \$30,000, and one per cent of salary exceeding \$30,000.

Manufacturers Hanover said it invites "no fixed amount" from its approximately 1,100 officers.

Cleveland's Central National proposed an "average contribution" of one-quarter of one per cent of base salary.

The 19 Seattle bank executives suggested contributions at a rate geared to annual income. A National Bank of Commerce official earning \$12-\$15,999 would pay 0.35 per cent (\$42 to \$56). If he earned \$16,000-\$18,999 he would pay 0.4 per cent (\$64 to \$76). For officials in the top bracket of \$30,000 or more the recommended rate is 0.7 per cent, or \$210 or more.

The National Bank of Commerce, with deposits of more than \$1.1 billion, ranked 44th in the nation as of last Dec. 31.

Bert L. Sellin, vice president for new business and co-ordinator of the "League for Good Government," said in Seattle that the bank's solicitation program is "not unusual."

Similarly, Harry J. Volk, board chairman of Union Bank, said in Los Angeles that political fund-raising by groups such as his "Good Government Associates" is "common practice in California banks," and in other businesses, as well.

None of the bankers interviewed by The Washington Post, however, was willing to identify any financial institution with such programs other than his own.

All of the solicitation letters obtained by this newspaper emphasized, sometimes with underlining, that contributions would be "completely voluntary."

In Los Angeles, Volk said the Union Bank exerts "absolutely no pressure. No one has to give a dime . . . anyone in financial difficulties is urged not to give."

Told of a subordinate who—in an unsigned statement—claimed to fear that he would be secretly blacklisted or considered uncooperative, Volk said the complainant must be a "crank" or "some kind of a nut" whose anonymous charges were "completely improper and wrong."

In Seattle, Bert Sellin said flatly that the National Bank of Commerce applies "no compulsion." Asked if a young officer might be concerned that a failure to contribute could jeopardize his career, Sellin said that was out of the question.

"We're a pretty independent bunch of guys out West," he said. "Maybe they don't think that way back East."

Back East, deputy controller Robert Isban—the man with the special account—said that independence was valued just as highly at Manufacturers Hanover. There is, he said, "absolutely no compulsion."

The bankers supported the denials with statements that their requests for contributions were frequently met with outright refusals or with donations smaller than the suggested one, although in Seattle some donations have exceeded the sums requested for years.

In Lubbock, Texas, A. C. Verner, president of the First National Bank, said the trust had raised "nothing like" the desired minimum of \$250,000.

Similarly, Union Bank's Harry Volk said that "a relatively small amount was raised, unfortunately."

Other bankers gave like disclaimers. But none was willing to say precisely how many dollars were raised or spent.

"In our small way, we contributed a few bucks," a "token" of perhaps \$100 for a candidate, Volk said.

In every case, high public purposes were ascribed to the fund-raising.

Central National Bank of Cleveland initiated its "Good Government Program" in 1963 "out of a deep concern for the preservation of our liberties and our economic system," chairman Carpenter said on June 13, 1969 in a memo to "all key men."

In Texas, seeking donations to the trust for "statewide races, and in some cases, other than statewide races," C. Glynn Lowe, president of the First National Bank of Paris, Texas, said in a letter dated last March 12:

"The bankers of Texas have become aware of the need to support political candidates they believe will best serve in the interest of the public and the economic climate."

Lowe, in a phone interview, refused to name any of the candidates. Neither would any of the other bankers.

However, trustee Verner said in Lubbock that no money was given to any candidate in a race for federal office. Specifically, he said, none went to Lloyd M. Bentsen Jr., who on May 1 defeated incumbent Ralph Yarborough in a race for the Democratic nomination for the U.S. Senate.

Bentsen is president of an insurance company which owns an estimated half-million dollars worth of stock in Texas banks.

At Manufacturers Hanover, vice president-comptroller Colin MacLennan and Isban, his deputy, said that a small unit of top-ranking officers allocates donated funds, the bulk of which go to mayoral and state candidates, dinners and the like.

A Union Bank letter dated July 19, 1966, said its "Good Government Associates" gives "entirely nonpartisan" support to candidates "who are sympathetic with American banking and the free enterprise system." The letter was signed by Harry Volk.

The other day, Volk told a reporter that the sole standard for deciding if a candidate merits a contribution is whether he gives "intelligent, fair" consideration to banking legislation.

While declining to identify any such candidates, Volk did name, as a hypothetical example of a deserving candidate, former Sen. A. Willis Robertson (D-Va.), a conservative who was chairman of Senate Banking and Currency.

Volk said Robertson was a "very understanding and great senator and a dedicated American."

During the 1966 primary, a group of bankers in Richmond called in local businessmen to invite contributions to Robertson's campaign because he had bottled up a truth-in-lending bill "and would keep it bottled up."

Volk, in the interview, said he opposes any legislation that "would preclude the banking system from growing as it is supposed to."

Drawing an analogy with the newspaper business, he said he would expect The Washington Post Co. to consider giving money to defeat "someone running in opposition to a free press." Volk volunteered the information that he is a director of the Times Mirror Co., publisher of the Los Angeles Times.

A fund-raising group of another kind is the Bankers Congressional Committee, which along with other groups, is represented in Washington by H. Vernon Scott.

The committee chairman, L. Shirley Tark, chairman of the Main Street Bank in Chicago, said the group seeks legislation to make savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks pay taxes on an equal basis with commercial banks.

In a report filed with the Clerk of the House, the committee said that in 1968 it gave a total of \$8,425 to candidates for the House and Senate.

Some of the listed contributions were as small as \$50. The two largest, \$1,000, went to Reps. John C. Watts (D-Ky.) and Al Ullman (D-Ore.). Both are members of the Ways and Means Committee, which writes tax legislation for the House. In all, the bankers

group contributed to 13 of the 25 members of the committee. Four members got \$500 each.

CALIFORNIA BANKERS OFFER TIPS FOR HANDLING LAWMAKERS

A "Political Handbook for Bankers," a copyrighted publication of the California Bankers Association, contains numerous practical tips for its members. Here are a few:

"Mere volume of mail alone, rarely—if ever—sways a politician. Pressure groups have become so proficient in running off 'canned letters' and flooding legislators with them, that this technique is no longer effective. The legislator is very sophisticated today and it's what's inside the envelope that influences his thinking."

"The CBA often sends out samples of correspondence which are for your guidance only. These should always be rewritten in your own words."

"Everyone is suspicious of friends or business associates who only drop around when looking for a favor. It's human nature. And politicians share that suspicion. Some elected officials have become cynical about such favor seekers and it's not uncommon to hear them reply: 'Where were you at primary time or election time when I needed workers and money?' . . . The first rule in contacts with legislators then, is to make contacts when you have nothing to ask."

If a legislator invited by local bankers to a cocktail party and dinner "requires overnight accommodations, they should be complimentary and very pleasant without being pretentious. Further thoughtfulness can be displayed by having a basket of fresh fruit or another appropriate gift delivered to his room before his arrival. Flowers should be sent if his wife accompanies him . . . The news media should not be invited to these functions, but it is possible they will show up . . . it should be made clear to them that the legislator's remarks are strictly 'off the record.'"

The 26-page handbook concludes with a "Political Effectiveness Test for Bankers." If answered "yes," each of two declarations gives five points and each of nine gives 10 points. Any one who scores 80 or more points out of a possible 100 rates as "excellent."

Among the 10-point declarations: "I contributed money to a candidate during the last election," "I worked for a candidate during the last election," and "Bankers in our area sponsored a dinner during the last year honoring a legislator."

AFL-CIO BLASTS NIXON'S ECONOMIC FAILURES

(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, on Tuesday, the AFL-CIO executive council issued a detailed analysis of the failure of the Nixon administration's economic policies with special emphasis on the administration's lack of action to bring down high interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from the policy statement:

The need for increased low- and moderate-income home construction, at reasonable interest rates, is not being met, forcing the government to initiate interest-subsidy programs that reward high interest rate policies at taxpayers' expense, in order to prevent the complete collapse of home-building. Small and medium-sized businesses have been hit by a lack of available credit at reasonable interest rates. The inability of local govern-

ments to obtain low-interest loans is resulting in postponing construction of needed schools, hospitals and other facilities, while available credit is being drained off for less-urgent investments and dubious objectives.

Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO calls attention to the fact that the 91st Congress, over objections from the Republican side of the aisle, voted broad standby credit controls. The President, as the statement points out, has failed to use these powers despite the highest interest rates in our history.

This legislation was originated in the House Banking and Currency Committee and it gives the President full power to control interest rates and all other aspects of credit transactions. Yet the President sits idly by, doing nothing while unemployment and interest rates climb.

Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO executive council's policy statement should be must reading for all Members of the Congress. I place a copy of this statement in the RECORD:

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The Administration's campaign against inflation has been a complete failure. Prices have gone up, unemployment has grown, and the nation has crossed the threshold of recession.

The time has obviously come for the Administration to abandon its bankrupt economic policies before the already grave damage to American living standards snowballs.

In April, unemployment soared to 4.8% of the labor force or close to 4 million workers—equalling the sharpest month-to-month rise since the 1960 recession. The jobless rate for Negro workers shot up to 8.7%; for teenagers, to 15.7%. In the four months since last December, 1.1 million workers were added to the swelling ranks of the unemployed—victims of the Administration's deliberate policy to slow production and employment.

Millions of additional workers have seen their paychecks shrink as the spreading effects of the squeeze on the economy has brought production cutbacks and reductions in working hours.

But living costs have continued to mount. The Consumer Price Index has risen at a yearly rate of about 6% since December.

The buying power of the weekly after-tax earnings of the average non-supervisory worker in private employment—about 48 million wage and salary earners—is less than last year and below 1965.

With unemployment rising sharply and industry operating at merely 79½% of its productive capacity, there is no classical inflationary condition of widespread shortages of goods and manpower that could justify government measures of severe, general economic restraint.

The Administration's policy—with the highest interest rates in 100 years—has been discriminatory, as well as ineffective, in combating the rapid rise of prices. It has cut urgently needed residential construction—with housing starts down from a yearly rate of 1.9 million in January 1969 to 1.4 million last March. It has hit the expansion of state and local government facilities and smaller businesses. In addition, skyrocketing interest rates have raised costs and prices all along the line to the consumer—adding to inflationary pressures.

Moreover, this blunderbuss policy has not curbed business profiteering, while it boosts bank profits. Cuts in government appropriations, as those for medical schools which threaten to continue the shortage of medical personnel, will continue the soaring rise of medical costs. And the tight monetary squeeze has not curtailed the credit in-

flation of the banks, with their lines of credit to the blue-chip corporations and wealthy families for lendable funds.

The banks have been permitted to evade the monetary squeeze. In 1969, for example, the international banks increased their "borrowings" from their foreign branches by \$7 billion and even modest government regulations were not imposed until September. Bank holding companies issued \$4 billion in promissory notes last year—and are continuing to issue such commercial paper, at present—at very high interest rates, free of government regulation.

Thus, while credit for needed production, such as housing, has been drying up—or if available at all, at extortionate interest rates—business loans of the large banks are up 5% from a year ago. The nation's major banks have been extending loans for such operations as conglomerate take-overs, gambling casinos, unnecessary inventory accumulation and a continuing boom of business investment in new plants and machines, while more than 20% of industry's existing capacity stands idle.

Even if the money supply should ease somewhat, there is no assurance that such utter misallocation of available credit by the banks and other financial institutions will not continue or that interest rates will not remain at high levels.

The regular operations of the banks and other financial institutions are not meeting America's needs. Moreover, they have been adding a high-interest rate credit-inflation to the business profit-inflation of the 1960s.

The time is long overdue for a sharp change in the nation's economic policies. The pace of rising prices must be slowed, without a growing army of unemployed. The urgent need is not last week's reduction of margin requirements for purchases in the stock markets to stimulate increased speculation.

The government must channel available credit, at low interest rates, to where it is needed and curb the inflationary expansion of credit for purposes that are less important to society.

Last December, Congress passed a bill entitled "Lowering Interest Rates, Fighting Inflation, Helping Small Business and Expanding the Mortgage Market"—which grants broad authority to the President for selective measures to curb the specific causes of credit inflation, while expanding credit for needed facilities and business operations. It provides the government with flexible means to re-balance the nation's credit structure and to finance housing, schools, hospitals and other community facilities at low interest rates.

More than four months have passed and still the President has not exercised this authority.

The need for increased low- and moderate-income home construction, at reasonable interest rates, is not being met, forcing the government to initiate interest-subsidy programs that reward high interest rate policies at taxpayers' expense, in order to prevent the complete collapse of home-building. Small and medium-sized businesses have been hit by a lack of available credit at reasonable interest rates. The inability of local governments to obtain low-interest loans is resulting in postponing construction of needed schools, hospitals and other facilities, while available credit is being drained off for less-urgent investments and dubious objectives.

So prices continue to rise rapidly; layoffs and production cutbacks are spreading; urgent social needs are not being met.

Therefore we recommend the following steps to take America out of recession and end inflation:

1. Confronted by the President's failure to use his authority, we urge the Congress to direct the Federal Reserve system to estab-

lish selective credit controls, maximum interest rates on specific types of loans and the allocation of available credit to where it will do the most good for America.

2. To meet the goal of 26 million new and rehabilitated housing units in ten years, the government should also require that a portion of such tax-exempt funds as pension, college endowment and foundation funds, as well as bank reserves, be invested in government-guaranteed mortgages.

3. To curb the price-raising ability of the dominant corporations, government action is needed to curtail the continuing high rate of business mergers, which has been greatly increasing the concentration of economic power in a narrowing group of corporations and banks.

4. The specific causes of soaring pressures on living costs, such as physicians' fees, hospital charges, housing costs and auto insurance rates, should be examined for the development of practical, sensible measures to dampen these pressures.

If the President, after exercising that authority voted him by Congress, determines he needs additional authority and decides that the situation warrants extraordinary overall stabilization measures, the AFL-CIO will cooperate, so long as such restraints are equitably placed on all costs and incomes—including all prices, profits, dividends, rents and executive compensation, as well as employees' wages and salaries. We are prepared to sacrifice as much as anyone else, as long as anyone else, so long as there is equality of sacrifice.

THE LATE GEN. WLADYSLAV ANDERS

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, all of us were saddened yesterday to read of the death of Gen. Wladyslaw Anders in London. All of us mourn the loss of one of the truly great heroes of contemporary history, because today a grateful world must pay him parting tribute.

Residing in London as an exile from his beloved Poland, General Anders was a living personification of the gallantry and courage manifested by the thousands of Polish freedom-loving people who too, were forced to flee Nazi brutalities and Communist enslavement of their homeland. Even in death the heroism of General Anders will be remembered and revered by the saddened multitude of his adoring countrymen.

The death of General Anders is particularly painful to me not only because of my close friendship with so many Polish Americans for whom he was such an inspiring idol, but more because of the privilege I have had to know him personally.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful indeed that within the past year I had the rare good fortune to participate in the moving ceremonies last August commemorating the 25th anniversary of the battle of Monte Cassino in Italy.

Standing in the historic old monastery made sacred by the heroic Polish Army under the world-famed General Anders, I was moved to tears as surviving Polish war veterans paid homage to their fallen comrades. Most illustrious of these war veterans in attendance was Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders.

I shall never forget the opportunity which was mine at the close of these impressive ceremonies to chat with General Anders. Even more vivid will be my memory of General Anders rising from his invalid's chair at the conclusion of my remarks to thank me publicly for my statement and for the greetings which I brought from the American people.

I was privileged on that day last summer to meet a great many other Polish notables as well as many Italian dignitaries in attendance at that historic meeting, but none impressed me so much as General Anders. To me he represented the highest in man's devotion to a mighty cause for the betterment of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all the Members of this body join me in expressing our deep sorrow in the passing of a great worldwide hero. I am sure too that all America joins us in expressing our deepest condolences to his wife and the family who survive him and to the friends who so intensely mourn him.

I know that our fine Polish-American organizations will make plans for paying further tribute to this illustrious hero. It will be fitting indeed for this Government and its people to keep the memory of Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders alive and to remember ever his magnificent deeds.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, after 20 years of delay and postponement the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is again considering the ratification of the Genocide Convention. For those who witnessed and understand the heinous crime of genocide in Central and Eastern Europe, this convention is most vital in towns of its politico-moral force to prevent a repetition of what occurred in the totalitarian environments of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia. Dr. Raphael Lemkin, a former Polish jurist who coined the term genocide and basically fathered this convention, consistently emphasized to the time of his death in 1959 that this special type of crime is only possible in a nondemocratic environment.

In recent testimony before a special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, this special form of crime was emphasized. As one who worked closely with Dr. Lemkin on the ratification of this treaty, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University stressed that with "no conflict in relation to our constitutional framework or our form of government, this convention is a legal suit of clothes patterned to fit the body of genocidal crime, which has appeared time and time again in environments different from ours." The testimony contains many other insights that the author acquired from Dr. Lemkin. For present enlightened discussion on this important subject I commend this testimony to the careful reading of our citizens and colleagues in the Senate. Dr. Dobriansky's suggestion for

an official tribute to the late Dr. Lemkin in the event of the treaty's ratification is well taken.

The material follows:

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

(By Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky)

Mr. Chairman and distinguished Members, I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to testify again in support of Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention. It was my privilege twenty years ago to offer in both empirical and legal dimensions extensive testimony in favor of the convention (*The Genocide Convention*, Hearings, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 1950, pp. 319-413). It was also my memorable and precious privilege to know intimately, down to August 28, 1959, and to work closely on the ratification of this treaty with Dr. Raphael Lemkin, who may veritably be called the father of this convention.

For the record, I don't hesitate to state that this truly great person actually sacrificed his life and treasure for the advancement of this vital convention, and we of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America are everlastingly proud of our close association with him and the many opportunities he afforded us in subsidizing and assisting his educational and humanitarian efforts. I sincerely feel that it is not in any measure of excessive laudation to suggest at this point that if and when, and on its own merits, this treaty is ratified by the Senate, a special tribute in Congress and by our Government, both here and in the United Nations, be posthumously made in honor of the founding and pioneering work of this man.

SOME PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS IN PERSPECTIVE

Although my profession is not that of law, I can say that the training and informal schooling I received from my close relationship with Dr. Lemkin have equipped me in some degree to testify on the legal aspects of this treaty. If anything, to the best of my ability I can strive to transmit the insights, perceptions and wisdom he implanted as concerns the solid legal structure and content of the convention. However, in this compressed statement, before dwelling on these essential aspects, I should like to make a few preliminary observations to place the subject in proper and accurate perspective, along with some generally unknown facts to be stated for the record. After all, law, as indeed economics, political science, psychology or any other humanistic discipline, cannot be viewed in a vacuum of events and surrounding developments.

My first perspectival observation is that it is almost in the nature of a national disgrace that the United States, which at the end of the 40's was in the vanguard of the movement for an international treaty against the crime of genocide and was one of the first to sign the treaty, has, in sharp contrast to 75 other states, not as yet ratified it. The reasons for this ironical development are, of course, many, but the fact remains that in this area, not to mention others, we lapsed in moral and political leadership in the world at large. However, in this, as in other areas, better late than never.

Among the various reasons for this unfortunate delay, undoubtedly the most prominent has been the political chaff and sophisticated extraneousities that cumulated about an objective consideration of the convention. Twenty years ago, opponents of the convention admitted it with civil rights, the threat to states rights, charges of genocide against negroes, a plot against our form of government, and a whole assortment of sophistry as to the constitutionality and legal perils of the treaty. Today, much of this chaff is being re-expressed in old and some new forms, such as American genocide in Viet-

nam, mass rioting and deaths, the Black Panthers, and even poverty.

For the record, let me state that in 1954, following a radio/TV program on the Georgetown University Forum, Dr. George A. Finch, one of the panelists and a leading ABA opponent to the convention, let his hair down to inform Dr. Lemkin and me how he and Messrs. Rix and Schweppe managed to have the treaty tabled up till then ("Genocide: Fact and Convention", G.U., June 10, 1954). Despite the overwhelming evidence in support of the convention, they were able to convince Chairman Tom Connally that the treaty would not prevent communist genocide and would be used against us. Furthermore, at this time, it will be recalled, the Bricker Amendment emerged as an additional obstacle to the Genocide Convention, which some opponents to the treaty even today are making use of. Yet, in all truth, I can testify that Senator Bricker himself admitted to Dr. Lemkin that he saw no inconsistency or discrepancy between the treaty and our Constitution.

Happily, this present attempt to separate the chaff from the wheat has received powerful assistance from President Nixon's endorsement, in reality taking off from where President Truman began, from the legal positions of our Secretary of State and Attorney General, and from the studied output of the American Bar Association's section on individual rights and responsibilities, not to mention the four-vote negative margin. In keeping abreast of all these developments, however, one cannot but conclude that all the pros and cons heard these past two decades were said and recorded in the 1950 Senate hearings. Nevertheless, it is important now to dispel some of the more prominent misconceptions held with regard to the convention by concentrating on the very essence of the meaning of genocide itself and the essential conformities of the treaty with our constitutional framework and limits.

MEANING AND COMFORTABLE PREDICTION

In an attempt to compress here the fundamental issues surrounding this treaty, the categories of (1) facts and meaning (2) the legal suit of clothes and (3) moral force for rule under law and justice will be found helpful and implementative. Concerning the facts or the empirical basis of the matter, most of the evidence was well supplied in the 1950 hearings, with appropriate emphasis placed on the far more extensive record of Soviet Russian genocide than that of the Nazi German one. This accumulated evidence is significant for two reasons: (a) it constitutes the experiential foundation for the meaning of genocide and (b) it determines objectively the legal suit of clothes necessary to fit the body of the crime.

Derived from this massive experience in genocide, the meaning is clearly stated in Article II of the convention. I submit that most, if not all, of the confusion and misunderstanding that has emerged in relation to this treaty can be attributed to an insufficient grasp of the meaning of genocide as conveyed in this article and, ultimately, to an unfamiliarity with the evidence. Aside from the enumerated acts of commission, the crux of the meaning is found in the words "with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such." Thus, obviously, Hitler's campaign against the Jews, Stalin's destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox Churches, deportations, man-made famine etc., Mao's assault upon the Tibetans—these and numerous other examples clearly spell genocide. The intent to destroy in whole or in part, and regardless of motivation or purpose, was realized overtly in the act itself.

There is a distinctive and substantial difference between genocide and homicide, whether singular or multiple. That difference

lies in the crux of the meaning given above. The loose and indiscriminate bandying about of the term twenty years ago and again now to cover such phenomena as lynching, "the killing of one person or a thousand," mass deaths resulting from wartime bombing operations, terrorism and guerrilla warfare, revolutionary activity or even "driving five Chinese out of town" is a measure of the misconception that has prevailed. The term has, of course, been prostituted in the political warfare lexicon of our enemies both abroad and at home. Covered adequately by other criminal statutes, these and similar acts are not in themselves genocidal where "intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such" is on evidence non-existent. The objection is often raised that the meaning excludes political groups. Here, too, acts of treason against a state, whether legitimately governed or no, whether they involve mass killing or no, are not in themselves genocidal and are covered by other laws. It is evident, therefore, that the whole thrust of both Articles II and III is against this special, differentiated type of crime that entails the destruction, in whole or in part, each of the entities mentioned.

Once one grasps the meaning of genocide and the uncivilized and barbarous content of the act, denying the apolitical right of self-preservation as a group itself, it should be evident that the commission of genocide is well nigh impossible in a free, open democratic society. Historically and logically, genocide is a cancer associated with totalitarian, autocratic and imperio-colonialist environments, as characterized by Soviet Russia within the USSR, Nazi Germany and Red China. In brief, it can be said that this treaty bears no objective relevance to our environment as presently constituted; it carries heavy weight, however, for our politico-moral leadership in the world at large for the prevention and punishment of this special, heinous crime.

With the definitional premise given in effect in Articles II and III, the treaty is formulated like a legal suit of clothes to fit the body of this crime and is predicated on this premise in conformity with our constitutional framework. Article IV thus logically addresses itself to the punishment of persons involved in genocide and acts pertaining to it "whether they are constitutionally responsible rulers, public officials or private individuals." The objection that the treaty "is directed largely toward individuals rather than nations and opens a new concept of international law whereby domestic crimes would be converted to international crimes by treaty law" is a specious one. Who can indict a nation and its countless innocents for genocide or any other crime? Specific individuals in government or beyond can only be punished, and on this the treaty stands on solid, moral ground. As for the supposedly new concept, it should be pointed out first, that the worst cases of genocide, both under the Nazis and the Soviet Russians, have been international in character and, second, that many domestic subjects of lesser intensity in antisocial conduct and the denial of human rights have properly been subjects of international concern, as witness treaties dealing with slavery, narcotics, inheritance rights and the like, not to mention the protection of the lives of seals and migratory birds.

Articles V and VI, dealing respectively with enabling legislation and trial by a competent tribunal, seem to be subjected to more distortion and misinterpretation than all others subsequent to the premial articles. Fears about foreign dictation to our Congress, the self-executing power of the treaty, and criminal prosecution without necessary legislation are totally unfounded. Article V, by specifying an undertaking to enact in accordance with the respective constitution the

necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the convention, clearly shows that the treaty is not self-executing, nor does it mandate or require any specific legislation. With equal explicitness, Article VI stipulates trial before a "tribunal of the State in the territory of which the act was committed" or by an international tribunal accepted by the parties involved. Contrary to prevalent distortions of fact and interpretation, this provision has nothing to do with the International Court of Justice, the so-called World Court; it would not deprive an American citizen of his constitutional right to a trial by jury if the act were committed here; nor, here again, does it mandate any American participation in an international tribunal, were one to be created. And even this would at some later date be subject to treaty and Senate advice and consent.

So with Articles VII, VIII and IX, concerning respectively extradition, calling upon the United Nations, and submitting disputes to the International Court of Justice, the language is perfectly clear and does not justify the propagandized misinterpretations made of them. Extradition is accommodated where treaties are already in force between the U.S. and other countries, and in cases of genocidal involvement Congressional legislative implementation may be required. Article VIII simply allows a country to call upon organs of the U.N. for the prevention of acts of genocide, and under the Charter even they are restricted jurisdictionally. And Article IX permits submission of disputes to the "World Court" which would be concerned solely with questions of interpretation only and not with decisions on genocidal cases. Thus circulated fears about extradition for "political crimes," U.N. subsumption of national sovereignty, dictation by the World Court and similar fiction are groundless here, too.

RATIFICATION FOR POLITICO-MORAL FORCE

Our failure to ratify this treaty twenty years ago has made us vulnerable to charges of insincerity, has in many parts of the world weakened our moral stance as our enemies skillfully propagandized this supposed insincerity, and has deprived us of the full politico-moral force and power that we could avail ourselves of in the use of international law as an instrument both for our primary national interest and world peace, justice and the rule of law. This failure can be redressed now by Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention.

I reiterate—and as Dr. Lemkin taught me—the crux of the issue is a vivid awareness of the nature of genocide, the presence of which in a free, democratic environment is tantamount to a squared circle. With no conflict in relation to our constitutional framework or our form of government, this convention is a legal suit of clothes patterned to fit the body of genocidal crime, which has appeared time and time again in environments different from ours. To reiterate, as some did twenty years ago and do today, that the convention will not prevent totalitarian regimes from perpetrating genocide misses the crucial point of this basically humanitarian action, not to mention the fatalistic omniscience the prediction enlists. Such perpetration may be or it may not be, but it cannot logically be denied that in this inter-nation-building of law for rule with justice, the convention generates an accruing strength of deterrence that, with definable consequences, may well secure the prevention of this grotesque crime. Lest we forget, technology and economic potency far from exhaust the reservoir of power in a nation; ultimately, they give way to politico-moral forces, such as this convention embodies to sustain and intensify our responsibilities in world leadership.

PUBLIC FINANCING OF THE SST

(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, we are painfully aware that consistency is not one of the hallmarks of the art of government and politics. A particularly good example of the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing was in evidence on May 13 when the administration sent two witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee to talk about Boeing's big boomer—the SST.

Attempting to show that all the bases had been touched, the President sent Judge Train—Chairman, Environmental Quality Council—to the committee with a carefully worded statement regarding the SST and its potential adverse environmental effects. Had Judge Train stuck strictly to the "environmental" problem, he would not have had to suffer the indignity of a contradiction from another administration witness. The bulk of Judge Train's prepared testimony dealt with the truly staggering adverse implications of building "a fleet" of SST's; nevertheless, he did venture into the realm of finances and said:

The administration's program has carefully separated prototype development from possible future commercial production.

Later before the committee, Transportation Under Secretary Beggs said:

The SST program will require a very sizable investment, from both the public and private sectors.

In order to present both sides of the story and prove my point that the administration was speaking with two diametrically opposed voices, I have incorporated the statements of Judge Train and Under Secretary Beggs as part of my remarks.

If our colleagues are interested in the overwhelming "environmental reasons" against building the SST, I heartily recommend Judge Train's comments. On the other hand, if our colleagues are looking for reasons to support the building of the SST, I recommend they disregard Under Secretary Beggs' testimony. If his statement is the best the administration can do in justifying the SST boondoggle—and I suspect it is—I predict the environmentalists are going to win a major battle this year.

The two statements follow:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE RUSSELL E. TRAIN

Chairman Proxmire, members of the committee, as Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality I am responding to your invitation to discuss environmental considerations which should enter into Federal transportation expenditure decisions and specifically the decision as to development of the supersonic transport. I am accompanied by Dr. Gordon J. F. MacDonald, a member of our Council and a scientist with considerable background in the scientific issues involved.

At the outset I should make clear that the mandate of the Council under the National Environmental Policy Act is to advise the President concerning the environmental aspects of Federal government programs and activities. The goal of the Act is to assure that, to the greatest extent practical, en-

vironmental considerations are given careful attention and appropriate weight at all stages of the planning and decision-making process in every agency of the Federal Government. We recognize, of course, that environmental considerations are not the only considerations relevant to this process.

I turn now to the views of the Council on Environmental Quality on the environmental considerations that would be relevant to the development of a fleet of supersonic transports. The question of a civilian supersonic transport is important in its own right but has a broader significance because of the problems and opportunities that we as a nation face in the years ahead. In the case of the supersonic transport our great technological strength provides us with an opportunity to make a significant advance in aviation. Yet we must assess whether such progress in aviation represents progress for society—for our whole society. We must at all times be careful that we do not pursue technology simply for the sake of technology—simply for its own sake—but rather for its contribution to human welfare. There is a growing awareness that, with certain technological advances, come social and environmental costs that are difficult to quantify but that must be taken into consideration. What is true for aviation is also true for many other technologies. In the years ahead we must assess the full consequences of technological advance well ahead of the deployment of that technology.

Before proceeding to a brief discussion of the specific environmental aspects of the development of a supersonic fleet, I wish to emphasize four points:

1. The Administration's program is for the design, development, fabrication, assembly and a hundred hour flight test of two identical prototype supersonic transportation aircraft. In and of themselves the two prototype models would not give rise to environmental problems provided appropriate precautions are taken with regard to their test flights.

2. The final decision with respect to the production of further supersonics will depend on a number of factors, including economic and foreign policy aspects, as well as environmental considerations. The Administration's program has carefully separated prototype development from possible future commercial production. I would hope that before the time that a decision must be made with regard to production, we will be in a position to assess correctly the environmental costs of full-scale production and operation. In the decision to proceed with prototype development, it has been implicit that a decision to proceed with commercial production would not be made in the absence of a satisfactory resolution of environmental problems.

3. The U.S. Government, together with a few other nations, has taken the environmental lead throughout the world in prohibiting supersonic flights over any land area of the United States. The proposed rules issued by the Federal Aviation Administration governing overland flights effectively forbid flights at speeds which would produce a detectable boom at the ground.

4. The environmental problems I will discuss are of concern not only to the United States but also to those nations that are proceeding with the development of supersonic transports, to those nations whose airlines might fly a supersonic transport and indeed to all nations of the world. I will return to this point.

At present the most significant unresolved environmental problem I see for the supersonic transport is the high level of noise in the vicinity of airports. Because of its relatively steep degree of climb, the SST will actually create less community noise in the direction of its flight path than present subsonic jet aircraft. The SST also generates

less noise on approach. However, the current design of the U.S. supersonic transport and of the Concorde leads to a noise field radiated perpendicular to the runway, called "sideline noise," that is substantially greater than that of the conventional subsonic jets. In terms of the measures used by the Federal Aviation Administration to assess annoyance, the SST would be three to four times louder than current FAA sideline noise standards and four to five times louder than the 747. In terms of noise pressure, the sideline noise level would also be substantially higher than that of subsonic jets meeting the FAA requirements.

I doubt that communities adjacent to our large international airports will accept this added noise burden if it should extend beyond airport boundaries—a circumstance which seems likely in the case of most existing airport facilities. This is a view that I believe is shared by a majority of those responsible for the operation of airports. Furthermore, the discomfort and hazard to those actually on the airport site—both passengers and service personnel—will require careful attention.

It has been suggested that the sideline noise problem can be solved by:

1. technical improvements to the airplane.
2. confining noise to the airport.
3. converting communities near airports into industrial or commercial areas.
4. developing new airports.

With regard to technical improvements, it is doubtful that current technology can produce the required lowering of noise levels and still carry a viable payload. If indeed new technology is to be the solution of the future, then there should be greater emphasis on research and development of a quieter engine.

As to the other possible solutions, I do not think it is practicable to confine the noise projected by the SST to the airport. Most airports were designed many years ago and were not built in such a way as to minimize the effects of sideline noise. Redevelopment of areas near airports would require an investment on the order of billions of dollars; it seems unrealistic to assume that the country would undertake investment of such magnitude simply to provide for the supersonic transport. Doubtless, some new airports must be constructed to facilitate the traffic volume forecast by 1980. Adequate land planning in such cases could mitigate sideline noise. At the same time, we believe it important to establish now and maintain the principle that the noise environment in the vicinity of all our airports is not to be degraded in any way. Furthermore, the problem of sideline noise at airports is not just a domestic matter. Other countries are developing supersonic transports with comparable high sideline noise characteristics and they will, without question, wish to use our airports. Further, noise problems at international airports abroad will be as severe as our own.

I now turn to a potential problem which has not received the attention it deserves. The supersonic transport will fly at an altitude between 60,000 to 70,000 feet. It will place into this part of the atmosphere large quantities of water, carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter. This part of the atmosphere is to a substantial extent isolated from the rest of the atmosphere. For example, on the average, 18 months are required for a water molecule introduced into the atmosphere at 65,000 feet to find its way to the lower atmosphere. A fleet of 500 American SST's and Concorde flying in this region of the atmosphere could, over a period of years, increase the water content by as much as 50 to 100 percent. This could be very significant because observations indicate that the water vapor content of the stratosphere has already increased about 50 percent over the last five years due presum-

ably to natural processes, although there is a possibility which should be researched that subsonic jets have been contributing to this increase.

Water in this part of the atmosphere can have two effects of practical significance. First, it would affect the balance of heat in the entire atmosphere leading to a warmer average surface temperature. Calculations on the magnitude of this increased temperature are most uncertain but probably it would be on the order of 2 to 3° F. Secondly, water vapor would react so as to destroy some fraction of the ozone that is resident in this part of the atmosphere. The practical consequences of such a destruction could be that the shielding capacity of the atmosphere to penetrating and potentially highly dangerous ultraviolet radiation is decreased. As in the case of surface temperature, we do not have adequate knowledge on which to make secure judgments as to the practical significance of the effect of water on the ozone. Finally, the increased water content coupled with the natural increase could lead in a few years to a sun shielding cloud cover with serious consequences on climate.

Clearly the effects of supersonics on the atmosphere are of importance to the whole world. Any attempt to predict those effects is necessarily highly speculative at this time. The effects should be thoroughly understood before any country proceeds with a massive introduction of supersonic transports.

There are other potential adverse environmental consequences of supersonics; for example, the effect of sonic booms over water on ship crews and passengers and on nesting birds on isolated islands. However, I will not discuss these as I have tried to confine my remarks to what I consider the two most important issues—namely, noise in and around airports and atmospheric effects.

In view of the known and potential environmental impacts of the operation of a fleet of supersonic transports, I make three specific, positive proposals for environmental protection at this time.

1. The guidelines with respect to noise certification of the supersonic civilian transport should assure that the noise environment in the vicinity of airports at the time of the introduction of supersonics will not be degraded in any way. As technology advances, permitted noise levels should be reduced and these reductions likewise applied to the supersonic transport.

2. We should increase substantially the level of investment in research on the environmental problems associated with the SST. Our knowledge about the environmental effects of the supersonic is clearly inadequate. Far greater emphasis should be devoted to research and development programs leading to an engine having a substantially reduced noise level. Further, an integrated research should be undertaken as to the effects of the chemical constituents introduced by the supersonic transport into high altitudes. Such a research program should include not only determining current changes in this part of the atmosphere but projected changes resulting from supersonic transport operations.

3. The United States should take the initiative in discussing present and potential environmental problems of SST operations with other nations. Discussions should certainly take place among those countries currently developing supersonic transports. Further, the whole issue of the supersonic transport and its environmental consequences should be considered for the agenda of the United Nations conference on the environment to be held in 1972.

This Administration endorses my first proposal and regulations to this effect will be issued. I have discussed the second and third proposals within this Administration and can report very definite agreement in principle. However, the shortness of time has

simply made it impossible, in view of budgetary and related considerations, to obtain final, formal clearance.

In assessing the feasibility of SST operations we should accept the likelihood that other nations will come to be as concerned about the environmental consequences as we are, and that there will be a "domino effect" from our own environmental protections. Our prohibition against sonic boom over U.S. territory and our concern about airport noise, for example, will surely be echoed abroad. I think it essential that the SST not be considered simply as a domestic issue. By its very nature, its implications are worldwide in scope, and it is important that we approach the matter as an international concern. Those of us who possess the capacity for developing and introducing new technologies into the world have a very special responsibility for insuring in advance that such technologies do not, on balance, create serious long-term environmental emergencies for the world as a whole.

All of this is to say, as I mentioned at the outset, that we are entering an age when there is a determination that the impact of new technology on the environment be examined closely. We will continue to keep the environmental aspects of SST development under review and I know that the Departments share our concern that degradation of the environment must be avoided.

I repeat that the current program is for prototype development only. The Administration remains committed to the view that commercial development of the SST will not be undertaken unless and until the significant environmental problems and uncertainties are satisfactorily resolved.

STATEMENT OF JAMES M. BEGGS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee: I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the program for the development of a supersonic transport.

First, I would like to describe briefly the nature of the SST program and its progress. The objective of the program is to develop a supersonic airliner which is safe for the passenger, economically sound for the world's airlines, and superior in operating performance to competing supersonic aircraft.

The SST is designed to be the fastest commercial airplane flying during the next two decades. It will fly above 60,000 feet, carry about 300 passengers, have a range of over 4,000 miles, cruise at 1,780 miles per hour, three times the speed of today's jets, and be equipped by the most powerful engines ever built. It will be designed for utmost passenger comfort and will be equipped with the most modern safety features.

The SST program will require a very sizeable investment, from both the public and private sectors. The Federal investment, however, is designed to be self-liquidating, with royalties on production sales set at a figure that provides for the return of the full prototype investment with the sale of the 300th airplane. The manufacturers and the airlines are sharing in the costs of the program under an arrangement which provides an incentive for diligent pursuit of program objectives.

The SST program has been subjected to careful evaluation at each critical point of its development. The program was given a particularly intensive review last year, both by the new Administration and the Congress. The Administration's review culminated in a decision by President Nixon last September to proceed with the program. The Congress approved this decision in December by appropriating the funds necessary to continue the program.

The Committee has asked the Department to discuss the public costs and benefits of the Federal investment in the development of a supersonic transport. I should note at the

outset that this type of program is not susceptible to a traditional quantitative benefit/cost analysis. The many intangible factors involved simply defy quantification. Nonetheless, the benefits and costs of the program have received careful scrutiny and a great deal of effort has been devoted to weighing and balancing the various elements involved. I doubt that any Federal investment has ever been subjected to more extensive and intensive analysis.

While I cannot quantify all of the costs and benefits of the program for the Committee, I can review the considerations involved in the President's decision to proceed. The President referred to two of these when he announced his decision: first, the future of American leadership in air transportation; and, second, the opportunity to make a massive stride forward in transportation art.

For many years the United States has dominated the free-world aircraft market. More than 80 percent of the total commercial fleet was built in this country. If we do not choose to compete for the market for the supersonic family of aircraft, we stand to lose the preeminence we have enjoyed in this field and the accompanying economic and political benefits.

This preeminence, of course, is not the only factor. Also involved are the impact of changes in the health of our aircraft industry on persons who work in the industry, the importance of maintaining a high level of competence in this area of technology, and the effect on our balance of payments.

With respect to the balance of payments issue, there are uncertainties in any assessment of the over-all impact of the SST. In terms of aircraft imports and exports, however, the picture is relatively clear. Of the 500 U.S. SST sales now projected, we estimate that 270 would be to foreign carriers. The sale of these aircraft and spare parts abroad would produce \$11.5 billion in export revenues over a 13-year period. In the same period, we estimate the U.S. airlines would buy about 60 Concorde at a total cost of \$1.4 billion, for a favorable net balance of \$10.1 billion.

Without a U.S. SST in being or on the way, U.S. carriers, for competitive reasons, would import about 300 Concorde by 1990, at a cost of 7 billion U.S. dollars flowing out of the country. Offsetting that flow to some degree would be exports of about \$1.3 billion in additional subsonic jets that could be sold if a U.S. SST were not available. The difference, combined with the \$10.1 billion in gold flow that would otherwise be earned through the sale of U.S. SST's overseas adds up to a possible net loss of \$15.8 billion for the United States.

On the issue of employment, we estimate that the production program will result in the direct employment of 50,000 persons. The work will be spread throughout the country, touching most of the 50 states. Because it is difficult to predict what the labor needs will be throughout the production stage—both in the technical and unskilled areas—the extent of the benefit attributable to the employment factor is indeterminable. On balance, however, it is a plus factor.

On the technological side, the SST program provides a seed-bed for the application of advanced technology. The SST program has already been responsible, for example, for advances in titanium fabrication techniques applicable to other sectors of our industrial society.

Another significant, but intangible factor to be considered is that of enabling travelers to move between distant points at supersonic speeds. Man has always sought ways to speed up communication, and the fact is that the supersonic transport is the next step in that process, whether the United States builds it or not. And this is not simply a case of providing an added convenience or commercial benefit to be realized by a selected group of

individuals—it concerns the impact that another step in the shrinking of the globe has on the outlook of man and his way of life. The United States SST presents an opportunity to make a giant stride in this regard.

In the environmental field, noise and sonic boom present the greatest difficulty. Both are being vigorously attacked along technological as well as regulatory lines. We believe the environmental consequences of the SST in these areas can be minimized.

I know of no major technical program where the environmental issues have been given more consideration than the SST program. Government studies of environmental effects over the last several years have significantly influenced the design of the SST. Smokeless engines, work on improved noise suppression devices, and the incorporation of a fixed horizontal stabilizer to provide high lift performance for community noise reduction are but a few examples of this design influence. Results of sonic boom studies have provided the basis for the current FAA rule-making action providing for the prohibition of boom-producing supersonic flight over populated areas.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, an extensive evaluation of the costs and benefits of the SST has been made. Many of the elements involved, however, cannot be assigned a monetary value because of their intangible nature. Therefore, in the final analysis, the decision to proceed with the SST program had to rest on a combination of informed judgments, technical evaluations and economic studies. In our view, the President and the Congress exercised sound judgment and the public interest has been served thereby.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my prepared statement. Now I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

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 largest producer of fresh poultry in the world. In 1966 the United States produced 3,445,000 metric tons of poultry. This is five times more than produced by France, the second ranked nation.

WALTER REUTHER

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has lost another great citizen with the tragic death of Walter Reuther. He was a man of passion and compassion. He fought so hard for the principles in which he believed, and he maintained leadership of a great union because he served his members well. Yet he was not all fire and ice. In his depth of kindness to others, he maintained constant interest in a project that he sought to visit when his plane crashed. All of us who knew his interest in the Black Lake, Mich., adult education and recreation center were aware that Walter Reuther had rejected proposals that it be named for him. We note with approval that the

United Auto Workers will now honor him as he would not permit while he lived.

I, for three decades, cherished the friendship of Walter Reuther. He was a man of honor and of high principles. He brought vigor and energy to the causes he supported, but he also brought intelligence and wisdom to the problems of those causes. Many of us mourned years ago when he was gunned down, yet he rallied his strength to reject that incident as a barrier to his efforts.

His idealism remained a banner to rally all good men as he continued his useful life. That banner still flies high after his death.

Mr. Speaker, I also expressed my sentiments about Walter Reuther in a telegram I sent to Victor G. Reuther, who invited me to attend the memorial services for Walter Reuther on May 18 in Detroit:

You will please accept my deepest thanks for your invitation to attend memorial services for Walter Reuther on Friday, May 15 and my profound regret that circumstances have arisen which prevent my being with you. I have respected and esteemed no man higher than Walter Reuther. He has left an indelible imprint upon his time and age in his leadership of labor and of those who want and have worked for a better country and a better world. He has caused innumerable men, women and children to walk on higher ground, to see new visions of the future and to feel a new sense of inspiration and brotherhood in their hearts. His love of his fellowman and his crusading courage will long move other men to noble deeds and meaningful victories. Walter was my cherished friend for more than three decades and I shall ever honor his memory. Mrs. Pepper joins me in sending deepest sympathy to you and all of his loved ones.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. FLYNT (at the request of Mr. Boggs), for today, 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. HAMMERSCHMIDT) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CONTE, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Texas, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. BOLAND, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ICHORD, for 60 minutes, on May 21.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CONTE to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PEPPER during the consideration of H.R. 14685 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAY and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. WATSON in two instances.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. CONTE in three instances.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. SCHERLE in two instances.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. BROCK.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. RUPPE in two instances.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in three instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. WEICKER.

Mr. BROTZMAN.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. ZWACH.

Mr. MYERS.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in two instances.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. WYDLER in two instances.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. ROBISON in two instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALEXANDER in two instances.

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.

Mr. SCHEUER in two instances.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. FISHER in three instances.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. FASCELL in two instances.

Mr. UDALL in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. EILBERG in three instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. ABBITT.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. RARICK in five instances.

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia.

Mr. MEEDS.

Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances.

Mr. KARTH in two instances.

Mr. HANNA in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. DULSKI in eight instances.
 Mr. FUQUA.
 Mr. NEDZI in two instances.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.
 Mr. RYAN in four instances.
 Mr. STEPHENS in two instances.
 Mr. STRATTON.
 Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.
 Mr. HICKS in two instances.
 Mr. ROONEY of New York.
 Mr. MINISH.
 Mr. SYMINGTON.
 Mr. PICKLE in three instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2208. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a national lakeshore on Lake Tahoe in the States of Nevada and California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. 3011. An act to establish a revolving fund for the development of housing for low- and moderate-income persons and families in the District of Columbia, to provide for the disposition of unclaimed property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 1232. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 856. An act to provide for Federal Government recognition of and participation in international expositions proposed to be held in the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 2999. An act to authorize, in the District of Columbia, the gift of all or part of a human body after death for specified purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) under its previous order the House adjourned until Monday, May 18, 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:

2058. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative and Public Affairs,

Agency for International Development, Department of State, transmitting a report on the programing and obligation of contingency funds for the third quarter of fiscal year 1970, pursuant to the provisions of section 451(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2059. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of proposed extensions of two concession contracts for the provision of concession facilities and services for the public in Grand Canyon (North Rim), Zion, and Bryce Canyon National Parks, and Cedar Breaks National Monument, during 1970, pursuant to the provisions of 87 Stat. 271, as amended (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2060. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on action being taken by the Department of Defense to achieve closer adherence to established policy for providing household furniture in the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OELLER: Committee of Conference. Conference report on S. 952 (Rept. No. 91-1086). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 520. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of House Report 91-610, 91st Congress, first session, entitled "Report of Special Study Mission to Southern Africa" for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 91-1087). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 537. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document the tributes of the Members of Congress to the service of Chief Justice Earl Warren (Rept. No. 91-1088). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 578. Concurrent resolution authorizing the reprinting of a "Compilation of Works of Art and Other Objects in the U.S. Capitol," as a House document, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1089). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 580. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Select Committee on Crime (Rept. No. 91-1090). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 584. Concurrent resolution relative to printing as a House document a history of the Committee on Agriculture (Rept. No. 91-1091). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 585. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain printing for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs (Rept. No. 91-1092). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DENT: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 1006. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of hearings entitled "Investigation of Students for a Democratic Society, part 7-A (Return of Prisoners of War, and Data Concerning Camera News, Inc., 'Newsreel') (Rept. No. 91-1093). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 1232. Joint resolution making further continuing ap-

propriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1094). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 17619. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1095). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 17550. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide increases in benefits, to improve computation methods and to raise the earnings base under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to make improvements in the medicare, medical, and maternal and child health programs with emphasis upon improvements in the operating effectiveness of such programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1096). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of title XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:
 H.R. 17619. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. GROVER, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SCHWENGL, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. ZION, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 17620. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1974 through 1976 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):
 H.R. 17621. A bill to modify the boundaries of the Coeur d'Alene, Nezperce, Payette, Boise, Sawtooth, and Targhee National Forests in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:
 H.R. 17622. A bill to provide for annual reports concerning price increases in Government contracts and failures to meet contract completion dates; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 17623. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for continuance of civil service retirement disability annuity in all cases in which the annuitant is not 100-percent recovered from his disability, irrespective of the earning capacity or income of the annuitant; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BERRY:
 H.R. 17624. A bill to provide (1) that the United States shall pay the actual cost of certain services contracted for Indians in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, Idaho, and Wisconsin; and (2) for a more equitable apportionment between such States and the Federal Government of the cost of providing aid and assistance under the Social Security Act to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND (for himself and Mr. CONTE):
 H.R. 17625. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and of foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DULSKI:
 H.R. 17626. 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.

H.R. 17627. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.R. 17628. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDADE (for himself, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. DENT, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 17629. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, relating to the control and extinguishment of outcrop and underground fires in coal formations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 17630. A bill to prohibit any National Guard unit from being assigned civil disturbance duty unless there is a prior finding that such disturbance requires its presence and that such unit is appropriately trained for such duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 17631. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SEBELIUS (for himself, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. MIZE, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.R. 17632. A bill to provide for the designation of certain highways as part of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. HOGAN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MELCHER, and Mr. ROE):

H.R. 17633. A bill to encourage States to establish abandoned automobile removal programs and to provide for tax incentives for automobile scrap processing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 17634. A bill to amend title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that programs and projects assisted thereunder be for the benefit of children from low-income families; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 17635. A bill, to define the authority of the President of the United States to intervene abroad or to make war without the express consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. O'KONSKI):

H.R. 17636. 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. FUQUA:

H.R. 17637. A bill to amend the peanut marketing quota provisions to make permanent certain provisions thereunder and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 17638. 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. OLSEN:

H.R. 17639. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to permit cer-

tain individuals retiring thereunder to receive their annuities while serving as an elected public official; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself and Mr. OLSEN):

H.R. 17640. 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 (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. REES, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. POWELL):

H.R. 17641. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to authorize assistance for States and public and non-profit private agencies for the establishment of narcotic addict rehabilitation, research, and maintenance centers in community mental health centers and other licensed facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 17642. 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. RARICK:

H.R. 17643. A bill to repeal the Credit Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 17644. A bill to provide floor stock refunds in the case of cement mixers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 17645. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize educational assistance and home loan benefits to wives of members of the Armed Forces who are missing in action or prisoners of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 17646. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to extend under certain circumstances the expiration date specified in a power of attorney executed by a member of the Armed Forces who is missing in action or held as a prisoner of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 17647. A bill to prohibit the use of any nuclear weapon in Southeast Asia unless Congress first approves such use; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLD:

H.R. 17648. 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. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1232. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.J. Res. 1233. Joint resolution to create a temporary Joint Congressional Committee to investigate and report to Congress on the shooting of students at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, by members of the Ohio National Guard; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.J. Res. 1234. Joint resolution designating July 12, 1970, as "Salute to Armed Forces in Vietnam Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.J. Res. 1235. Joint resolution to restrict certain defense expenditures for fiscal year 1971 without a declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. COWGER):

H. Con. Res. 614. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the question of the maintenance of the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia and the human rights of the Cambodian people be referred to the Security Council of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H. Con. Res. 615. Concurrent resolution for peace in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. KARTH, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. REES, and Mr. WALDIE):

H. Con. Res. 616. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on Friday, May 22, 1970; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 617. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on Friday, May 22, 1970; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H. Con. Res. 618. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on Friday, May 22, 1970; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MINISH:

H. Res. 1011. Resolution relative to the use of funds in the fiscal year 1971 for troops in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PODELL (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. REES, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. POWELL):

H. Res. 1012. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the establishment of an international consortium under the auspices of the United Nations for the purpose of controlling illicit traffic in certain drugs and limiting the market supply of such drugs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. NIX, Mr. POWELL, and Mr. ROGERS of Colorado):

H. Res. 1013. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. ROE, and Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey):

H. Res. 1014. Resolution to stop funds for war in Cambodia, Laos, and to limit funds for war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. Res. 1015. Resolution to stop funds for war in Cambodia, Laos, and to limit funds for war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 1016. Resolution to stop funds for war in Cambodia, Laos, and to limit funds for war in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. Res. 1017. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H. Res. 1018. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey:

H. Res. 1019. Resolution for the safe and orderly withdrawal of American combat troops from South Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEGLE (for himself, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. CELLER):

H. Res. 1020. Resolution to set an expenditure limitation on the American military effort in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 17649. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mascaro and Giuseppa Mascaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 17650. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. O'Connor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 17651. A bill for the relief of Emile Georges Cochand and Marjorie Almo Cochand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 17652. A bill for the relief of Luz Maria Cruz Aleman Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

381. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve the reciprocal immunities of tax exemption, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

480. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Pittsburgh County Choctaw Council, McAlester, Okla., relative to repeal of the Choctaw Termination Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

481. Also, petition of the 22d Saipan Legislature, Saipan, Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to reintegration of the Marianas District with the U.S. territory of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

KNOW THE SEA

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 14, 1970

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Rear Adm. O. D. Waters, Jr., Oceanographer of the Navy, delivered the keynote address Tuesday, May 12, at the opening of the U.S. Navy Symposium on Military Oceanography, held this year at the U.S. Naval Academy with the Naval Ship Research and Development Laboratory as host.

A year ago, it will be recalled, the annual symposium was held at the Seattle Center Playhouse, Seattle, with the Applied Physics Laboratory of the University of Washington as host. Admiral Waters also keynoted that symposium.

The admiral's address this year at Annapolis discussed in some detail budget cuts in naval oceanography which have resulted in programs being curtailed or slowed down, abandonment of new starts and retardation of coastal and deep ocean surveys.

On the other hand certain important technological improvements were noted and there have been major advances in forecasting services and increased emphasis on Arctic and Mediterranean requirements.

Mr. President, Admiral Waters has presented a factual, up-to-the-minute account of the status of naval oceanography which will, I am sure, interest all of us.

I ask unanimous consent that his keynote address before the U.S. Navy Symposium on Military Oceanography be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOW THE SEA TO CONTROL THE SEA
(By Rear Adm. O. D. Waters, Jr.)

Mr. Chairman, Gentlemen: Last year at our Symposium in Seattle I promised you some beautiful spring weather for our meeting here in Annapolis and you can see that I delivered.

These predictions of course should be simple for me when I have able meteorologists on my staff to advise me. Actually however, for this long range stuff I depend mostly on the Farmers Almanac.

Once more I want to thank all of you who took time to research and prepare the papers to be delivered here and to all of you who

have traveled here to listen and learn and to take part in the discussions.

At this point I want to express my appreciation to Mr. H. V. Nutt, the General Chairman, and members of his staff from our host organization, the Naval Ship Research and Development Laboratory, and to Admiral James Calvert for making the fine facilities of the Naval Academy available to us.

As you know the stress this year is on the immediate problems of our Fleet operators and what oceanography can do to help solve them.

Fortunately, as sponsor of this 7th Annual Symposium, all I was asked to do was give a short keynote address. Keynote I take to mean a few words about the purpose of the meeting, and some optimistic generalities about past accomplishments and future prospects.

I don't intend however to do either.

What we have done in the past and are doing now is known to you and I suppose we must be doing something right or we wouldn't still be here.

As to the future I cannot speak with the optimism that I felt a short year ago.

The war we are fighting on two fronts—the bitter military battle abroad and the frustrating combination of poverty, pollution and inflation at home—has served to put us in a holding pattern in many areas.

I have no doubt that we will eventually solve our problems and win our wars, but meanwhile the keynote for the government is economy. Major budget cuts are being taken by the Defense Department and Oceanography has to take its share. This means that many new starts had to be abandoned, survey ships laid up and many programs that were near to fruition have had to be curtailed or slowed down.

I am going to say just a few words about some of those programs—for we seek to protect those most vital to the Fleet—and then I will let the experts take over.

First let me explain for the benefit of some of you new to the field, that Naval Oceanography spans a very broad range of effort—perhaps described best by our three major management categories of Ocean Science; Ocean Engineering and Development; and Oceanographic Operations, which includes our Environmental Prediction Services. All of these areas are represented on the agenda here, and many of the symposium subjects of course include more than one category.

I want to give the status of some of the highlight programs—efforts which we consider of major importance to the Fleet. Programs that we have worked on for a long time, programs where in some cases we are on the brink of significant accomplishments on the verge of putting the results at your disposal.

In the matter of surveys. We have reached what is known to the trade as Indian Springs Low Water in our capabilities for both coastal hydrographic surveys and deep sea oceanographic surveys, as the last of our military manned survey ships have been stricken this

fiscal year. We have four MSTs manned replacements being delivered in the next 14 months, but until they are well shaken down we will be pursuing only very limited coastal surveys, primarily off South Korea.

The next big increase in capability will have to await the completion of development of our high speed coastal survey system which promises to enhance such operations by a factor of 6 or more. We need it—JSOP requirements translate into hundreds of ship years of effort. ASW/USW surveys in support of the SQS-26 and BQQ-2 sonars will be intermittent. We will give full support to Project CAESAR, to insure timely data in support of that project, but as things now stand we will have few resources to apply against other oceanographic survey requirements.

We will continue our Polaris/Poseidon support at a steady level, although that level is not adequate to the need. We hope to obtain funds by FY-72 at the latest for the conversion of an additional survey platform which will help immensely in later years. We have contracted with the Coast and Geodetic Survey for about ten ship-months of effort this year, which has relieved the pressure, but next year's funding does not allow this option. Even to generate the contract funds this year we had to give up one of our two aging gravity survey ships.

We have also lost one of our two magnetic survey aircraft, and until fiscal year 1972 when a P-3 type aircraft is shaken down and replaces the remaining plane, we will be curtailing our magnetic surveys supporting ASW and nautical charting.

Many of you have heard that we have laid up relatively new ships, and indeed we do have three small ones in reduced readiness status at MSTs in Brooklyn. We will not be able to reactivate the ships very soon for their original purpose, but we are seeking to place them where the Navy, and if possible our oceanographic programs will benefit from them. We hope to see one operating directly for the Naval Undersea Research and Development Center, San Diego, supporting all that laboratory's projects, while others may go to universities if their operation can be funded by the National Science Foundation, or perhaps to our allies, where we will reap the benefit of the research they support, and perhaps be able to execute joint projects with them.

These have been the operational areas impacted. Let me speak briefly of R&D. Our efforts centering on Deep Submergence have noted milestones, but many have also undergone significant modification. Our man in the sea effort, for example, is no longer habitat oriented, but rather is being conducted as a cautious, three phase project utilizing a Mark II Deep Dive System. The modified project will achieve virtually all the original objectives, however. We do not intend to refurbish the habitat until we launch our extended depth Man in the Sea project, probably in 1973.