"Only the President—and a President who has the respectful attention of virtually all of the American people can do it.

"This should not paralyze protest. It should not inhibit criticism. But it should persuade us to credit the President for the good he is doing and make our criticism aimed at those Presidential policies with which we disagree—never at the President, his character or his motives."

JOE FISER AND "PROJECT THANK YOU"

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, throughout the history of this great country it has been individuals through their own initiative, integrity, and love of God, country and fellow man, who have come up with just the right action to put difficult situations in the right prospective.

While it is the demonstrators who burn and destroy who get the maximum coverage in the news media, there are those who are quietly promoting patriotism and support for our forces serving in foreign lands. They go, without fanfare, about the business of displaying loyalty to this country and what she is trying to do in a difficult world.

Such an individual is a constituent of mine, who, in my judgment, is going beyond the call of duty to promote harmony among all citizens and to encourage support for our country and her undertakings. That individual is Joe Fiser of Springfield, Tenn. I a confident that what Mr. Fiser is doing in Springfield is being done in hundreds of communities around the country and I believe they deserve all the recognition we can muster. And while I am not advocating that his way is the way that every single American should show his appreciation for this great land, I do say that his way makes me proud that he is a fellow Tennessean.

Joe Fiser is a rural mail carrier who just a little more than a year ago opened a restaurant in Springfield. Until recently he was content to give away American flags and to talk for Americans. Then through a 16-hour broadcast over Radio Station WLAC in Nashville, Tenn., he became interested in "Project Thank You." In this regard WLAC Radio should be commended for its participation in this project.

"Project Thank You" is an undertaking of the Christian Reformed Laymen's League of Grand Rapids, Mich. The membership of this league volunteers its time and efforts in working with radio stations to produce marathon broadcasts in support of the project. Money raised in these broadcasts is used by members of the Christians Reformed Laymen's League to purchase the eight most needed items for troops in the field.

While Joe Fiser has been in the restaurant business only a short time, he wanted to do something to help "Project Thank You." To show his support for our troops he pledged 1 day's receipts to the project. The day he set aside for this contribution there were cash sales of $706.41 and donations of $309.90, so that he raised a total of $1,016.31, enough for the purchase of about 1,500 "Thank You" packets. It was the largest single donation ever made to the project.

But that is just one of Joe Fiser's activities.

Prior to that effort he had given away about 60 American flags in drawings. He contributed two flagpoles to churches for use in front of the buildings. He gave another flagpole to a mother whose son was killed while he was piloting a jet. He has given away more than 3,000 American flag lapel pins.

Inside his restaurant is a 6-foot-wide reproduction of "The Star-Spangled Banner," on which three spotlights are focused 24 hours a day.

What Joe Fiser is doing was brought to my attention by his neighbors and officials of radio WLAC. I know that my colleagues will want to join me in congratulating Mr. Fiser, extend to him our warmest thanks for a job well done, and to encourage him to continue in his efforts.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JAVITS TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) tomorrow, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. 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 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 1970, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 15, 1970:

U.S. ATTORNEY

George Beall, of Maryland, to be United States Attorney for the District of Maryland for the term of four years vice Stephen M. Sachs, resigning.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1970:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Elliot L. Richardson, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Edward F. Zigler, of Connecticut, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Samuel R. Pierce, Jr., of New York, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, June 15, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain, that men may go into the gates of the nobles.—Isaiah 13: 2.

Oh God of Truth and Love, we come to Thee this day as we unfurl the starry banner of our life as a nation and celebrate its birth. Floating high in the air may it ever speak to men of liberty and justice, of peace and good will. Wherever it goes, whenever it is seen, may it bring hope to the oppressed, freedom to those in bondage, and light to all who sit in darkness.

Under this banner and by Thy grace may we keep moving forward toward the goal of a free world at peace, with liberty and justice for all. To the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 11, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

On June 12, 1970:

H.R. 4813. An act to extend the provisions of the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11628. An act to transfer from the Architect of the Capitol to the Librarian of Congress the authority to purchase office equipment and furniture for the Library of Congress;

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

H.J. Res. 1069. Joint resolution extending for 4 years the existing authority for the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Mary McLeod Bethune.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 2012. An act to amend the Act of October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 1205), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a tract of land to Lillian I. Anderson;

H.R. 9854. An act to authorize the Secre-

tary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the East Greenacres unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12860. An act to establish the Ford's Theatre National Historical Site, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 12858) entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain funds awarded to the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska by a judgment entered by the Court of Claims against the United States," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. FANNIN, and Mr. STEVENS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

S. 710. An act to designate the Mount Baldy Wilderness, the Pine Mountain Wilderness, and the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness with certain national forests in the State of Arizona; and

S. 3889. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for two years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of April 29, 1970, the Chair declares the House in recess for the purpose of observing and commemorating Flag Day.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

FLAG DAY

During the recess the following proceedings took place in honor of the United States flag, the Speaker of the House of Representatives presiding:

FLAG DAY PROGRAM, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 15, 1970

The United States Naval Air Training Command Band and Choir entered the door to the left of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them.

The honored guests, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, entered the door to the right of the Speaker and took the positions assigned to them.

The Naval Air Training Command Choir, directed by Lieutenant James E. Lois, USNR, presented *America the Beautiful.*

The Doorkeeper (Honorable William M. Miller) announced *The Flag of the United States.*

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The Naval Air Training Command Band, directed by Mr. Art Symington, played *The Stars and Stripes Forever.*

The Flag was carried into the Chamber by Colorbearer and a Guard from each of the branches of the Armed Forces: Sergeant Michael R. Siedler, USA, NCO in Charge; Corporal Dennis Sweigart, USMC; SA James Branchick, USN; SA Michael Mathis, Coast Guard; Sergeant John McCandless, USAF.

The Color Guard saluted the Speaker, faced about, and saluted the House.

The Flag was posted and the Members were seated.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) will now lead the Members and our guests in the *Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.*

The Honorable DURWARD HALL led the Members and guests in the *Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.*

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to express my appreciation to the other members of your Flag Day Committee, the Honorable BILL NICHOLS, of Alabama; the Honorable DURWARD HALL, of Missouri; and the Honorable RICHARD ROUDEBUSH, of Indiana for their hard work and dedicated efforts.

The Naval Air Training Command Pageant of Flags, from Pensacola, Florida, will now be presented with narration by Lieutenant J. W. Dickson.

The Naval Air Training Command Pageant of Flags was presented, with narration by Lieutenant J. W. Dickson, as follows:

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. The year 1495. Flying the Portuguese flag, Amerigo Vespucci, following the trail blazed by Columbus, proclaimed the discovery of a new world, European mapmakers gave the new continents Vespucci's name—"Amerigo" or America.

Music. Portuguese hymn.

FLAG BEARER. Step off on music.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. In 1513, Juan Ponce de Leon, under the Castillian colors, landed in Florida and claimed that land for Ferdinand V of Spain.

Music: Royal March of Spain.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. In 1534, the French made their move. Flying the ancient fleur-de-lis banner, sturdy Jacques Cartier of France sailed into the Gulf of St. Lawrence and claimed half a continent for Francis I.

Music: French Patriotic Song.

FLAG BEARER. Step off and take position on stage with French flag.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. In the next century Spain and France solidified and strengthened their claims in the new world as English settlers raised their flag over colonies founded at Jamestown in 1607.

Music: Grenadiers.

FLAG BEARER. Step off on music and take position on stage with British flag.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. In 1609, Henry Hudson sailed into what is now New York Harbor with the red, white and blue banner of the Netherlands flying from the mainmast.

Music: Mien Neerlandish Bloed.

FLAG BEARER. Step off on music and take position on stage with Dutch flag.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. In 1628, Peter Minuit organized the New Sweden Company and ten years later, founded a Swedish settlement on the Delaware River within the present limits of Wilmington, Delaware. Minuit's historic banner, a gold cross on a blue shield, still remains the national colors of Sweden.

Music: Our Swedish Feeling.

FLAG BEARER. Step off on music and take place on stage with the colors of Sweden.

Music: (Up and out) (lower flags, (6), pause).

Music: Stars and Stripes.

NARRATOR. From the day we became a nation, back in 1776, the American flag, as a part of our American tradition, has been a symbol of everything great in our country and ever citizen should know its history.

The flags of many nations form a part of our own flag story, but of all of them, the British ensign (cue for British flag bearer to step forward) was to play the most important role in the early evolution of our national flag. A flag of honor, truth, and virtue, the design of the Union Jack was then based on the red cross of St. George on a white field, and the white cross of St. Andrew on a blue field. From this, to our present flag of 50 stars and 13 stripes of red and white, the flags that have represented the United States of America throughout our history have all played an important part in the tradition, the honor and prestige which are America's today.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. The date 1775.

Music: "Girl I Left Behind Me."

NARRATOR. In 1775, the Bunker Hill flag was one of the first to include the pine tree emblem. It was carried by the American colonial troops who opposed the British regulars at the battle of Bunker Hill, June 17, 1775. (Pine tree flag bearer steps off.) Later, a white flag, with a green pine tree and the inscription "An Appeal to Heaven" became familiar on the seas as the Navy ensign, of cruisers commissioned by George Washington.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. The date 1776.

Music. "Yankee Doodle Dandy."

Uniform. Step off on music and take position on stage.

NARRATOR. As the day of America's revolution drew near, there appeared flags of defiance, flags of cause and purpose, (cue for Rattlesnake flag bearer to step off) of determination and appeal . . . for instance, our Rattlesnake flag. A flag of defiance. "Don't tread on me" it proclaimed to the world, making plain that young America would fight for its freedom. At this time, General Washington adopted our Grand Union flag. This flag, bearing 13 stripes of our 13 states, also bore the British Union Jack to show the origin of our land. The day, July the 4th 1776: on this day, and under this flag, a group of American patriots led by Thomas Jefferson, presented not only to an infant Nation, but to the world, a Declaration of Independence that to this day is known as one of the great compositions of history.

Music. Stars and Stripes.

COLOR BEARER. 13 star flag step off on music.

NARRATOR. June the 14th 1777. The birthday of our modern flag. On this day, we broke tradition with our British forebears and abandoned the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew. Now, a new flag, the stars and stripes, was presented to the young Nation, and to its proud citizens. To many of those who saw this flag for the first time, it was just a beautiful combination of red, of white, and of blue; but to George Washington, and to those patriots who had brought our country through its fight for freedom, it meant much more . . . for . . . the thirteen stripes of red and white were to represent the 13 colonies which were the genesis of our nation's struggle in the cause of liberty. First stripes of red, it indicates honor and valor and certainly the blood that had been spilled in order to gain the victory. The stripes of white were a symbol of purity and purpose. As to the field of blue . . . a heavenly panorama, with the 13 stars, to show a new constellation in the nations of the world, and an appeal to Almighty God to guide and protect the United States of America.

This is why June the 14th 1777, the birth date of our Stars and Stripes is a treasured American heritage. About the time General Washington sent his flag aloft, America's first fleet rode at anchor in the Delaware.

(John Paul Jones enter) as Commodore Esek Hopkins came aboard the flagship "Alfred", an ambitious unknown named John Paul Jones hoisted this "flag of America" to the roar of guns and the cheers of spectators. Later, on the Bon Homme Richard, Captain Jones awarded a rich heritage to our great navy which was to follow, by his immortal words in the heat of battle, "I have not yet begun to fight".

Music: Up and cut, Stars and Stripes.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. The year 1812.

Music: Columbia the Gem of the Ocean.

Uniform. Step off on music.

NARRATOR. In 1812, "Freedom of the Seas" was our cry for equality among nations. Then it was, "through the rockets red glare, the bombs bursting in air" . . . that an American patriot stood, inspired by pride in his native land. (Cue, flag bearer step off) as this country's flag . . . now bearing 15 stripes and 15 stars, was hoisted swiftly to the top of the mast by the brave defenders of Fort McHenry, Francis Scott Key, wrote the inspiring words of our national anthem.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. The year, 1846.

Music: The Flag of our Union.

Uniform. Step off on music.

NARRATOR. During the war with Mexico, (flag bearer steps off) in defense of American ideals and principles, still another American flag was unfurled. After almost a quarter of a century, in which our flag bore 15 stars and 15 stripes, the leaders of our nation came to realize that there would soon be many more states, so they decreed by law that henceforth, the flag would have only 13 stripes of red and white, and that a star would be added for each new state. And so it was, in the Mexican war that our banner bore 26 stars and 13 stripes.

Music: up and out

Drum roll.

Music: Battle Hymn of the Republic.

Uniform. Confederate and Union enter from opposite sides.

NARRATOR. In 1861, a shadow crossed our nation, and the smoke of battle disclosed another flag. (Enter Confederate and Union flags) the unity of our country was at stake . . . American fought American . . . brother against brother, but in the end, (enter Abraham Lincoln) a tall, lean, God-respecting man, named Abraham Lincoln, reunited our nation under the Stars and Stripes . . . a stronger United States of America . . . destined in Lincoln's words not to perish from this earth.

Music: Battle Hymn of the Republic, up and out.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. The year, 1898.

Music: Battle Cry of Freedom.

Uniform. Step off on music.

NARRATOR. This was an era when westward progress was on the march. A great movement of freedom-loving pioneers (color bearer step off) answered the call of the west. New States came rapidly on the scene and more stars were added to the field of blue 'n our colors. In the Spanish-American war, a handful of dedicated Americans, in defense of the Monroe Doctrine, unfurled an American flag now bearing 45 stars.

Music: Up and out.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. The year, 1917.

Music: Over There.

Uniform. Step off on music.

NARRATOR. For the first time, America was recognized as a world power . . . and for the first time in a war that encompassed the world the new red, white and blue . . . bearing 48 stars . . . (color bearer step off) was carried on the battlefields of the Old World by the defenders of freedom, liberty and justice.

Music: Taps.

NARRATOR. "To a soldier, there is one moment above all others during which the flag assumes supreme meaning. It is when the last volley is stilled and the flag is gently removed and carried to where the mourners stand. A man has given his best to his country . . . and she, in turn, gives back her best acknowledgement . . . her colors."

Music: Taps, up and out.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. Sunday, December 7, 1941.

Music: Guadalcanal March.

Uniform. Step off on music.

NARRATOR. (Color bearer step off) . . . a day of infamy . . . a day that will live in the hearts of Americans for generations to come . . . a day when millions of our citizens rallied round the flag . . . to renew their vows of loyalty. They proclaimed, as the patriots of 1776 proclaimed . . . Woe be to the man who seeks to destroy our freedom.

Music: Up and out.

Drum roll.

NARRATOR. The year, 1970.

Music: God Bless America.

Uniform. Astronaut steps off on music.

NARRATOR. The pioneers of today are much the same as our forefathers, who through their patriotism, courage and love of country founded and developed this great Nation. Our new pioneers under freedom have succeeded in achieving unthought of goals in outer space, and will continue, under our democratic way of life, to explore the unknown. In recent years, two territories have won their right to statehood. July 4, 1959, the forty-ninth star, for Alaska, made obsolete the flag of forty-eight stars, flown since 1912. For the first time in history, the Union was extended to a State outside our continental boundaries. (Color bearer steps off) July 4, 1960, Hawaii added the fiftieth star. This addition created the twenty-seventh national flag in our history.

(Pause.)

The ideals that the flag stands for, were fostered by the experiences of a great people. Everything it stands for was written by their lives. The flag is the embodiment, not of sentiment, but of history, representing the experiences of men and women, the experiences of those who live under the flag.

July 4, 1960, Hawaii added the fiftieth star. This addition created the twenty-seventh national flag in our history. The flag is the embodiment, not of sentiment, but of history, representing the experiences of men and women, the experiences of those who live under the flag. (Pause.) (Fanfare.) The day . . . today . . . the hour, now.

Music: America the Beautiful.

Uniform: George Washington step off, take position in center of stage.

Narrator: As Americans today, we are living in grave and troubled times. But, this is nothing new. We have lived in troubled times before. Perhaps, in the course of the past history, may be the answer to our problems today. So, let us turn back the pages of history for the moment to a cold day at Valley Forge, when our young nation faced a moment of severe trial. A group of patriots approached General George Washington, told him the situation was desperate; and that a strong British attack was expected at any time. They asked him, "What can be done in order to save our Nation and our Cause?" with tears in his eyes, not tears of fear or failure but rather tears of pride, pride for his fellow man and admiration for a struggling Nation George Washington gave his military patriots a simple command. "Put none but Americans on guard tonight."

What General Washington meant was simply this . . . that the salvation of our cause required true men, men willing to stand firm in the face of great odds, men who love this flag and liberty and freedom more than life, men willing to prove it. His words are just as true now as they were in 1776.

Music: Up and out.

Drum roll. Start soft and build through pledge . . .

Draw swords.

Narrator: "May the God we trust as a Nation throw the light of his peace and grace on a flag with its stripes untarnished and with every star in place."

Music: Grand Old Flag.

The Naval Air Training Command Pageant of Flags retired from the Chamber.

[Applause.]

Mr. BROOKS. The Naval Air Training Command Choir, directed by Lieutenant James E. Lois, will now sing, *This Is My Country*.

The Naval Air Training Command Choir, directed by Lieutenant James E. Lois, sang *This Is My Country*.

[Applause.]

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Flag Day 1970, is a day for all Americans to rededicate their energies to the construction of a society in which the democratic values of liberty and freedom may take root and flourish for the benefit of generations to come. It is a day to reaffirm our commitment to the principles we share as a united people. It is a day to reflect upon the meaning of citizenship in a democratic society. And, it is a day to remember and honor the sacrifices that have been made to protect our heritage of equality and justice for all men.

Dedicated to the enhancement of man's more noble aspirations, our democratic political system places the individual first. His needs, his goals, and his growth as a rational being are the paramount concerns of national life.

Our democracy also places a heavy burden on the shoulders of its citizens:

It requires an enlightened and understanding citizenry—dedicated to the ideals and principles which form the basis of our development as a civilization.

It requires a determination on the part of all men to participate fully in every aspect of national life.

And, it requires, above all, that everyone recognize and accept the fundamental dignity of all other men.

The framers of our Constitution recognized this essential point, and they created a government designed to enlarge the role of the individual in our society. They created a government to meet the needs of a free people. And, through an intricate set of checks and balances, they created a limited government—limited to protecting the rights of every man against the efforts of those who would curtail those rights.

As a symbol of the majesty and strength of a great nation and a great people, our flag embodies the American spirit and its commitment to the rights of man.

As this flag unfurls each day throughout our land, may it serve as a striking reminder that we are the proud heirs and trustees of an honored tradition of democracy and freedom.

May it remind us of the courage and determination of the dedicated and resourceful men who sacrificed their lives to defend and strengthen this Nation.

And, may it remind us that all Americans must be willing to assume the burden of responsible citizenship in

working to build a society on the foundation of justice and self-government.

May our flag offer hope, opportunity, and promise to all who value freedom as a way of life. Let it inspire all Americans to be noble of spirit, lofty of purpose, wise in decision and humane in action. Let it fill our hearts with love of country—and let it inspire in us a desire to serve and a desire to protect and defend our liberties and the free institutions of this great Nation.

[Applause.]

Mr. BROOKS. Members and guests will please rise to join with the Naval Air Training Command Choir, accompanied by the Band, in singing *The National Anthem.* Will everyone please remain standing while the Colors are retired from the Chamber?

The Members and guests rose and sang *The National Anthem,* accompanied by the Naval Air Training Command Band and Choir.

The Colors were retired from the Chamber, the Naval Air Training Command Band playing *The National Emblem March.*

The Naval Air Training Command Band and Choir retired from the Chamber.

The honored guests retired from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m., the proceedings in honor of the United States Flag were concluded.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

FLAG DAY

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of your Flag Day Committee, I want to express my deepest appreciation and that of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and on the committee to the young men who performed here today. The Naval Air Training Command Flag Pageant, Choir and Band presented a most stirring tribute to our flag. These young men, all of whom are, or soon will be, marine and naval aviators, are true examples of our Nation's young people.

We are most grateful to them for appearing today. We know that the brilliance of their performance reflects the many hours of hard work that they have dedicated to the presentation. These hours are in addition to their already busy and arduous training schedule.

While the program they presented was inspirational, the greatest inspiration was that which we feel when we consider that these young men are the future of our country.

The list of officers and men who took part in the program today are as follows:

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Lt. James Lois, Lt. W. W. Dickson, Lt. J. B. Hogan, Mr. A. L. Symington, Mr. W. D. Barrineau.

Ens. E. M. Bigers, Ens. J. E. Moln, Ens. G. E. Herman, Ens. J. D. Beard, Ens. R. V. Assen, Ens. N. C. Miller, Ens. C. R. Harrison, Ens. R. E. Messersmith, Ens. N. W. Hanna.

Mr. R. O. Woodring, Mr. L. P. Turner, Mr. C. W. Pittman, Mr. D. W. Jones, Mr. E. P. Puryer, Mr. A. A. James III, Mr. R. B. Dent, Mr. C. E. Radune, Mr. R. F. Royce, Jr., Mr. P. D. Zicko, Mr. J. S. Atkinson, Jr., Mr. D. S. Akel, Mr. J. A. Masog, Mr. C. L. Blazer, Jr., Mr. R. B. Kolts, Mr. D. A. Brown, Mr. C. E. Parker, Mr. J. M. Simpson, Mr. R. W. Frame, Mr. A. D. Burns, Mr. W. R. Richardson, Mr. E. D. Cooper, Mr. R. Lewis, Mr. E. H. Kelio.

Lt. (jg) R. L. Rogers, Ens. J. R. Grunzke, Ens. W. J. Robbitale.

Mr. J. P. McAlister, Mr. E. C. Burr, Mr. A. M. Thomas, Mr. J. W. Higgens, Mr. G. E. Nitez, Mr. J. A. McPherson, Mr. M. Olived, Mr. E. S. Smith, Mr. J. S. Bond, Mr. R. G. Intevalde, Mr. D. R. Jones, Mr. J. McGuire, Mr. C. G. Wall.

Mr. M. M. McLarity, Mr. J. M. McBee, Mr. R. B. Jordan, Mr. C A Wardlow, Mr C. A. Giagolich, Mr. K. J. Rogge, Mr. M. J. McLean, Mr. R. C. Melano, Mr. C. A. Heard, Mr. R. G. Martin, Mr. A. M. Wing, Mr. J. J. Somer, Mr. B. C. Davis, Mr. R. P. Gibson, Mr. G. M. Cockerham, Mr. J. R. Taylor, Mr. G. P. Soustead, Mr. R. E. Nevers, Jr., Mr. W. E. Jawson, Mr. F. X. Kramer, Jr.

Ens. J. P. Wolff, Ens. S. J. Atlas, Ens. D. D. Siedschlag, Ens. D. A. Lotter, Lt. J. B. Glenn, AOC R. L. Fry, Ens. T. S. Scott, Ens. D. J. Soshuk, 2nd Lt. D. A. Rummery, AOC C. M. Nolte, Ens. L. E. Nann, Ens. W. R. Patteson, Ens. R. J. Adkins, AOC J. E. Wallin, 2nd Lt. D. T. Jefferson.

Ens. D. C. Alexander, Ens. T. E. Anschuty, Ens. D. L. Siddle, Lt. (Jg) J. F. Frkyenberg, Lt. (Jg) J. M. Stevens, Ens. R. M. Seraphin, NAOC W. J. Overend, Ens. E. L. Renner, Ens. I. R. Farlow, Ens. J. R. Stablein, AOC R. J. Edington, Lt. (Jg) P. T. Clausen, AOC E. S. Heald, Ens. D. C. Walklet, NAOC J. D. Price, Ens. L. F. Plummer, Lt. (Jg) D. R. Hay, Lt. (Jg) J. E. Kirby, NAOC G. B. Lancaster.

FLAG DAY CEREMONIES

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure every Member of the House thoroughly enjoyed and was inspired, as I was, with the ceremonies that took place shortly after we convened in honor of our flag. It was a moving occasion in every aspect.

I should like to express to the Members of the committee who were in charge of these ceremonies my appreciation for the impressive presentation we have just witnessed. It was obvious to all of us that they gave close attention to every detail in order that we might obtain a full appreciation of the history of the Stars and Stripes. No other performance that I have ever witnessed was so perfect in every detail and so impressive.

I wish the people of the United States themselves could have witnessed these ceremonies. As meaningful as our flag is to all, to witness these ceremonies could make it even more meaningful. They would have a better understanding of the "blood, sweat, and tears" and sacrifices that have been made that our Stars and Stripes should today fly so gloriously. Our flag is a symbol of peace and freedom. It is symbolic of the fact that while we love peace and will forever work tirelessly for peace, and make sacrifices for it, we love freedom even more. Countless men have died that they and others might be free.

The question immediately came to my mind as to why such an occasion as this has not been nationally televised. I raised this specific point with one of the members of the committee in charge of these ceremonies. He informed me that the television networks were invited to participate and given full and ample notice of the ceremonies. Apparently they decided against it. My question is: Why?

In my humble opinion the public interest would be better served if the people could be given opportunity to witness such a ceremony as this. It may be that the news is largely based on conflict and confrontations between groups and with established authorities. This is not, however, a true picture of America which today is being disseminated throughout the world. If our television people would but recognize that a true picture of America is a picture of one people, although with differences of opinion they stand united in their determination that our flag shall always symbolize freedom.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. This has been the finest Flag Day ceremony we have ever had in the House during my years here.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have set aside this day as a special time for honoring our flag, although we do revere that symbol of our Nation and its greatness every day of the year. Today I would speak of what the flag means to me.

The flag speaks to me of much more than the kind of patriotism that is roused by the ruffle of drums and the blare of bugles. It speaks to me of the long, glorious history of our country—of the incredibly courageous men and women who crossed the storm-swept Atlantic Ocean in tiny ships more than three centuries ago and braved threats of shipwreck, mutiny, starvation, disease and death at the hands of hostile Indians to establish the mighest Nation the world has known—a nation that grew from sea to shining sea with the winning of the West and the slow healing that followed a Civil War which threatened to tear it completely asunder—a nation that today must fulfill its destiny as leader of the free world despite the desperate desire of its people simply to live in peace.

Whenever we look at our flag we feel a sense of the great history that has been ours.

George Washington described the symbolism in the flag. He said:

We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes

shall go down in posterity representing liberty.

Liberty. There are some Americans today who flee from the defense of it. And there are those who scoff at patriotism, as though it were an emotion to be ashamed of.

I feel pity for those Americans who have no deep love for their country. I place myself on the side of John Hancock, who signed the Declaration of Independence with a magnificent flourish and called patriotism "this noble affection which impels us to sacrifice everything dear, even life itself, to our country."

I do not believe patriotism is dead in America. It is not always evident, but the love that most of our people feel for our country is there nevertheless.

How glorious is the Nation that sets forth our flag! What a great banner it is—standing as it does for the deep moral values, the divine principles, and the rugged determination that has made us a free and democratic people.

I know nearly all Americans join with us in tribute to the Flag as an emblem of the freedoms we cherish and share with us the love we feel for our great country. With God's help, it will ever be thus.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this year again we have set aside a special day to honor our flag as the symbol of the many attributes our Nation possesses. During a time of war in Southeast Asia and increased political conflict between people at home, we are prone sometimes to forget our Nation's achievements during its history. On Flag Day we should take the time to reflect on the struggles, achievements, and goals of our Nation, as represented by our flag.

Henry Ward Beecher once said:

A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of Liberty and men rejoiced in it.

Perhaps it is now fitting to mention some of the highlights of the interesting history of our flag. The first flags of our colonial forefathers were symbolic of their struggles with the wilderness of a new land. As we drew near to the day of our declared independence from England, our flag became the symbol of our struggle for separation and autonomy from our mother country. On June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress passed a resolution that established the flag of our Nation. At first, there were a number of flag designs, all incorporating stars and stripes. George Washington was reputed to have described the flag flown by the Continental Congress as follows:

We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down in posterity representing liberty.

Today our flag is the symbol of a multitude of diverse ideas and beliefs held by millions of people in our Nation.

Keep in mind these words spoken on Flag Day, 1917, by President Woodrow Wilson:

This flag, which we honor and under which we serve, is the emblem of our unity, our power, our thought and purpose as a nation. It has no other character than that which we give it from generation to generation. The choices are ours.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, today, the House celebrates Flag Day, the 193d anniversary of the adoption of the Stars and Stripes as the flag of the United States of America with the color scheme of the red, white and blue.

Oddly enough, many of us today are as concerned as were our Nation's founders on that first Flag Day in 1777—will this flag of ours survive?

In these troublous times, we must admit there are danger signs on the horizon.

At home and abroad the American flag is under attack as the symbol of the last great fortress for freedom's cause in an increasingly hostile world where tyranny is again on the march. The threat to our flag by external enemies is not new. The attempts to desecrate it by some who call themselves Americans here at home is very new indeed. Even in the Civil War the American flag was loved by both North and South as the banner of a nation both sides, if anything, loved too well—not too little.

Today, however, there are those among our radicals who find the flag of the Communist Vietcong preferable to our own even though under the enemy's banner the forces of despotism kill and maim American servicemen.

The popular spokesmen of the American campus radicals of the left actually employ American flags to carry out their on-stage obscenities.

It appears to be part of the ritual of violence among the leftist extremists to pull down, tear up or burn the Stars and Stripes whenever and wherever they have the opportunity.

There are laws enough to prevent desecration of the flag or punish those who perpetrate indignities upon our flag but seldom do I hear that such statutes are enforced.

So we stand here today, Mr. Speaker, paying homage to a flag that has been poorly defended in recent years except by our fighting men overseas and by those much-too-silent Americans who are in the overwhelming majority but whose only display of feeling is limited to flying the flag from a front window on national holidays.

It is time we rededicated ourselves to the defense of our Nation's flag and take the steps necessary to providing that symbol of America's finest ideals with the protection it so dearly deserves.

I would close my remarks on this day of congressional observance of Flag Day, 1970, by recalling the words of President Woodrow Wilson in an address on June 14, 1915. Mr. Wilson said:

The things that the flag stands for were created by the experiences of a great people. Everything that it stands for was written by their lives. The flag is the embodiment, not of sentiment, but of history. It represents the experiences made by men and women, the experiences of those who do and live under that flag.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, those of my vintage remember vividly the dark days just before the Battle of Britain when Hitler's Nazis were on their march of unprovoked aggression. Nation after nation had fallen, France being the last. Was Britain to be next? And after Britain, America?

Somehow we managed to rally enough commitment, sufficient common dedication, to stem the Nazi tide—with God's help. Those of us who passed through that period of World War II with its 26 million dead, were profoundly grateful for the respite granted civilization by their sacrifice.

The Sunday New York Times has reprinted its lead editorial, this Flag Day, of 30 years ago. It is an interesting and nostalgically compelling account of the synthesis of America and the raison d'etre of patriotism. Yet editorially the Times then undoes much of the constructive helpfulness of its message by suggesting that being for AGNEW is being against students—not so—and referring once more to the new left against forces of repression—sic AGNEW. What does it avail the Times to engage in such editorial encouragement of further polarization?

The new left's SDS advocates violence. SDS's Weathermen faction both urges and practices violence. The declared objectives of the violence-prone, action-oriented factions within the new left is violent revolution in the United States. For what they do not say. To change to what alternative form of government they do not know. Many do not appear to care just as long as they "burn, burn, burn" or "wreck the establishment" whatever that means.

American society has had enough of this violence stuff. Vice President AGNEW speaks for most Americans when he deplores it, urges that it be stopped and warns that those who deliberately commit violence are bound to invoke violence in response to preserve an orderly society.

What are Americans supposed to do, confronted by such violence—lie down and play dead while their homes are burned, their businesses bombed, their children's education shut down, and their national economy disrupted? Of course not. To suggest that public expression of objection and resistance to arbitrary force to achieve a state of anarchy in this country is to further polarize leading to more violence is ridiculous. The American public has had it up to here with the violence kick, whether from students, or teachers or anyone else. If it is kept up, it is bound to involve peril for the violent, and little sympathy will be shown or deserved.

Unfortunately, most of this need never have happened had we minded a sound house these past two decades. But we have not. A combination of material interests, unwillingness to confront incipient unpleasantness, and indifference to danger signals flying from academic towers has resulted in the chickens coming home to roost. No people can give the Timothy Learys free reign, or apathetically accept a judiciary that refuses to

control obscenity, or turn the other cheek to the presence of teachers who have encouraged hatred in young people for parents, or their marketplace, or their flag, or remain indifferent to the problems of the local school boards or the trustees of their universities—and expect that all will be peaches and cream. It is not, and now we must face it a lot further down the road to violence and hatred than we needed to be at this juncture in history. America is not all that bad. It does not deserve SDS and its ilk, nor can it longer afford to remain indifferent to the hatemongers and the inciters to riot in its midst.

But it is not too late either. Let us progress with restrained firmness in a common resolve to cut out the nonsense and get down to the mighty important business of making America that better Nation the kids are for—or as close to it as we can come without ruining the free enterprise system in the process. And let us do it without the drugs, without the violence, without the crime, and always with eternal respect for our American flag that stands for freedom with justice for all.

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1970]

OUR FLAG IS STILL THERE

(NOTE.—Thirty years ago today the conquering armies of the most powerful military dictatorship the world had ever known were sweeping through Western Europe under the hooked cross and blood-red banner of Nazi Germany. The flags of Norway, Denmark and the low countries had already been struck. On this very day in 1940 the swastika was for the first time unfurled atop the Eiffel Tower. The Battle of Britain was about to begin.

(The American people were watching apprehensively, with every passing day of Nazi triumph, increasingly conscious of what our own democracy and our own flag meant to us. It was in this spirit and this atmosphere that Robert L. Duffus of the editorial board of The New York Times wrote the small classic reprinted below, which first appeared on this page on Flag Day, 1940.)

WHAT'S A FLAG?

What's a flag? What's the love of country for which it stands? Maybe it begins with love of the land itself. It is the fog rolling with the tide at Eastport, or through the Golden Gate and among the towers of San Francisco. It is the sun coming up behind the White Mountains, over the Green, throwing a shining glory on Lake Champlain and above the Adirondacks. It is the storied Mississippi rolling swift and muddy past St. Louis, rolling past Cairo, pouring down past the levees of New Orleans. It is lazy noontide in the pines of Carolina, it is a sea of wheat rippling in Western Kansas, it is the San Francisco peaks far north across the glowing nakedness of Arizona, it is the Grand Canyon and a little stream coming down out of a New England ridge, in which are trout.

It is men at work. It is the storm-tossed fishermen coming into Gloucester and Provincetown and Astoria. It is the farmer riding his great machine in the dust of harvest, the dairyman going to the barn before sunrise, the lineman mending the broken wire, the miner drilling for the blast. It is the servants of fire in the murky splendor of Pittsburgh, between the Allegheny and the Monongahela, the trucks rumbling through the night, the locomotive engineer bringing the train in on time, the pilot in the clouds, the riveter running along the beam a hundred feet in the air. It is the clerk in the office, the housewife doing the dishes and sending the children off to school. It is the teacher, doctor and parson tending and helping, body and soul, for small reward.

It is small things remembered, the little corners of the land, the houses, the people that each one loves. We love our country because there was a little tree on a hill, and grass thereon, and a sweet valley below; because the hurdy-gurdy man came along on a sunny morning in a city street; because a beach or a farm or a lane or a house that might not seem much to others were once, for each of us, made magic. It is voices that are remembered only, no longer heard. It is parents, friends, the lazy chat of street and store and office, and the ease of mind that makes life tranquil. It is summer and winter, rain and sun and storm. These are flesh of our flesh, bone of our bone, blood of our blood, a lasting part of what we are, each of us and all of us together.

It is stories told. It is the Pilgrims dying in their first dreadful winter. It is the Minuteman standing his ground at Concord Bridge, and dying there. It is the Army in rags, sick, freezing, starving at Valley Forge. It is the wagons and the men on foot going westward over Cumberland Gap, floating down the great rivers, rolling over the great plains. It is the settler hacking fiercely at the primeval forest on his new, his own lands. It is Thoreau at Walden Pond, Lincoln at Cooper Union, and Lee riding home from Appomattox. It is corruption and disgrace, answered always by men who would not let the flag lie in the dust, who have stood up in every generation to fight for the old ideals and the old rights, at risk of ruin or of life itself.

It is a great multitude of people on pilgrimage, common and ordinary people, charged with the usual human failings, yet filled with such a hope as never caught the imaginations and the hearts of any nation on earth before. The hope of liberty. The hope of justice. The hope of a land in which a man can stand straight, without fear, without rancor.

The land and the people and the flag—the land a continent, the people of every race, the flag a symbol of what humanity may aspire to when the wars are over and the barriers are down; to these each generation must be dedicated and consecrated anew, to defend with life itself, if need be, but, above all, in friendliness, in hope, in courage, to live for.

(This was the meaning of the flag thirty years ago; this is the meaning of the flag today. But it is a measure of the bitter divisions of the era in which we live that the symbolism of that flag should have become distorted and degraded by the partisan extremists of both New Left and Old Right. The flag must not be captured either by the repressive legions of the right who employ it daily to prove they are for Agnew and against the students; nor must its meaning be destroyed by the frustrated demagogue of the left who find a cheap and easy outlet by reviling it and dragging it in the dust. The flag is a symbol of the unity of America. We must not allow it to be perverted by the forces of disunity, whether the Birchers or Weathermen, that today are abroad in this land.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, because our flag symbolizes all that is dear to us, we Americans are unique in the honor and respect which we deliver our national standard. The flag is a handsome, stirring symbol of our American ideal of liberty and all those who have sacrificed their lives in our quest for liberty. For that reason, we honor the flag today.

But, while some of us honor the flag because it is a symbol, others desecrate it for the same reason. They spit upon it, step upon it, and set fire to it. Frankly, I must admit that nothing arouses in me such rage and revulsion as the sight of our flag being desecrated. Such actions are incomprehensible to me, because the dissenters seek to symbolically destroy the very thing which should give them hope: the American political system. The flag itself is the perfect demonstration of America's ability to accommodate dissent and differing ideas and mold them into a single, viable entity. But while we can accommodate and tolerate dissent, we can neither accommodate nor tolerate desecration.

I would hope that all of us—both within the Congress and without—honor the flag for what it can be as well as for what it is and was. If all of us speak with reason and not contempt and with an aim to solving problems, not creating them, we can insure justice and tranquillity in our Nation. If, however, we fail to tolerate, if we fail to accommodate, I fear we will destroy ourselves and all else for which our flag stands.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today we once again set aside this time to honor our flag on the anniversary of its adoption in 1777. We meet once again to reaffirm that our flag does still wave "o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave." We meet once again to reaffirm our allegiance to the flag and rededicate ourselves to the proposition for which it stands—"one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Throughout our history our flag has withstood threats from its foes, both foreign and domestic. Today it faces a grave threat from within—a threat posed by extremists on the left and right, the forces of anarchy and repression, of destruction and stagnation. Our flag is caught in a savage cross-fire between what John Gardner has called its "unloving critics" and its "uncritical lovers."

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that both of these extreme forces are wittingly or unwittingly contributing to a dangerous polarization which threatens to destroy our democratic institutions and the concepts of liberty and justice for all.

Therefore, let us seize upon the occasion of this Flag Day ceremony to reject the appeals of both our flag's "unloving critics" and its "uncritical lovers." Let us take this opportunity to call for a new spirit of national unity—a spirit which recognizes that the survival of our Flag and Nation depends upon our willingness to treat them with both loving and critical care.

The New York Times, in an editorial yesterday, summed it all up this way:

> The flag is a symbol of the unity of America. We must not allow it to be perverted by the forces of disunity . . . that today are abroad in this land.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with all Americans today as the citizens of the United States fly the flag in grateful honor of the life of freedom that this country has given every American and in honor of all Americans who have fought and died for the flag, the symbol of freedom and America.

It is the flag of America which has stood for two centuries as the unifying

element of our society. The American flag and its meaning remain as the strong force which pulls this country together every day and during times of alien pressure against America.

While the Old Glory stands tall and lofty on homes, buildings and on American shrines and monuments, the flag is continuously put to test by some anti-American nations and their peoples and, sadly enough, by some citizens of this land of ours who misguidedly forget their heritage and the symbolic meaning of the American flag which has accomplished so much for America and her people to this date. And, that feat of accomplishment will continue to grow and grow as the American flag withstands all attacks, from within and without.

Mr. Speaker, Flag Day is every day in America and the millions of Americans in this country who honor the flag and hold it in deep respect, are by far the majority and are the truly dedicated citizens who will keep Old Glory at the mainmast at home and at American installations abroad.

I also wish to take a moment to enter my remarks regarding the extremely impressive Flag Day ceremonies held today in the House of Representatives.

Each succeeding era of America and her flag from the very beginning to today, June 1970, was so aptly portrayed by the ceremony of flags, bands and the uniformed honor guards.

This was an American ceremony which I wish all Americans could have witnessed today.

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, June 14 was Flag Day in America and this week is being celebrated as Flag Week. Let all Americans at this time realize that the flag is the very symbol of the freedoms we enjoy.

In recent years, the flag has all too often been made the target of criticism and even debased by those who wish to destroy our freedoms or who are so depraved they give vent to their emotional tirades through defiling the flag.

Too many have stood by complacently for too many years while flags were burned; too few raised their voices above a whisper when flags were used as hammocks on the stage; too few have felt the necessity for restraint against those who tear our flag to shreads and trample it in the dirt; because of this apathy the unruly and unpatriotic mob has grown more daring and defiant.

It is time we replace complacency with action, whispers with voices, meekness with firmness. Only until these wicked weaklings realize that most of us in America honor, love, and intend to protect and respect our flag, will they stop their disrespectful attacks on it.

Celebration of Flag Day goes back to the very beginnings of our history as a nation. The Continental Congress, in 1777, meeting in Philadelphia, adopted our flag as our national emblem, and in 1895, we adopted a special day for its observance.

Flag Day should be a happy day, a day of thanksgiving and prayer. Nowhere else in all the world do we have so great a country—one that offers its people so much. Let us use Flag Week to recount our blessings by paying a very special tribute to "Old Glory."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the House of Representatives has been privileged to enjoy the pleasure of witnessing the Naval Air Basic Training Command Pageant of Flags from Pensacola. The program was arranged by the Honorable JACK BROOKS, chairman of the Flag Day Committee. In this he was ably assisted by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. NICHOLS), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH), who are also committee members. They have provided a most fitting tribute to the flag and each of them is entitled to the appreciation of the membership of the House.

I consider this unique patriotic exhibition one of the finest and most inspiring examples of pageantry that I have ever seen. The Flag Pageant, in its 7 years of existence, has performed before audiences throughout the Nation, rekindling the type of patriotism and national pride with which our country was founded. It has received the George Washington Honor Medal at Valley Forge for its programs. The members of the pageant are future Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard aviators and flight officers who are in training at Pensacola. They were accompanied by the 50-piece Naval Air Basic Training Command Band. In addition to the Pageant of Flags, the Naval Air Training Command Choir also appeared on the Flag Day program. This choir has delighted millions on radio and TV on the Nation's top shows and it, too, is composed of young men who are currently flight students in the Naval Basic Training Command.

Today's Flag Day program in the House is, I am confident, one of the outstanding programs we have been privileged to witness in these historic halls. I am confident that each of us has been thrilled beyond measure by what we have seen and heard and that we will carry with us a stronger measure of devotion to the American flag and all that it symbolizes. Elsewhere in the RECORD will appear a complete listing of the names of those who participated in the program.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, what is the cost of Old Glory? Is it a dollar or $10 or even a hundred dollars? To be sure, these varying amounts of money would buy a varying quantity of stars and stripes, large or small. But what is the real cost of Old Glory? The cost is blood. The cost is broken spirit and torn flesh. The cost is a mother's tears for a son dead in the service of his country.

The cost is all of these. The cost is Iwo Jima. The cost is Chateau Thierry. The cost is Bull Run, Gettysburg, the Wilderness, and Appomattox. All over the world, the flag is flying where American boys have given their lives and are buried. That is the cost of the flag—the loss of their lives by our men and the anguished grief of their survivors.

And what is the price of our flag? For what would we sell it? The price is our honor. The price is a one-transaction sale; if we sell it, we are, as one great people, no more.

The price is peace at any price. The price is peace without honor. The price is this great Republic giving in to a lot of ranting pacifists and goon hippies demanding peace at a price we dare pay only at our peril. The price is a country without a past, without any pride. The price is an America which is so longer the land of the free and the home of the brave. That is the price.

Match it with the cost. Are we to pull down the glory of Old Glory out of cowardice and give in to our enemies, abroad and at home?

No. Let Old Glory—that vibrant national symbol—let it forever fly, free and brave, as our people have always been, and, with God's mercy and guidance, will always be.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as I rise to commemorate Flag Day and with my colleagues to honor the emblem of our Nation, I do so mindful of the times in which we live. The recent vision of the American flag being desecrated by contemptuous vandals has, I am sure, distressed and disgusted a majority of Americans.

I thank God that precedent to these episodes is a history and tradition of honor and glory which belies such acts and sustains the faith of those living and dead who defended the principles for which our flag stands.

On this occasion, I would like to offer thanks to those Americans serving in Vietnam and around the world, as well as those at home who have endured the hostilities, the criticism, and the doubt of these times. By their steadfastness and devotion they honor their country and their flag.

The times ahead will be troublesome as we search for the road to peace and stability at home and abroad. We must do so mindful, not only of our obligations, but also of our destiny as a nation and as a people.

Daniel Webster speaking in 1824 called our Nation the greatest republic of the earth, and he said, "we cannot obscure ourselves, if we would; a part we must take, honorable or dishonorable, in all that is done in the civilized world." And John F. Kennedy in his inaugural address said:

> Let every nation know that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship . . . to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

The flag we honor today is the symbol to all of mankind of a nation which has dedicated itself to seeking for its people liberty, equality, and justice. We may not have obtained them to the degree that all would hope, but so long as we try, we may still hope to succeed.

It would be wrong of me to hold forth an image of America free from folly, grief, and trouble. Mixed with the blessings and the abundance of our land, with the progress and prosperity of our people, are also the tragedy and despair of war, poverty, and the well-being of all of our citizens, young and old. Stephen Vincent Benét seemed to strike to the heart of our destiny as a nation with these words from his poem "Nightmare at Noon":

"Oh yes, I know the faults on the other side,
The lyncher's rope, the bought justice, the wasted land,
The scale on the leaf, the bores in the corn,
The finks with their clubs, the gray sky of relief,
All the long shame of our hearts and the long disunion."

He concluded:

"I am merely remarking—as a country, we try.
As a country, I think we try."

We no longer live in a time when it is fashionable among some to demonstrate our patriotism. I suspect, nevertheless, that millions of Americans still feel a thrill go through them with the playing of the national anthem and the presentation of the flag. I do. It is perhaps a tribute to the confidence that each of us has in our country and in ourselves that we need no outward expression of the emotion we feel. Perhaps. But I, for one, often long for a more innocent time when a man like Henry Holcomb Bennett could, without embarrassment, write:

"Hats off!
Along the street there comes
A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums;
And loyal hearts are beating high.
Hats off!
The flag is passing by!"

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our lifetime, we detect many signs and symbols. The Star of David represents the history and faith of the Jewish people. To a Christian, the Holy Cross is a symbol of his faith. We realize the ideal of justice in the balanced scales. We light a candle to symbolize hope, and shake a hand to greet a friend. We experience, in the course of a lifetime, literally thousands of outward, visible signs which signify something invisible. Most signs have a cultural significance that excite a heartfelt response and objectify an inner feeling.

Patriotism is such a feeling. Since it is a personal emotion we are somewhat embarrassed to discuss it as we are other private thoughts. We, therefore, have the symbol of the flag through which we express our degree of love for country.

Soldiers salute "Old Glory"; citizens proudly display it; the Nation drapes its star-spangled badge over the remains of those who died for it. There are rules on how to display it, and respectful chords that accompany its hoisting and lowering. How we revere the Stars and Stripes reflects our attitude to our country.

To most Americans, no other man-made object gives the patriotic thrill and excitement as the flag of their country. Today, we are witnessing the brilliant pagentry of the posting of the colors and hear speeches honoring our Nation's flag. While we are mindful today of some who malign and overtly disrespect the great symbol of our Nation, we recall that the same flag is the symbol of Flanders Field, Bataan, Iwo Jima, and Normandy Beach.

Under the Stars and Stripes, a nation has been born, suffered its adolescence, and matured to become the "last best hope" of humanity. While we continue to seek an improvement of conditions in many needy areas of public concern, the flag reminds us of the successes of the past and gives us the hope that our problems can and will be overcome.

What makes us love our flag, our country? Surely, other men of other nations love and admire their own flag as much. What is it about America and Americanism that elicits patriotism?

It is the idea of it. The encompassing idea of America is unique and superior to any other idea of nationality.

Thomas Jefferson and our founding fathers expressed it better than I:

We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Through the symbol of the flag, we honor today the idea of America. As we view "Old Glory," we are mindful of its meaning for the past, and are hopeful for the furtherance of this idea of America for the future.

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, June 14, was Flag Day. It marked the day in the year 1777 that the Stars and Stripes was adopted as our national banner. Today, special patriotic observances will be held throughout the country. Individuals of different races, creeds, colors, and ages will join in paying tribute to the United States as it is symbolized by our national flag.

The love and regard that the American people have for our Nation is symbolized by the pledge of allegiance to the flag. All Americans should pause while saying this sacred pledge today, and consider what each of the phrases means.

In my mind, the pledge of allegiance means many things:

I pledge allegiance—I promise loyalty to my country; because, since we live in a nation whose protection and privileges we enjoy, it is basic that we recognize the benefits we receive by being true to our Government and its ideals, and respecting and obeying its laws.

To the flag—our flag is our national symbol. It bears our national colors. It represents the proud spirit of America whether it is being flown over the U.S. Capitol, the sands of Iwo Jima, the paddies of Vietnam, or the roofs of our Nation's schools.

Of the United States of America—the "American's Creed" sums up the spirit of this country by stating:

I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed.

And to the Republic for which it stands—We are a democracy within a republican form of government. Each American's voice can be heard through the ballot box. Each American can participate in the process of self-government.

One nation—We are a union established on the principles of freedom, equality, and justice. To preserve these ideals, American patriots have, for generations, sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

Under God, indivisible—Having respect for a supreme being is at the heart of what America means. As Americans, we are free to worship God in any way we choose. This recognition of our universal dependence upon God, combined with our freedom of worship, is the wellspring of our Nation's strength.

With liberty—Liberty exists for each citizen. The law enforces certain rules that protect the basic rights of individuals to life, liberty, and property. It sees that the will of the majority is carried out when that will does not violate the rights of any citizen. For this reason, liberty under law does not mean that everyone is free to do as he or she pleases, it means that freedom is qualified by responsibility, and that rights have reciprocal obligations.

And justice for all—Our system of government rests on two mighty pillars, the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America. This Nation was conceived with the bold words of the Declaration of Independence, the spirit of which is found in these words:

We hold these truths to be self-evident—that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.

The union from which our country was formed was created by the Constitution of the United States, whose opening words are among the most important in the entire document:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish the Constitution of the United States of America.

These two passages are brief, and their words are simple. Yet they are of deep and lasting significance. In them is to be found the fundamental expression of the American heritage, a deep and abiding faith in individualism, in freedom, and in equality.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that whenever Americans repeat this sacred pledge, they will think about the meaning of the words they are saying. If they do, I am sure they will be, as I am, eternally thankful for being an American.

Since the dawn of our independence, our national flag has been a vivid witness to great moments in America's history. It has also grown up, in a sense, as has the Nation. Initially, the flag with the original number of stars and stripes symbolized the formation of the Union, and its expansion from 13 uncertain, divided colonies, to a nation of global power and significance. With the addition of each new star, the flag has reflected the growing strength and dynamism of our great Nation.

Today, while the seeds of discord and dissent are being so visibly sowed across the land, I believe Americans should take time out from their daily activities, and reflect on the greatness of our country. Today, while revering our national flag, let us also revere the Union for which it stands, and dedicate ourselves anew to principles on which our Nation rests.

FLAG DAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair, speaking not only for himself but all Members of the House, desires to express our sincere thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BROOKS), the chairman, and to the other members of the Special Committee on Flag Day who arranged, conducted, and carried on the impassioned and most beautiful and inspiring Flag Day services presented in the House today.

The Chair also desires to express the sincere thanks of the Members of the House to those branches of the military services who today participat d in the Flag Day ceremonies.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on Flag Day in general and the ceremonies in this House in particular.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY FIRSTHAND THE RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 796, 91st Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Study Firsthand the Recent Developments in Southeast Asia the following Members of the House.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, from Mississippi, chairman, Mr. SMITH from Iowa; Mr. HAWKINS, from California; Mr. ANDERSON from Tennessee; Mr. HAMILTON from Indiana; Mr. MOLLOHAN, from West Virginia; Mr. ADAIR, from Indiana; Mr. ROBISON, from New York; Mr. KEITH, from Massachusetts; Mr. CLANCY, from Ohio; Mr. WATSON, from South Carolina; and Mr. HANSEN from Idaho.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16516, NASA AUTHORIZATION, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 16516) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities and research and program management, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91–1189)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16516) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities and research and program management, 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 House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

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

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

(a) For "Research and development," for the following programs:

(1) Apollo, $994,500,000;

(2) Space flight operations, $565,200,000;

(3) Advance missions, $1,500,000;

(4) Physics and astronomy, $116,000,000;

(5) Lunar and planetary exploration, $144,900,000;

(6) Bioscience, $12,900,000;

(7) Space applications, $167,000,000;

(8) Launch vehicle procurement, $124,900,000;

(9) Space vehicle systems, $30,000,000;

(10) Electronics systems, $23,900,000;

(11) Human factor systems, $18,300,000;

(12) Basic research, $18,000,000;

(13) Space power and electric propulsion systems, $30,900,000;

(14) Nuclear rockets, $38,000,000;

(15) Chemical propulsion, $20,300,000;

(16) Aeronautical vehicles, $87,100,000;

(17) Tracking and data acquisition, $295,200,000;

(18) Technology utilization, $4,500,000;

(b) For "Construction of facilities", including land acquisitions, as follows:

(1) Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California, $1,525,000;

(2) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $1,928,000;

(3) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, $1,950,000;

(4) John F. Kennedy Space Center, NASA, Kennedy Space Center, Florida, $575,000;

(5) Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Texas, $900,000;

(6) Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, $525,000;

(7) Nuclear Rocket Development Station, Nevada, $3,500,000;

(8) Various locations, $18,575,000;

(9) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $5,000,000.

(c) For "Research and program management," $683,300,000, of which not to exceed $506,108,000 shall be available for personnel and related costs.

(d) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used (1) for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts, and (2) for grants to nonprofit institutions of higher education, or to nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is the conduct of scientific research, for purchase or construction of additional research facilities; and title to such facilities shall be vested in the United States unless the Administrator determines that the national program of aeronautical and space activities will best be served by vesting title in any such grantee institution or organization. Each such grant shall be made under such conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required to insure that the United States will receive therefrom benefit adequate to justify the making of that grant. None of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee has notified the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(e) When so specified in an appropriation Act, (1) any amount appropriated for "Research and development" or for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation, and (2) maintenance and operation of facilities, and support services contracts may be entered into under the "Research and program management" appropriation for periods not in excess of twelve months beginning at any time during the fiscal year.

(f) Appropriations made pursuant to subsection 1(c) may be used, but not to exceed $35,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

(g) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) for maintenance, repairs, alterations, and minor construction shall be used for the construction of any new facility the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $100,000.

(h) No part of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may be used for grants to any nonprofit institution of higher learning unless the Administrator or his designee determines at the time of the grant that recruiting personnel of any of the Armed Forces of the United States are not being barred from the premises or property of such institution except that this subsection shall not apply if the Administrator or his designee determines that the grant is a continuation or renewal of a previous grant to such institution which is likely to make a significant contribution to the aeronautical and space activities of the United States. The Secretary of Defense shall furnish to the Administrator or his designee within sixty days after the date of enactment of this Act and each January 30 and June 30 thereafter the names of any nonprofit institutions of higher learning which the Secretary of Defense determines on the date of each such report are barring such recruiting personnel from premises or property of any such institution.

(i) No funds appropriated pursuant to this section in excess of $500,000 shall be used for the payment of services, per diem, travel, and other expenses of experts and consultants.

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7) and (8) of subsection 1(b) may in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such paragraphs shall not exceed the total of the amounts specified in such paragraphs.

SEC. 3. Not to exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(a) hereof may be transferred to the "Construction of facilities" appropriation, and, when so transferred, together with $10,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(b) hereof (other than funds appropriated pursuant to paragraph (9) of such subsection) shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations at any location (including locations specified in subsection 1(b)), if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering development, and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made

available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the Administrator or his designee has transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate and to the Comimttee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) the reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences,

(2) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by sections 1(a) and 1(c), and

(3) no amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee,

unless (A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Administrator or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action, or (B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Administrator written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the proposed action.

(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the expenditure of amounts for personnel and related costs pursuant to section 1(c) to exceed amounts authorized for such costs, except that a transfer in the manner prescribed by this section of funds not to exceed 1 per centum of such amounts authorized may be made whenever the Administrator determines that such transfer is necessary for the safety of any mission.

SEC. 5. It is the sense of the Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

SEC. 6. (a) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of this Act and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or the seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, and that such crime was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution with respect to which such crime was committed, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act. If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of the preceding sentence of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(b) If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this Act, and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs authorized by the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, the funds for which are authorized pursuant to this Act.

(c)(1) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit any institution of higher education from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under any such Act to any individual because of any misconduct which in its judgment bears adversely on his fitness for such assistance.

(2) Nothing in this section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an independent disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice, and law.

(3) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the freedom of any student to verbal expression of individual views or opinions.

SEC. 7. Section 6 of the NASA Authorization Act, 1970 (83 Stat. 196), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'former employee' means any former officer or employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including consultants or part-time employees, whose salary rate at any time during the three-year period immediately preceding the termination of his last employment with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was equal to or greater than the minimum salary rate at such time for positions in grade GS–13.

"(2) The term 'aerospace contractor' means any individual, firm, corporation, partnership, association, or other legal entity, which provides services and materials to or for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in connection with any aerospace system under a contract directly with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(3) The term 'services and materials' means either services or materials or services and materials which are provided as a part of or in connection with any aerospace system.

"(4) The term 'aerospace system' includes, but is not limited to, any rocket, launch vehicle, rocket engine, propellant, spacecraft, command module, service module, landing module, tracking device, communications device, or any part or component thereof, which is used in either manned or unmanned spaceflight operations.

"(5) The term 'contracts awarded' means contracts awarded by negotiation and includes the net amount of modifications to, and the exercise of options under, such contracts. It excludes all transactions amounting to less than $10,000 each.

"(6) The term 'fiscal year' means a year beginning on 1 July and ending on 30 June of the next succeeding year.

"(b) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator:

"(1) Any former employee who during any fiscal year,

"(A) was employed by or served as a consultant or otherwise to an aerospace contractor for any period of time,

"(B) represented any aerospace contractor at any hearing, trial, appeal, or other action in which the United States was a party and which involved services and materials provided or to be provided to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by such contractor, or

"(C) represented any such contractor in any transaction with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration involving services or materials provided or to be provided by such contractor to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration,

shall file with the Administrator in such form and manner as the Administrator may prescribe, not later than November 15 of the next succeeding fiscal year, a report containing the following information:

"(1) His name and address.

"(2) The name and address of the aerospace contractor by whom he was employed or whom he served as a consultant or otherwise.

"(3) The title of the position held by him with the aerospace contractor.

"(4) A brief description of his duties and the work performed by him for the aerospace contractor.

"(5) His gross salary rate while employed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(6) A brief description of his duties and the work performed by him while employed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the three-year period immediately preceding his termination of employment.

"(7) The date of the termination of his employment with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the date on which his employment, as an employee, consultant or otherwise, with the aerospace contractor began, and if no longer employed by such aerospace contractor, the date on which his employment with such aerospace contractor terminated.

"(8) Such other pertinent information as the Administrator may require.

"(2) Any employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including consultants or part-time employees, who was previously employed by or served as a consultant or otherwise to an aerospace contractor in any fiscal year, and whose salary rate in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is equal to or greater than the minimum salary rate for positions in grade GS–13 shall file with the Administrator, in such form and manner and at such times as the Administrator may prescribe, a report containing the following information:

"(A) His name and address.

"(B) The title of his position with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(C) A brief description of his duties with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

"(D) The name and address of the aerospace contractor by whom he was employed

or whom he served as a consultant or otherwise.

"(E) The title of his position with such aerospace contractor.

"(F) A brief description of his duties and the work performed by him for the aerospace contractor.

"(G) The date on which his employment as a consultant or otherwise with such contractor terminated and the date on which his employment as a consultant or otherwise with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration began thereafter.

"(H) Such other pertinent information as the Administrator may require.

"(c)(1) No former employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be required to file a report under this section for any fiscal year in which he was employed by or served as a consultant or otherwise to an aerospace contractor if the total amount of contracts awarded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to such contractor during such year was less than $10,000,000; and no employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be required to file a report under this section for any fiscal year in which he was employed by or served as a consultant or otherwise to an aerospace contractor if the total amount of contracts awarded to such contractor by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during such year was less than $10,000,000.

"(2) No former National Aeronautics and Space Administration employee shall be required to file a report under this section for any fiscal year on account of employment with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration if such employment was terminated three years or more prior to the beginning of such fiscal year; and no employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be required to file a report under this section for any fiscal year on account of employment with or services performed for an aerospace contractor if such employment was terminated or such services were performed three years or more prior to the beginning of such fiscal year.

"(3) No former employee shall be required to file a report under this section for any fiscal year during which he was employed by or served as a consultant or otherwise to an aerospace contractor at a salary rate of less than $15,000 per year; and no employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including consultants or part-time employees, shall be required to file a report under this section for any fiscal year during which he was employed by or served as a consultant or otherwise to an aerospace contractor at a salary rate of less than $15,000 per year.

"(d) The Administrator shall, not later than December 31 of each year, file with the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives a report containing a list of the names of persons who have filed reports with him for the preceding fiscal year pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section. The Administrator shall include after each name so much information as he deems appropriate, and shall list the names of such persons under the aerospace contractor for whom they worked or for whom they performed services.

"(e) Any former employee of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration whose employment with or services for an aerospace contractor terminated during any fiscal year shall be required to file a report pursuant to subsection (b)(1) of this section for such year if he would otherwise be required to file under such subsection; and any person whose employment with or services for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration terminated during any fiscal year shall be required to file a report pursuant to subsection (b)(2) of this section for such year if he would otherwise be required to file under such subsection.

"(f) The Administrator shall maintain a file containing the information filed with him pursuant to subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section and such file shall be open for public inspection at all times during the regular workday.

"(g) Any person who fails to comply with the filing requirements of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by not more than six months in prison or a fine of not more than $1,000, or both.

"(h) No person shall be required to file a report pursuant to this section for any year prior to the fiscal year 1971.

"SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1971".

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH E. KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JAMES G. FULTON,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
ALPHONZO BELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
HOWARD W. CANNON,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
CARL T. CURTIS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The Managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16516) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1971 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, 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 amendment of the Senate struck all after the enacting clause in the House bill and substituted new language. The Committee of Conference agreed to accept the Senate amendment with certain amendments and stipulations proposed by the Managers on the part of the House.

For fiscal year 1971 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested authorization in the amount of $3,333,000,000. The House approved authorization in the amount of $3,600,875,000. The Senate approved $3,315,950,000.

As a result of the conference, the total amount to be authorized was adjusted to $3,410,878,000. To this sum the Managers on the part of the House agreed. The amount agreed to by the Committee of Conference is $189,997,000 less than passed by the House for authorization, and $94,928,000 more than passed by the Senate.

Prior to the conference, the House had passed the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act which would provide $3,197,000,000 in appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in fiscal year 1971. The amount passed by the House for appropriations, still subject to Senate action, is $213,878,000 less than agreed to by the Committee of Conference for authorization.

The disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H.R. 16516 were resolved in conference as follows:

(1) For *Research and Development*, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested $2,606,100,000. The House passed version of H.R. 16516 included research and development programs totalling $2,873,200,000. The Senate approved $2,606,100,000, the amount of the Administration's request. The conferees agreed to research and development programs totalling $2,693,100,000 to be authorized. Adjustments to the Senate amendment were made in conference as follows:

(a) NASA requested a total of $956,500,000 for the Apollo Program. The House increased this by $130,500,000 noting the need to provide funds for augmented scientific payloads for lunar exploration missions and improvements for the Saturn V vehicle and maintenance of Saturn V vendor capability.

The Senate approved the amount requested by NASA, $956,500,000. The Senate receded and agreed to an addition of $38 million for the Apollo Program bringing the authorized total to $994,500,000. The increase of $38 million will provide for additional scientific payloads for lunar exploration flights.

(b) NASA requested a total of $515,200,000 for the Space Flight Operations Program. The House increased this amount by $139,500,000 noting the need for increasing the scientific return from the long duration Skylab flights in 1972–1973 and the need to assess and more intensively examine the technology associated with the space shuttle/station program. The Senate approved the amount requested by NASA, $515,200,000. The Senate receded and agreed to an increase of $50,000,000 in Space Flight Operations bringing the authorization total to $565,200,000. These funds will provide for additional emphasis on the development of scientific payloads for the Skylab Program scheduled to fly in 1972–1973.

(c) NASA requested a total of $2,500,000 for the Advanced Missions Program. The House decreased this amount by $1,500,000 noting the fact that NASA has sufficient unobligated FY 1970 funds to support advanced mission planning for a portion of FY 1971. The Senate approved the amount requested by NASA, $2,500,000. The Senate receded and agreed to a reduction of $1,000,000 in the Advanced Missions Program bringing the authorized total to $1,500,000. Based on the latest information furnished by NASA as to obligation of their advanced mission funds, an authorization of $1,500,000 will provide sufficient funding to support advanced missions analyses in FY 1971.

(d) NASA requested $116,000,000 for the Physics and Astronomy Program. The House reduced that amount by $5,600,000, the reduction to be applied to Explorer satellites. This action was designed to make available an additional $5,600,000 for the ATS–F and G project without increasing the total budget for the Office of Space Science and Applications. This necessitated deferral of certain Explorer satellites. The Senate approved the amount requested by NASA for Physics and Astronomy, $116,000,000. The House receded and accepted the Senate amendment.

(e) NASA requested $167,000,000 for Space Applications, of which $31,100,000 was designated for the ATS–F and G project. The House increased this amount by $5,600,000, in order to re-establish the original launch schedule of this important project, which had been delayed by six-to-twelve months during consideration of the FY 1971 NASA budget within the Administration. The Senate approved the amount requested by NASA, $167,000,000. The House receded and accepted the Senate amendment in view of the fact that the passage of time precluded the possibility of reestablishing the original launch schedule of ATS–F and G.

(f) The House added $1,500,000 to the NASA request of $22,400,000 for Electronics Systems to perform needed research on safety of flight items. The Senate approved the Administration request. Of the amount added by the House $800,000 was for Wake Turbulence detection at airports, $300,000 for Clear Air Turbulence detection and $400,000 for Pilot Warning Indicator development. The

Senate receded and accepted this House increase resulting in a total authorization of $23,900,000 for Electronics Systems.

(g) The House added $400,000 to the NASA request of $17,900,000 for Human Factor Systems. The Senate approved the Administration request. The Senate receded and accepted the House increase. The amount added by the House is to be used for the study of aircrew workload and stress problems. A better understanding of the factors involved in these problems will result in increased flight safety. The authorization for Human Factor Systems is therefore $18,300,000.

(h) The House added $400,000 to the budget request of $17,600,000 for Basic Research. The Senate approved the Administration request. The Senate receded and accepted the House increase. This additional amount is to be used for materials research to alleviate noise and pollution from combustion products. The authorization for Basic Research is therefore $18,000,000.

(i) The House reduced the Tracking and Data Acquisition request of $298,000,000 by $4,200,000. The Senate approved the Administration's request. The compromise agreed to by the Committee of Conference resulted in a net reduction of $2,800,000, resulting in a total authorization of $295,200,000 for this item.

(j) The House added $500,000 to the Technology Utilization request of $4,000,000. The Senate approved the requested amount. The Senate receded and agreed to the House figure. This additional amount is to be used to expedite the flow of NASA technology to aid in the solution of urban and environmental problems. The total authorization, therefore, for Technology Utilization is $4,500,000.

(2) For Construction of Facilities the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested $34,600,000. The House passed authorization totaled $33,975,000 and the Senate passed bill included $32,550,000 for Construction of Facilities. Projects in disagreement were resolved as follows:

(a) A line item of $2,050,000 was included in the Administration budget for the construction of an experimental Earth Resources Technology Laboratory at Goddard. The House approved it; the Senate rejected it. Meantime, NASA's plan for the facility was changed, to provide for modification of the 3d floor of the existing Data Interpretation Laboratory at Goddard (Building 23) and the addition of a 4th floor, at an estimated cost of $1,928,000. Accordingly, the conferees agreed to authorize the revised plan at the reduced cost estimate for the experimental research laboratory, with an understanding that early attention will be given by NASA and other executive agencies to future operational facilities that will be required for beneficial utilization of earth resources satellites.

It is clear that several federal agencies will have a need for the kind of information that will be provided by earth resources satellites. In fact, NASA is designing the data collection and return systems of the Earth Resource Technology Satellites (ERTS) so as to maximize their usefulness for the prospective user agencies. It is equally clear, however, that insufficient attention has been given to the organizational aspects of an operational system which are compounded by the very nature of the multiple interests that would be served. In addition, there are international ramifications to an operating ERTS system that have not been adequately considered.

The conferees agreed, therefore, that the Executive Branch and particularly NASA and the Office of Management and Budget should give prompt and careful study to the problem of how an operational earth resources survey satellite system would be structured both in terms of the many federal agency interests that will be involved and in terms of its international aspects. However, in view of the current developmental status of the NASA experimental project, operational facilities for an earth resources survey system should not be built until such time that the benefits of continuing satellite surveys can be assessed and a determination made that an operational earth resources satellite system should be built.

(b) For "Various Locations" the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested $18,575,000. Included in this request was a program involving 38 major modification and rehabilitation projects at NASA field installations amounting to $14.0 million.

The House reduced this request by $625,000, denying authorizations for two projects: Rehabilitate Utility Systems, Michoud Assembly Facility, $250,000; Rehabilitate High Pressure Gas Facility, Mississippi Test Facility, $375,000. The House action was based on the fact that the two installations will revert to standby status in mid FY 1971 and, accordingly, extensive rehabilitation should not be performed until a firm long-term need for these stations is identified.

The Senate approved the request for the two projects in question with the proviso that the work at the Mississippi Test Facility be cancelled if subsequent information makes it clear that the project will not be required to support future programs.

The Managers on the part of the House receded to the Senate position on the amount to be authorized, recognizing that the annual request for NASA-wide facilities modification and rehabilitation work is composed of candidate projects selected from a large backlog of deferred maintenance work. Further, if a long-term need for the work at the installations concerned does not materialize, the Administrator of NASA has the option under established procedures to substitute more urgently required projects. Annual reporting by NASA on the use of funds authorized for these purposes is required by the House.

(c) Consequently, the amount to be authorized for Construction of Facilities is $34,478,000.

(3) For *Research and Program Management* the National Aeronautics and Space Administration requested $692,300,000. The House increased this amount by $1.4 million recommending authorization in the amount of $693,700,000 and in the accompanying legislative report stipulated that the increase was intended specifically for research fellowships, additional summer jobs and graduate and undergraduate scholarships in the field of aeronautics.

The Senate amendment contained no provision for additional authorization for aeronautical trainees. However, the conferees agreed that there is an urgent need for encouraging younger personnel, trained in the Aeronautical Sciences, to accept research positions in NASA. Thereby, the quality of personnel and the national reservoir of basic scientific data needed to keep the country and the industry foremost in this field will be enhanced. Testimony taken by the Committee on Science and Astronautics has revealed the declining numbers of engineering graduates in Aeronautics and the increasing average age of personnel in NASA performing needed aeronautical research. To correct this trend, the conferees were in agreement that NASA should initiate such a program and that this action should be taken within the total authorized amount.

The Senate reduced the authorization request for Research and Program Management by $15,000,000 recommending that $677,300,000 be authorized for these purposes. The reduction by the Senate was made specifically in the area of personnel and related costs. The Senate amendment added new language to Section 1(c) prescribing a ceiling of $500,108,000 for personnel and related costs.

In conference, a compromise was reached and a total authorization of $683,300,000 for Research and Program Management was agreed to. The House conferees receded to the Senate insistence that restrictive language be included in Section 1(c) concerning personnel and related costs. However, the Senate receded on the ceiling to be prescribed and the conferees agreed to a limit of $506,108,000.

Thus, the amount to be authorized for Research and Program Management is $683,300,000 which is $10,400,000 less than approved by the House and $6,000,000 more than approved by the Senate.

(4) *Legislative Amendments:* In addition to specific programs and projects in conference, three general legislative amendments were in disagreement. Differences between the House and Senate versions were resolved as follows:

(a) The Senate amendment to H.R. 16516 contained a new provision [subsection 1(i)] which places a ceiling of $500,000 on funds appropriated pursuant to Section 1 which may be used for the payment of services, per diem, travel and other expenses of experts and consultants. The House bill contained no such provision.

Information available to the Managers on the part of the House indicates that funds used for consultant salaries, travel and other expenses by NASA for the first ten months of fiscal year 1970 are estimated at $753,000. The cost accounting system at the NASA headquarters was not sufficiently responsive to determine the exact cost experience in this area. The House conferees agreed that some legislative controls are necessary for this type of expense and accepted the Senate provision subject to further evaluation for fiscal year 1972.

(b) The Senate amendment included additional language in the fund transfer authority contained in Section 4 of the House bill. The Senate provision [subsection 4(b)], was in the nature of conforming language, which would prohibit the transfer of funds appropriated pursuant to this Act to the Research and Program Management appropriation for the purpose of exceeding the authorized ceiling placed on personnel and related costs imposed by Section 1(c). The House bill contained no such provision.

The Managers on the part of the House disagreed with the Senate conferees on the basis that the proposed language was entirely too restrictive, removed all flexibility, and failed to take into account the impact of reduction-in-force procedure on test and evaluation activities, mission operations and particularly mission safety.

Therefore, substitute language was agreed to by the conferees which will permit the transfer of up to one per centum of the amounts authorized to the personnel account whenever the Administrator determines that such a transfer is necessary for the safety of any mission. Due notification and the normal 30 day waiting period as prescribed in the annual Act would prevail.

(c) The Senate amendment included a new provision, Section 7, substantively the same as Section 6 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act, 1970 (83 Stat. 196). This latter section was amended to perfect the wording which provides for the disclosure of the names, titles, and work descriptions of personnel who are former employees of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration involved in procurement or other contractual effort and who now work for companies under contract with the agency with more than $10 million in annual business. The same provision also applies to present employees of the agency who have worked for aerospace contractors. The House bill contained no such provision.

The Managers on the part of the House, recognizing that the language is identical, except for minor perfecting modifications to Section 6 of the National Aeronautics and

Space Administration Authorization Act, 1970, agreed to the Senate provision.

GEORGE P. MILLER,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
JOSEPH KARTH,
KEN HECHLER,
JAMES G. FULTON,
CHARLES A. MOSHER,
ALPHONZO BELL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17138, SALARY INCREASES FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICEMEN, FIREMEN, AND TEACHERS

Mr. DOWDY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 17138) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91–1190)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17138) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, 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 House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

"SALARY SCHEDULE

"Salary class and title	Service step						Longevity step		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	A	B	C
Class 1:									
Subclass (a) Fire private. Police private.	$8,500	$8,755	$9,180	$9,605	$10,285	$10,965	$11,390	$11,815	$12,240
Subclass (b) Private assigned as: Technician. Plainclothesman. Station clerk. Motorcycle officer. Horse mounted officer.	9,095	9,350	9,775	10,200	10,880	11,560	11,985	12,410	12,835
Class 2:									
Subclass (a) Fire inspector.	9,775	10,340	10,905	11,470			12,035	12,600	13,165
Subclass (b) Fire inspector assigned as technician.	10,370	10,935	11,500	12,065			12,630	13,195	13,760
Class 3 Assistant marine engineer. Assistant pilot. Detective.	10,625	11,155	11,685	12,215			12,745	13,275	13,805
Class 4:									
Subclass (a) Fire sergeant. Police sergeant.	11,475	12,050	12,625	13,200			13,775	14,350	14,925
Subclass (b) Detective sergeant.	11,900	12,495	13,090	13,685			14,280	14,875	15,470
Subclass (c) Police sergeant assigned as: Motorcycle officer. Horse mounted officer.	12,070	12,645	13,220	13,795			14,370	14,945	15,520
Class 5 Fire lieutenant. Police lieutenant.	13,300	13,965	14,630	15,295			15,960	16,625	
Class 6 Marine engineer. Pilot.	14,550	15,280	16,010	16,740			17,470	18,200	
Class 7 Captain.	15,800	16,590	17,380	18,170			18,960	19,750	
Class 8 Battalion fire chief. Police inspector.	18,500	19,425	20,350	21,275			22,200	23,125	
Class 9 Deputy fire chief. Deputy chief of police.	21,500	22,575	23,650	24,725			25,800	26,875	
Class 10 Assistant chief of police. Assistant fire chief. Commanding officer of the Executive Protective Service. Commanding officer of the U.S. Park Police.	23,800	25,780	27,760	29,750					
Class 11 Fire chief. Chief of police."	28,500	29,925	31,350	32,775					

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

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

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

(3) Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was serving in service step 1, 2, 3, or 4 of subclass (b) of salary class 9 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed in and receive basic compensation in salary class 10 at the service step corresponding to that service step in which he was serving immediately prior to the effective date of this title.

Each officer or member who immediately prior to the effective date of this title was serving in longevity step A or B of subclass (b) of salary class 9 shall, on the effective date of this title, be placed in and receive basic compensation in service step 4 of salary class 10.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 109. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the District of Columbia government or of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, or the Executive Protective Service, who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this title for services rendered during such period, and (2) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after July 1, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this title by an officer or member who dies during such period.

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

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

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

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

SEC. 112. This title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after July 1, 1969.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN POLICE MATTERS

SEC. 201. (a) The uniform of officers and members of the United States Park Police force, the Executive Protective Service, the Capitol Police, and the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall bear a distinctive patch, pin, or other emblem depicting the flag of the United States or the colors thereof.

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

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

SEC. 202. All laws of the United States in force on the date of enactment of this title in which reference is made to the White House Police force are amended by substituting "Executive Protective Service" for each such reference.

SEC. 203. The first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside", approved July 25, 1956 (D.C. Code, sec. 4–132a) is amended—

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

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

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

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

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

TITLE III—SALARY INCREASE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

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

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

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

"Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 1:									
Superintendent of schools	$38,500								
Class 2:									
Group A, Deputy superintendent	31,000								
Group B, Associate superintendent	29,000								

"Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 3:									
Assistant superintendent	$22,190	$22,720	$23,250	$23,780	$24,310	$24,840	$25,370	$25,900	$26,430
Class 4	19,480	19,940	20,400	20,860	21,320	21,780	22,240	22,700	23,160
Director, curriculum.									
Director, staff development.									
Executive assistant to superintendent.									
Class 5:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	17,600	18,040	18,480	18,920	19,360	19,800	20,240	20,680	21,120
Group B, master's degree	18,380	18,820	19,260	19,700	20,140	20,580	21,020	21,460	21,900
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	18,770	19,210	19,650	20,090	20,530	20,970	21,410	21,850	22,290
Group D, doctor's degree	19,160	19,600	20,040	20,480	20,920	21,360	21,800	22,240	22,680
Chief examiner.									
Executive assistants to associate superintendents.									
Director of food services.									
Director, industrial and adult education.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level IV, principal	17,860	18,285	18,710	19,135	19,560	19,985	20,410	20,835	21,260
Level III, principal	17,345	17,770	18,195	18,620	19,045	19,470	19,895	20,320	20,745
Level II, principal	16,830	17,255	17,680	18,105	18,530	18,955	19,380	19,805	20,230
Level I, principal	16,315	16,740	17,165	17,590	18,015	18,440	18,865	19,290	19,715
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	18,250	18,675	19,100	19,525	19,950	20,375	20,800	21,225	21,650
Level IV, principal	18,250	18,675	19,100	19,525	19,950	20,375	20,800	21,225	21,650
Level III, principal	17,735	18,160	18,585	19,010	19,435	19,860	20,285	20,710	21,135
Level II, principal	17,220	17,645	18,070	18,495	18,920	19,345	19,770	20,195	20,620
Level I, principal	16,705	17,130	17,555	17,980	18,405	18,830	19,255	19,680	20,105
Group D, doctor's degree	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level IV, principal	18,640	19,065	19,490	19,915	20,340	20,765	21,190	21,615	22,040
Level III, principal	18,125	18,550	18,975	19,400	19,825	20,250	20,675	21,100	21,525
Level II, principal	17,610	18,035	18,460	18,885	19,310	19,735	20,160	20,585	21,010
Level I, principal	17,095	17,520	17,945	18,370	18,795	19,220	19,645	20,070	20,495
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent of pupil personnel services.									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (industrial and adult education, vocational education, evening and summer school).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics, and safety.									
Director, special education.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization school.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans' high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree	16,205	16,595	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	16,595	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325	19,715
Group D, doctor's degree	16,985	17,375	17,765	18,155	18,545	18,935	19,325	19,715	20,105
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Director, school attendance.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Director, elementary education.									
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree	14,800	15,175	15,550	15,925	16,300	16,675	17,050	17,425	17,800
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,190	15,565	15,940	16,315	16,690	17,065	17,440	17,815	18,190
Group D, doctor's degree	15,580	15,955	16,330	16,705	17,080	17,455	17,830	18,205	18,580
Statistical analyst.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization school.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree	13,880	14,240	14,600	14,960	15,320	15,680	16,040	16,400	16,760
Group B, master's degree	14,660	15,020	15,380	15,740	16,100	16,460	16,820	17,180	17,540
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	15,050	15,410	15,770	16,130	16,490	16,850	17,210	17,570	17,930
Group D, doctor's degree	15,440	15,800	16,160	16,520	16,880	17,240	17,600	17,960	18,320
Assistant director, food services.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree	14,095	14,445	14,795	15,145	15,495	15,845	16,195	16,545	16,895
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,485	14,835	15,185	15,535	15,885	16,235	16,585	16,935	17,285
Group D, doctor's degree	14,875	15,225	15,575	15,925	16,275	16,625	16,975	17,325	17,675
Assistant director, audio visual instruction.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Assistant director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree	13,670	14,005	14,340	14,675	15,010	15,345	15,680	16,015	16,350
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	14,060	14,395	14,730	15,065	15,400	15,735	16,070	16,405	16,740
Group D, doctor's degree	14,450	14,785	15,120	15,455	15,790	16,125	16,460	16,795	17,130
Assistant director, practical nursing.									

"Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree	$13,200	$13,525	$13,850	$14,175	$14,500	$14,825	$15,150	$15,475	$15,800
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,590	13,915	14,240	14,565	14,890	15,215	15,540	15,865	16,190
Group D, doctor's degree	13,980	14,305	14,630	14,955	15,280	15,605	15,930	16,255	16,580
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree	12,080	12,456	12,850	13,235	13,620	14,005	14,390	14,775	15,160
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	12,470	12,855	13,240	13,625	14,010	14,395	14,780	15,165	15,550
Group D, doctor's degree	12,860	13,245	13,630	14,015	14,400	14,785	15,170	15,555	15,940
Psychiatric social worker.									

"Salary class and group	Service step 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Class 14:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$9,250	$9,660	$10,070	$10,480	$10,890	$11,300	$11,710
Group B, master's degree	10,030	10,440	10,850	11,260	11,670	12,080	12,490
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	10,420	10,830	11,240	11,650	12,060	12,470	12,880
Group D, doctor's degree	10,810	11,220	11,630	12,040	12,450	12,860	13,270
Coordinator of practical nursing.							
Census supervisor.							
Class 15:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	7,800	8,115	8,430	8,745	9,060	9,375	9,760
Group A–1, bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours	8,190	8,505	8,820	9,135	9,450	9,765	10,150
Groub B, master's degree	8,580	8,965	9,350	9,735	10,120	10,505	10,990
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,970	9,355	9,740	10,125	10,510	10,895	11,380
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree	9,360	9,745	10,130	10,515	10,900	11,285	11,770
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.							
Attendance officer.							
Child labor inspectors.							
Counselor, placement.							
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.							
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.							
Research assistant.							
School social worker.							
Speech correctionist.							
School psychologist.							

"Salary class and group	Service step 8	9	10	11	12	13	Longevity step Y
Class 14:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	$12,120	$12,530	$12,940	$13,350	$13,760	$14,170	----------
Group B, master's degree	12,900	13,310	13,720	14,130	14,540	14,950	----------
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	13,290	13,700	14,110	14,520	14,930	15,340	----------
Group D, doctor's degree	13,680	14,090	14,500	14,910	15,320	15,730	----------
Coordinator of practical nursing.							
Census supervisor.							
Class 15:							
Group A, bachelor's degree	10,145	10,530	10,915	11,300	11,685	12,070	$13,000
Group A–1, bachelor's degree plus 15 credit hours	10,535	10,920	11,305	11,690	12,075	12,460	13,800
Group B, master's degree	11,475	11,960	12,445	12,930	13,415	13,900	15,200
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	11,865	12,350	12,835	13,320	13,805	14,290	15,600
Group D, master's degree plus 60 credit hours or doctor's degree	12,255	12,740	13,225	13,710	14,195	14,680	16,100
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.							
Attendance officer.							
Child labor inspectors.							
Counselor, placement.							
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.							
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.							
Research assistant.							
School social worker.							
Speech correctionist.							
School psychologist."							

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"(f) Whenever a teacher or school officer is changed to a lower salary class or to a lower level in the same salary class as in the case of school principals in the public school system, the Superintendent of Schools is authorized to fix the rate of compensation at a rate provided for in the salary class or level to which the employee is changed which does not exceed his existing rate of compensation, except that if his existing rate falls between two service steps provided in such lower salary class or level, he shall receive the higher of such rates; if he is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum rate provided in such lower salary class or level in which he is to be placed, he will retain his existing rate of compensation and receive one-half of any

future increases granted his new salary class or level until such time as his rate of basic compensation is no longer in excess of the maximum rate provided in such lower salary class or level. This subsection shall not apply if such reduction to a lower salary class or level is (1) for personal cause, (2) at the request of such teacher or school officer, (3) as a condition of a previous temporary promotion to a higher grade, or (4) because of a reduction in force brought about by lack of funds or curtailment of work."

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

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

(7) Section 6(b) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1531(b)) is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "On July 1 of each year, following the effective date of the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act Amendments of 1970, each permanent employee who has not reached the highest service step for his group, or, if his salary class has no group, the highest service step for such salary class, shall advance one such service step until he reaches the highest service step for such group or salary class. However, the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement following any school year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of 'satisfactory' from his superior officer."

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

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

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

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

whichever is later.

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

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

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

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

(10)(A) Section 13(d)(1) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(d)(1)) is amended by—

(1) striking out "a classroom teacher" and inserting in lieu thereof "any employee";

(2) striking out "teaching load assigned for a regular day school teacher at his particular school level" and inserting in lieu thereof "work assignment";

(3) striking out "a teacher" and inserting in lieu thereof "such employee"; and

(4) striking out "$750" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000".

(B) Section 13(d)(2) (D.C. Code, sec. 31–1542(d)(2)) is amended by—

(1) striking out "classroom teachers" and inserting in lieu thereof "employees";

(2) striking out "monthly";

(3) inserting after "extra duty activity" the following: "in the same manner as regular pay"; and

(4) striking out "a classroom teacher" and inserting in lieu thereof "such an employee".

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

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

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

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

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

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

SEC. 305. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) on the date of enactment of this title, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to any employee covered in this title who, as of June 29, 1970, is in the service of the Board of Education, (2) to any employee covered in this title who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after September 1, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this title, for services rendered during such period, and (3) in accordance with the provisions of subchapter VIII of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code (relating to settlement of accounts of deceased employees), for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first

pay period which began on or after September 1, 1969, and ending on the date of enactment of this Act, by any such employee who dies during such period.

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

SEC. 306. The provisions of this title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after September 1, 1969.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Section 3 of title VI of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1567(a)) is amended to read as follows:

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

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

SEC. 402. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, up to $8,000,000 for use in defraying the cost of the pay increases provided for by this Act for the period commencing July 1, 1969, and ending December 31, 1969. Such sum authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section shall be in addition to any other sums authorized under any other law, and in addition to the increase in revenue raised as a result of the amendment to section 3 of the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, sec. 47–1567(a)) made by section 401 of this Act.

TITLE V—PAY RATE FOR THE COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE MILITIA OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 501. (a) Section 7 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved March 1, 1889 (D.C. Code, sec. 39–201), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 7.", and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c), any person serving as the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia shall be considered to be an employee of the Department of Defense, and of the United States, within the meaning of section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

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

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

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

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
JOHN DOWDY,
DON FUQUA,
EARLE CABELL,
ANCHER NELSEN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
ALAN BIBLE,
W. B. SPONG,
WINSTON PROUTY,
CHARLIE GOODELL,
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR.,
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 Senate to the bill (H.R. 17138) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, 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 Senate amendment struck out all the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below expect for minor technical and clarifying changes made necessary by reason of the conference agreement.

POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY SCHEDULE

The House bill provided for an overall average salary increase of 13 percent. The conference substitute contains the House schedule, except that it increases the pay for service steps 2, 3, and 4 in Class 10.

RETIRED ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS

The House passed bill provided that certain retired Assistant Superintendents shall be held and considered for the purpose of computing their retirement benefits (payable on and after the effective date of the Act) to have retired in the rank of Assistant Chief. The Senate amendment contained no comparable provision.

It is the intention of the House provision that, for the purpose of computing such retirement benefits, such Assistant Superintendents shall be held and considered to have retired after the effective date of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF POLICE AND FIREMEN'S SALARY INCREASE

The House bill provided that the salary increase for police and firemen was to be effective January 1, 1970. The Senate amendment provided that such salary increase was to be effective July 1, 1969. The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

POLICE TRIAL BOARD

The House bill provided that the trial board would be the exclusive body to receive, hear, and determine complaints against officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force. No comparable provision was contained in the Senate amendment, and none is contained in the conference substitute.

SUPERINTENDENT'S PAY

The House bill provided a salary of $35,000 for the Superintendent of Schools. The Senate amendment provided for a salary of $38,500. The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF TEACHERS' SALARY INCREASE

The House bill provided that the salary increase for teachers was to be effective January 1, 1970. The Senate amendment provided that such increase was to be effective September 1, 1969. The conference substitute adopts the Senate provision.

EXTRA-DUTY PAY FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

The Senate amendment provided that the District of Columbia Commissioner would determine the rate of extra-duty pay, and that any employee in salary class 15 would be eligible for such extra-duty pay. There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The conference substitute provides that the determination of the rate of extra-duty pay shall remain in the Board of Education as under existing law, that all employees in salary class 15 shall be entitled to extra-duty pay (existing law permits extra-duty pay only for teachers), and that the maximum rate of extra-duty pay shall be $1,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE FOR TEACHERS

The House bill provided that the 3 days of administrative leave permitted employees would be available only for purposes authorized by the Board of Education. No comparable provision was contained in the Senate amendment, and none is contained in the conference substitute.

EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The House bill required the Board of Education to formulate certain policies, procedures, rules, and regulations relating to employee-management relations between the board and its employees. No comparable provision was contained in the Senate amendment, and none is contained in the conference substitute.

TAX ON THE SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

The House bill amended the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act to reduce the sales tax on those alcoholic beverages sold for consumption off the premises from 5 percent to 4 percent. No comparable provision was contained in the Senate amendment, and none is contained in the conference substitute.

FEDERAL PAYMENT

The Senate amendment contained provisions for Federal payments or contributions to the District of Columbia totaling $21,546,000. No comparable provision was contained in the House bill.

It was the conclusion of the managers on the part of the House that the predicted additional revenues to the District from the increases in individual income taxes provided in H.R. 17138 will be sufficient to finance the salary increases and other costs to the District of the bill as passed by the House. However, in view of the added cost to the District taxpayers resulting from the increase in their income taxes, your conferees agreed to authorize a one-time Federal payment, not to exceed $8,000,000 to meet the added costs resulting from the conference action which made the substitute bill further retroactive to July 1, 1969, for police and firemen, and to September 1, 1969, for teachers. This would enable the Appropriations Committees, should they find the additional revenues from the income tax increases in-

sufficient to finance this legislation, to appropriate such amount as may be necessary up to $8,000,000 to cover the costs of the legislation.

COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE MILITIA OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The House bill provided that the Commanding General would be paid at a rate equal to the minimum rate of basic pay for GS–15. No comparable provision was contained in the Senate amendment. The conference substitute provides that the Commanding General shall be considered to be an employee within the Federal competitive service.

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY,
JOHN DOWDY,
DON FUQUA,
EARLE CABELL,
ANCHER NELSEN,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on June 8 I was absent in order to attend my son's graduation exercise in college. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the various votes to authorize the select committee to study recent developments in Southeast Asia.

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the annual report on the international educational and cultural exchange program conducted during the Fiscal Year 1969 under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–256, the Fulbright-Hays Act).

This program, in Fiscal Year 1969, exchanged more than 6,500 teachers, scholars, students and distinguished leaders between the United States and 132 countries and territories. More than 2,000 of these were leaders, potential leaders and professionals from other lands who came to observe and study the United States, its people and institutions. Cumulatively, from 1949 through 1969, 132,380 United States and foreign grantees have been exchanged under this State Department program.

This exchange has directly contributed to the achievement of our foreign policy objectives. Observing and working with colleagues here on mutual problems, our visitors have established personal and institutional relationships which persist through the years. They have realized what they have in common with us, as well as our differences. Together with American grantees studying and teaching abroad, they have contributed greatly to the store of knowledge and understanding of our respective cultures, penetrating below the surface news and impressions of the mass media.

This report for the Fiscal Year 1969 educational and cultural exchange program is largely devoted to an aspect of the program too often overlooked—that is, the extraordinary extent to which it receives the cooperation and assistance, including financial assistance, from United States private groups, private individuals, private educational institutions and business corporations. This private cooperation not only indicates the high level of citizen interest in exchange but gives the program its essential character and effectiveness.

Perhaps in no other way have the American people made so direct a contribution to our foreign policy objectives for the 1970's which I defined in my February 18 message to Congress.

I commend this report to the thoughtful attention of the Congress.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 15, 1970.*

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

GOLD AND SILVER ARTICLES—CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8673) to protect consumers by providing a civil remedy for misrepresentation of the quality of articles composed in whole or in part of gold or silver, and for other purposes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE 1972 UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

The Clerk called House Resolution 562, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should actively participate in the 1972 United Nations Conference on Human Environment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

TO COMMEMORATE OPENING OF CHEROKEE STRIP TO HOMESTEADING

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15012) to authorize a study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the national park system to commemorate the opening of the Cherokee Strip to homesteading, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 15012

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of commemorating the opening of the Cherokee Strip to homesteading, and the historic use of the Chisholm Trail, cattle trails of the old southwest, and other such arteries of commerce which contributed to the expansion of our Nation; and to preserve for the benefit of the American people outstanding examples of the natural prairie scene which existed during this period of expansion and growth, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause the National Park Service to study, investigate, and formulate recommendations on the feasibility and desirability of establishing as a part of the national park system, an area, on lands in the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, associated with the aforesaid events and representative of the terrain and natural environment existing during such times.

SEC. 2. As a part of such study, other interested Federal agencies, and State and local bodies and officials shall be consulted, and the study shall be coordinated with applicable outdoor recreation plans, highway plans, and other planning activities relating to the region.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall submit to the President, within one year after the date of this Act, a report of the findings and recommendations of the National Park Service, as approved by him. The report of the Secretary shall contain, but not be limited to, findings with respect to the scenic, scientific, historic, and natural values of the land resources involved, including specifically, recommendations as to scenic, and historic site preservation or marking.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "cause the National Park Service to".

Page 2, line 13, strike out "President," and insert "President and to the Congress of the United States,"

Page 2, lines 22 through 24, strike out all of section 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $30,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15012, which is sponsored by my friend from Kansas (Mr. SKUBITZ), has one objective: to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to commence a study to determine what national recognition would be suitable and desirable for the area known as the Cherokee Strip.

The historic significance of the events which occurred in this part of Kansas and Oklahoma is indisputable. History buffs will recall that this area is rich in Indian history, but it also represents an important phase in western history. Many of the cattle trails of the Old Southwest crossed the Strip and it was here that homesteading had some of its most dramatic moments.

I want to make it absolutely clear, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation authorizes only a study. If the study reveals that it would be desirable to establish some type of unit of the National Park system in this area, then the matter will come before the Congress again. At that time, we will have the benefit of the informa-

tion developed by the study in making our recommendations.

The committee recommends that the bill be amended to allow the Secretary some measure of flexibility in selecting the agency which is to make this study. While the committee recognizes that the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is to conduct studies on some of the old cattle trails of the Southwest, we do not feel that the study of those portions of those trails crossing the Cherokee Strip will interfere with the broader studies which it is making. It may well be that some shorter segments of these historic trails could be recognized, while recognition of their entire length would not be feasible. In any event, we expect these studies to be coordinated to avoid unnecessary duplication.

Another amendment approved by the committee merely directs the Secretary to transmit his report to the Congress, as well as to the President. This will assure the prompt availability of the information to the Congress.

The other committee amendment deletes the open-ended authorization in the bill and inserts an authorization limited to the amount estimated to be needed for this purpose—$30,000.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, that summarizes the provisions of H.R. 15012. I believe that the Members will find the bill in good form and I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to say a few words about this bill, H.R. 15012, which I introduced.

The purpose of this bill is to authorize the study of the feasibility and desirability of establishing a unit of the National Park system in this to commemorate the opening of the Cherokee Strip to homesteading, the recognition of historic trails in the old Southwest, and a restoration of some outstanding examples of the natural prairie landscape.

It is estimated that this study will cost approximately $30,000.

The Cherokee Strip—located in Oklahoma—adjacent to Kansas—was land given to the Cherokee tribe as a hunting corridor.

It is an area about the size of the States of Delaware, Connecticut, and Rhode Island combined.

In September 1893, thousands of homesteaders, land grabbers, and what have you, gathered on the southern border of Kansas, waiting for the shot that would open this area to homesteading.

It was not the first opening, but it was the largest in our Nation's history.

First. As many as 50,000 people gathered in Arkansas City.

Second. Over 115,00 certificates were issued to homesteaders.

It was rich in history—it tells the story of the—

First. Conflict between cattlemen who needed grassland for grazing and the farmer who sought to till the soil.

Second. It is the story of the cattle movement from Texas, through Oklahoma, into Kansas, where the railroads were being built linking the East to the West.

This bill provides for the study of this strip area, which should have been done decades ago.

I urge the passage of this bill.

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

PROVIDING FOR DESIGNATION OF SPECIAL POLICEMEN AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14452) to provide for the designation of special policemen at the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 14452

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 3 of title 44, United States Code be amended by adding section 317, as follows:

"§ 317. Special policemen

"The Public Printer or his delegate may designate employees of the Government Printing Office to serve as special policemen to protect persons and property in premises and adjacent areas occupied *by* or under the control of the Government Printing Office. Under regulations to be prescribed by the Public Printer, employees designated as special policemen are authorized to bear and use arms in the performance of their duties; make arrest for violations of laws of the United States, the several States, and the District of Columbia; and enforce the regulations of the Public Printer, including the removal from Government Printing Office premises of individuals who violate such regulations. The jurisdiction of special policemen in premises occupied or under the control of the Government Printing Office and adjacent areas shall be concurrent with the jurisdiction of the respective law enforcement agencies where the premises are located."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert in lieu thereof: "That chapter 3 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:".

On page 2, line 1, insert "by" immediately after "occupied".

On page 2, line 10, insert "by" immediately after "occupied".

On page 2, immediately below line 14, insert the following:

(b) The table of sections of chapter 3 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof—"317. Special policemen.".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING COMPENSATORY TIME OFF FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14453) to authorize the Public Printer to grant time off as compensation for overtime worked by certain employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone sponsoring this bill a question or two.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

FALLS OF THE OHIO INTERSTATE PARK COMPACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13971) granting the consent of Congress to the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Compact.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 13971

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Compact in substantially the following form:

"SECTION 1. The State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky agree to create, develop and operate an interstate park to be known as Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park, which shall be located along the Ohio River at the Falls of the Ohio and on adjacent areas in Clark and Floyd Counties, Indiana, and Jefferson County, Kentucky. Said park shall be of such area and of such character as may be determined by the commission created by this compact.

"SEC. 2. There is hereby created the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Commission, which shall be a body corporate with the powers and duties set forth herein and such additional powers as may be conferred upon it by subsequent action of the appropriate authorities of Indiana and Kentucky. The commission shall consist of three (3) commissioners from each of the two (2) states, each of whom shall be a citizen of the state he shall represent. Members of the commission shall be apponted by the governor. Vacanies shall be filled by the governor for the unexpired term. The term of one of the first commissioners appointed shall be for two (2) years, the term of another for three (3) years, and the term of the third for four (4) years. Their successors shall be appointed for terms of four (4) years each. Each commissioner shall hold office until his successor is appointed and qualified. An officer or employee of the state, a political subdivision or the United States government may be appointed a commissioner under this act.

"SEC. 3. The commission created herein shall be a joint corporate instrumentality of both the State of Indiana and the Commonwealth of Kentucky for the purpose of effecting the objects of this compact, and shall be deemed to be performing governmental functions of the two states in the performance of its duties hereunder. The commission shall have power to sue and be sued, to contract and be contracted with, to use a common seal and to make and adopt suitable bylaws, rules and regulations. The commission shall have the authority to acquire by gift, purchase, or otherwise, real estate and other property, and to dispose of such real estate and other property. Each state agrees that it will exercise the right of eminent domain to acquire property located within each state required by the commission to effectuate the purposes of this compact.

"SEC. 4. The commission shall select from among its members a chairman and a vice-chairman, and may select from among its members a secretary and treasurer or may designate other persons to fill these positions. It may appoint, and at its pleasure remove or discharge, such officers and legal, clerical, expert and other assistants and employees as may be required to carry the provisions of this compact into effect, and shall fix and determine their duties, qualifications and compensation. It may establish and maintain one or more offices for the transaction of its business, and may meet at any time or place. A majority of the commissioners present shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. The commissioners shall serve without compensation, but shall be paid their expenses incurred in and incident to the performance of their duties. They shall take the oath of office required of officers of their respective states.

"SEC. 5. Each state agrees that the officers and departments of each will be authorized to do all things falling within their respective jurisdictions necessary or incidental to the carrying out of the compact in every particular. The commission shall be entitled to the services of any state officer or agency in the same manner as any other department or agency of this state. The commission shall keep accurate records, showing in full its receipts and disbursements, and said records shall be open at any reasonable time to the inspection of such representative of the two (2) states as may be duly constituted for that purpose. The commission shall submit annually and at other times as required such reports as may be required by the laws of each state or by the governor thereof.

"SEC. 6. The cost of acquiring land and other property required in the development and operation of the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park and constructing, maintaining, and operating improvements and facilities therein and equipping same may be defrayed by funds received from appropriations, gifts, the use of money received as fees or charges for the use of said park and facilities, or by the issuance of revenue bonds, or by a combination of such sources of funds. The commission may charge for admission to said park, or make other charges deemed appropriate by it and shall have the use of funds so received for park purposes. The commission is authorized to issue revenue bonds, which shall not be obligations of either state, pursuant to procedures which shall be in substantial compliance with the provisions of laws of either or both states governing the issuance of revenue bonds by governmental agencies.

"SEC. 7. All money, securities and other property, real and personal, received by way of gift or otherwise or revenue received from its operations may be retained by the commission and used for the development, maintenance, and operation of the park or for other park purposes.

"The commission shall not pledge the credit of either state except by and with the authority of the general assembly thereof.

"SEC. 8. This compact may be amended from time to time by the concurrent action of the two (2) states parties hereto.

"The compact approved herein shall become effective upon ratification and approval of the compact by the general assembly of the state of Indiana and upon approval of this compact by the Congress of the United States."

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, strike out lines 24 and 25 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 2. The consent herein granted does not constitute consent in advance for amendments to the compact made pursuant to Section 8 thereof or for the conferral of additional powers upon the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Commission pursuant to Section 2 of the compact.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the last sentence of Section 2 of the compact, this Act does not grant consent for the appointment to the Commission of an officer or employee of the United States whose service as a member of the Commission is prohibited by Federal law or regulation.

"SEC. 4. The right is hereby reserved by the Congress or any of its standing committees to require the disclosure and the furnishing of such information and data by or concerning the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Commission in its operation under the compact as is deemed appropriate by Congress or such committee.

"SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend or repeal this Act is expressly reserved."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

CREATING UNIFORM POLICY FOR ADMINISTRATION OF TRAINING AT THE SERVICE ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2499) to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the Academies of the military departments.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 2499

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 403 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4335(a) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end thereof:

"The Dean shall be appointed to serve for a period of four years and may be reappointed by the Secretary of the Army to serve additional four year periods."

(2) The following new section is added at the end thereof:

"§ 4356. Professional Training Advisory Board

"(a) There is a Professional Training Advisory Board at the Academy. The Board consists of not more than six career officers who are members of the faculty and are appointed by the Secretary of the Army.

"(b) The Board shall, on a continuing basis, evaluate and monitor the professional military training at the Academy. For each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the Board shall submit a written report of the results of its review and its recommendations through the Superintendent to the Secretary and the Congress."

(3) The following item is added to the analysis at the end thereof:

"4356. Professional Training Advisory Board."

SEC. 2. Chapter 603 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The following new section is added after section 6952:

"§ 6952a. Academic Dean

"(a) The Academic Dean shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy to serve for a period of four years and may be reappointed to serve for additional four year periods. The Academic Dean, if a regular military officer, shall be appointed from among those officers who have served as heads of departments of instruction at the Naval Academy.

"(b) The Academic Dean shall perform such duties as the Superintendent may prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary. The Academic Dean, if a regular military officer, has the grade of rear admiral of the lower half or brigadier general while serving as such, or, if a civilian, is entitled to such compensation for his services as the Secretary shall prescribe, but not more than the rate of compensation provided for grade GS-18 of the general schedule as provided in section 5104 of title 5."

(2) The following new section is added after section 6968:

"§ 6968a. Professional Training Advisory Board

"(a) There is a Professional Training Advisory Board at the Academy. The Board consists of not more than six career officers who are members of the faculty and are appointed by the Secretary of the Navy.

"(b) The Board shall, on a continuing basis, evaluate and monitor the professional military training at the Academy. For each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the Board shall submit a written report of the results of its review and its recommendations through the Superintendent to the Secretary and the Congress."

(3) The following new items are added to the analysis after sections 6952 and 6968, respectively:

"6852a. Academic Dean.

"6968a. Professional Training Advisory Board."

SEC. 3. Chapter 903 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 9335 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Dean of the faculty shall be appointed as an additional permanent professor from the permanent professors who have served as heads of departments of instruction at the Academy. The Dean shall be appointed to serve for a period of four years and may be reappointed by the Secretary of the Air Force to serve additional four year periods.

(b) The Dean shall perform such duties as the Superintendent shall prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary. The Dean has the grade of brigadier general while serving as such, with the benefits authorized for regular brigadier generals of the Air Force, except that his retirement age is that of a permanent professor of the Academy."

(2) The following new section is added at the end thereof:

"§ 9356. Professional Training Advisory Board

"(a) There is a Professional Training Advisory Board at the Academy. The Board consists of not more than six career officers who are members of the faculty and are appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force.

"(b) The Board shall, on a continuing basis, evaluate and monitor the professional military training at the Academy. For each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the Board shall submit a written report of the results of its review and its recommendations through the Superintendent to the Secretary and the Congress."

(3) The following new item is added to the analysis at the end thereof:

"9356. Professional Training Advisory Board."

With the following committee amendment:

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

That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 4335(a) is amended by adding the following new sentence at the end: "The Dean shall be appointed to serve for a period

of 4 years and may be reappointed by the Secretary of the Army to serve additional 4-year periods."

(2) Chapter 603 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new section after section 6952:

§ 6952a. Academic Dean

"(a) The Academic Dean shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Navy to serve for a period of 4 years and may be reappointed to serve for additional 4-year periods. The Academic Dean, if a regular military officer, shall be appointed from among those officers who have served as heads of departments of instruction at the Naval Academy.

"(b) The Academic Dean shall perform such duties as the Superintendent may prescribe, with the approval of the Secretary. The Academic Dean, if a regular military officer, has the grade of rear admiral of the lower half or bragadier general while serving as such, or, if a civilian, is entitled to such compensation for his services as the Secretary shall prescribe, but not more than the rate of compensation provided for grade GS–18 of the general schedule as provided in section 5104 of title 5."; and

(B) by adding the following new item to the analysis:

"6952a. Academic Dean."

(3) Section 9335 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new sentence at the end of subsection (a): "The Dean shall be appointed to serve for a period of four years and may be reappointed by the Secretary of the Air Force to serve additional four-year periods."; and

(B) by inserting the following new sentence at the beginning of subsection (b): "The Dean shall perform such duties as the Superintendent shall prescribe with the approval of the Secretary."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PROVIDING RELIEF TO CERTAIN FORMER OFFICERS OF THE SUPPLY CORPS AND CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8663) to amend the Act of September 20, 1968 (Public Law 90–502), to provide relief to certain former officers of the Supply Corps and Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 8663

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 6388 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following after the last sentence: "The provisions of this subsection are effective as of August 7, 1947.".

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a former officer of the Navy in the Supply Corps and Civil Engineer Corps who was not selected for promotion and was discharged prior to September 20, 1968, is entitled to be credited with his total commissioned service in determining the amount of his severance pay and to submit a claim prior to September 20, 1973, for any diminution thereof through a failure to be credited for prior service as an officer in the line.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 9, delete the words "was not selected for promotion and ", and substitute therefor the words "is considered to have twice failed of selection for promotion to either the grade of lieutenant commander or the grade of lieutenant and who".

On page 2, line 3, after the word "claim" insert the words "for payment".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

EXTENDING AUTHORITY TO GRANT SPECIAL 30-DAY LEAVE FOR MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES WHO VOLUNTARILY EXTEND THEIR TOURS OF DUTY IN HOSTILE FIRE AREAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16298) to amend section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to grant a special 30-day leave for members of the uniformed services who voluntarily extend their tours of duty in hostile fire areas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 16298

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 703(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

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

REPEALING OBSOLETE SECTIONS OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, AND SECTION 208 OF TITLE 37, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15112) to repeal several obsolete sections of title 10, United States Code, and section 208 of title 37, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 15112

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) sections 4539, 4623, 5981, 6159, and 6406 of title 10, United States Code, are hereby repealed, and (b) section 208 of title 37, United States Code, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. A. The analysis of chapter 433 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following:

"4539. Horses and mules."

B. The analysis of chapter 439 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following:

"4623. Tobacco: enlisted members of Army."

C. The analysis of chapter 553 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following:

"5981. Squadrons: detail of officers on active duty to command."

D. The analysis of chapter 561 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following:

"6159. Half rating to disabled naval enlisted personnel serving twenty years."

E. The analysis of chapter 573 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following:

"6406. Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps; officers: furlough; furlough pay."

F. The analysis of chapter 3 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the following:

"208. Furlough pay: officers of Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, following the existing language of section 2 of the bill, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the first section of this act, a person who is entitled to a pension under section 6159 of title 10, United States Code, on the day before the date of enactment of this act shall continue to be entitled to that pension on and after that date of enactment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

PAY AND ALLOWANCES FOR ENLISTED MEMBERS OF A UNIFORMED SERVICE WHO ACCEPT APPOINTMENTS AS OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16732) to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide that enlisted members of a uniformed service who accept appointments as officers shall not receive less than the pay and allowances to which they were previously entitled by virtue of their enlisted status.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16732

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 17 of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section:

"§ 907. Enlisted members appointed as officers; pay and allowances stabilized.

"An enlisted member who accepts a permanent or temporary appointment as an officer in a regular or reserve component of a uniformed service shall, following his appointment, be paid the greater of—

"(1) the pay and allowances to which, immediately prior to his appointment, he was entitled as an enlisted member, including—

"(A) proficiency pay to which he would be entitled had he not been appointed as an officer; and

"(B) clothing allowance, except when such member is eligible for payment of a uniform allowance as provided in section 415 of this title; or

"(2) the pay and allowances to which he thereafter becomes entitled as an officer.

However, proficiency pay, incentive pay for hazardous duty , special pay for diving duty, and sea and foreign duty pay may be used in calculating the amount of his former pay and allowances only for so long as the member continues to perform the duty and would be eligible to receive payment had he remained in his former status"; and

(2) by adding the following new item to the analysis:

"907. Enlisted members appointed as officers: pay and allowances stabilized

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

PROVIDING A MORE EQUITABLE STANDARD FOR AWARDING GOLD STAR LAPEL BUTTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10772) to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide a more equitable standard for awarding the gold star lapel button.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 10772

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 1126 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) A lapel button, to be known as the gold star lapel button, shall be designed, as approved by the Secretary of Defense, to identify widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the armed forces of the United States—

"(1) who lost or lose their lives during World War I, World War II, or during any subsequent period of armed hostilities in which the United States has been, or may be, engaged; or

"(2) who lost or lose their lives after June 30, 1958, while serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent party against an opposing armed force."

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

AUTHORIZING U.S. FLAGS BE PRESENTED TO PARENTS OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13195) to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require that U.S. flags be presented to parents of deceased servicemen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 13195

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1482(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (9), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (10) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) if the person to be presented a flag under paragraph (10) is other than a parent of the decedent, presentation of a flag of appropriate size, but smaller than the flag presented under paragraph (10), to the parents or parent; for the purposes of this paragraph, the term 'parent' includes a natural parent, a stepparent, a parent by adoption or a person who for a period no less than one year before the death of the decedent stood in loco parentis to him, and preference under this paragraph shall be given to the persons who bore a parental relationship at the time of, or most nearly before, the death of the decedent."

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That section 1482(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out 'and' at the end of clause (9), by striking out the period at the end of clause (10) and inserting in lieu thereof ', and ', and by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(11) presentation of a flag of equal size to the flag presented under clause (10) to the parents or parent, if the person to be presented a flag under clause (10) is other than the parent of the decedent; for the purposes of this clause, the term 'parent' includes a natural parent, a stepparent, a parent by adoption or a person who for a period of not less than one year before the death of the decedent stood in loco parentis to him, and preference under this clause shall be given to the persons who exercised a parental relationship at the time of, or most nearly before, the death of the decedent."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that United States flags may be presented to parents of deceased servicemen."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES INCIDENT TO DEATH OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHERE NO REMAINS ARE RECOVERED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11876) to amend section 1482 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide for the payment of certain expenses incident to the death of members of the Armed Forces in which no remains are recovered.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 11876

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1482 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In any case in which there are no remains of a person covered by section 1481 of this title and the Secretary concerned makes a finding of death with respect to such person, the Secretary may pay the necessary expenses of the services listed in paragraphs (2), (7), and (10) of subsection (a) for the purposes of a memorial service at a location specified by the person who would have been designated under subsection (c) to direct disposition of the remains if there had been any remains."

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That section 1482 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(e) When the remains of a decedent covered by section 1481 of this title, whose death occurs after January 1, 1961, are determined to be nonrecoverable, the person who would have been designated under subsection (c) to direct disposition of the remains if they had been recovered may be—

"(1) presented with a flag of the United States; however, if the person designated by subsection C is other than a parent of the deceased member, a flag of equal size may also be presented to the parents, and

"(2) reimbursed by the Secretary concerned for the necessary expenses of a memorial service.

However, the amount of the reimbursement shall be determined in the manner prescribed in subsection (b) for an interment, but may not be larger than that authorized when the United States provides the grave site. A claim for reimbursement under this subsection may be allowed only if it is presented within two years after the effective date of this subsection, or the date of death, whichever is later."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, we are today considering legislation to provide payment of certain expenses incident to the death of members of the Armed Forces in which no remains are recovered.

I introduced this legislation, H.R. 11876, in June of last year. Constituents of mine had a young son who was planning, after his service in the Navy, to study for the ministry. But fate ordained otherwise. While standing watch alone in the early hours of a spring morning as his ship steamed through the calm Pacific, he disappeared. When his absence was noted, the ship was able to retrack in its own wake, but no trace of the young man was ever found.

His parents held a complete memorial service. Later, they were as surprised as I was to learn that even though this son gave his life in the service of his country, there was no provision to reimburse his family for the costs of the memorial services.

The Department of the Army has said that the failure to authorize the reimbursement of the small costs of memorial services is an oversight which warrants correction. This bill would provide for reimbursement of memorial services from January 1, 1961. From that date to the present, there have been only 630 cases where remains have not been recovered. In normal times, the number would be minimal. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we now have the opportunity to correct this situation, and I urge that all Members join in supporting this bill.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend section 1482 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the payment of certain expenses incident to the death of members of the armed forces in which no remains are recovered."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING CIVIL DEFENSE EMERGENCY AUTHORITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16731) to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 16731

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2297), is further amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1974".

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

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 16731 is to provide for the continuation of the President's current standby authority to deal with the effects of an enemy attack upon the Nation.

Under section 307 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, these emergency powers would terminate on June 30, 1970. Each 4 years since 1950 the Congress has extended the President's power for another 4-year period.

Briefly stated, the power which the President has under this law is to direct that any Federal department provide personnel, materials, and facilities to the Director of Civil Defense, for the aid of the States, to build emergency shelters, arrange for clearing debris and wreckage, repair utilities, hospitals, transportation facilities, and all other activities of this general nature which would be necessary in the event of an imminent or actual attack on this country.

I will point out that the committee report includes all of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, and all the powers of the President during a civil defense emergency situation are set out in detail in the law itself.

Mr. Speaker, the Armed Services Committee acted favorably upon this bill and unanimously recommended that it be favorably reported. I, therefore, strongly urge that the House take favorable action on H.R. 16731.

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

CERTAIN LANDS HELD IN TRUST FOR WASHOE TRIBE OF INDIANS, ALPINE COUNTY, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4587) to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Indians certain lands in Alpine County, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 4587

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described public domain land located in Alpine County, California, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California:

Township 12 north, range 19 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, section 36, lots 5, 6, that portion of lot 7 lying in the northwest quarter southwest quarter, and lot 9, containing 101.23 acres, more or less.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out all of lines 8 through 11 and insert in lieu thereof "Southeast quarter southeast quarter of section 20 and the northeast quarter northeast quarter of section 29, all in Township 11 North, Range 20 East, Mount Diablo base and meridian. Alpine County, Calif., containing 80 acres."

Page 1, following line 11, insert a new section 2 as follows:

"SEC. 2. The amount expended by the United States to acquire the land granted by this Act, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be deducted from any appropriation that is made to satisfy a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in Docket No. 288 in which the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California is entitled to share, and the amount deducted shall be deposited in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 759) to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Indians certain lands in Alpine County, Calif.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 759

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described public domain land located in Alpine County, California, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California:

Township 11 north, range 20 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, section 20, southeast quarter southeast quarter and section 29, northeast quarter northeast quarter, containing 80 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 759 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4587 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4587 is to convey to the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California a trust title to 80 acres of public domain.

The Washoe Tribe consists of approximately 1,200 members located in four communities in Nevada and California. One of them is the Woodfords Community in California. This community consists of about 250 Indian members of the tribe. About 10 families are "squatting" on four public domain allotments to individual Indians that are held in trust for multiple heirs of the original allottee. About 20 families are living by invitation on one allotment that is owned by an Indian in fee simple. About 20 families are living on public lands. There is no tribal land at Woodfords.

The 80 acres of public domain that will be conveyed to the tribe by this bill are located 4 miles east and 1 mile north of the Woodfords Community, and are needed by the tribe as a land base on which to construct a housing project with financial assistance from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In order to qualify under the U.S. Housing Act, a project must have a limited property tax exemption and be located within the area of a local housing authority. The Washoe Tribe has a tribal housing authority for its other communities, and when a trust title to the 80 acres of Woodsford Community is granted the jurisdiction of the tribal housing authority can be extended to include that land.

These Indians have lived in Alpine County for generations and are reluctant to move. Their living conditions are deplorable. They have inadequate housing, contaminated water, and inadequate waste disposal facilities.

The proposed housing development is expected to meet HUD standards and to comply with county code requirements.

The land is now in a tax-exempt status, and the county board of supervisors has endorsed the proposed legislation. The California Legislature has by Senate Joint Resolution No. 16 memorialized the United States to enact legislation of this kind. There is no objection to the bill as amended.

Enactment of the bill will require no appropriation of Federal funds, and the cost to the United States for acquiring the land conveyed will be recouped from the judgment in Indian Claims Commission Docket No. 288.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 4587) was laid on the table.

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE MISSISSIPPI SIOUX INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14984) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 142, 359–363, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 14984

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds appropriated by the Act of June 19, 1968 (82 Stat. 239), to pay compromise judgments to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Tribes of Sioux Indians, and the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered

142, 359, 360, 361, 362, and 363, together with interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and litigation expenses and the costs of carrying out the provisions of this Act, shall be distributed as provided in this Act.

SEC. 2. The direct descendants of Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes now residing in organized groups at Flandreau, South Dakota, known as Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe, Niobrara, Nebraska, known as the Santee Sioux Tribe of the Sioux Nation of the State of Nebraska, Morton, Minnesota, known as Lower Sioux Community, Welch, Minnesota, known as Prairie Island Indian Community. The above named tribes and communities shall prepare rolls of their members with available records and rolls at the local agency and area offices. Applications for enrollment must be filed with each group named in this section and such rolls shall be subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary's determination on all applications for enrollment shall be final.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall prepare (a) a roll of persons of Sisseton and Wahpeton Mississippi Sioux Indian blood born on or prior to and living on the date of this Act whose name or the name of a lineal ancestor appears on the official approved current rolls of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of North Dakota, the Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, and the Upper Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota, of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Band of Sioux Indians, and (b) a roll of persons of Sisseton and Wahpeton Mississippi Sioux Indian blood born on or prior to and living on the date of this Act whose name or the name of a lineal ancestor appears on the 1909 Annuity Payroll of members of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of Fort Peck, Montana. Applications for enrollment must be filed with the Area Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Aberdeen, South Dakota, in the manner and within the time limits prescribed by the Secretary for that purpose. The Secretary's determination on all applications for enrollment shall be final. No person shall be eligible to be enrolled under this section who is not a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 4. Any person qualifying for enrollment with more than one of the named Indian groups shall elect the group with which he shall be enrolled for the purpose of this Act.

SEC. 5. After deducting the amounts authorized in section 1 of this Act, from funds derived from the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 360, 361, 362, 363, and one-half of the amount remaining from docket numbered 359, the balance, plus accrued interest, shall be apportioned on the basis of the roll prepared pursuant to section 2 of this Act. An amount equivalent to the proportionate shares of those persons who are members of the Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, the Santee Sioux Tribe of the Sioux Nation of the State of Nebraska, the Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota, and the Prairie Island Indian Community in Minnesota, shall be placed on deposit in the United States Treasury to the credit of the respective tribes and 60 per centum of such funds shall be distributed per capita to those tribal members listed on the rolls prepared pursuant to section 2 of this Act, the remainder may be advanced, deposited, expended, invested, or reinvested for any purposes designated by the respective tribal governing bodies and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That none of the funds may be paid per capita to any person other than persons whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 2 of this Act. The shares of enrollees who are not members of the tribal groups named in this section shall be paid to them in accordance with the terms of this Act, provided they are not on rolls of other tribes not directly concerned.

SEC. 6. After deducting the amounts authorized in section 1 of this Act, from funds derived from the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 142 and one half of the amount remaining from docket numbered 359, the balance, plus accrued interest, shall be apportioned on the basis of the roll prepared pursuant to section 3 of this Act. An amount equivalent to the proportionate shares of those persons who are members of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe, Fort Totten, North Dakota, the Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana, and the Upper Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota, shall be placed on deposit in the United States Treasury to the credit of the respective tribes and 70 per centum of such funds shall be distributed per capita to those tribal members listed on the rolls prepared pursuant to section 3 of this Act. The remainder may be advanced, deposited, expended, invested, or reinvested for any purposes designated by the respective tribal governing bodies and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided, however,* That none of these funds may be paid per capita to any person other than persons whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 3 of this Act. In the case of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana, the Fort Peck Sisseton Wahpeton Sioux Council shall act as the governing body in determining the distribution of funds allotted for programing purposes.

SEC. 7. Sums payable to enrollees or their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures, including the establishment of trusts, as the Secretary of the Interior determines appropriate to protect the best interest of such persons, upon the recommendation of the governing bodies of the tribes named in sections 5 and 6 of this Act.

SEC. 8. Any part of such funds that may be distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax and shall not be subject to any lien, debt, or attorney fees except delinquent debts owed by the tribes to the United States or owed by individual Indians to the tribes, or the United States.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, including the establishment of deadlines.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning on line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the funds appropriated by the Act of June 19, 1968 (82 Stat. 239), to pay compromise judgments to the Sisseton and Wahpeton Tribes of Sioux Indians, and the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes of Sioux Indians in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 142, 359, 360, 361, 362, and 363, together with interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and litigation expenses and the costs of carrying out the provisions of this Act, shall be distributed as provided in this Act.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe at Flandreau, South Dakota, the Santee Sioux Tribe of the Sioux Nation of the State of Nebraska, the Lower Sioux Indian Community at Morton, Minnesota, the Prairie Island Indian Community at Welch, Minnesota, and the Shakopee Medwakanton Sioux Community of Minnesota shall prepare rolls of their members who are lineal descendants of the Medwakanton and Wahpakoota Tribes, and who were born on or prior to and are living on the date of this Act, using available records and rolls at the local agency and area offices. Applications for enrollment must be filed with each group named in this section and such rolls shall be subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary's determination on all applications for enrollment shall be final.

"(b). The Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of the lineal descendants of the Medawakantan and Wahpakoota Tribes who were born on or prior to and are living on the date of this Act whose names or the name of a lineal ancestor appears on any available records and rolls acceptable to the Secretary, and who are not members of any of the organized groups listed in subsection (a). Applications for enrollment must be filed with the Area Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Aberdeen, South Dakota. The Secretary's determination on all applications for enrollment shall be final.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of North Dakota, the Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, and the Upper Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota shall prepare rolls of their members who are lineal descendants of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Mississippi Sioux Tribe and who were born on or prior to and are living on the date of this Act, using available records and rolls at the local agency and area offices. Applications for enrollment must be filed with each group named in this section and such rolls shall be subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary's determination on all applications for enrollment shall be final.

"(b). The Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of the lineal descendants of the Sisseton and Wahpeton Mississippi Sioux Tribe who were born on or prior to and are living on the date of this Act whose names or the name of a lineal ancestor appears on any available records and rolls acceptable to the Secretary, including the 1909 Annuity Payroll of members of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Reservation, Montana, and who are not members of any of the organized groups listed in subsection (a). Applications for enrollment must be filed with the Area Director, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Aberdeen, South Dakota. The Secretary's determination on all applications for enrollment shall be final.

"SEC. 4. No person shall be eligible to be enrolled under sections 2 or 3 who is not a citizen of the United States.

"SEC. 5. Any person qualifying for enrollment with more than one of the named Indian groups shall elect the group with which he shall be enrolled for the purpose of this Act.

"SEC. 6. After deducting the amounts authorized in section 1 of this Act, the funds derived from the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 360, 361, 362, 363, and one-half of the amount awarded in docket numbered 359, plus accrued interest, shall be apportioned on the basis of the rolls prepared pursuant to section 2 of this Act. An amount equivalent to the proportionate shares of those persons who are members of the Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe, the Santee Sioux Tribe of the Sioux Nation of the State of Nebraska, the Lower Sioux Indian Community, the Prairie Island Indian Community, and the Shakopee Medawakauton Sioux Community, and who reside on their respective reservations, shall be placed on deposit in the United States Treasury to the credit of the respective groups. Sixty per centum of such funds shall be distributed per capita to such tribal members, and the remainder may be advanced, deposited, expended, invested, or reinvested for any purpose designated by the respective tribal governing bodies and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Pro-*

vided, That none of the funds may be paid per capita to any person whose name does not appear on the roll prepared pursuant to subsection 2(a) of this Act. The shares of non-resident members of such groups and the shares of enrollees who are not members of such groups shall be paid to them in accordance with the terms of this Act.

"SEC. 7. After deducting the amounts authorized in section 1 of this Act, the funds derived from the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 142 and the one-half remaining from the amount awarded in docket numbered 359, plus accrued interest, shall be apportioned on the basis of the rolls prepared pursuant to section 3 of this Act. An amount equivalent to the proportionate shares of those persons who are members of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of North Dakota, the Sisseton and Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, the Upper Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota, and the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana, and who reside on their respective reservations, shall be placed on deposit in the United States Treasury to the credit of the respective groups. Seventy per centum of such funds shall be distributed per capita to such tribal members, and the remainder may be advanced, deposited, expended, invested, or reinvested for any purpose designated by the respective tribal governing bodies and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That none of the funds may be paid per capita to any person whose name does not appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 3(a) of this Act; and in the case of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Montana, the Fort Peck Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Council shall act as the governing body in determining the distribution of funds allotted for programing purposes. The shares of non-resident members of such groups and the shares of enrollees who are not members of such groups shall be paid to them in accordance with the terms of this Act.

"SEC. 8. Sums payable to enrollees or their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures, including the establishment of trusts, as the Secretary of the Interior determines appropriate to protect the best interest of such persons, after considering the recommendations of the governing bodies of the groups involved.

"SEC. 9. The funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

"SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act, including the establishment of deadlines."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 14984 is to authorize the distribution and use of seven Indian Claims Commission judgments in favor of the Mississippi Sioux Indians. The judgments in favor of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Bands of the Mississippi Sioux totaled $5,874,039.50. The judgments in favor of the Medawakanton-Wahpakoota Bands totaled $6,375,960.50.

The money to pay the judgments has been appropriated, but it cannot be used until authorizing legislation is enacted.

The judgments were in favor of aboriginal bands that do not exist today, and there is no modern tribal entity that can be said to be the successor of the aboriginal bands. The bill, therefore, provides that the money will be distributed on the basis of rolls to be prepared or approved by the Secretary of the Interior containing the names of the living descendants of the aboriginal bands.

It is estimated that about one-half of the descendants of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Bands are residing on the Devils Lake Reservation, N. Dak., the Sisseton Reservation, S. Dak., the Fort Peck Reservation, Mont., and the Upper Sioux Community, Minn. The rest of the descendants are scattered.

It is estimated that about one-sixth of the descendants of the Medawakanton-Wahpakoota Bands are residing on the Flandreau Reservation, S. Dak., the Santee Reservation, Nebr., the Lower Sioux Community, Minn., the Prairie Island Community, Minn., and the Shakopee Community, Minn. The remaining descendants are scattered.

After the descendancy rolls have been prepared, the bill requires the unexpended balances of the judgments, plus accrued interest, to be apportioned equally among the persons whose names appear on the rolls. Enrolled descendants of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Bands who are members of the Devils Lake, Sisseton-Wahpeton, Upper Sioux, and Fort Peck tribes and who are residing on their respective reservations will receive 70 percent of the amount apportioned to them per capita, and the remaining 30 percent will be paid to their respective tribes to be used for tribal programs. Enrollees who are not residing on the reservations named will receive 100 percent of the amount apportioned to them per capita. Any part of the 30 percent paid to the tribes for tribal purposes, however, may also be distributed per capita if the tribes wish to do so and the Secretary of the Interior approves.

The bill provides for the same distribution to enrolled descendants of the Medawakanton–Wahpakoota Bands, except that the percentages are 60 to 40 percent rather than 70 to 30 percent, and the tribal groups involved are the Flandreau Santee Sioux, S. Dak., the Santee Sioux, Nebr., the Lower Sioux, Minn., the Prairie Island Community, Minn., and the Shakopee Community, Minn.

The funds paid to the nine modern tribes or groups may be used for any purpose that is authorized by the tribe and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Although restrictive language has not been included in the bill, the committee has requested the Secretary of the Interior to consider carefully the feasibility and desirability of programing the use of some of these funds for educational purposes. The educational needs of the Indians should have a high priority when program plans are made.

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

REPEAL OF ACT OF AUGUST 25, 1959, RESPECTING FINAL DISPOSITION OF THE AFFAIRS OF THE CHOCTAW TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15866) to repeal the act of August 25, 1959, with respect to the final disposition of the affairs of the Choctaw Tribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 15866

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of August 25, 1959 (73 Stat. 420), as amended, is repealed.

SEC. 2. Repeal of the Act of August 25, 1959, shall not be construed to abrogate, impair, annul, or otherwise affect any right or interest which may have vested under the provisions of said Act nor shall repeal affect any legal action pending on the date of enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, following line 4, add a new section 2 as follows:

"SEC. 2. Repeal of the Act of August 25, 1959, shall not be construed to abrogate, impair, annul or otherwise affect any right or interest which may have vested under the provisions of said Act nor shall repeal affect any legal action pending on the date of enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 15866 is to repeal a 1959 statute which directed the Secretary of the Interior to complete the action authorized by a 1906 statute entitled "An act to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes."

The 1959 statute directed the Secretary to complete this action by disposing of the few remaining tribal assets; and by conveying to a tribal corporation organized under State law any tribal assets which the tribe wants to retain. A per capita distribution of any tribal funds was already authorized by the 1906 act.

The 1959 statute did not affect the trust status of lands allotted to individual members of the tribe, but it did provide for a termination of all special relationships between the United States and the tribe as a governmental entity.

Numerous problems arose in carrying out the provisions of the 1959 statute, which directed that the statute should be fully executed within 3 years or as soon thereafter as practicable. This time requirement was extended by Congress three times to the present date of August 25, 1970.

The problems encountered revolved principally around clearing land titles and finding able and willing buyers for the tribal lands. In addition some Federal programs initiated during recent years require continued Federal recognition of the tribal entity in order for the tribe to participate. Finally, there has been a change of sentiment within the tribe and within the Department of the Interior regarding the wisdom of terminating all special relationships between the Federal Government and the tribe.

Enactment of the bill is justified, the committee believes, on the grounds that, first, it has been difficult to clear title to tribal lands and dispose of them, second, there is no need to proceed with the process rapidly, third, dissolution of the

tribal government at this time is not necessary for the accomplishment of any current Federal policy, fourth, retention of the tribal government is desired by the Indians and will facilitate participation in some Federal programs, fifth, if the 1959 statute were not repealed it would need to be amended in some particulars, and sixth, repeal of the 1959 statute will contribute to the economic betterment of the tribe and its members.

The committee wishes to emphasize that it will not regard the enactment of this bill, before the termination of the Choctaw tribal government is an accomplished fact, as any precedent for reestablishing a tribal government that has already been terminated.

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

AUTHORIZING PREPARATION OF ROLL OF PERSONS WHOSE LINEAL ANCESTORS WERE MEMBERS OF THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES OF WEAS, PIANKASHAWS, PEORIAS, AND KASKASKIAS, AND DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 885) to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose lineal ancestors were members of the confederated tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, merged under the treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 314, amended, 314–E and 65, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 885

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of all persons who meet the following requirements: (1) they were born on or prior to and were living on the date of this Act; (2) their names or the name of a lineal ancestor from whom they claim eligibility appears on (a) the final roll of the Peoria Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, pursuant to the Act of August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 937), or (b) the January 1, 1937, census of the Peoria Tribe, or (c) the 1920 census of the Peoria Tribe, or (d) the Indian or Citizen Class lists pursuant to the Treaty of February 23, 1867 (15 Stat. 520), or (e) the Schedule of Persons or Families composing the United Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, annexed to the Treaty of May 30, 1854.

(b) Applications for enrollment must be filed with the area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Muskogee, Oklahoma, in the manner and within the time limits prescribed for that purpose by the Secretary of the Interior. The determination of the Secretary regarding the eligibility of an applicant shall be final.

SEC. 2. After the deduction of attorneys' fees and expenses and the administrative costs involved in the preparation of the roll and the distribution of the individual shares, the remaining funds on deposit in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Peoria Tribe on behalf of the Wea Nation that were appropriated by the Acts of May 13, 1966 (80 Stat. 141, 150), and June 19, 1968 (82 Stat. 239), in satisfaction of judgments that were obtained by the Peoria Tribe on behalf of the Wea Nation in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 314, amended, and 314–E, respectively, and the funds to the credit of the Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma on behalf of the Wea, Piankashaw, Peoria, and Kaskaskia Nations that were appropriated by the Act of July 22, 1969 (83 Stat. 49, 62), in satisfaction of a judgment in docket numbered 65, shall be disposed of in the following manner: The Secretary shall pay $3,000 of such funds to the Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma for improvement and maintenance of the Peoria Indian Cemetery located approximately ten miles northeast of Miami, Oklahoma, and shall distribute the balance of such funds in equal shares to those persons whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall distribute a share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee and the Secretary shall distribute a per capita share of a deceased enrollee directly to his heirs or legatees upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary, whose findings upon such proof shall be final and conclusive.

(b) A share payable to a person under twenty-one years of age or to a person under legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures, including the establishment of trusts, as the Secretary determines will adequately protect the best interest of such person.

SEC. 4. Funds that may hereafter be deposited in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Peoria Tribe on behalf of the Wea, Kaskaskia, Piankashaw, or Peoria Nation, to pay any judgment arising out of proceedings presently pending before the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 99, 289, 313, 314–A, B, C, and D, and 338 and the interest accrued thereon, after payment of attorneys' fees and expenses and all costs incident to bringing the roll current as provided in this section and distributing the shares, shall be distributed on a per capita basis in accordance with section 3 of this Act to persons whose names appear on the roll prepared under section 1, after the roll has been brought current to the date the funds are appropriated by adding names of persons to the roll who were born after the date of this Act, but on or prior to and living on the date the funds are appropriated, and by deleting names of enrollees who died between the effective date of this Act and the date the funds are appropriated.

SEC. 5. The funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to the Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 6. All claims for per capita shares, whether by a living enrollee or by the heirs or legatees of a deceased enrollee, shall be filed with the Area Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Muskogee, Oklahoma, not later than three years from the date of approval of this Act. Thereafter, all claims and the right to file the same shall be forever barred and the unclaimed shares, along with unexpended tribal and judgment funds appropriated for tribal roll preparation and distribution, shall revert to the Peoria Tribe.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 11, strike out "funds." and insert "funds in equal shares to those persons whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 1 of this Act."

Page 3, line 23, strike out "persons." and insert "person."

Page 4, following line 20, insert a new section 6 as follows, and renumber the succeeding section "Section 7.":

"SEC. 6. All claims for per capita shares, whether by a living enrollee or by the heirs or legatees of a deceased enrollee, shall be filed with the Area Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Muskogee, Oklahoma, not later than three years from the date of approval of this Act. Thereafter, all claims and the right to file the same shall be forever barred and the unclaimed shares, along with unexpended tribal and judgment funds appropriated for tribal roll preparation and distribution, shall revert to the Peoria Tribe."

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 885 is to provide for a per capita distribution of three judgments by the Indian Claims Commission totaling $2,049,273 that have been recovered on behalf of Indian groups that were merged under an 1854 treaty and called the Confederated Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias. The distribution will be on the basis of a roll to be prepared by the Secretary of the Interior showing the descendants of the 1854 group. Before making the distribution, $3,000 will be paid to the Peoria Tribe for the maintenance of a tribal cemetery.

The bill also provides for a per capita distribution, on the basis of an updated roll, of any judgments that may be recovered by this same group in seven claims cases that are still pending.

Appropriations to pay the three judgments have been made, but the money may not be used until authorizing legislation is enacted. This bill will provide that authorization.

There is no present-day tribe that is the full and complete successor of the Confederated Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, and the Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma is one over which Federal supervision has been terminated. The judgment funds should therefore be distributed equally among the lineal descendants of Confederated Tribes who are now living, and the bill so provides. When the other pending claims cases of these Indians are completed, any judgments rendered will be distributed in the same manner, but on the basis of an updated descendancy roll.

Any per capita share that is not claimed within 3 years from the date the bill is enacted, and any unused funds that were reserved for the preparation of the roll, will escheat to the Peoria Tribe.

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

FURTHER EXTENDING PERIOD OF RESTRICTIONS ON LANDS OF QUAPAW INDIANS, OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 887) to further extend the period of restrictions on lands of the Quapaw Indians, Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 887

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

existing restrictions, tax exemptions, and limitations affecting lands of Quapaw Indians in Oklahoma that were extended to March 3, 1971, by the Act of July 27, 1939 (53 Stat. 1127), are hereby extended for a further period of twenty-five years from the date on which such restrictions, tax exemptions, and limitations would otherwise expire.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 887 is to extend for 25 years the existing restrictions, tax exemptions, and limitations on Quapaw Indian lands in Oklahoma. These restrictions will expire on March 3, 1971, unless extended by statute.

At the present time there are 79 allotments, comprising almost 12,500 acres, held wholly or partially in a restricted fee status. The Quapaw Indians have lead and zinc leases, but no oil and gas leases. More than 6,500 acres are under permit. Several small towns are located on Quapaw lands, and many of these permits cover town lots. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has had problems collecting rents and expresses a doubt that the residents would pay rent to the Indian owners if the lands become unrestricted. The Indians would probably lose control of the land.

The Department of the Interior advised the committee that there is a definite need to continue supervision and administration of the mineral leases and the town lots. Although the Department recommended substitute language which would have extended the period of restrictions for an indefinite time, the bill as enacted by the Senate retains the 25-year provision. The committee concurs in that action. The Congress, rather than the Secretary of the Interior, should decide whether an extension beyond 25 years is needed.

No additional Federal expenditure will result from the enactment of this bill.

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

LAND USE IN MILWAUKEE COUNTY, WIS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16496) to authorize certain uses to be made with respect to lands previously conveyed to Milwaukee County, Wis., by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 16496

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any provision of the Act entitled, "An Act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands and to lease certain other lands to Milwaukee County, Wisconsin", approved September 1, 1949 (63 Stat. 683), or the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain property to Milwaukee County, Wisconsin", approved August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 866)—

(1) Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, is authorized to lease all or any part of the land conveyed to it pursuant to such Acts subject to the following conditions—

(A) such land or part thereof may be leased by Milwaukee County only to a nonprofit corporation, which corporation shall construct and equip on such land structures, facilities, and other permanent improvements useful for either public recreational purposes, general civic purposes, or both such purposes; and

(B) after completion of the improvements specified in subparagraph (A) above, such lands or parts thereof shall be leased back to Milwaukee County.

(2) No action or use of any kind made with respect to the lands leased pursuant to paragraph (1) above, whether made by Milwaukee County or the nonprofit corporation concerned, shall be deemed to be grounds for the reversion to the United States of the title to the lands conveyed to Milwaukee County pursuant to such Acts.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall issue such written instruments as may be necessary to bring the conveyances made to Milwaukee County, Wisconsin, on January 11, 1950, and April 19, 1955, pursuant to the Acts referred to in the first section of this Act, into conformity with such first section.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 13, strike out down to and including the comma on line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(2) Neither the leasing of the lands pursuant to paragraph (1) above nor the use thereof for public recreational or general civic purposes".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes that Milwaukee County, Wis., be authorized to lease to a nonprofit corporation for improvement for recreational or civic purposes land previously conveyed to the county. After such improvement the land would be leased back to the county. No use or action would be grounds for reversion of title to the United States.

The Veterans' Administration hospital and center at Wood, Wis., was established in 1867 as a national home for disabled volunteer soldiers. Subsequently, by an Executive order in 1930, this home and other agencies were consolidated and transferred to the Veterans' Administration. As presently operating, a center exists comprising 1,080 hospital beds, 132 nursing beds, 1,150 domiciliary beds, and 100 restoration beds.

Under Public Law 81–281 the Veterans' Administration conveyed to the county of Milwaukee two parcels of land containing approximately 101.5 acres and then leased, September 1, 1949, to the county a third parcel of approximately 18.5 acres, the latter to be for a 20-year period. Public Law 83–669 authorized the conveyance by the Veterans' Administration of 28 acres to be used for highway, recreational, and other purposes. Both of these laws provided for the reversion of the land to the United States in the event there was any alienation or attempt to alienate a portion of the land.

The committee has been advised by the corporation counsel that—

Milwaukee County is the owner and operator of a stadium constructed on approximately 130 acres of land conveyed to the county by the United States Government. The stadium is used for the playing of professional baseball and football games and occasionally for other public gatherings.

The county board is the governing body of the county and presently has under consideration a proposal by a non-stock, nonprofit corporation called "the Greater Milwaukee Pladium, Inc." to build an indoor sports arena on the stadium grounds. The cost of constructing the arena is estimated to be in the area of $24,000,000.00 and is to be financed by the sale of bonds issued by the corporation. The financing arrangement contemplates a lease by the county of the land to the corporation for a period of 28 years and then a lease-back to the county for a similar period of years under a guaranteed annual rental of approximately $1,760,000.00. The annual rental would be sufficient to amortize the bonds over the term of the lease. Title to the arena would vest in the county on the termination of the lease. While the bonds would be secured by a mortgage on the sports arena as well as the leasehold interest in the land, the primary security for the bonds would be the guaranteed annual rental to be paid by the county.

The Veterans' Administration favors this proposal provided that it is enacted as reported by the committee which provides that neither the leasing of the lands nor the use thereof for recreation or general civic purposes shall be deemed grounds for the reversion of entitlement to the United States.

There would be no additional cost as a result of the enactment of this proposal.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a few explanatory remarks relating to H.R. 16496, of which I am one of the cosponsors, along with my colleagues who represent parts of Milwaukee County, Mr. ZABLOCKI and Mr. REUSS.

A new sports arena has long been the dream of the sports-minded people of Milwaukee County. This bill, if enacted, will permit the county to lease a tract of land to a nonprofit corporation known as Greater Milwaukee Pladium, Inc., that corporation to construct the sports arena thereon and then re-lease the entire property back to Milwaukee County for operation.

The tract in question is a portion of a larger tract, on which the Milwaukee County Stadium now stands, conveyed to Milwaukee County in two separate parcels in 1930 and in 1949. The conveyance for both parcels provided for the reversion of the land to the United States in the event there was any alienation or attempt to alienate any portion of the land conveyed.

The question has been raised as to whether the above-cited leasing arrangement might be construed as an alienation so as to effect reversion of title to the United States.

As the bill has been amended after consideration by the Veterans' Administration and the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, it would simply make it clear that the above leasing arrangement would not be considered as grounds for such reversion.

Mr. Speaker, this is purely a technical corrective measure and it involves no additional cost.

I trust the bill will be unanimously passed. I want to take this occasion to thank Chairman TEAGUE and the mem-

bers of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for their prompt and favorable consideration.

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

NAMING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AT BEDFORD, MASS., FOR EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 17352) to designate a Veterans' Administration hospital in Bedford, Mass., as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 17352

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Veterans' Administration hospital at Bedford, Massachusetts, shall hereafter be known and designated as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital. Any reference to such hospital in any law, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to it as the Edith Nourse Rogers Memorial Veterans' Hospital.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers was elected to the 69th Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of her husband, John Jacob Rogers, and was reelected to the 70th and succeeding Congresses and was serving at the time of her death on September 10, 1960, a period of over 35 years.

Mrs. Rogers' first activity in the field of disabled veterans was when she served with the American Red Cross in the care of disabled soldiers in the First World War in 1917. Thereafter, President Harding appointed her a special representative in 1922; President Coolidge continued her appointment in 1923.

She served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, or its predecessor committee, the Committee on World War Veterans' legislation, from the time of her election to Congress until her death and was chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

While Mrs. Rogers was interested in all of the affairs of veterans, she is mainly identified in the public mind with her special concern for paraplegics as evidenced by the two laws in which she was keenly interested; namely, housing for paraplegic veterans, and the so-called automobiles for amputees.

No hospital during her service received more attention from her than the one at Bedford, Mass., though she was keenly interested in the entire medical program. It seems indeed appropriate to the committee that the hospital at Bedford be named in her honor.

While it is not the general practice of the Veterans' Administration to name its hospitals for individuals, there are exceptions. The first hospital named was for Royal C. Johnson, the first chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation, and by Public Law 79–93 the VA hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was designated as the Royal C. Johnson Veteran Hospital. By Public Law 79–189 the hospital at Montrose, N.Y., was designated as the President Franklin Delano Roosevelt VA Hospital.

There would be no additional expense to the Treasury as a result of the enactment of this legislation.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I warmly applaud the proposal to rename the Veterans' Administration's Bedford Hospital to honor a distinguished and very gracious woman, the late Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers. I urge its passage. The name of Mrs. Rogers is well known to many of the men and women who served in World War I and World War II, for the American veteran has had few greater champions of his cause.

The list of her contributions to the cause of veterans everywhere is unlimited. She played a major role in drafting the GI Bill of Rights for veterans of World War II. She also introduced the bill which created the Women's Army Corps, the WAC. She made many military and veterans' hospital inspection trips overseas during World War I—when she was a $1-a-year inspector of veterans hospitals—and also during the recent World War. In Congress, Mrs. Rogers was ranking minority member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee for many years and its chairman during the 80th and 83d Congresses. She ably represented the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts for 35 years.

I also applaud my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE), who succeeded Mrs. Rogers, for his sponsorship of this bill which is an entirely fitting tribute to a great lady.

The Bedford VA Hospital is a neuropsychiatric hospital, which has some 936 operating beds. It is an old hospital, and I have no doubt that Mrs. Rogers gave it considerable attention and concern since it was located in her district.

Congresswoman Rogers, of Lowell, Mass., developed her interest in veterans' needs when she served overseas for the American Red Cross. She was later a personal representative of three Presidents, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover as a hospital inspector. She also worked at one time at the Walter Reed Army Hospital here in Washington. Her lifetime of personal experience and active concern made her an authority on veterans' affairs.

As a member myself of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I know of the legacy of her concern which inspires us today in our work.

To rename the Bedford VA Hospital after Congresswoman Edith Nourse Rogers is an appropriate memorial to her good works. I am sure she would have felt great pride at this recognition. I again urge the passage of this bill to honor her name.

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

NAMING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION CENTER AT BONHAM, TEX., FOR SAM RAYBURN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 17613) to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration facility at Bonham, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I should like simply to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Veterans' Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) for having brought this bill to the floor to designate the Veterans' Administration center at Bonham, Tex., in honor of our late beloved Speaker Sam Rayburn.

I think it is highly appropriate that this action be taken. Indeed, I have expressed my support for it in the past. I think we do our former Speaker honor, and we honor the veterans by doing so.

Mr. Speaker, also I was glad to support the passage of the previous bill H.R. 17352, naming the Veterans' Administration hospital at Bedford, Mass., for the late Edith Nourse Rogers.

Both of these bills have been presented as separate pieces of legislation. They are not controversial. For many years I have urged the Veterans' Committee to bring them to the floor, independent of other legislation, to which, as the Veterans' Committee well knows, I am adamantly opposed.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 17613

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Veterans' Administration center at Bonham, Texas, shall hereafter be known and designated as the Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Center. Any reference to such center in any law, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be deemed a reference to it as the Sam Rayburn Memorial Veterans Center.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill would name the Veterans' Administration center hospital and domiciliary at Bonham, Tex., for the late Sam Rayburn, who served as Speaker of the House of Representatives longer than any other Member of the House in the history of the United States.

Prior to Mr. Rayburn's election as Speaker on September 16, 1940, Mr. Rayburn had served as majority leader in the 75th and 76th Congresses and he served as minority leader in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

During his long period of service which began on March 4, 1913, until his death on November 16, 1961, Speaker Rayburn had always shown a keen interest in the affairs and general welfare of the veterans of this Nation. The hospital and domiciliary at Bonham had a special place in his heart and it is indeed appropriate that this installation be named in honor of this great American.

While it is not the general practice of the Veterans' Administration to name its hospitals for individuals, there are exceptions. The first hospital named was for Royal C. Johnson, the first chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans Legislation, and by Public Law 79–93 the VA hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., was designated as the Royal C. Johnson Veteran Hospital. By Public Law 79–189 the hospital at Montrose, N.Y., was designated as the President Franklin Delano Roosevelt VA Hospital.

There would be no additional expense to the Treasury as a result of the enactment of this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15608) to amend the Act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 6 of the Act entitled, "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), as amended (16 U.S.C. 407r), is further amended by striking out "$7,950,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,200,000."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Iowa seek to have the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I was simply going to ask someone to give this bill a slight explanation at least.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the legislation now before the House deals with the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia. It is the same legislation which the House considered and approved during the 90th Congress, but which failed to become law because the other body did not act.

All the bill proposes to do is to raise the authorized ceiling on appropriations for the park so that the National Park Service can request the funds to acquire the last nonhistoric structures within the heart of the historical area. It calls for an increase from $7,950,000 to $11,200,000—a total of $3,250,000. If the properties involved are acquired, the Park Service expects to spend approximately $58,000 to have the buildings demolished and to landscape the property so that it will be compatible with the historic setting.

Mr. Speaker, the park which we are talking about is no ordinary area—it is the Independence National Historical Park. The heart of the park is a 3-block area comprising Independence Hall, where the Declaration of Independence was first read publicly on July 8, 1776; Carpenter's Hall, where the first Continental Congress met; Congress Hall, where the Federal Congress met; and many other historic or restored structures.

It also includes, within its boundaries, the property and buildings which housed the central offices of the Reliance Insurance Co. The company has since moved its main offices elsewhere because it had no room to expand and it has no objection to the acquisition of its property by the Government. In fact, it gave the Park Service an option to buy the property in 1967. In good faith, the company has renewed that option several times in order to allow a reasonable opportunity for the necessary authorization to be approved. Now, it is pressed to consummate the transaction or remodel the buildings so that it can get a reasonable return on its investment.

The option which the National Park Service is presently holding expires on June 20, this year. While the company is not willing to renew it indefinitely, the members of the committee were told that the company would again renew the option if it appeared reasonably certain that the Congress would take favorable action on the proposal. I am confident that approval of this legislation today will result in an extension of the option until the needed funds can be approved.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation affords the Government a reasonable opportunity to acquire a property which should be purchased in order to protect the historic setting of the area. This is one of those areas where the historic values are so important that we should not allow this opportunity to purchase the incompatible nonhistoric structures to pass—especially when it is obvious that the purchase at some later date could cost substantially more.

The property involved consists of three buildings—one of which is a 16-story office building constructed in the 1920's. If they are acquired they should be promptly removed from the scene so that their demolition will not interfere with the celebration of the bicentennial of the American Independence which is expected to draw millions of visitors to the historic area.

Mr. Speaker, the committee reviewed this legislation just as it would a new proposal. We remain convinced of its merits now, just as we were in the 90th Congress when we recommended the bill which the House approved. The bill which we recommend today is substantively identical with the bill which the other body has approved. I recommend approval of the legislation by the Members of the House.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I will be glad to yield to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from Colorado for yielding.

Do I understand this started out to cost $4,435,000 or somewhere in that neighborhood?

Mr. ASPINALL. This authorization calls for an additional $3,250,000. Of that amount, of course, we expect to spend $580,000 and have the buildings demolished.

Mr. GROSS. I am speaking of earlier legislation on this subject.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I remember it—and I would have to go back to the record on this, because I was not looking for this question—as I recollect, the requests in the first authorizations were considerably more than what we have in the present legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Considerably more or less?

Mr. ASPINALL. More.

Mr. GROSS. That is why I am asking this question. I cannot figure out from the report whether the original request was $4 million, $7 million, or what.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think my friend is mixed up with the previous authorizations that we had in order to obtain other property in order to establish this historical park. This legislation places this authorization on top of the others, and that is the reason why the various figures of $8,950,000 and $11,200,000. We amended the bill to get the money for this particular purpose, and we raised the original authorization.

Mr. GROSS. I see. Then, this does not cover all of the property that has been acquired to take care of this park?

Mr. ASPINALL. No; my colleague is correct. I do not know how many millions of dollars it is, but it is a good-sized sum.

Mr. GROSS. But a good many millions of dollars have been spent in addition to this to acquire the properties. Is that correct?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I see.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I might state that the 1948 act which established this park authorized $4,435,000 to be spent. The monetary figures have been increased on two occasions, once in 1952 and again in 1958. It is now $7,950,000. This legislation will increase it by the sum of $3,250,000, to a total of $11,200,000. I might point out that the property we are acquiring is inside the original boundaries of the park. It is the last remaining structure in the park to be acquired.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, may I ask the gentleman from North Carolina, has the city of Philadelphia made any contribution by

way of contributing property or funds to this project?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will permit me, the city of Philadelphia and those residing there have contributed a great deal.

I will yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) to answer that question.

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to tell my good friend from Iowa that the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania have matched dollar for dollar all of the money that has been spent both for acquisition of property and for development.

Mr. GROSS. That is more than most places. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 15608.

The purpose of this legislation is to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, by increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park, from $7,950,000 to $11,200,000. The increase of $3,250,000 will provide the sum necessary to permit the acquisition of the last remaining nonhistoric structures within the boundaries of the Independence National Historical Park.

The properties involved in the proposed acquisition are owned by the Reliance Insurance Co. The properties are located in the central area of the park and constitute a severe intrusion on the historic values and scenic qualities of the park.

In 1967, the United States obtained an 18-month option to purchase these properties from the Reliance Insurance Co. for the sum of $3,250,000. The option has been renewed to the financial detriment of the owners and is based upon a 1966 appraisal. Involved in the proposed acquisition are a 16-story office building and two smaller adjacent structures.

If this legislation is passed and the properties acquired, the National Park Service plans to demolish the buildings and landscape the areas to be compatible with the surrounding historical park. The National Park Service anticipates that the demolition and landscaping of the area can be completed in sufficient time to permit the planning of events and activities within the central unit of the Independence National Historical Park to commemorate the 200th anniversay of the Declaration of Independence and the bicentennial of the American Revolution.

In 1948 Congress authorized Independence National Historical Park for the purpose of preserving for the benefit of the American people certain historical structures and properties of outstanding national significance associated with the American Revolution, the founding and growth of these United States. In 1976 this Nation will commemorate the 200th aniversary of the historical events which occurred at Independence National Historical Park. The passage of this legislation is in keeping with the original intent of Congress in establishing Independence National Historical Park.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the rules be suspended and H.R. 15608 be passed.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be happy to yield to my good friend from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. In further response to the gentleman from Iowa, regarding contributions made by the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania, the city of Philadelphia has had removed from its tax rolls some of the most valuable property that otherwise would be taxed.

I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for taking the time to discuss this matter. The proposal is again brought to the floor of the House by the gentleman from Colorado with complete honesty, and I would not want to have anyone think there is some specious operation involved. So I thank him very much.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to say to the Members of the House that as near as I can determine this is the only park in the United States where you have had the Federal Government and the State government and the city government cooperate. We have had other parks where States have acquired parks and given them to the Federal Government. But this a a metropolitan area right in the heart of the city of Philadelphia.

The property being acquired at the present time was within the original boundary of the city.

Mr. Speaker, I might as a Member of the House state that insofar as I am personally concerned there is still one building that should be acquired for the rounding out of Independence National Historical Park and that is the building of the New Amsterdam Casualty Co.

Mr. Speaker, I would sincerely hope that the Park Service would cooperate with our committee, the city of Philadelphia and the State of Pennsylvania in seeing to it that very shortly they will recommend the acquisition of that property.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules be suspended and that this bill be enacted.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation now before the House.

It is not a complex bill. If enacted it will authorize the appropriation of the funds necessary to acquire the last remaining nonhistoric property within the boundaries of the Independence National Historical Park.

The property to be acquired is a 16-story steel and concrete-frame office building and two associated smaller buildings. As office buildings go, I am told, this building is not unsuitable for continued use, but it is within the authorized boundaries of one of our most sacred national historical parks—the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia—and it is incompatible with the historic seting.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that the Government proceed with this acquisition promptly for at least two reasons:

First, we will soon be celebrating the bicentennial of American independence. At that time, visits to this nationally significant area are expected to expand tremendously. Visitations at this area are already substantial. We were advised that in 1969, the recorded visitation rate was almost 2½ million. It is anticipated that the visitation rate will double in 1976.

Second, we should act on this legislation promptly so that the Government can be assured of acquiring this property at a reasonable price. In April of 1967, the owner of this property—Reliance Insurance Co.—offered to sell the property involved to the National Park Service at its appraised value—$3,200,000. Since that time properties in Philadelphia as elsewhere have continued to increase in value, but the company has extended the option which it gave to the Government several times. Naturally, the company cannot extend its option indefinitely. It has now reached the conclusion that if the Government is not going to acquire it, then it should proceed to remodel it so that it can rent it to desirable tenants on long-term leases. This would, of course, drive the purchase price up if the Government decided to acquire it later. So we now have the choice of first, purchasing it at a known price; second, deferring purchase and probably paying substantially more later; or third, not purchasing it at all. But action now—one way or the other—is imperative, because the current option expires on June 20, 1970. The members of the committee have been assured that if favorable action is taken on the legislation, then the company will agree to an extension of the option for a reasonable period of time so that the necessary funds can be approved.

The objective of the national historical park is to create an unforgettable atmosphere of the past at a place which, perhaps more than any other, determined the course of this country. Here, the Continental Congress met and established the framework which founded our system of government and developed the principles which have guided this country for nearly two centuries. Here the Declaration of Independence was prepared and signed, so that this is the birthplace of our Nation. Here the Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution.

If this legislation is approved and funds are made available, I am convinced that the Park Service will move promptly to consummate this transaction. Then it will demolish the buildings and landscape the lands in such a way as to add to—rather than detract from—this national historical site.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to approve this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15608, as amended

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of an identical Senate bill

(S. 2940) to amend the act of June 28, 1948, as amended, relating to the acquisition of property for the Independence National Historical Park.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 2940

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 6 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 407r), is further amended by striking out "$7,950,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$11,200,000".

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 15608) was laid on the table.

TO REIMBURSE THE UTE TRIBE FOR TRIBAL FUNDS USED TO CONSTRUCT THE UINTAH INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, UTAH

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 16416) to reimburse the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for tribal funds that were used to construct, operate, and maintain the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and for other purpose, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 16416

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reimburse the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah for tribal funds that have been used for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, computed and adjusted as follows:

(a) With respect to construction charges, the tribal funds originally involved amounted to $920,112.74. From that sum there shall be deducted the amount of $275,864.25, which represents a reimbursement of tribal construction funds under a judgment of the United States Court of Claims for the portion of the construction costs chargeable against non-Indian lands. From the balance so calculated, there shall be deducted an amount equal to the construction charges against irrigable land (determined according to the approved designation of 1964) which were collected from the proceeds of sales of land and deposited in the tribal accounts. From the balance so calculated there shall be deducted $1,250, which represents the tribal funds usd to purchase the following described lands, title to which was taken in the name of the United States and which hereafter shall be held by the United States in trust for the tribe:

west half southwest quarter southeast quarter southeast quarter section 18, township 1 south, range 1 east, containing 5 acres;

south half southeast quarter northeast quarter northeast quarter section 36, township 1 south, range 4 west, containing 5 acres;

northeast quarter northeast quarter southwest quarter section 32, township 1 north, range 1 west, containing 10 acres; and

southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter southwest quarter section 12, township 1 south, range 4 west, containing 2.5 acres, all in Uintah special base and meridian, Utah.

The balance so calculated shall be increased by adding interest on the amounts that comprise the $920,112.74 from the end of the year in which each amount was originally used for the project to January 28, 1958, the date of the Court of Claims judgment, and interest from January 28, 1958, to the date of this Act on $920,112.74 adjusted by the deductions provided for in the foregoing provisions of this subsection.

(b) With respect to operation and maintenance charges, the tribal funds originally involved amounted to $529,828.20. From that sum there shall be deducted the amount of $158,856.17, which represents a reimbursement of tribal operation and maintenance funds under a judgment of the United States Court of Claims for the portion of the operation and maintenance costs chargeable against non-Indian lands. From the balance so calculated, there shall be deducted an amount equal to the operation and maintenance charges against irrigable land (determined according to the approved designation of 1964) which were collected from the proceeds of sales of land and other sources and deposited in the tribal accounts. The balance so calculated shall be increased by adding interest on the amounts that comprise the $529,828.20 from the end of the year in which each amount was originally used for the project to January 28, 1958, the date of the Court of Claims judgment, and interest on the amounts that comprise the balance calculated pursuant to the first three sentences of this subsection, from January 28, 1958, or the end of the year in which each amount was used for the project to the date of this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to reimburse Indians and former members of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation terminated by the Act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868) who sold project lands that were nonirrigable (determined according to the approved designation of 1964) for the construction, operation, and maintenance charges which were collected from the proceeds of such sales.

SEC. 3. Twenty-seven and one hundred and sixty-two one-thousandths per centum (27.162 per centum) of the sum determined to be due the tribe under section 1 hereof shall be paid by the Secretary of the Interior, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to the persons whose names appear on the roll of mixed-blood members that was prepared pursuant to section 8 of the Act of August 27, 1954, or to their heirs or legatees, under such rules as the Secretary may prescribe. All claims for payment by mixed-bloods shall be filed not later than three years from the date of this Act. Thereafter, all claims and the right to file the same shall be forever barred and the unclaimed shares shall revert to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation.

SEC. 4. No part of any of the funds appropriated in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be subject to attorneys' fees.

SEC. 5. Reimbursement of the Ute Indian Tribe, its members, or its former members, as provided in this Act shall be regarded as a gratuity, shall not be regarded as the settlement of a claim against the United States, shall not be recognized as the basis for any claim against the United States, and shall not prejudice any litigation now pending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16416. Under early Indian policy, when irrigation projects were constructed on Indian reservations, tribal funds were used to finance the construction, at least in part. This was done notwithstanding the fact that the irrigation project would not benefit all members of the tribe, and the members benefited would not be benefited equally.

Congress later recognized the inequity of this system and changed the policy. Under the changed policy, Federal funds were used to construct the Indian irrigation projects, and the costs were then assessed against the specific lands benefited. In this way the individual Indian who was benefited had to pay, and tribal funds which belonged to all members were not used. This policy is still in effect today.

In the case of three of the larger Indian irrigation projects, Congress has already reimbursed the tribes for the use of their tribal funds. This was in 1914. This Ute Tribe, however, has not been reimbursed, and this is the reason for this bill. In other words, enactment of this bill will do for the Ute Tribe the same thing Congress has already done for the Blackfeet, Flathead, and Fort Peck Tribes.

The amount of money involved is $773,560 in principal, and approximately $2,645,640 in interest. The interest is figured at 4 percent simple interest from the date the tribal money was expended. If the tribal money had not been used for the irrigation project it would have drawn interest at 4 percent in the U.S. Treasury. Since the United States had the use of the tribe's money, it is only fair that the tribe be reimbursed for the interest the tribe lost.

I believe the bill is fully justified, and I urge its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 16416 is to reimburse Ute Indian Tribe in Utah for tribal funds that were used to construct, operate, and maintain the Uintah Indian irrigation project.

The project was started in 1906 with tribal funds appropriated by Congress. The tribe was to be reimbursed, first with the proceeds from the sale of land within the former reservation, and second by assessments made against the water users.

As construction of the project proceeded during succeeding years, both tribal and Federal funds were used, and some Federal expenditures were reimbursed from tribal funds—principally proceeds from the sale of ceded lands.

In 1914 Congress changed the policy for Indian irrigation projects so that

the cost would not be borne by the tribe as a whole, but would be assessed against the water users. In accordance with this change in policy, a 1916 statute—30 Stat. 141—reimbursed three tribes—Blackfeet, Flathead, and Fort Peck—for tribal funds that had been used to construct and operate their projects. In effect, the tribal expenditures were converted into Federal expenditures, and the United States was expected to recover its costs from the individual water users instead of from the tribe.

This change in policy was recognized and applied by the Comptroller General in an opinion dated February 27, 1926, with respect to a fourth tribe—Wind River, Wyo. The Comptroller General refused to allow the Federal expenditures to be reimbursed from tribal funds.

The Utes, which are the subject of the pending bill, will be the fifth tribe to be reimbursed. The Department of the Interior reports that there probably are other Indian tribes that should be reimbursed, but that it would take considerable time and effort to assemble the information.

Mr. Speaker, in all candor I should indicate that I would have been happier if the Department had given us more information about these other tribes, but the information just was not available. Nevertheless, the merits of this bill are clear, and there is no reason, in my opinion, to defer action on the bill merely because some other tribes may be entitled to similar relief.

In addition to reimbursement of the principal sum, the bill provides for payment to the tribe of interest on its money at 4 percent from the date of expenditure to the date the bill is enacted. There is one precedent for this payment of interest—the Flathead Tribe, Act of May 25, 1948; 62 Stat. 269, 272—and payment is also justified by the fact that the tribal funds used by the Government were in a 4-percent interest bearing account, and the tribe would have received interest on the funds if they had not been used for the irrigation project.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than candid if I did not indicate that this provision may be subject to some question. The interest amounts to $2,645,640, based on tribal expenditures that totaled $1,449,940. The interest is therefore 176 percent of the principal. Part of these tribal expenditures have already been repaid to the tribe, and only $773,560 of the principal remain to be repaid under this bill. All of the interest, however, remains to be paid.

I believe the interest should be paid, for the reasons I have already stated. Nevertheless, if this provision of the bill should become the subject of a conference with the other body, I for one will re-examine that matter with an open mind.

The committee amended the bill to provide that the reimbursement of the tribe shall be regarded as a gratuity, shall not be regarded as the settlement of a claim against the United States, and shall not be recognized as the basis for any claim against the United States. The committee regards the original use of tribal funds to meet the costs of an irrigation project to irrigate Indian lands as a proper and lawful use. A decision now to reimburse the tribe is a policy decision reflecting the choice between permissible alternatives, and is based on considerations of equity. It should not be regarded as the settlement of a claim or as the basis for a claim. Moreover, the bill provides that none of the money paid under the bill will be subject to attorney fees.

The committee also amended the bill to require a portion of the funds paid to reimburse the tribe to be paid to the mixed-blood former members who withdrew from the tribe pursuant to the act of August 24, 1954. Under the act the mixed-bloods were entitled to a share of the tribal assets, and the Ute Distribution Corp. was organized to handle the distribution of the mixed-blood share. Of the 4,900 shares of stock issued by the corporation, 2,165 now are owned by non-Indians, however, and the mixed-blood share of the funds paid under the bill should be paid to the mixed-bloods individually, rather than to the Ute Distribution Corp. for the benefit of its present stockholders.

Enactment of the bill will require an appropriation of $3,539,792, plus interest accruing since January 1, 1970, to reimburse the tribe. Of this amount, $773,560—representing principal without interest—will be a reimbursable charge against the Indian land. An additional appropriation will be needed to reimburse individual Indians who sold nonirrigable land for irrigation charges that were improperly assessed and collected from the sales prices. The amount has not been determined, but it will be something less than $218,000.

I recommend that the bill be passed.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 16416, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The purpose of this bill is to reimburse, with interest, the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for tribal funds that were used to construct, operate, and maintain the Uintah Indian irrigation project in the State of Utah. The cost of the Federal Government to reimburse the Ute Tribe is approximately $3,539,792.

The Uintah Indian irrigation project was authorized by the act of June 21, 1906 for construction by the Federal Government. The project was designed to irrigate 87,591 acres of allotted lands and construction was completed around 1912. During construction both tribal and federally appropriated funds were expended for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. Tribal funds were also used to reimburse the Federal Government for Federal expenditures in the construction, operation, and maintenance of this project.

Provisions to reimburse the Ute Tribe provided that the tribe was to be reimbursed from the proceeds of the sale of lands within the former reservation, and by assessments made against the water users.

Congress in 1914 changed the policy with regard to Indian irrigation projects by requiring the Secretary of the Interior to apportion the costs of any irrigation project constructed for Indians and reimbursable out of tribal funds to be in accordance with the benefits received by each individual Indian.

On the basis of the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. 582, 583), the Ute Tribe is seeking the authorization and appropriation of Federal funds to reimburse the tribe for the tribal funds used in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the project.

Since this change is policy which requires reimbursement to be made by the owners of the land benefited by the project rather than the tribe, Congress has approved the reimbursement of three other tribes for tribal funds used to construct and operate their projects. They are the Blackfeet, the Flathead, and the Fort Peck Tribes of Montana.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules be suspended and this bill be passed.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I believe my colleague would join me in advising Members of the House that we have cancelled many items of operation and maintenance expense on Indian projects. These come before us every year, and the committee assumes such responsibility. The only change in this instance is that some of these charges have been or have not been cancelled and the interest is requested on particular O & M charge accounts. That is the only difference between this and the other projects which we have had brought to us every year. It is because of this that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I have some reservations.

We promise our colleagues that we will take a look at this matter if this goes to a conference committee, because what is involved in the future is what bothers me more than what is involved in this small bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. If the bill before the House was designed to repay the construction cost, cost of O & M and to repay interest on construction, I would not have any objection to this at all, because this would follow the established pattern. We have done this before. But when we are asked to repay the interest on the O & M charges, this is something we have never done, and I think it raises a very serious question. Despite that fact, I ask that the rules be suspended and that the bill be passed.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 16416, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED AUTOMOBILE ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 370) to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount allowed for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans, and to extend benefits under such chapter to certain persons on active duty, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 370

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 1901, 1902, and 1903 of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "$1,600" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,500".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1906. Assistance for certain persons on active duty

"The Administrator, under such regulations as he may prescribe, shall make the benefits provided for under this chapter available to any person who, on or after the effective date of this section, is (1) on full-time active duty in the Armed Forces (not including active duty for training), and (2) suffering from any disability described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 1901(a) of this title if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or *air* service during any period of war or service specified in section 1901 of this title."

(b) Section 1904 of such title is amended by striking out "No veteran" and inserting in lieu thereof "No veteran or person eligible under section 1906 of this title".

(c) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 39 of such title is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"1906. Assistance for certain persons on active duty."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to increase the maximum amount of money allowed for monetary assistance toward the purchase of an automobile or other conveyance by a veteran who is service connected in such a way as to have lost, or lost the use of, one or both hands, or one or both feet. Or who is blind to a prescribed degree, as the result of disability incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II or the Korean conflict. It would also increase the amount provided for those veterans who incurred the requisite disability as the result of service after January 31, 1955, and who incurred the injury or contracted the disease in line of duty as the direct result of the performance of military duty.

The measure will also extend this benefit to any person who suffers the required disability and who is still on active duty in one of the branches of the Armed Forces.

The grant was established in Public Law 79–663 approved August 8, 1946. The original provisions in it were more limited but are now as described above.

In view of the drastic increase in the cost of living which has occurred since the original enactment, it seems entirely appropriate to the committee that a new level of benefits should be set at $2,500.

It is estimated that the cost of the bill would be $562,500 the first year affecting approximately 625 cases, and would decrease until on the fifth year it would be estimated at $472,500 affecting 525 cases. Insofar as the provision which makes individuals on active duty eligible for this benefit the Department of Defense believes that there will be as many as 150 in this category which would add an additional cost of $375,000.

Mr. Speaker, because of typographical mistakes which were made in printing the Ramseyer I am including as a part of my remarks the text of a corrected Ramseyer section on this bill:

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

CHAPTER 39—AUTOMOBILES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

Sec.
1901. Veterans eligible for assistance.
1902. Limitation on types of assistance furnished and veterans otherwise entitled.
1903. Limitation on amounts paid by United States.
1904. Prohibition against duplication of benefits.
1905. Applications.
1906. Assistance for certain persons on active duty.

§ 1901. Veterans eligible for assistance

(a) The Administrator, under such regulations as he may prescribe, shall provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance by paying not to exceed [$1,600] *$2,500* on the purchase price, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran who is entitled to compensation under chapter 11 of this title for any of the following due to disability incurred in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during World War II or the Korean conflict:

(1) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both feet;

(2) Loss or permanent loss of use of one or both hands;

(3) Permanent impairment of vision of both eyes of the following status: Central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye, with corrective glasses, or central visual acuity of more than 20/200 if there is a field defect in which the peripheral field has contracted to such an extent that the widest diameter of visual field subtends an angular distance no greater than twenty degrees in the better eye.

(b) The benefits of this chapter shall also be made available to each veteran who is suffering from any disability described in subsection (a), if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service after January 31, 1955, and the injury was incurred or the disease was contracted in line of duty as a direct result of the performance of military duty.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term "World War II" includes, in the case of any veteran, any period of continuous service performed by him after December 31, 1946, and before July 26, 1947, if such period began before January 1, 1947.

§ 1902. Limitation on types of assistance furnished and veterans otherwise entitled

No payment shall be made under this chapter for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority; however, a veteran who cannot qualify to operate a vehicle shall nevertheless be entitled to the payment of not to exceed [$1,600] *$2,500* on the purchase price of an automobile or other conveyance, as provided in section 1901 of this title, to be operated for him by another person, but only if such veteran meets the other eligibility requirements of this chapter.

§ 1903. Limitation on amounts paid by United States

The furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance, or the assisting therein, shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price, if not in excess of [$1,600] *$2,500*, or the amount of [$1,600] *$2,500*, if the total purchase price is in excess of [$1,600] *$2,500*, to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran.

§ 1904. Prohibition against duplication of benefits

No [veteran] *No veteran or person eligible under section 1906 of this title* shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this chapter.

§ 1905. Applications

The benefits of this chapter shall be made available to any veteran who meets the eligibility requirements of this chapter and who makes application for such benefits in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

§ 1906. Assistance for certain persons on active duty

The Administrator, under such regulations as he may prescribe, shall make the benefits provided for under this chapter available to any person who, on or after the effective date of this section, is (1) on full-time active duty in the Armed Forces (not including active duty for training), and (2) suffering from any disability described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 1901(a) of this title if such disability is the result of an injury incurred or disease contracted in or aggravated by active military, naval, or air service during any period of war or service specified in section 1901 of this title.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 370. This bill will increase the automobile allowance for certain seriously disabled service-connected veterans from its present $1,600 to $2,500.

Under existing law, Mr. Speaker, veterans of World War II or the Korean conflict who have suffered the service-connected amputation or loss of use of one or more extremities or blindness in both eyes are entitled to $1,600 toward the purchase of an automobile. Veterans of service after January 31, 1955, are

entitled if the disability was incurred as a direct result of the performance of military duty.

This benefit was first made available in 1946 under Public Law 79–663 to veterans of World War II who had suffered the service-connected loss or loss of use of one or more legs. The legislation has been amended several times to make veterans of later conflicts eligible and to grant entitlement to veterans with other serious disabilities. The only provision that has remained unchanged, Mr. Speaker, is the amount of the grant, $1,600.

I can well remember that $1,600 would buy a medium price range automobile with the special attachments required by amputees. Today, $1,600 will not buy the most reasonably priced compact. By increasing the amount to $2,500, we will at least be putting the veteran back in the ball park in his efforts to purchase an automobile.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the bill will extend this benefit to active duty servicemen who meet the criteria for entitlement. I believe this legislation is long overdue, and urge that it be passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 370, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION INCREASE FOR VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 17958) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation, to liberalize certain criteria for determining the eligibility of widows for benefits under such title, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 17958

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$23" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$25";

(2) by striking out "$43" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$46";

(3) by striking out "$65" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$70";

(4) by striking out "$89" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "$96";

(5) by striking out "$122" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "$135";

(6) by striking out "$147" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "$163";

(7) by striking out "$174" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "$193";

(8) by striking out "$201" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "$223";

(9) by striking out "$226" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "$250";

(10) by striking out "$400" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "$450";

(11) by striking out "$500" and "$700" in subsection (k) and inserting in lieu thereof "$560" and "$784", respectively;

(12) by striking out "$500" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "$560";

(13) by striking out "$550" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "$616";

(14) by striking out "$625" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "$700";

(15) by striking out "$700" in subsections (o) and (p) and inserting in lieu thereof "$784";

(16) by striking out "$300" in subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof "$336"; and

(17) by striking out "$450" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "$504".

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by this section, the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85–857 who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. Section 315(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$25" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "$28";

(2) by striking out "$43" in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "$48";

(3) by striking out "$55" in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "$61";

(4) by striking out "$68" and "$13" in subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "$75" and "$14", respectively;

(5) by striking out "$17" in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "$19";

(6) by striking out "$30" in subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "$33";

(7) by striking out "$43" and "13" in subparagraph (G) and inserting in lieu thereof "$48" and "$14", respectively;

(8) by striking out "$21" in subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "$23"; and

(9) by striking out "$40" in subparagraph (I) and inserting in lieu thereof "$44".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 312 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "For" at the beginning of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) For"; and by adding the following new subsections:

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (c) of this section, any veteran who, while serving in the active military, naval, or air service, was held as a prisoner of war for not less than six months by the Imperial Japanese Government or the German Government during World War II, by the Government of North Korea during the Korean conflict, or by the Government of North Korea, the Government of North Vietnam or the Viet Cong forces during the Vietnam era, or by their respective agents, shall be deemed to have suffered from dietary deficiencies, forced labor, or inhumane treatment in violation of the terms of the Geneva Conventions of July 27, 1929, and August 12, 1949.

"(c) For the purposes of section 310 of this title and subject to the provisions of section 313 of this title, in the case of any veteran who, while serving in the active military, naval, or air service and while held as a prisoner of war by an enemy government, or its agents during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era, suffered from dietary deficiencies, forced labor, or inhumane treatment (in violation of the terms of the Geneva Conventions of July 27, 1929, and August 12, 1949), the disease of—

"(1) Avitaminosis,

Beriberi (including beriberi heart disease),

Chronic dysentery,

Helminthiasis,

Malnutrition (including optic atrophy associated with malnutrition),

Pellagra, or

Any other nutritional deficiency, which became manifest to a degree of 10 per centum or more after such service; or

"(2) Psychosis which became manifest to a degree of 10 per centum or more within two years from the date of separation from such service;

shall be considered to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service, notwithstanding that there is no record of such disease during the period of service."

(b) The catchline of section 312 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 312. Presumptions relating to certain diseases and disabilities"

(c) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 11 of such title is amended by striking out

"312. Presumptions relating to certain diseases."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"312. Presumptions relating to certain diseases and disabilities."

SEC. 4. Subsection (d) of section 103 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(1) immediately after "(d)" and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The remarriage of the widow of a veteran shall not bar the furnishing of benefits to her as the widow of the veteran if the remarriage has been terminated by death or has been dissolved by a court with basic authority to render divorce decrees unless the Veterans' Administration determines that the divorce was secured through fraud by the widow or collusion.

"(3) If a widow ceases living with another man and holding herself out openly to the public as his wife, the bar to granting her benefits as the widow of the veteran shall not apply."

SEC. 5. (a) If a widow terminates a relationship or conduct which resulted in imposition of a prior restriction on payment of benefits, in the nature of inference or presumption of remarriage, or relating to open and notorious adulterous cohabitation or similar conduct, she shall not be denied any benefits by the Veterans' Administration, other than insurance, solely because of such prior relationship or conduct.

(b) The effective date of an award of benefits resulting from enactment of subsection (a) of this section shall not be earlier than the date of receipt of application therefor, filed after termination of the particular relationship or conduct and after December 31, 1970.

SEC. 6. Subsection (b) of section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "paragraph (2)" in paragraph (1) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (2) and (3)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) Benefits other than insurance under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration may not be paid to any person by reason of the death of more than one person to whom he or she was married; however the person may elect one or more times to receive benefits by reason of the death of any one spouse."

SEC. 7. Section 3010 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(l) The effective date of an award of benefits to a widow based upon termination of a remarriage by death or divorce shall be the date of death or the date the judicial decree or divorce becomes final, if an application therefor is received within one year from such termination.

"(m) The effective date of an award of benefits to a widow based upon termination of actions described in subsection 103(d)(3) of this title shall not be earlier than the date of receipt of application therefor filed after termination of such actions and after December 31, 1970."

SEC. 8. (a) Subsection 211(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) On and after October 17, 1940, except as provided in sections 775, 784, and as to matters arising under chapter 37 of this title,

the decisions of the Administrator on any question of law or fact under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration providing benefits for veterans and their dependents or survivors shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such decision by an action in the nature of mandamus or otherwise."

(b) Chapter 53 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 3111. Prohibition of certain benefit payments

"There shall be no payment of dependency and indemnity compensation, death compensation, or death pension which, because of a widow's relationship with another man before enactment of Public Law 87–674, would not have been payable by the Veterans' Administration under the standard for determining remarriage applied by that agency before said enactment."

(c) The analysis of such chapter 53 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"3111. Prohibition of certain benefit payments."

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to redeem at par the United States Treasury bonds numbered 32870L, 68196F, and 68197H in the aggregate face amount of $25,000, maturing June 15, 1983, if such bonds are presented to the Secretary of the Treasury for redemption by the United States Spanish War Veterans within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 10. The first two sections of this Act take effect July 1, 1970, Sections 4, 5, 6, and 7 take effect January 1, 1971.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill as reported provides for an average increase in the service-connected rates of compensation available to veterans who have such disabilities of approximately 10 percent effective July 1, 1970.

The committee has adhered to the policy which was adopted in 1952 when it reported legislation which was enacted as Public Law 82–356, which provides for increases in relation to the amount of disability. In other words, in the bill, section 1, as reported, those veterans rated 10, 20, 30, and 40 percent will receive increases of 8 percent to approximate the cost-of-living increase which has occurred since the last compensation increase was voted in the form of Public Law 90–493 effective January 1, 1969. Veterans rated 50 percent through 90 percent are given an increase of 11 percent, and for the totally disabled, and above total, the increase is 12 percent.

Section 2 of the bill provides increases in the rates of additional compensation for veterans who have dependents and who are rated at least 50 percent or more disabled. This provision was added in the 80th Congress. The increase in this case is approximately 8 percent for the veteran rated 100 percent disabled. These rates were last increased in 1965.

A history of wartime service-connected increases follows:

HISTORY OF WARTIME SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION INCREASES

Sec. 314, title 38, subpar.—	Percent	July 1, 1933	Plus percent increase equals—	Jan. 19, 1934	Plus percent increase equals—	Public Law 312, 78th Cong., June 1, 1944	Public Law 182, 79th Cong., Oct. 1, 1945	Plus percent increase equals—	Public Law 662, 79th Cong., Sept. 1, 1946	Plus percent increase equals—	Public Law 339, 81st Cong., Dec. 1, 1949	Plus percent increase equals—	Public Law 356, 82d Cong., July 1, 1952	Plus percent increase equals—	Public Law 427, 82d Cong., Aug. 1, 1952	Plus percent increase equals—
(a)	10	$9	11.1	$10	15	$11.50		20	$13.80	8.7	$15	5	$15.75			7.9
(b)	20	18	11.1	20	15	23.00		20	27.60	8.7	30	5	31.50			4.8
(c)	30	27	11.1	30	15	34.50		20	41.40	8.7	45	5	47.25			5.8
(d)	40	36	11.1	40	15	46.00		20	55.20	8.7	60	5	62.00			4.8
(e)	50	45	11.1	50	15	57.50		20	69.00 / 60.00	8.7	75	15	86.25			5.5
(f)	60	54	11.1	60	15	69.00		20	82.80	8.7	90	15	103.50			5.3
(g)	70	63	11.1	70	15	80.50		20	96.60	8.7	105	15	120.75			5.2
(h)	80	72	11.1	80	15	92.00		20	110.40	8.7	120	15	138.00			5.0
(i)	90	81	11.1	90	15	103.50		20	124.20	8.7	135	15	155.25			5.0
(j)	100	90	11.1	100	15	115.00		20	138.00	8.7	150	15	172.50			4.9
Subpar (s) (housebound cases—Public Law 86–663, effective Sept. 1, 1960																
(l)	150				33.3		$200	20	240.00					10.8	$266	4.9
(m)	175				34.3		235	20	282.00					11.0	313	5.1
(n)	200				32.5		265	20	318.00					11.0	353	5.1
(o)	250				20.0		300	20	360.00					11.1	400	5.0
(p)							300	20	360.00					11.1	400	5.0
Subpar (r) "A and A" nonhospitalization, Public Law 85–782, effective Oct. 1, 1958																
(k)	25				40.0		35	20	42.00					11.9	47	
(q)															67	

Sec. 314, title 38, subpar.—	Public Law 695, 83d Cong., Oct. 1, 1954	Plus percent increase equals—	Public Law 85–168, Oct. 1, 1957	Plus percent increase equals—	Public Law 87–645, Oct. 1, 1962	Plus percent increase equals—	Public Law 89–311, Oct. 31, 1965	Plus percent increase equals—	Public Law 90–493, Jan. 1, 1969	Plus percent increase equals—	H.R. 17958, 91st Congress	Percent increase from Jan. 19, 1934, to Jan. 1969	Percent increase from June 1, 1944, to Jan. 1969	Percent increase from Oct. 1, 1954, to Jan. 1969	Percent increase from Oct. 1, 1954, to H.R. 17958
(a)	$17	11.8	$19	5.3	$20	5.0	$21	9.5	$23	8.7	$25	130.0	100.0	35.3	47.1
(b)	33	9.1	36	5.6	38	5.3	40	7.5	43	7.0	46	115.0	87.0	30.3	39.4
(c)	50	10.0	55	5.5	58	3.4	60	8.3	65	7.7	70	116.7	88.4	30.0	40.0
(d)	66	10.6	73	5.5	77	6.6	82	8.5	89	7.9	96	122.5	93.5	34.8	45.5
(e)	91	9.9	100	7.0	107	5.6	113	8.0	122	10.7	135	144.0	112.2	34.1	48.4
(f)	109	10.1	120	6.7	128	6.3	136	8.1	147	10.7	163	145.0	113.0	34.9	48.6
(g)	127	10.2	140	6.4	149	7.4	161	8.1	174	10.9	193	148.6	116.1	37.0	52.6
(h)	145	10.3	160	6.3	170	9.4	186	8.1	201	10.4	223	151.3	118.5	38.6	53.8
(i)	163	9.8	179	6.7	191	9.4	209	8.1	226	10.6	250	151.1	118.5	38.7	53.4
(j)	181	24.3	225	11.1	250	20.0	300	33.3	400	12.5	450	300.0	247.8	121.0	148.6
Subpar (s) (housebound cases) Public Law 86–663, effective Sept. 1, 1960			265	9.4	290	20.7	350	28.8	450	12.0	504				
(l)	279	10.8	309	10.0	340	17.6	400	25.3	500	12.0	560	233.3	233.3	79.2	100.7
(m)	329	9.1	359	8.6	390	15.4	450	22.2	550	12.0	616	214.3	214.3	67.2	87.2
(n)	371	8.1	401	9.7	440	19.3	525	18.2	625	12.0	700	212.5	212.5	68.5	88.7
(o)	420	7.1	450	16.7	525	14.3	600	16.7	700	12.0	784	108.0	108.0	66.7	86.7
(p)	420	7.1	450	16.7	525	14.3	600	16.7	700	12.0	784			66.7	86.7
Subpar (r) "A and A" nonhospitalization, Public Law 85–782, effective Oct. 1, 1958			150	33.3	200	25.0	250	20.0	300	12.0	336				
(k)												88.0	88.0	0	0
(q)														0	0

All of the rates of service-connected compensation have been increased with the exceptions of the statutory award rate of $47 a month, which is in addition to the basic rates of compensation, and the $67-a-month rate for arrested tuberculosis. The exact percentage increase for each degree of disability, the number of cases affected, and cost are shown in the following table:

	Degree of disability (percent)	Cases	Cost
$25	10	816,226	$19,589,424
$46	20	320,096	11,523,456
$70	30	275,964	16,265,700
$96	40	168,245	13,992,180
$135	50	106,220	16,293,120
$163	60	102,920	18,228,960
$193	70	60,666	13,597,608
$223	80	32,042	8,334,288
$250	90	10,640	3,021,120
$450	100	94,825	55,441,800
Subtotal			176,287,656
$560	(L)	7,439	$5,244,192
$616	(M)	5,299	4,113,660
$700	(N)	1,259	1,113,200
$784	(O)		
$784	(P)		
$336	(R)	8,035	11,190,240
$504	(S)	6,870	4,346,160
Subtotal			26,007,552
Total basic rates			202,295,208
Additional for dependents			14,506,000
Grand total			216,801,208

Section 3 of the bill contains a special provision related to former prisoners of war. Because of the conditions of their captivity and the kinds of long-range arm that may have been caused, it is sometimes difficult for a former prisoner of war to establish, some time after the completion of his military service, that a disability or the aggravation of a previous disability is related to his military service.

The provision of the committee bill concerns former prisoners of war who were in that category for 6 months or more who suffered from dietary deficiencies, forced labor, or inhumane treatment. The bill considers any veteran who was a prisoner of war of Japan or Germany during World War II. North Korea during the Korean conflict and thereafter, or North Vietnam or the Vietcong during the Vietnam era, to have suffered from dietary deficiencies, forced labor, or inhumane treatment.

The table which follows shows cost of living increases in relation to compensation.

Sec. 314, title 38, subpar.—	Percent	Public Law 695, 83d Cong., effective Dec. 1954	Public Law 90-493, effective Jan. 1969	Percent increase cost of living, 1954-69	Percent increase compensation, 1954-69
(a)	10	$17	$23	32.4	35.3
(b)	20	33	43	32.4	30.3
(c)	30	50	65	32.4	30.0
(d)	40	66	89	32.4	34.8
(e)	50	91	122	32.4	34.1
(f)	60	109	147	32.4	34.9
(g)	70	127	174	32.4	37.0
(h)	80	145	201	32.4	38.6
(i)	90	163	226	32.4	38.7
(j)	100	181	400	32.4	121.0
Subpar. (s) (housebound cases) Public Law 86-663, effective Sept. 1, 1960			$450		
(l)		$279	500	32.4	79.2
(m)		329	550	32.4	67.2
(n)		371	625	32.4	68.5
(o)		420	700	32.4	66.7
(p)		420	700	32.4	66.7
Subpar. (r) "A and A" nonhospitalization, Public Law 85-782, effective Oct. 1, 1958			300		
(k)				32.4	

Under the bill, the following diseases would be presumed to be service connected if suffered by a former prisoner of war who meets the criteria discussed above:

Avitaminosis, beriberi—including beriberi heart disease, chronic dysentery, helminthiasis, malnutrition—including optic atrophy associated with malnutrition, pellagra, and any other nutritional deficiency.

Under present law, a psychosis which became manifest within 1 year of a veteran's separation from military service is presumed to be service connected. The period is 2 years for admission to a VA hospital as a service-connected patient. The bill extends this period of presumption of service connection from 1 to 2 years in the case of former prisoners of war who suffered from dietary deficiencies, forced labor, or inhumane treatment.

The next four sections—sections 4 through 7—of this bill amend the existing remarriage requirements now contained in Veterans' Administration law. The amendments would be effective January 1, 1971. Generally speaking, these VA requirements bar the payment of compensation, pension, and education benefits upon remarriage and are considerably more restrictive than those found in some other federally administered programs such as social security and civil service retirement. This is shown by the table which follows:

EFFECT OF REMARRIAGE OF WIDOWS ON BENEFITS UNDER CERTAIN FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Federal program	Effect of remarriage	Effect of termination of remarriage
Veterans' Administration benefits	Terminates monthly payments permanently—unless remarriage is void, or has been annulled by a court with basic authority to render annulment decrees.	None.
Social security	1. Remarriage under age 60 terminates payments.	1. Payments resumed at age 60 or older.
	2. Remarriage at age 60 or over, payments continue at reduced rate (reduced from 81½ percent of the primary insurance amount to 50 percent of such amount).	2. Full payments restored.
Civil service retirement	1. Remarriage under age 60 terminates payments.	1. Payments restored at any age.
	2. Remarriage at age 60 or over: none (i.e. full benefits continue).	2. None.
Railroad retirement	Terminates monthly payments permanently.	None.
Federal employees compensation	Terminates monthly payments permanently—Lump-sum settlement equal to 24 monthly payments.	None.

The basic change of these four sections is to permit a widow, who has remarried, to revert to her earlier eligibility when her second marriage is ended by death or divorce. The cost of such sections of the bill is $8,538,000 the first year rising to $9,206,000 the 5th year. These sections were included in H.R. 372 which passed the House on October 6, 1969, and is pending before the Senate Committee on Finance.

Section 8 stems from H.R. 17564, 91st Congress. It relates to the longstanding statutory provisions excluding from judicial review determinations with respect to benefits of a noncontractual nature provided for veterans and their dependents and survivors.

The background of this immunity from review and the events that have transpired in recent years which gave rise to this amendment are discussed in detail in the Veterans' Administration report on H.R. 17564, dated June 1970, which is set forth below. The following is a brief summary of this material.

For many years before 1958, based on statutory provisions similar to that now appearing as 38 United States Code 211 (a), the Federal courts held that decisions of officials responsible for administering laws providing noncontractual benefits to veterans and their dependents and survivors were not subject to judicial review. The current provision (38 U.S.C. 211(a)) provides, in part:

The decisions of the administrator on any question of law or fact concerning a claim for benefits or payments under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power to review any such decision.

This language would seem to be perfectly clear in expressing the congressional intent that any and all decisions of the Administrator on questions of entitlement to veterans' benefits—except for certain contractual benefits which were specifically excluded from the application of this provision—were to be final and not subject to judicial review.

Nevertheless, beginning in 1958, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that the term "claim" employed in the quoted statute—and in Public Law 886, 76th Congress, an earlier, substantially identical provision—related only to an original "claim" or application for benefits initiated by a veteran or other prospective beneficiary and did not encompass any action that might be taken once the original application was adjudicated and benefits granted. Hence, the court concluded that a decision of forfeiture of benefits previously granted because the veteran was found to have rendered assistance to an enemy during time of war—*Wellman* v. *Whittier, Administrator,* 259 F. 2d 163; *Thompson* v. *Gleason, Administrator,* 317 F. 2d 901—or a termination of benefits because the beneficiary had failed to return reports required to establish continued eligibility for the payments—*Tracy* v. *Gleason, Administrator,* 379 F. 2d 469—were not immune from judicial review.

Complicating this matter was the declaration by the mentioned circuit court in the Tracy decision, that its other decisions on finality—including Sinlao against United States and Whittier, administrator, 271 F. 2d 846—were overruled to the extent they were in conflict. Sinlao involved the termination of death benefits awarded to a Philippine widow of a World War II serviceman, under the Veterans' Administration's rule of presumed remarriage. Because experience had shown that many widows apparently successfully concealed the record of their ceremonial marriage in order to continue to receive benefits, the Veterans' Administration employed an administrative rule that there is an inference or presumption of a widow's remarriage, placing on her the burden of proving her continued eligibility to receive benefits, when there is proof of:

First. A cohabitation by the widow with a man as man and wife; and

Second. A "holding out" by the two persons to the general community in which they reside that they are husband and wife—which generally is embraced in the requisite cohabitation; and

Third. A general reputation in such community that they are married to each other.

In 1959, the Appellate Court, in dictum in the Sinlao case, had questioned the Veterans' Administration's rule on remarriage stating that it could not be reconciled with congressional intent. Thereafter, the Veterans' Administration advised this committee of the court's statements and urged the Congress to amend a then pending bill to confirm the agency's application of the presumption of remarriage rule. As a result, this committee—and, in due course, the Congress, in Public Law 87-674—amended the definition of "widow" in title 38, United States Code, to provide an even more restrictive statutory provision with respect to future cases—that is, after September 19, 1962, the date of enactment—excluding any woman who, since the death of the veteran, lived with another man and held herself out openly to the public to be the wife of such other man. As to earlier cases, this committee, and the Senate committee, endorsed the application by the Veterans' Administration of its presumption of remarriage rule, and stated that the agency was expected to continue to apply that rule to relationships prior to the 1962 law.

Since the decision in the Tracy case—and as the result of that decision and the Wellman and Thompson decisions—suits in constantly increasing numbers have been filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia by plaintiffs seeking a resumption of terminated benefits. A small number of these involve a large variety of matters—a 1930's termination of a widow's pension payments under a statute then extant, because of her open and notorious adulterous cohabitation; invalid marriage to a veteran; severance of a veteran's service connection for disability compensation; reduction of such compensation because of lessened disability, et cetera.

However, the great majority of these suits have been brought by Philippine widows of World War II servicemen seeking restoration of death compensation or pension benefits terminated after the Administrator raised a presumption of their remarriage on the basis of evidence gathered through field examination. Notwithstanding the 1962 endorsement by the Congress of the Veterans' Administration's administrative presumption of remarriage rule, most of these suits have resulted in judgments adverse to the Government.

It seems to this committee that it is quite clear that the Congress, in enacting the exemption from judicial review in Public Law 866, 76th Congress, intended that exemption to be all inclusive and did not intend the fairly tortured construction adopted by the courts of appeals in the Wellman, Thompson, and Tracy holdings. It is obvious that if the Congress had intended to authorize judicial review, it would not have adopted a form so inherently unfair as to deny review of any original claim for benefits; providing no time limitation or conditions governing such suits against the United States and its officials; and, contrary to all past practice in the veterans' benefits field—see 38 U.S.C. 748 (g) and 3404(c)—establishing no limitation on attorney fees.

In view of the foregoing, this committee has included in H.R. 17958, new subsection 8(a), which restates the provisions of subsection 211(a) of title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the word "claim" from that subsection. The restated subsection will provide that except for certain contractual benefits, the decisions of the Administrator on any question of law or fact under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration providing benefits for veterans and their dependents or survivors shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such decision by an action in the nature of mandamus or otherwise. The provision is specifically made effective October 17, 1940, the date of enactment of Public Law 866, 76th Congress. The committee believes that this approach to solving the problem is preferable to that employed in H.R. 17564, that is, adding a definition of the word "claim" to title 38, United States Code. The restated section 211(a) will make it perfectly clear that the Congress intends to exclude from judicial review all determinations with respect to noncontractual benefits provided for veterans and their dependents and survivors.

The committee has also added subsection 8(b) to H.R. 17958. This language, which stems from H.R. 7624, 91st Congress, will expressly ratify the application of the Veterans' Administration administrative presumption of remarriage rule with respect to all pre-1962 cases. This action is deemed necessary because the judiciary has ignored the Congress' endorsement, in 1962, of that administrative practice.

As noted above, a large percentage of the suits filed to date have involved the presumption of remarriage rule. A study of the first 32 judgments adverse to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has shown that accrued and estimated future payments in those cases alone will total in excess of $1.4 million. It is therefore apparent that the enactment of these provisions will result in substantial savings to the Government.

Section 9 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem three bonds held by the United Spanish War Veterans in the total amount of $25,000 which mature June 15, 1983, these bonds purchased in 1954 for $25,000 would, if sold on the open market today, result in the loss of several thousand dollars to the holder of the securities. Admittedly it was a mistake for the organization to purchase these bonds. Equity would seem to dictate that this provision be enacted since the average age of the United Spanish War Veterans is 89 and that 13 years from now very few, if any, would be living to utilize the proceeds of these bonds. This section was included as section 10 of H.R. 372 which passed the House on October 6, 1969, and is pending before the Senate Committee on Finance.

The Veterans' Administration favors the enactment of sections 4 through 8. The Treasury is opposed to the proposal in section 9:

Summary of costs

Sec. 1	$202,295,208
Sec. 2	14,506,000
Sec. 3	(1)
Secs. 4 through 7	8,538,000
Sec. 8	(2)
Sec. 9	(3)
Total	225,339,208

[1] No estimate.
[2] Unestimated savings; possibly $50,000,000 to $75,000,000.
[3] No cost.

Mr. Speaker, the compensation bill which we are considering today was designed by the subcommittee on compensation and pension following the conclusion of 3 days of hearings on May 26, 27, and June 3. In my judgment this subcommittee has acted in a responsible fashion and has maintained the liberal stance which the committee and the Congress has always held toward service-connected veterans. To all the members of the subcommittee my special word of thanks for a job well done, and I am sure that my appreciation will be echoed by all the service-connected veterans of this country. Members of the subcommittee are the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DORN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MONTGOMERY), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ADAIR), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this is the provision of the bill, dealing with the widow who remarries, which gives me some concern. What happens if she is durable and remarries three or four times and loses husband after husband by death or divorce? Does she go back for benefits the third and fourth and fifth time?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Yes. This bill has been considered by our committee, and our committee has become convinced it is wise to permit the widow to go back on the rolls. It will probably save more money than it costs. The VA does not agree, but most of my committee does.

Mr. GROSS. It is predicated on either death or divorce. Is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Correct.

Mr. GROSS. If a woman divorces her husband and, regardless of whether the next husband is a veteran or not, she remarries and loses that husband, then does the first husband have to start paying alimony all over again? That is not in this bill, but it seems to me it is on the same order as the provision we are discussing.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I cannot answer that question, but this bill puts the widow of the serviceman in the same category as in the case of social security or employees' compensation, and we have passed this bill once before.

Mr. GROSS. But what happened to it? Did the other body refuse to concur?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The other body did not pass it.

Mr. GROSS. This provision apparently will be costly, I may say to the gentleman. According to the gentleman's figures the first year cost would be close to $10 million.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The VA estimates the first year costs at about $8 million. I do not necessarily agree with that cost, and I do not think they can prove it in any way. There is no way they can know how many women will remarry, but many times when the women remarry, they come off the pension rolls.

Mr. GROSS. Being predicated upon death is one thing, but being predicated upon divorce is quite another. It seems to me this provision lends itself to husband shopping.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, of course they have to have earned this. The first husband had to have died, so the women have earned their right already to be considered veterans' widows. The minute the woman remarries she goes off the roll, under the present law, and permanently. What happens is a matter of, I suppose, morality. In some cases the man just lives at the house, and the couple does not get married, because they cannot afford the loss of the pension. In this case if the woman remarries and it turns out to be a failure, through death of otherwise, she just reverts to her status, already earned, as widow of the first man. So we are not adding new people to the rolls but just adding someone who has been already on the rolls.

Mr. GROSS. I guess we are going down the road as fast as we can to socialization.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 17958. The bill will increase the monthly payments for veterans who are in receipt of compensation for service-connected disabilities. The Congress has never been reluctant to increase the payments for this deserving group. Today's cost of living affects them, especially the seriously disabled, in the same manner as it affects any segment of our population. The bill authorizes the greatest percentage increase for the more seriously disabled veteran while providing a cost of living adjustment for all others.

The bill also increases the dependency allowances of those who are rated at 50 percent or more; liberalizes the law with respect to disabilities resulting from dietary deficiencies suffered by former prisoners of war; permits remarried widows to receive death benefits upon the termination of their subsequent marriage and clarifies congressional intent with respect to judicial review of Veterans' Administration decisions.

I want to congratulate the members of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension for their efforts on behalf of the Nation's disabled veterans as represented in this legislation. I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 17958. The principal thrust of this bill is to increase the rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities. The bill provides a minimum increase in compensation rates of approximately 8 percent. This increase would be applied to ratings in the 10- to 40-percent bracket. More disabling conditions would receive an 11-percent increase, while the totally disabled veteran would receive a 12-percent increase.

The cost of living since the last compensation bill became effective has increased approximately 8 percent. The minimum increase authorized by the bill is commensurate with the increased cost of living.

Additionally, the bill will increase the allowances for dependents paid to veterans who are at least 50 percent disabled. The increased allowance in the case of a totally disabled veteran is 8 percent, again approximating the increased cost of living.

The bill also contains special provisions relating to disabilities incurred by former prisoners of war. I am sure most Members have experienced some frustration in attempting to obtain service connection of disabilities incurred by former prisoners of war. You know the disabilities are the result of inhumane treatment and malnutrition; yet, because they did not surface until several years after military service, then service connection is denied.

I happen to believe that any disease entity or psychiatric condition suffered by a prisoner of war of the Japanese in World War II, the North Koreans, the North Vietnamese, or the Vietcong should be service connected, irrespective of the length of time that has elapsed since the serviceman's incarceration. Unfortunately, this bill does not go that far.

The bill authorizes a presumption of service conection, in the case of those held as prisoners of wars for at least 6 months, if they incur diseases associated with nutritional deficiencies. It also permits the payment of compensation in such cases for psychoses which become manifest to a 10-percent degree within 2 years after service.

Should this bill become law, Mr. Speaker, I would invite the attention of Veterans' Administration rating board personnel to the language of the committee report at the bottom of page 7:

> The Committee is highly sympathetic with the problems of former prisoners of war and wishes to stress its desire that the Veterans' Administration administer this provision of law, a well as all existing laws and regulations on the subject, in the most liberal fashion possible.

The bill also contains provisions that revise the conditions under which certain widows may be entitled to Veterans' Administration benefits. Under existing law, upon the remarriage of a veteran's widow, her benefits are terminated permanently. Both social security and civil service retirement laws permit widows to receive benefits under certain conditions upon the termination of their subsequent marriage. This bill proposes to make veterans' widows eligible for veterans' bene-

fits upon the termination of their remarriage.

Another section of this bill, Mr. Speaker, will revise the provisions of law that prohibit judicial review of veterans' claims, thus making clear the congressional intent that all decisions of the Veterans' Administration with respect to noncontractual benefits, are to be exempt from judicial review. At the outset, Mr. Speaker, let me make it crystal clear that I believe there is considerable merit in the proposition of court review of certain decisions of the Veterans' Administration, and I have for many years supported legislation to provide judicial review. I do not want judicial review, however, through the back door—that is, through an involved interpretation by the court of a simple provision of law. As a result, the law prohibiting judicial review is almost meaningless in certain types of Veterans' Administration decisions on individual cases.

The law—38 U.S.C. 211(a)—states:

The decision of the Administrator on *any question of law or fact* concerning a claim for *benefits or payments* under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power to review *any* such decision.

Despite the clarity of this provision of law, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that the word "claim" related only to an original application for benefits by a veteran and did not include any reopened claim or subsequent action that might be taken after adjudication of the initial claim is completed.

If we are to have judicial review, Mr. Speaker, I hope it will result from the mature deliberations of 435 Members of the House of Representatives and the 100 Members of the other body, rather than from the erroneous interpretations of a small panel of jurists. The bill before the House makes clear the longstanding intent of Congress that all decisions of the Administrator involving nocontractual benefits should be exempt from judicial review.

I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this measure to grant an increase in the rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities and as a member of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension, I am pleased to voice my support of H.R. 17958.

The Congress has always demonstrated a compassionate interest in the needs of the service-connected disabled and their dependents. In fact, these Americans who gave so much of themselves in the interests of our national security have always merited the highest priority consideration, and we have never been reluctant to respond with alacrity to their needs. That need exists today. The cost of living has increased substantially since the last time the Congress increased the rates of compensation for service-connected disability. Almost every segment of the population has received some increase in their income within the last year. We cannot do less for the Nation's war disabled veteran.

H.R. 17958 will increase in varying amounts the monthly rates of compensation payable to these veterans. Those who are rated as 10- to 40-percent disabled will receive an 8-percent increase in monthly payments. Payments to the 50- to 90-percent group will be increased approximately 11 percent, while the totally disabled veteran will receive a 12-percent boost in payments.

Since the more seriously disabled veteran is in most cases entirely dependent upon his compensation payments for living expenses, the committee has attempted to recognize this fact in the percentage increases authorized by the bill. At the same time, we have assured that every disabled veteran, irrespective of the degree of disability, receives an increase that is commensurate with the increased cost of living.

The bill also provides for increases in dependency allowances for those who are 50 percent or more disabled. Equally important, the bill provides more liberal criteria for determining service connection and eligibility for compensation payments for former prisoners of war.

Remarried widows of veterans, under the terms of the bill, can qualify for monthly benefit payments upon the termination of the subsequent marriage. Existing law requires the Veterans' Administration to terminate payments to a veteran's widow upon her remarriage. Even though the second marriage does not survive, the widow has forfeited her right to benefits based upon the death of her veteran husband. Other Federal benefit programs are less stringent in their criteria for remarried widows.

These are the major provisions of the bill, Mr. Speaker. The bill has merit. It is for the disabled veteran. I urge that it be passed.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 17958. This bill, if enacted into law, will authorize a badly needed increase in the rates of compensation for service-connected disabilities. As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a cosponsor of this legislation, I am pleased that it has been reported so promptly for your consideration today.

Within the past year, almost everyone in the Nation receiving payments from the Federal Government has received an increase in such payments in recognition of the increased cost of living. The men who have defended our Nation in time of war, and received disabilities therefrom, have not been so fortunate. I have been deluged with correspondence, not only from my own constituents, but from disabled veterans throughout the Nation from coast to coast and beyond. The commander of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Hawaii, Mr. Ah Kee Leong has been particularly persuasive in setting forth the great need for compensation increases on behalf of the members of his organization.

This bill provides not only a cost-of-living increase for all veterans with service connected disabilities but it also will increase the dependency allowances paid to the most seriously disabled veterans. I shall vote for this legislation and urge my colleagues as well to support this bill.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension which reported H.R. 17958 after holding hearings and making a careful study of the subject, I rise in support of this bill and urge its favorable consideration by my colleagues.

There are several very important provisions in this bill. Foremost among these is a cost-of-living increase in the compensation rates payable to the disabled veterans who are suffering from disabilities which were incurred as a result of their military service. There is certainly no group of recipients of Federal benefits more deserving of our consideration than those who will be aided by the increased and new benefits proposed by H.R. 17958.

The veterans' organizations in testifying before our subcommittee strongly urged that the proposed increase in compensation rates should be made effective July 1, 1970, rather than January 1, 1971, as was proposed in the bill recently passed by the other body. It was called to our attention that, in the passage of legislation to provide a cost-of-living increase to other groups, such as Federal employees and military personnel, the Congress did not require them to wait until January 1, 1971, to receive such benefits. Therefore, to do so for disabled veterans would be unjust. The committee concurred and, therefore, provided in this bill that the increased rates should become effective July 1, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to my colleagues, Messrs. RAY ROBERTS, G. V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY, E. ROSS ADAIR, JOHN P. SAYLOR, and WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT, for their serving as members of the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pension.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, all of us should be pleased that the chairman of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs has called up a bill which provides for service-connected compensation increase for veterans. I rise in support of H.R. 17958.

My own regret is that this measure is being considered under suspension of the rules. Because of this parliamentary situation, there will be no opportunity to offer liberalizing amendments.

There should be a more greater across-the-board increase in benefits paid to those with service-connected limitations. The reason I make this statement without any apology is that since we last increased the date of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans, there has been two increases in benefits to social security recipients and railroad retirement annuitants. The 1970 increase alone for social security recipients was 15 percent across the board. Surely the men who defended this country's freedom should be accorded as much in increases as these other categories of compensation.

As a real and substantial reason why I am not completely happy with the content of this bill is that the last increase in disability compensation benefits was away back in 1965. When all is said and done, the new rates of compensation pro-

vided today does bring the person back to the level that prevailed 5 years ago, when we take into account all the cost of living increases since 1965.

No one can deny the necessity for economy in Government. All of us hope and look forward to a possible reduction in Federal spending, but I submit without any apology that veterans care should not be the first place to commence Federal economy.

Even though I have complained that some of the provisions of this bill are deficient, I would be moved to support this measure if for no other reason because of the section dealing with former prisoners of war. We should recall that these veterans who were in enemy hands for 6 months or longer in World War II, the Korean engagement, and the Vietnam war, if they have suffered from dietary insufficiencies, inhuman treatments, and other abuses will now be recognized as having a service-connected condition for the purpose of receiving disability benefits should the effects of such imprisonment become manifest within 2 years following such experiences. Such diseases as beriberi, pellagra, malnutrition, and chronic dysentery will now be presumed to be service connected, as to those former prisoners of war who were held prisoner for 6 months or more.

Then also H.R. 17958 contains a long needed change in the effect of remarriage of those widows who were receiving compensation, pension, and education benefits. At present, of course, payments are terminated permanently upon remarriage and under present law, the subsequent termination of this remarriage has no effect to restore these benefits. Even under social security these payments are resumed at age 65 or older and under the civil service retirement, payments are restored at any age upon the termination of the second marriage. All of us are glad that this bill will permit a widow who has remarried and thus forfeited payments under present laws to revert to her former status upon termination of her later marriage by death or divorce.

In my opinion our committee has been very practical and certainly most realistic to provide by this bill the right for United Spanish War Veterans to cash certain bonds purchased in 1954 rather than have to hold these until their maturity in 1983. It is simply an application of some commonsense for this provision to be enacted in to law because the average of of these Spanish War veterans is now 89 and 13 years from now in 1983, very few, if any, will be alive to enjoy the benefits of the proceeds of these bonds.

Mr. Speaker, when I began these comments I said I was glad to see this measure reported for action by the House. Then I went on to add and to emphasize that I was not satisfied with the amount of the increase, particularly in light of the ravages of inflation since the last increase away back in 1965. However I am convinced that the committee has brought out the best measure they believe can be passed and then signed into law. On April 27, 1970, the other body passed S. 3348. It was less generous than our bill today. Our measure will be substituted and sent back to the other body. Goodness knows our increase in benefits is little enough but let us hope that the Senate will quickly agree to the House version, and that it may be signed into law in order for these benefits to be rushed into effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 17958.

The question was taken.

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

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

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

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 313, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 115, as follows:

[Roll No. 168]

YEAS—313

Abbitt	Cohelan	Haley
Abernethy	Collins	Hall
Adair	Colmer	Hanley
Adams	Conable	Hanna
Albert	Conte	Hansen, Idaho
Alexander	Corbett	Hansen, Wash.
Anderson, Calif.	Coughlin	Harsha
	Crane	Hawkins
Anderson, Ill.	Culver	Hechler, W. Va.
Anderson, Tenn.	Daniel, Va.	Heckler, Mass.
	Davis, Wis.	Helstoski
Andrews, Ala.	de la Garza	Henderson
Annunzio	Delaney	Hicks
Arends	Denney	Hogan
Ashbrook	Dennis	Holifield
Aspinall	Derwinski	Hosmer
Ayres	Devine	Howard
Baring	Dickinson	Hull
Barrett	Donohue	Hungate
Beall, Md.	Dorn	Hutchinson
Belcher	Dowdy	Jarman
Bell, Calif.	Downing	Johnson, Calif.
Bennett	Duncan	Johnson, Pa.
Betts	Dwyer	Jonas
Biester	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Bingham	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, N.C.
Blanton	Edwards, La.	Jones, Tenn.
Boggs	Eilberg	Karth
Boland	Eshleman	Kastenmeier
Bolling	Evans, Colo.	Kazen
Bow	Evins, Tenn.	Kee
Bray	Feighan	Keith
Brinkley	Fisher	King
Brooks	Flood	Kleppe
Broomfield	Flowers	Kluczynski
Brotzman	Flynt	Koch
Brown, Calif.	Foley	Kuykendall
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Gerald R.	Kyl
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford, William D.	Landgrebe
Broyhill, Va.		Langen
Buchanan	Foreman	Latta
Burke, Fla.	Fountain	Leggett
Burke, Mass.	Frelinghuysen	Lennon
Burleson, Tex.	Frey	Lloyd
Burlison, Mo.	Friedel	Long, Md.
Burton, Calif.	Fulton, Pa.	Lowenstein
Button	Fulton, Tenn.	Lujan
Byrne, Pa.	Fuqua	Lukens
Byrnes, Wis.	Galifianakis	McCloskey
Caffery	Garmatz	McCulloch
Camp	Gettys	McDade
Carter	Giaimo	McFall
Casey	Gibbons	McKneally
Celler	Gonzalez	Macdonald, Mass.
Chamberlain	Goodling	
Chappell	Gray	MacGregor
Clancy	Green, Oreg.	Mahon
Clark	Griffin	Mailliard
Clausen, Don H.	Griffiths	Mann
	Gross	Marsh
Clawson, Del	Grover	Martin
Clay	Gubser	Matsunaga
Cleveland	Gude	May
Mayne	Pucinski	Stephens
Meeds	Purcell	Stokes
Mikva	Quie	Stubblefield
Miller, Calif.	Quillen	Stuckey
Miller, Ohio	Railsback	Sullivan
Mills	Randall	Symington
Minish	Rees	Talcott
Mink	Reid, Ill.	Taylor
Mize	Reuss	Teague, Calif.
Mizell	Rhodes	Teague, Tex.
Mollohan	Riegle	Thompson, N.J.
Monagan	Roberts	Thomson, Wis.
Montgomery	Robison	Tiernan
Moorhead	Rodino	Udall
Morgan	Rogers, Colo.	Ullman
Morse	Rogers, Fla.	Van Deerlin
Mosher	Rooney, Pa.	Vander Jagt
Moss	Rosenthal	Vanik
Murphy, Ill.	Rostenkowski	Vigorito
Myers	Roth	Waggonner
Natcher	Roybal	Waldie
Nelsen	Ryan	Wampler
Obey	Sandman	Watts
O'Hara	Satterfield	Whalen
O'Konski	Saylor	Whalley
Olsen	Scherle	White
O'Neill, Mass.	Scott	Whitehurst
Patman	Sebelius	Whitten
Patten	Shipley	Widnall
Pepper	Shriver	Wiggins
Perkins	Sikes	Wilson, Bob
Pettis	Sisk	Winn
Philbin	Skubitz	Wold
Pickle	Slack	Wright
Pike	Smith, Calif.	Wyatt
Pirnie	Smith, Iowa	Wydler
Poage	Smith, N.Y.	Wylie
Poff	Snyder	Wyman
Pollock	Springer	Yates
Preyer, N.C.	Stafford	Young
Price, Ill.	Staggers	Zablocki
Price, Tex.	Stanton	Zion
Pryor, Ark.	Steiger, Wis.	Zwach

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Michel

NOT VOTING—115

Addabbo	Fascell	Morton
Andrews, N. Dak.	Findley	Murphy, N.Y.
	Fish	Nedzi
Ashley	Fraser	Nichols
Berry	Gallagher	Nix
Bevill	Gaydos	O'Neal, Ga.
Biaggi	Gilbert	Ottinger
Blackburn	Goldwater	Passman
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Pelly
Brademas	Hagan	Podell
Brasco	Halpern	Powell
Brock	Hamilton	Rarick
Brown, Mich.	Hammer-schmidt	Reid, N.Y.
Burton, Utah		Reifel
Bush	Harrington	Rivers
Cabell	Harvey	Roe
Carey	Hastings	Rooney, N.Y.
Cederberg	Hathaway	Roudebush
Chisholm	Hays	Ruppe
Collier	Hébert	Ruth
Conyers	Horton	St Germain
Corman	Hunt	Schadeberg
Cowger	Ichord	Scheuer
Cramer	Jacobs	Schneebeli
Cunningham	Kirwan	Schwengel
Daddario	Kyros	Steed
Daniels, N.J.	Landrum	Steiger, Ariz.
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Stratton
Dawson	McCarthy	Taft
Dellenback	McClory	Thompson, Ga.
Dent	McClure	Tunney
Diggs	McDonald, Mich.	Watkins
Dingell		Watson
Dulski	McEwen	Weicker
Eckhardt	McMillan	Williams
Edwards, Ala.	Madden	Wilson, Charles H.
Erlenborn	Mathias	
Esch	Melcher	Wolff
Fallon	Meskill	Yatron
Farbstein	Minshall	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Schwengel.

Mr. Carey with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Roe with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Finley.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Fraser with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. McClure.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Jacobs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 3348) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes, and for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3348

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$23" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$25";

(2) by striking out "$43" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$48";

(3) by striking out "$65" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$72";

(4) by striking out "$89" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "$99";

(5) by striking out "$122" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "$135";

(6) by striking out "$147" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "$163";

(7) by striking out "$174" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "$193";

(8) by striking out "$201" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "$223";

(9) by striking out "$226" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "$250";

(10) by striking out "$400" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "$450";

(11) by striking out "$500" and "$700" in subsection (k) and inserting in lieu thereof "$550" and "$750", respectively;

(12) by striking out "$500" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "$550";

(13) by striking out "$550" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "$600";

(14) by striking out "$625" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "$675";

(15) by striking out "$700" in subsections (o) and (p) and inserting in lieu thereof "$750"; and

(16) by striking out "$450" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "$500".

(b) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by this section, the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. Section 315(1) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$25" in subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "$28";

(2) by striking out "$43" in subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "$48";

(3) by striking out "$55" in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "$61";

(4) by striking out "$68" and "$13" in subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "$75" and "$14", respectively;

(5) by striking out "$17" in subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "$19";

(6) by striking out "$30" in subparagraph (F) and inserting in lieu thereof "$33";

(7) by striking out "$43" and "$13" in subparagraph (G) and inserting in lieu thereof "$48" and "$14", respectively;

(8) by striking out "$21" in subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "$23"; and

(9) by striking out "$40" in subparagraph (I) and inserting in lieu thereof "$44".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 312 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "For" at the beginning of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) For"; and by adding the following new subsections:

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (c) of this section, any veteran who, while serving in the active military, naval, or air service, was held as a prisoner of war by the Imperial Japanese Government during World War II, by the Government of North Korea during the Korean conflict, or the Government of North Vietnam or the Viet Cong forces during the Vietnam era, or by their respective agents, shall be deemed to have suffered from dietary deficiencies, forced labor, or inhumane treatment in violation of the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929.

"(c) For the purposes of section 310 of this title and subject to the provisions of section 313 of this title, in the case of any veteran who, while serving in the active military, naval, or air service and while held as a prisoner of war by an enemy government or its agents during World War II, the Korean conflict, or the Vietnam era, suffered from dietary deficiencies, forced labor, or inhumane treatment (in violation of the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929), the disease of—

"(1) Avitaminosis,

Beriberi (including beriberi heart disease),

Chronic dysentery,

Helminthous disease,

Malnutrition (including optic atrophy associated with malnutrition),

Pellagra, or

Any other nutritional deficiency,

which became manifest to a degree of 10 per centum or more after such service; or

"(2) Psychosis which became manifest to a degree of 10 per centum or more within two years from the date of separation from such service;

shall be considered to have been incurred in or aggravated by such service, notwithstanding that there is no record of such disease during the period of service."

(b) The catchline of section 312 of such title is amended to read as follows:

"§ 312. Presumptions relating to certain diseases and disabilities"

(c) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 11 of such title is amended by striking out

"312. Presumptions relating to certain diseases."

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"312. Presumptions relating to certain diseases and disabilities."

SEC. 4. The first two sections of this Act shall become effective January 1, 1971.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TEAGUE OF TEXAS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Strike all after the enacting clause of S. 3348 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 17958, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 17958) was laid on the table.

INCREASING SERVICEMEN'S GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1479) to amend chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase from $10,000 to $15,000 the amount of servicemen's group life insurance for members of the uniformed services, with Senate amendments to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments to the House amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 21, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out "istration." and insert "istration." ".

Page 3, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out all after line 21 over to and including line 13 on page 5.

Page 19, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out all after line 19 over to and including line 16 on page 20 and insert:

"SEC. 13. (a) The first sentence of section 417(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting '(1)' immediately after 'unless', and by striking out the period at the end of such sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: 'or (2) the total amount paid to the widow, children, or parents of such veteran under any such policy is equal to or exceeds the face value of the policy and such amount paid

when added to any amounts paid as death compensation is equal to or less than the total amount which would have been payable in dependency and indemnity compensation following the death of such veteran if such widow, children, or parents had been eligible for such compensation upon the death of such veteran. Any person receiving death compensation at the time he becomes eligible for dependency and indemnity compensation pursuant to clause (2) of the preceding sentence shall continue to receive such death compensation unless he makes application to the Administrator to be paid dependency and indemnity compensation. An election by such person to receive dependency and indemnity compensation shall be final.'.

"(b) The last sentence of section 417(a) of such title is amended by striking out 'preceding sentence' and inserting in lieu thereof 'first sentence'.

"(c) No dependency and indemnity compensation shall be payable to any person by virtue of the amendments made by subsection (a) of this section for any person prior to the effective date of this Act."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in considering this bill S. 1479, which has as its primary purpose the increasing of the amount of insurance for men on active duty from $10,000 to $15,000, the House adopted a complete substitute for the Senate bill with certain liberalizations.

The Senate has now accepted 99 percent of the House amendments but has changed in two instances the provisions of the bill as passed by the House, one of which is to provide a slightly altered definition of certain terms—widow, widower, child, and parent—and a provision making certain widows eligible for dependency and indemnity compensation in some instances where the husband had maintained a national service life insurance policy for a limited time on a premium-free basis.

Mr. Speaker, for obvious reasons I would have preferred the House language, but because of other matters in this program which are urgent I am moving to concur in the Senate amendments.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments to the House amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the veterans' bills considered today.

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

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION OF AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

JUNE 15, 1970.

Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter is written to notify you that I am resigning as a Conferee on H.R. 14685, the International Travel Act.

Thanking you in advance for removing my name from the above, I am,

Respectfully yours,

GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusets, Mr. HASTINGS KEITH, as a conferee to replace the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT UNTIL MIDNIGHT WEDNESDAY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Wednesday to file a privileged report.

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

There was no objection.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS ACT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1063 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1063

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. 15361) to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, 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 Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. 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 to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 15361, the Committee on Education and Labor shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1076, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 15361 as passed by the House.

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1063 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of House Resolution 15361, the Youth Conservation Corps Act. The resolution also provides that, after passage of the House bill, the Committee on Education and Labor shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 1076 and it shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and amend it with the House-passed language.

The purpose of H.R. 15361 is to establish the Youth Conservation Corps which would be a 3-year pilot program employing roughly 3,000 young people ages 14 to 18 each year during the summer on public lands.

There are 4.8 million acres of national forest land needing replanting. Each year, more than 14 billion board feet of public timber are lost to fire, insects, and disease. Recreational use of the public lands is skyrocketing. National park visitations are expected to double between 1968 and the early 1970's and could increase 10 times by the year 2000. Trails, campsites, roads, picnic grounds, watersheds, fish stocking—all must be increased and maintained.

In June of last year, unemployment among youths ages 14 to 18 was 16.4 percent and neglect of a budgetary nature frustrates Federal land management. In Olympic National Park are 600 miles of trails that the staff has never been able to open completely or maintain.

The bill authorizes an appropriation of $3.5 million annually for 3 years following enactment of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1063.

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

Mr. SISK. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the House, I would just like to make a brief statement and then ask a couple of questions.

Mr. Speaker, the brief observation is that I am very much in accord with the objectives of this bill; namely, conservation both of the natural resources and of the youth of this country. But, Mr. Speaker, this bill is not all gold, although it may glitter. The objective is worthy, but with all of the trouble in the land among our youth, to select a group of youngsters from the tender age of 14 to 19 from all sections of the country and to concentrate them in these camps of both races and, more important still, of both sexes is going to pose a very serious situation. I do not want to raise any question of race here. Even if I did, I would have too much discretion to do so, because I know where the votes would be. But I am saying—and I hope that those who are not listening will at least read the bill so that they will know what they are doing—to select young girls of 14 years of age up to 19 years of age and send them in to this type of a camp under the conditions that exist in the country today I think would be most unwise.

Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Rules was very much disturbed about this bill. It was held up there for a number of weeks, if not months. It killed the bill on one occasion and then reported it again on a motion to reconsider by a still divided vote.

I think it is a grave mistake to take young people and particularly young girls of 14 years of age and concentrate them in these camps, regardless of the objective. I feel it is a grave mistake when you consider the fact that you have opposite sexes—I assume that there will be separate dormitories or barracks for them; I certainly hope so—but there is nothing in the bill here that would indicate that to be the fact.

So, Mr. Speaker, as one who opposed the bill in committee, I wanted to raise my voice against it here on the floor of the House.

Now, if the chief author of the bill, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), or some of the cosponsors would care to answer the question as to whether they would be willing to accept an amendment when we get into the Committee of the Whole or either omit the young girls entirely from this thing and make it a male proposition, I would be inclined to go along with it. However, I still think that the age of 14 years is too young. Let me impress if I can upon my friend, Mr. MEEDS, that this is not the old CCC camp operation in any manner. This is an entirely new project with a worthy objective, I agree, but a mistake to administer it in this way.

If the gentleman cares to comment on that I hope my friend from California will yield to him, or if he wants to comment upon it during general debate. I hope he will do so.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, if I can just make a brief comment and then I certainly shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) to make a further comment, it is my understanding that certain amendments will be offered to this legislation. I, personally, am committed to support such amendments, because as I stated a moment ago in my appraisal and estimation this bill is a conservation measure. It is not necessarily that way as it is now written. I would oppose the bill as it is presently written. I expect to support amendments to the bill which will make of it a conservation measure not only for the people involved but also for the benefit of our national resources.

With reference to the further comment, we are taking out of the bill—at least I would hope if the amendments are adopted—certain agencies that some of us may have some concern about. If amendments are adopted, as I hope they will be, this program will be administered by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture.

Again, with reference to the ages and the matter of sexes I feel certain—and, now, I am going on the basis of some experimental programs that we now have going in California to some extent I might say on which this program has been patterned where we have no problem with the mixing of the sexes—of girls or boys—and we have not had any problem with reference to the youth. That is why, as I say, basically, the manner in which the program is being operated as a form of a local program in California at the present time is very closely akin to the old Civilian Conservation Corps program of many years ago to which I am sure my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER), was referring.

I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that I want to see some amendments to this bill. It is my understanding that the authors have agreed to accept some amendments and I expect to support them. In fact, I would hope that once we amend this bill in the proper form that my good and able friend, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, gentleman from Mississippi, will be in a position to support it. I think that the authors of the bill are for generally the same thing.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further to me before he yields to the gentleman from Washington, I think the gentleman from California, my friend (Mr. SISK), is most forthright on most occasions but I am afraid a little evasive on this one.

Mr. SISK. I had no intention to be, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman failed to reply to me on the question I raised on concentrating these children of tender age of both sexes in the same camp.

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will allow me just a comment, of course, my answer to that aspect was my confidence in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, based on their past record.

Now, this, as I said in the beginning, is not in my opinion and must not be a so-called manpower training program, or anything of that kind. To the extent that prohibitions could be written into the bill I certainly personally would have no objection to them, but I think this might be a matter for the authors of the bill to consider.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), to make comments in connection with this problem.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman correctly states the situation with regard to the amendment that he has discussed. However, I have heard of no amendment which would either strike the young ladies from this bill, or would place impediments upon the administering agencies to require them to be in separate camps.

They may well do this—I do not know. But I think one of the great problems we could run into in this legislation is attempting to define very strictly the way this program should be operated. We have properly left some discretion with the departments because this is a pilot program, and we expect them to try different types of programs so that we can get the kind of program eventually that this Nation should adopt, and utilize for conservation of our great natural resources.

I would just point out to the able gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER) that not only are young men from ages 14 to 18 in this Nation in turmoil and unrest, and not only are they energetic and desirous of working with our natural resources, but the young ladies in this age group are also willing and determined and aggressive for work in outdoor projects.

We have in the State of Washington a private program which is run by the Olympic National Park and the Seattle School Districts, which is proceeding with the program in which there are young ladies involved in conservation work, and they are doing a very fine job. They are working. They are contributing to our ecology, and to the betterment of our conservation projects daily in the summer in Olympic National Park. They have had no accidents, they are out doing a good, hard day's work, and they enjoy it. They as a matter of fact recount it as one of the most valuable experiences they have had.

So I would hope this House would not take upon itself to make conditions as to the type of programs which should be tried within the context of this pilot program. If we find out that it does not work then I would assure the gentleman from Mississippi that I would be the first one to be opposed to it, but I do not think we should prejudge it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) a question, if I may.

I believe the gentleman from Washington made a remark in his comments a short time ago that there would be various kinds of programs within a 90-day limit. It is difficult for me to comprehend how you could have various pilot programs in a 90-day limit, which is only 3 months, by the time you would hire your supervisory personnel—and who they would be, I do not know.

I think the most astonishing thing about this entire bill is that nobody wants to administer it.

I have three letters—one from the Department of Labor—they do not want it. One from the Department of Agriculture—they do not want it. One from the Department of the Interior—and they do not want it.

Furthermore, this is an unbudgeted item. I think when you are talking about 14- to 18-year-olds, we are in a situation here where we are going to have nothing more than a glorified baby-sitting project. I think at this time this program is being well implemented under an existing program in the Department of Labor through the Park Service. I would certainly hope that this House would take another look at this bill that involves $3.5 million, and vote it down.

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

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEDS. I hope the gentleman will correct the record. He said $3.5 billion. He should have said $3.5 million.

Mr. SCHERLE. That is what I said.

Mr. MEEDS. That is a little different.

Mr. SCHERLE. I said $3.5 million.

Mr MEEDS. I will just try to respond to one of the issues at this time that the

gentleman raised when he said we would not have time to try different programs within this pilot program.

First of all, let me point out to the gentleman that this envisions a 3-year bill—three summer trials, and I think a number of different programs could be tried during that time. Also, different kinds of programs could take place at different locations in the country. This is a national program and we certainly would not be tied to any one set kind of program all over the United States.

As a matter of fact, I hope they try different ones.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize a Youth Conservation Corps to employ young people, during the summer, on the public lands.

The program is authorized for 3 years. It expects to employ about 3,000 young people each summer, ranging in age from 14 to 18. They will do conservation work in the national forests, on replanting projects, and in parks, on maintenance of trails, campsites and picnic grounds.

Employment will be for a period of up to 90 days in the summer. Income factors will not be weighed in choosing corpsmen for the program. The program will be under the direction of a newly created Inter-Agency Committee composed of representatives of the Departments of Interior, Agriculture, and Labor. Authorizations are for $3,500,000 annually for 3 years. At the time this bill was before the Rules Committee it was decided that this program could be improved by limiting its scope to the Interior and Agriculture Departments. The chairman of Labor and Education Committee (Mr. PERKINS), and the bill's chief sponsor (Mr. MEEDS), both agreed to accept such an amendment. I am prepared to offer such an amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Minority views are filed by five members. They oppose enactment because:

First, the project will be another "category" grant program, not coordinated with other manpower and training programs;

Second, it would teach no skills to the enrollees, who would be employed for no more than 90 days each summer; and

Third, it does not provide preference for those who need assistance most—the poor.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time during the consideration of the rule to ask a question because there seems to be a conflict in the bill itself and the report.

Referring to page 3, section 3(b)(2) the bill reads as follows:

(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

Referring to the committee report on page 5 in the section-by-section analysis of the bill, in analyzing section 3(b)(2) the report says:

(2) Determine the rates of pay, hours and other conditions of employment. Corps members are not deemed Federal employees for purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

That provision seems to me to be a direct conflict. I would like somebody to explain what has happened here. The bill is not at all consistent with the explanatory analysis section by section.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. The provision to which the gentleman refers has been carried in similar legislation since the days of the committee's original consideration of legislation to establish a conservation corps.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Does the gentleman mean it has been in conflict all this time and that I have just now caught it?

Mr. PERKINS. No, there is no conflict in the bill.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Read the language. It states:

They shall not be deemed to be Federal employees other than for purposes of Chapter 171 of Title 28, United States Code, and Chapter 81, of Title 5, United States Code.

And the explanation states:

Corps members are not deemed Federal employees for the purpose of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

But the bill itself states they will not be considered Federal employees except for the purposes of the Tort Claims Act.

Mr. PERKINS. I shall apologize to the gentleman and say there is a discrepancy. The report is in error, not the bill.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman. I yield back to the balance of my time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I personally introduced a conservation corps bill that was sent to the committee along the lines of this bill except that it did speak primarily to young men. It was directed in terms of an age span a little higher than this bill, and it was particularly directed toward forest conservation and forest management. However, I am in full sympathy with the desires of the committee to go on a pilot program and to determine at this point in time what it is that we really need. I can understand their being concerned about high school students and the desire to bring productive employment as early as possible to those who may not be completing high school work. I note that this is going to be only a summer program, and I am rather disappointed in that, because I would like to have seen a program that would be extended over the entire year. But again, we did learn when we went into the massive programs projected by the last administration that it is best to try pilot programs first and find out what you are doing.

I think the best thing this report provides is shown on page 4 beginning at line 16, where it states:

The Inter-Agency Committee must also prepare a report describing how best to initiate a State-local-Federal cost-sharing program for a Youth Conservation Corps that would work on State and municipal lands.

It is my view that what this Federal Government should start to do more in earnest is to work out programs by which States can take over more responsibility for some of these domestic programs, so we can have diversification in order to meet the needs of the States. We should encourage the States to make commitments of its own resources in this kind of program so important to the total Nation.

I hope that this part of the bill will get significant attention and will take on real meaning, because I think if we will do that, and we can get the State governments where they are giving assistance, with the guidance of the Federal Government, sharing the responsibility with the Federal Government, we are going to have some programs that will begin to answer some of the problems across the Nation.

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

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

Mr. WHITE. Would it not be wise if we would allow the age limit for employable persons in the summertime in private industry to go down to 14? I favor this particular bill, but it seems to me that private industry throughout the United States could also help to take young people off the streets if they were able to employ them at that age.

Mr. HANNA. In the State of California conditions have been brought to my attention showing that we do need to have some meshing of our employment policies. The real problems exist in the cities, and we do know that it would be better if young high school dropouts had some kind of employment. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker I had not intended to speak on this bill at this time, but several questions have been raised.

A question has been raised about the age at 14. I think I agree with the response to the last question. I think in terms of the entire Nation there ought to be a review and a study of the child labor laws we have, and I think there ought to be a review and a study of the compulsory education laws we have. I think we are doing a great disservice to the young people of this country to say they must remain in school although, while they are physically there, intellectually and in every other way they have dropped out, and yet to say at the same time they cannot work.

We have an age gap where the young people ought to be employed and doing constructive things. So certainly I would defend the 14-year age in this bill.

A question has been raised about

making girls eligible for this program. I believe the suggestion was made we ought to eliminate the girls and have it just for young men. If Members will pardon me my own bias on the basis of sex, would the Members be willing to eliminate all the boys and say it is a program just for girls?

I can cite 101 instances where there is discrimination against girls and women and many cases where they are not eligible for programs. Not too long ago—and I believe, still, the highest unemployment rate in the Nation was for girls between the ages of 16 and 21, and in too many instances the only thing they have to do is to wander around the streets.

The question has also been raised about the advisability of letting boys and girls be in the same program. May I suggest that boys and girls are together on the streets without any supervision at all. The boys and girls are together in the alleys without any supervision at all. And I cannot see if we structure a program—and where there is even some supervision, though not maybe what all of us would desire—that we would not be making an improvement over the present circumstances. So it would seem to me that if we are going to have a program like this, we ought to have it for girls as well as for boys.

The question has also been raised in terms of the kinds of programs and who is going to administer them. I, too, am interested, and I want to talk to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Iowa about the letters to which he referred a moment ago from the various departments, and that does concern me, but may I point to a program which has been run in my school district in Portland, Oreg. It is one of the finest programs we have had and one of the reasons, I suggest to my friend from Washington, that I was greatly interested in this bill, which the gentleman originally sponsored.

The city of Portland has a program for every sixth-grade youngster. Every sixth-grade youngster, boy or girl, goes out for 1 week to live in the woods. They learn about wildlife, the need to combat pollution, and to work on conservation. It is one of the best innovative programs I have seen. I do not know of any bad reports that have come from that. It seems to me this kind of program has so many things to recommend it.

If we have a program that is for up to 90 days, I would suggest the departments can carry on different kinds of pilot projects and then report back to us on which ones work and which ones do not work. I think we can learn a great deal from it, and I think we can help these youngsters at this particular age, from 14 years on up, to spend their time in a constructive way rather than in a haphazard way with nothing to do but roam the streets.

So, Mr. Speaker, I give my support to this legislation.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my very able and lovable friend, the gentlewoman from Oregon, that I did not start out to discriminate among the sexes. That is a very bad word any time it is used. As a matter of fact, I would call the attention of the gentlewoman to the fact that I was one of the coauthors of the amendment to the civil rights bill we had, which put women and put sex into that bill. So I certainly cannot be charged here with being discriminatory.

But what I was merely asking for was a division, and I dislike very much to find myself in disagreement with my good friend of the opposite sex.

As a matter of fact, I know that I cannot win when I get into that situation.

I might say, for the benefit of the gentlewoman or anybody else, since she has been talking I got a lecture from another one of the gentler sex here who has not spoken on this subject.

All I wanted was not discrimination but segregation on the basis of sex.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am really delighted to know of the views of my good friend the very distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, because there are a couple of little old bills in my committee. We were going to have hearings tomorrow, with various women appearing as witnesses in opposition to discrimination against women, as now exists.

However, we were asked to cancel those hearings. We do intend to continue those, and I do hope to have that bill with those provisions, covering discrimination based on sex before the Rules Committee some time this year. I am delighted to know in advance that the chairman of the committee fully intends to support that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I talked with the chief sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Washington, a moment ago. It seems to me, if it is not now clear in the language, one of the amendments which might well be offered to this bill would be an amendment to make it possible for such a great organization as the Girl Scouts of America or the Boy Scouts of America to have a program. The department could contract with them to run it. I believe those two organizations probably have done as much for the young people of this country as any other organizations.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I should like to congratulate the gentlewoman for the very fine statement she has made. I intended to point out that the bill has the support of the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of America. Is that not correct?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would think it would have the support of both of them. I would think specifically they ought to be able to run some of the programs because of the very fine records they have made over many, many years.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentlewoman also has made a very fine record in this whole field, and I congratulate her.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield again, briefly?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Bearing in mind again that I know I cannot win, is it not a fact that the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts have segregated camps where they send these young people? That is the point.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes, this is true and I approve, but I just suggest, also, that we believe in the experimental programs, such as the one run by the Portland schools, which is not segregated, this bill might allow this. They do have, of course, separate living facilities for them. It is a highly successful program.

I am suggesting there could be some programs run by the Girl Scouts, some programs run by the Boy Scouts, and some programs run by school systems where they would have both boys and girls, as well as other programs run by the Government agency.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution, and 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. PERKINS. 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. 15361) to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

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

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. 15361, with Mr. PREYER of North Carolina 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 Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15361, a bill to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, because I believe in the purposes the bill will serve.

We are reminded time and again of the accelerating pace at which American citizens are migrating to urban centers.

The importance of the great natural resources of our Nation—its forests, its

lakes, its streams, its soil, its minerals—are lost to a generation which is losing touch with the outdoors.

These resources not only have played a prominent role in the growth and development of our Nation but also continue to provide our Nation with the highest level of productivity and prosperity that any nation has heretofore enjoyed.

The legislation we bring to the floor today authorizes only a pilot program involving summer employment for young people on our public lands, and in our national forests and parks.

The summer program will furnish approximately 3,000 enrollees with 90 days of work, of conservation study, and of a new opportunity for a new generation of young Americans to become acquainted with the beauty of our land, to understand the tremendous conservation needs and to learn of the importance of our natural resources.

There are other immediate and direct benefits to be gained by the enactment of this legislation.

There is the tremendous backlog of conservation work which awaits the attention of enrollees.

There are available in our national parks, forests and public lands, camp facilities which can accommodate 5,683 enrollees.

There are now higher numbers of idle and unemployed youth whose education and future contribution to society could be greatly enhanced by participating in a summer conservation program.

I want to commend my distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Chairman DANIELS, for the diligent work in his subcommittee in initiating action on this legislation.

I also want to extend my congratulations and commendations to our distinguished colleague from the State of Washington (Mr. MEEDS) for his authorship of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the Youth Conservation Corps Act, H.R. 15361, would establish a Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee composed of representatives of the Departments of Interior, Agriculture and Labor. It would be the responsibility of the Interagency Committee to administer a 3-year pilot program to enlist young men and women in a Youth Conservation Corps for the purpose of providing them gainful employment, generating understanding and developing, preserving and maintaining the lands and waters of the United States.

Eligibility for participation in the Corps will be open to youth of all social, economic and racial classifications. Enlistment in the Corps cannot exceed 90 days.

For carrying out the program there is authorized to be appropriated $3,500,000 a year for the 3 years of the life of the pilot program. The bill contains a statement of policy and purpose setting forth clearly the objectives sought by the legislation. Inherent in this policy is the concept that the gainful employment of American youth from all segments of society in a healthy, outdoor atmosphere can be found in our national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system and other public land and water areas creates an appropriate understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage and will have lasting national benefits to future conservation and natural resources preservation.

I urge adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, no one actually could be against this type of bill, particularly because of its content and solely because of its content.

However, we are now contemplating in this honorable body a project which is unbudgeted, which will cost the taxpayers of this country $3.5 million for what could aptly be labeled as a "Kiddy Corps."

What in the world can we do with a young boy or a young girl 14 years of age out in the forests, out in the various areas that are contemplated under this program, other than to set up supervisory personnel who will do nothing more than baby sit.

Now, I do not think the people of this country, the taxpayers of this Nation, should be asked to do that.

The National Park Service has a program where each summer they take 18-year-olds, mind you, 18-year-olds and hire them to go out into the various parks and to our various other natural resources in the country, to cut down timber, build trails and to work in watershed projects and everything else.

Why do they choose 18-year-olds? Because an 18-year-old is usually healthy enough and big enough to do the job. The National Park Service has been in this business for a long time. They know what they are doing. But can you imagine what you could do with a great group of people—14-year-old boys and girls, perhaps 500 or 1,000 miles away from home? It is just impossible to comprehend.

When we use the term "employment" we are talking about someone who is qualified to do a day's work.

Now, I have two sons of my own. I know what they are capable of doing. I know what the differences are between the ages of 14 and 18 based upon my own experience.

This program, furthermore, is not budgeted. There was nothing in the budget whatsoever for it.

Here we are talking about inflation, here we are talking about fiscal irresponsibility, here we are talking about getting value received for each dollar spent. How in the world can you do this under this program which will continue for 3 years as a pilot program at a cost of $3.5 million?

Someone was trying to compare this with the CCC. Well, it depends on how old you are as to whether or not you can remember the CCC. This is not the same type of a program at all. The CCC was set up at a time of depression to help our young men further their interests and give them some type of employment. They were all young men and none of them were 14 years of age. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, as far as the Job Corps is concerned, I can tell you what the habits of a 14-year-old are, and I can tell you what it means to throw them into different age groups. It is not healthy. It is just that simple. And to take these young people, young boys and young girls, thousands of miles away from their homes and expose them through these programs when they are still basically infantiles I believe is not right, and cannot be at all justified.

Furthermore, let us consider the cost; $1,600 for 90 days. That is pretty expensive, is it not, $1,600 for 90 days? Some figures have been used of $1,200 for 90 days, $400 a month. What are you going to get out of it? Furthermore, in 90 days do you think you can walk into a camp on June 1st and set it up, and then do you think you can close down that camp on the last day of August? It is going to take a great deal of preliminary work before you can get to June 1st. Some one has to be there to open it up and to close it down. Also who is going to take employment in these programs as supervisors for 3 months?

This is a good bill, ladies and gentlemen, but it is not for us here in the Congress; this is a bill, for those who are interested in it, that should be operated on the local level, on a State level, but not here in Washington—not at the Federal level.

We talk about gainful employment. Our esteemed chairman mentioned this before. How in the world can you derive gainful employment out of what will be asked these young people in the forests of our Nation? They will not be there very long, they cannot be exposed to a great deal as far as employment is concerned, and at 14 years of age many hopefully will go back to school in the fall of the year. So I do not think at this time that this House should consider this type of a bill, and I certainly agree in many of the aspects expressed by the fine and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Furthermore, the Department of Agriculture does not need this type of a bill. They have got enough to do. The Department of the Interior already has their program, they do not need this type of a bill. And the Department of Labor—and I understand an amendment will be offered to exempt them from this—and really that is where the program belongs, if you are talking about labor then it belongs in the Department of Labor, and not with the Department of Interior or the Department of Agriculture—least of all not with them.

Also what are you going to ask these Departments when you set up a 90-day course, 3 months in the summer months, what are administrative costs going to be? Has anyone looked into that?

In addition to that, when these youngsters arrive at these camps they have to be fed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

We talk about food and clothing, and subsistence. How long will it take to provide the necessary type of clothing? Are

they going to wear uniforms, or are they going to bring their clothing with them from home?

Ladies and gentlemen, when they talk about a pilot program they are talking about a real pilot program, because nothing up until this date has been started, nor has it been considered.

I would ask that if the proponents of this legislation are really sincere in their efforts that they contact the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior, and ask them to go along with some type of a program from the State legislatures in their own individual States, to set up some kind of legislation that would permit this on a State level. But I do not think the taxpayers of this country at this time should be asked to finance this type of a baby-sitting project, not simply because it is a pilot project, but simply because it will not and cannot work.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MAYNE. As I understand the report and the bill, this is going to be for children of all social and economic backgrounds. Does that mean that the taxpayers are going to have to pay for sending children of very wealthy people or upper middle class people to these camps with no part of the expense being paid by well-to-do parents?

Mr. SCHERLE. My colleague has brought up a very pertinent part of this bill and one that is perhaps the guts of the whole thing—yes, your assumption is correct.

Mr. MAYNE. How much more expensive is that going to make the bill than it would be if it were to be limited to needy youngsters?

Mr. SCHERLE. Let me give you an example.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps at the present time can take a youngster, and has taken youngsters, for less than $500 a year and have equipped themselves to do much more than can be offered under this program. This program here at a minimum will exceed $1,200 and this is according to figures of the Department of Labor and I think also by the proponents of the bill.

If this bill were to serve its purpose, I will say in answer to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE), then it should be directed toward disadvantaged youngsters and not to those of our affluent society who can well afford to provide means of recreation—and that is what this will be—it will not be a work program as much as it will be a baby sitting and recreation program.

Mr. MAYNE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, first let me congratulate most warmly the sponsor of the bill now before the House. Our distinguished colleague from Washington (Mr. MEEDS) has offered a bill which provides a very modest yet basic investment in America's future. I consider it an investment we cannot afford not to make. I am one of those who knew firsthand of the work of the old Civilian Conservation Corps in the early 1930's. I saw the great benefits which it provided in conservation—conservation of human values and human resources as well as of natural resources. The lessons which came from the Civilian Conservation Corps were extremely important at a time when our Nation badly needed direction, courage, and goals. Two camps were established very early in the program in my home county in Florida in what was then the Choctawhatchee National Forest. From those camps emerged some of the strong young leaders of that area in the years which followed.

Many years have elapsed and great strides have been made in many areas, yet many of the same problems which plagued us then still exist, and some are even more aggravated now than they were then. We are much more conscious of the environment now than we were in the early 1930's and if for no other reason, the Corps members will contribute most helpfully to the huge backlog of conservation work on public lands and recreation areas. As a part of their total summer activities, they will build and maintain camp and picnic areas, build hiking trails, plant trees, et cetera. The advantage of these activities should be very obvious.

But there are even more important advantages. For instance, the program would provide young people an opportunity for a productive, wholesome summer. There probably is no greater need for young people today than that they be gainfully occupied. Too many of them, whether affluent or disadvantaged, have nothing to do but hang around street corners and seek new thrills for release from boredom or frustration.

One of the most important advantages that I see is that the Corps' conservation work-education program will inject into the minds and spirits of tomorrow's citizens a sound and meaningful environmental ethic. Some of us know that nothing teaches the necessity of wise conservation better than practicing it. Youths would be trained, shown, and then actually participate in implementation of current principles and methods of conservation. In the process, they would absorb a deeper appreciation of the necessity of wisely managing our natural environment. An environmental ethic—what a meaningful thing for this generation to pass to the next.

There is another advantage which certainly cannot be overlooked in the area of troubled relationships between youngsters of different social, economic, and ethnic backgrounds. The Youth Conservation Corps can help to bridge the gap between them. Under the organized supervision of experienced educators and conservationists, young people would learn to get along together, to communicate, to gain new lasting understandings. A human and outdoor living environment provides a unique resource of easing some of today's social problems. At summer's end, the youths would return to their homes with new friendships, new insights, and perhaps in some future time, new and workable answers to old and destructive problems.

Existing Federal youth programs are not similar to that proposed in H.R. 15361. Youth programs which provide job opportunities aim at increasing youth employability and otherwise relieving the conditions of poverty. These are very worthwhile goals, but are not the prime purposes of the Corps.

Two programs most similar to the Corps are Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps. Both include only disadvantaged, out-of-work and usually out-of-school youth. The Youth Conservation Corps includes youth from all economic backgrounds and would primarily include in-school youth.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is not a residential program nor does it aim at providing youth the opportunity to understand and appreciate the Nation's natural environment. Furthermore, Department of Labor policy has not encouraged such involvement. In 1969, around 364,000 youth were enrolled in New York City; about 600 were involved in conservation agency work. Most New York City slots have been programed to large urban areas.

The Job Corps civilian conservation centers program is a residential living program where youth, as a part of their training, conduct conservation work on Federal lands. This program, however, has and is being modified. Of the original 88 federally operated centers, 30 are currently operating. Conservation work is being deemphasized. The recent USDL redirection of Job Corps states:

> It is necessary to . . . deemphasize the work program to the maximum extent possible.

In addition, the President's Manpower Training Act of 1969 (proposed), would further modify conservation activities in Job Corps.

I think it is clear that the proposed program does not overlap existing Federal programs and certainly there are none which, in my opinion, can be more effective for the objectives which are set forth. The Youth Conservation Corps is not primarily a manpower training program. It is not intended as such.

Yet, opponents have stated:

> It would establish another categorial manpower program and that it does not provide the manpower services necessary for skill development.

The bill may not provide all manpower services necessary for skill development. This bill clearly states:

> Employment of American youth in public lands creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage.

Employment, as envisioned in this bill, is a meaningful way to involve, acquaint, and commit youth to wise management of our natural environment. While the youth learn, they are productively contributing to the improvement and maintenance of natural resources on public lands and are being properly compensated. In addition, they would gain some work experience.

There are areas in the bill which

should be improved, but this I believe can be accomplished during debate.

Again this is a modest program but one which is patterned on a most successful earlier program. The objectives are sound; the thinking back of the program is good. It can contribute significantly to America. It is worth all the cost and all the effort. I support it strongly.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I had an opportunity to sit in on the committee hearings, and I can state that the bill was very ably presented. I wish everyone could have had the opportunity of hearing about the real challenge youngsters would have if they could go to the mountains of Washington or Oregon. I have never been there myself, but when we heard about these great mountains and what the outdoors would do for the youth, one could visualize everything that could be done through this particular bill.

But while we analyze it, I would like to call your attention to two or three things. First, at most, all we are talking about are 3,000 youngsters. In other words, we are talking about a plan to take care of 3,000 youngsters, although we have millions and millions of teenagers who would like to participate. This bill applies only to 3,000. So we really are not going to be able to accomplish much.

Ask yourselves this question: How would they find 10 boys or girls from Corpus Christi? How would they select another 25 out of Little Rock, or another 30 from Waterloo, Iowa, and so on down the line? How do you pick 3,000?

The other point is in relation to the length of the program. It is only a 90-day program, the hardest program in the world to administer.

This gets back to one of the two big problems we have in connection with it. We are creating a new bureaucracy. We are creating a new commission. If this thing was really needed, if we needed a program of this type, it could be handled through the National Park Service.

The one thing we do not need in Washington today is more and more bureaus. We need more and more consolidation and savings of administrative costs. The other thing we need to evaluate is what do we accomplish in America if we go to Atlanta, Ga., and pick up 10 youngsters and take them up to the State of Oregon and let them spend 90 days in this camp? What do we accomplish? All we do is stir up unrest among the other 3,000 youngsters who do not get to go. When we help the 10, we are stirring up dissatisfaction among the others.

The program of the CCC was brought into this. Many of us are strong believers in what the CCC accomplished. We ought to compare it in its true light. It was a program for men. It could also have been a program for ladies. But it was a long-term program in which they brought the people in for a sufficient length of time so they could accomplish something.

The dollar amount in this bill does not seem to be a great amount in terms of our large budget, but it is a matter of principle and intent. All of us should evaluate very carefully whether this is the right way to be expanding our Government economy.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, the author of the bill.

(Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. MEEDS) was granted permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15361, the Youth Conservation Corps bill, of which I am a cosponsor. This legislation would establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps over the next 3 years for young people, ages 14 through 18, to work in conservation on Federal lands.

This bill has been approved by our House Committee on Education and Labor as part of the growing national concern with preservation and protection of our environment. Its intent is to establish a means to channel the dedication and enthusiasm of our young people for this meritorious cause into activities that will have a direct beneficial impact on our environment.

There is a great need for such services by our young people because of the tremendous increase in the public use of our wildlife refuges, parks, and national forests for recreation and other purposes. This extensive use increases soil and water conservation problems on these properties, and there are many such areas which could greatly benefit by the type of activities evisioned by this legislation.

In addition to the benefits gained by the public through the availability of improved recreational areas, the Youth Conservation Corps members themselves would benefit through wholesome, healthy outdoor activity on behalf of a worthy cause. This will increase the role and relevance of nature and the environment in their lives, an appreciation which is in their personal interest as well as the national interest.

The program would help meet the need for summer jobs for our youth. Unemployment for May was 5 percent for the Nation as a whole, but 14.3 percent for young people, an increase of 2 percent over last year. This legislation would provide timely help in a critical need.

Since no other existing programs are directed to the same ends, the Youth Conservation Corps would fill a measurable gap in our efforts to improve the environment. Federal agencies such as the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior with related programs have expressed an interest in cooperating with the proposed Corps in ways which would reap the greatest return for the modest investment to be made.

We proposed to invest $3.5 million a year for 3 years in this pilot program to test the best means of implementing our objectives. At the conclusion of this period we will be in a better position to determine the future status and funding levels of such activities.

Young people of both sexes and all income levels would be encouraged to participate. We would take advantage, also, of experiences gained by the Job Corps and other programs available to youth so as to provide the most constructive and productive approaches possible.

There are many pressing goals in our society, but this program is one of the few that can produce benefits in many of the most critical areas. We would implement vital ecological work on our Federal lands at the same time that we attacked unemployment and alienation among young people.

Because of the great promise offered by this legislation, I urge my colleagues to support the Youth Conservation Corps bill.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I was shocked and saddened by the catch phrases which were used by my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, when he termed this a "kiddie corps" and a "baby-sitting venture." I think this shows a caloused disregard for the aspirations and the ability of the youth of this Nation. I certainly wish the gentleman could go with me to some of the programs I have seen operating, programs such as this. I am sure he would no longer feel they were babysitting or kiddie corps operations.

The young people are doing meaningful things in our national lands. They are creating trails and campsites and the types of things which we need very much today. I am sure they would not like to be considered as members of a kiddie corps.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is, indeed, patterned after the old CCC concept, a concept which enhanced the public lands of this Nation for years and enhanced a generation of Americans.

Despite the protestations of a minority on the committee, this is a bipartisan bill. Over 32 Members of this House of Representatives have sponsored this legislation. There were six Members from the side of the aisle of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is supported by more organizations than I have seen support a piece of legislation in a long time. I want to take the time to read who is supporting this legislation. This bill has support of: the Sierra Club, the Western Forest Industries Association, the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts of America, the National Wildlife Federation, the National Association of Counties, the National Rifle Association, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, the Izaak Walton League, the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, the American Forestry Association, the National Recreation and Parks Association, the National Forest Products Association, and the National Audubon Society.

I would like also, Mr. Chairman, to point out that this is a pilot program. This is a pilot program in which we want to test different methods. One of the

great complaints coming from the other side of the aisle during the years we debated the Job Corps was that we dashed headlong into it and did not know what we were doing when we started it. I will venture to say perhaps we did not, and we found out to chagrin we did not. We should have tried some pilot programs, but we did not do so. We are suggesting on this type of program to start with a pilot program and test the concept, so when we have the program, we will have a good one, and we will know how to handle it.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is an excellent program.

No one program is going to solve all the ills of the United States, foreign and domestic, but this is a bill which directs itself toward two of the most glaring problems the United States has today, the conservation of our natural resources and the conservation of our young people. Indeed, it is a bill that puts these two things together.

Somebody said over here in debate a moment ago that children from wealthy families could attend. Of course they can, because they are going out there to do an honest day's work. We expect to get dollar value out of their work.

This is not a program which is going to solve all the ills, but it will direct itself to two of our problems.

People are trying to make of it a complicated program. This is not a complicated program. It is a program premised on the belief that there is a lot of therapy in a good, hard day's work. It is not some big social program in which we will rush in with a lot of sociologists and check everything out. We just happen to believe that a good, hard day's work provides a lot of therapy. That work is going to be done in the areas where it needs to be done.

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

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, 5 million acres of national forest land in this country have been cut over and never reforested. Campsites, trails, picnic areas, and everything else must be built.

The use of our national parks will increase twofold from 1968 to 1975, and it will increase tenfold by the year 2000. What are we going to do?

Somebody pointed out that 600 miles of trails in the Olympic National Park alone have never been tended because we do not have people to do it.

Fourteen million board feet of softwood lumber is burned in this Nation or destroyed by insects and disease every year. One billion board feet more than we produce, than we make lumber out of, are destroyed by fire and insects. Why cannot young people be put into the forests, to reforest, to fight disease, to fight fires, to fight insects which are attacking these trees?

This work is to be done by those people who need the work. Someone said that this was not a poverty program, and we can bet it is not a poverty program. All the young people of ages 14 to 18 are disadvantages in the respect that they cannot find employment. Some 16.4 percent of our young people last year, and probably 18 percent this year, are unemployed. There are 1.6 million young people who want jobs and cannot find them.

This is not going to solve that problem, but it does direct itself toward a solution of the problem by placing those people who are the most disadvantaged in terms of finding jobs in a position where they can get jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is a good purpose. It is a purpose to blend conservation and development of our natural resources with our most important resource, the youth of this Nation.

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

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

Mr. MAYNE. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the fact that there are many hundreds of camps in this country available for people who can afford to send their children to them, which are performing a very useful function.

Mr. MEEDS. Yes, I am well aware of that, but may I go on and say they are not conserving our natural resources. They are not building trails and campsites or replanting trees and the things such as I am talking about here.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY).

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill, which I am sponsoring along with several other members of the congressional delegations from the Pacific Northwest States. The bill and proposed program, however, have interest over a much wider area than just our part of the country. I think perhaps the best way to describe the legislation is to say that we are all aware of the pressing problems our society faces today: backlog of ecological work on Federal lands, unemployment, and alienation of some of our young people. Now I am not going to claim that the Youth Conservation Corps is a complete panacea for these problems, but I do believe that the program would attack these problems, and it should do this even in a limited way, as a quite effective way.

The Corps would be directly involved in conservation and improving the environment. It would have the responsibility of enhancing public lands by making campground improvements, building trails, planting trees and constructing soil erosion works. The YCC would cut substantially into a very heavy backlog of much needed work on our public lands that has too long gone undone. In this respect it could be fairly stated that the Youth Conservation Corps would be in some ways similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps, known as CCC, of many years ago. But, there are some very profound differences. For one thing, the Youth Conservation Corps, as it is envisioned in the bill, would consist of youth of both sexes, ages 14 through 18. The Corps would be open to youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, and service as a member of the Corps would be limited to not more than 90 days during any single year.

Now the idea of a Youth Conservation Corps is not new, as I said. As a matter of fact, the concept has been discussed, off and on, for many years. I, myself, have introduced legislation about setting up a Youth Corps on two previous occasions since coming to Congress. But right now, in 1970, there seems to be a series of justifications for the program that are particularly compelling. Among these are the fact there is an urgent need for conservation work; the fact that the Youth Conservation Corps would be expected to provide experience of great educational value, directly to the enrollees and ultimately to the Nation; and finally, that the proposed program would help meet the need for summer jobs for youth. Of course there are other considerations such as the low cost of the program as compared with its benefits. If this is approved and enacted into law, it will be a "pilot program" however. Through such a pilot program a determination can be made as to how extensive a program of this sort would be desirable for the Nation. I have always thought that one of the major reasons for the initial problems we had with the Job Corps, was that there was not at first a pilot program to provide trial-and-error experience.

It seems to me that the Youth Conservation Corps would provide constructive "relevant" experience for restless youth who complain that they cannot find such experience in traditional school curricula. And at this time of great national concern over the quality of environment, the Youth Conservation Corps offers opportunities to contribute to the needs of a modern society.

I urge full support of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this bill. I have supported this concept in previous Congresses, and I am deeply gratified that this time we have the spelled out form of the project which I think has long been needed in this country. A great many of the remarks that I intended to make have been made by previous speakers. I think there have been some legitimate questions raised that need answering, particularly that of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE). I would like to give the gentleman, the original sponsor of the bill, an opportunity to respond further on this question of what I think is the strength of the bill. I do not believe we should make this a bill just to help those who are in deprived circumstances or in low economic circumstances, because in that way we would lose the impact of the program.

I wonder if the gentleman would like me to yield to him so that he may further respond to the question of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

Mr. MAYNE. Would the gentlewoman yield so that I can phrase the question more precisely?

Mrs. MAY. I yield to the gentleman for the purpose of asking the question.

Mr. MAYNE. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Washington why it is that with such a stringency of Federal funds available at the present time the taxpayers of this country should be asked to pay for a summer camp for the children of affluent people. Do not these parents have some respon-

sibility themselves to see to it that their children are not on the streets doing these horrendous things which some speakers have talked about? Is there not a very ample opportunity at least for the children of the well-to-do? Now, I am not opposed to having needy children put in these camps and given this opportunity, but I am very much at a loss to see why the taxpayers of the country should be sending affluent children to summer camps in beautiful mountain areas of the country.

Mrs. MAY. I am limited as to time, and that is a question, I believe. Would the gentleman please respond?

Mr. MEEDS. If the gentlewoman will yield, I will be happy to respond.

First of all, I would like to point out, as I said earlier, that this is not a program where we are just attempting to provide jobs for people. I am trying to conserve our natural resources, our trees, our forests, and all of the other things that have to be done on our public lands. I think this is a responsibility of the Federal Government. We are going to ask the young people to go into the national forests and the public lands and work on them, and we are going to pay them. They will get what they deserve. Whether they are poverty stricken or are the youngsters of wealthy people does not make any difference. If they are performing a service, they should be paid for it.

Mrs. MAY. I would agree with my colleague from the State of Washington that the real strength of the bill, since its emphasis is on a contribution and in a very urgent area where contributions require a great deal of work and where there is a backlog of work in enhancing our public lands—I would agree that this job is so big that there should not be discrimination against a young person who wants to study and make a contribution and learn more about it on the basis of the facts. I do not believe that they should be discriminated against because their parents have money.

I would also comment, as I said before, that this is a pilot program. Perhaps the matter of contribution of money by those whose young people are working in this area could be taken up in some way, but I would say that it would be a great mistake to confine this bill only to those young people who would have to be found at a poverty level. Probably I would end up by saying that a great many of the young people—and I feel it would be too bad if this happened—would be those who were motivated to work and contribute. However, I think it would be an artificial barrier to say that those young people who want to make a contribution in this very important field would be kept from doing so by virtue of their parents' wealth.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is a need for this type of program, which is contemplated in this legislation, the conservation of our natural resources in our country.

It seems to me there is also a need for wage earning experience among many of the youth of our country. I think those two things are very important things in this legislation.

One reason why I am on my feet at this moment is that earlier during the debate someone said something about the difficulty of choosing among the people who would be participants in this pilot program; and that there might be some problem along that line. I previously thought that would be so when some 20 years ago I started appointing pages in the House of Representatives. I wondered how I could choose between the hundreds of thousands of young people in my district as to whom should be appointed and that this would give rise to a lot of difficulty. As a matter of fact, I found it did not. As a matter of fact, I found that these young people carried back to others the message and value of their work experience here at the Nation's Capital; and this was a wonderful experience for everyone concerned. Perhaps this bill's effect could become, as with pages here, a real honor for those chosen. So much the better.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WYATT).

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, to understand this bill, I think that we must understand it is a very modest program and that it has very modest goals. It has a relatively modest cost. I do not believe that anyone can truthfully look at this bill and know what is proposed to be accomplished if it is enacted and what is contained in it and then suggest that this is a federally financed summer camp program for children. It certainly is not. The needs have been very carefully spelled out, such as the millions of acres in this country of Federal timberland capable of growing timber which are not growing timber because they are not being reforested, the needs of maintaining the trails in our country, the needs of maintaining the firefighting potential so necessary, and stream clearance which is of the utmost importance in our country to mention only a few.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to concentrate if I may upon a few of the arguments that have been used against this bill. I have read the minority views very carefully. I notice, Mr. Chairman, that they are subscribed to by a minority of the minority. I am sorry to find myself in opposition to them. However, it seems to me that the opposition would love this bill to death. They say, of course, that it is not limited to the disadvantaged. Therefore, it is no good. Second, they say it is for too short a period of time and that you cannot get anything going in that length of time. Finally, that during the period of time provided for there could be no useful work experience gained.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to examine each of these items very briefly.

I think the fact that this bill is not limited to the disadvantaged is one of the real strengths of this program. We have had program after program after program in this country designed specifically for the disadvantaged. I have had mail from people in my district saying, what are you doing for my son, what are you doing for my daughter?

The organizations which the minority suggest that this program competes with are all designed for the disadvantaged. There is no program designed for a person in the middle class or for a child of the wealthy. I might remind everyone in this Chamber that children of the wealthy, children of the middle class, use drugs; they become delinquents, they indeed kill themselves, and this despite the affluence into which they are born.

Mr. Chairman, if we are ever going to start picking up the pieces in this country and start working together, this modest effort would be a good starting point, the sharing of the work experience, the sharing of the outdoors experience, and the mingling of all socioeconomic classes.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very, very good, if modest, starting place.

I think it is about time that we started giving some thought to all of our youth, regardless of their socioeconomic backgrounds.

In regard to the 90-day period, this is not a Job Corps program, this is a program to improve our outdoors environment, to permit our young to know the woods, and the outdoors. Much can be done in a 90-day period. It is an entire summer.

I do not buy the argument that it is not useful work experience. Even if I agreed with that statement I would point out that this is not job training. It is an introduction to the great outdoors for our young people, with them performing many useful and much-needed jobs in the course of it.

Our friends in opposition say two things. They say that what is needed is a coordinated and all-inclusive program for youth as a part of a comprehensive manpower program——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WYATT. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, they say that the objectives can be achieved through other methods without these methods being described. I do not believe that we need or that we want any huge, new, structured bureaucracy as suggested here. I think we need to provide a simple, inexpensive program, free of all the usual bureaucratic trappings, to make a real try to see if taking a given number of young people and introducing them to simple outdoor living and jobs is helpful in making useful citizens of them while at the same time improving our environment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, one of the rewards of being chairman of the Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations is working with our youth.

A very dramatic work-learn program has been started on our Indian reservations. We did not go through the Committee on Education and Labor, and I today am rather grateful for it. The Bu-

reau of Indian Affairs and my subcommittee members all have become very encouraged by the results, and we are gradually extending these programs.

Perhaps the most successful of these programs is on the Makah Reservation in the congressional district represented by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS). At Neah Bay, in the State of Washington, the Indian youths themselves administer the program. They clean up, fix, and paint their own reservation houses and facilities, and the results are outstanding. I have here for any Member to see a copy of the report on the Makah's program. Each of you should glance at it before voting on H.R. 15361. It came into being because we realized that many young people need pocket money to attend school, and they also need the opportunity to participate in the development and in the growth of their own Indian reservations. The results are shown by their enthusiasm and by the success of their programs.

The bill before the Committee today in my estimation sets out to do for all American young people what already is being done on our various Indian reservations.

The Youth Conservation Corps, as provided for in this bill, gives 3,000 young people a chance to work in conservation on our Federal lands. Across those 754 million acres there is plenty of work, and I am sure that the $3.5 million annual appropriation authorized under this bill will be returned manifold. And if you could sit and listen to the hearings of our committee and the testimony there presented as to the number of trails developed, the areas of forest lands that have been saved by our young people working on them, you would be convinced. Not only will there be improvements on the land, but the young people involved have an investment of labor in their land.

Young people become involved, have an investment of labor in their land, and come to love in a special way this land of ours.

This bill provides a 3-year pilot program. If the Youth Conservation Corps is successful, and judging from the experience with the Makah Indians, it will be successful, the Congress can then expand and develop the program for the benefits of our public lands and for the benefit of young people.

After months of studying the budget as well as the administration of our public lands, I am sure these 3,000 new workers and $3½ million in the additional budget can be used most economically and most prudently.

I am happy to be a sponsor of the legislation and intend to vote for it as well as urge all of you to vote for it.

Young people need our help. The Nation needs our young people and their services to our land. Together we have the important partnership which is America.

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

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the gentlewoman's remarks and say I appreciate very much what she has just said and would join her wholeheartedly in her remarks.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

I might say to those who say that this is not a program for the rich or the poor that neither is the draft a program for the rich and the poor. Neither is any other American program. This is a program for every young American. Let us hope that we keep America that way for every young person—a program to grow, live, survive and help our country to build itself.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for yielding, and I rise in support of the bill H.R. 15361.

Mr. Chairman, the objectives of the Youth Conservation Corps Act are twofold: First, to develop and maintain our public land resources; and second, to provide a practical education for our young people through training and experience.

More and more people each year are enjoying our national parks and forests, and, of course, the heaviest use occurs during the summer months. There is a great need for extra temporary help at this time to supplement the excellent job done by the U.S. Forest Service. The greater summer use means that there is more work to be done to maintain trails and clean up campsites as well as such long-range projects as revegetation, erosion control, and wildlife habitat improvement.

The Youth Conservation Corps Act would be a 3-year pilot program employing approximately 3,000 young people ages 14 to 18 for 3 months. It would enroll youth of all social, economic, and racial backgrounds—offering them an opportunity to work together, to shoulder the responsibility of wage earning and to aid in the conservation of our natural resources.

They would learn the physical skills of using tools and the personal skills of working effectively and constructively on jobs they could be proud of—jobs that would represent a meaningful contribution to their country.

There is concern that this program would be a duplication of Federal programs already established—in particular the Neighborhood Youth Corps, community action programs, and the Job Corps. The Youth Conservation Corps would share with programs that might be considered comparable to the aim of employment for youth, but it would be unique in that it would provide those jobs solely in forest conservation. Also, it is aimed not only at those ordinarily thought of as disadvantaged; it would bring together young people of various backgrounds that they might have the added benefit of learning from each other.

The need of our youth for the kind of training and experience the Youth Conservation Corps would offer and the need of our country for the benefits of such a program are clear. The Youth Conservation Corps would represent a wise investment in our public lands and in our young citizens.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose as I understand it of this bill certainly cannot be argued—to teach young people, 14 to 18 or regardless of age, we may finally agree to, to work. The other purpose I understand is to improve and develop our public lands as a better place to enjoy our environment.

I do wonder, however, if this is really the best way to accomplish either one of those two purposes?

I can recall back a few months ago we had the so-called National Timber Supply Act which was intended also to improve our national forests. However, that particular bill would not have cost the taxpayers anything but merely would have provided that as timber was cut on our national forests, and not extending this cutting of national forest virgin timber wilderness areas, but provided that the money from harvested forests would go into a trust fund to build roads and improve our national forests.

But I notice that three of the favoring groups of those who want this bill, the Izaak Walton League, the Sierra Club, and the National Audubon Society all violently opposed that particular bill. It also is of interest that a majority of the authors of this legislation opposed the National Timber Supply Act.

I wonder why we accomplish or want to accomplish something now by digging into the taxpayers pockets when we had an opportunity just a few months ago to do the same job by setting up a trust fund of profits from timber sales and now are going to get it from the general treasury?

I wonder if one of the authors of the bill who opposed the Timber Supply Act or the chairman of the committee might be able to answer why we are asking the poor, overburdened, hard working taxpayer to do the same job now.

Since no one responds in answer to that question, I assume they would rather spend the taxpayers' money than to spend the profits from the national forest that now go into the general treasury.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it may be that I should not get into this debate because I do not pose as an expert in the areas that are generally proposed to be covered by the legislation. But I do have some questions that bother me, because I do know something about what can be expected, of children in some of these age groups, just from a personal knowledge.

I wonder, since you suggest here that this is not for the purpose of being a summer camp for the disadvantaged or a particular group of children, and it is really designed to improve our outdoors and the environment, whether we really have paid much attention to what a

young person of 14 or 15 years of age is capable of doing in this area, and the desirability in some respects of taking a 14-year-old and putting him in with 17- and 18-year-olds in terms of living together. If my experience means anything, it does mean that there is quite a little difference between a young boy 14 years of age and a young man who is 17 or 18. I would think, frankly, the proposal here would have much more meaning if it were the 16-, 17-, 18- and 19-year-old level that you were talking about.

Is there anything that the proponent or the author of the legislation can say to give us some confidence that there is some real meaning rather than dangers in having this program encompass the 14- and 15-year-old young person? For example, you cite the case of a witness before the committee, Mr. Louis Clapper, who tells about the experience of his son, 18. I can agree to that. I think we can all understand the meaningfulness and the contribution that can be made doing a day's work by an 18-year-old or by a 17-year-old. It begins to be more questionable when the 16-year-old is involved. But I think it is much more questionable when you think it is realistic to expect 14-year-old or 15-year-old boys doing a day's work, 8 hours, for 5 days a week.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. I will not take much of the gentleman's time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am seeking information on the program.

Mr. MEEDS. There are programs operating today, similar to the proposed program, in which they do have 14-, 15-, 16-, 17-, and 18-year-old children participating.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What I am asking particularly about are those in the 14- and 15-year age group. Would they have to do a days work, or even 5 hours for 5 days a week?

Mr. MEEDS. No, they do not. That is correct. But, for example, they can plant trees. They can do a lot of things. Someone will propose an amendment. I do not want my judgment to be the judgment of the House. Let us vote it up or down and determine if the age should be 16, 17, or 18——

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thought maybe I could get some assistance from the author of the legislation as to the reason for including those 14 and 15 years of age.

Mr. MEEDS. Yes. We studied the programs.

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONNER).

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, pilot programs can be good. And this program can be good. It will be just as good or bad as its administration.

We have in my congressional district a pilot program underway for the first time, begun just a week ago today. This pilot program makes use of the physical facilities of one of our Air Force installations. Youngsters who participate in this pilot program are sent there by mutual agreement by the juvenile courts.

A private sponsor, unknown to the public, pays the entire cost of feeding and clothing these youngsters while they are there, and pays for their incidentals. They draw no salary as is proposed here.

The military has approved this pilot project there. They provide the facilities and the personnel who direct these youngsters for the few weeks they are there. The program was begun a week ago today. Just last Saturday morning I talked at length with the base commander at Barksdale Air Force Base, Col. Marvin Anding. Colonel Anding told me I would not believe the change for the better that had come over those yougsters in just 1 week.

They are not there to train to be members of the military. They are there to be indoctrinated in the American way of life and to work while they are there and to take exercise and to make a contribution for their upkeep.

This pilot program which is proposed here, which will create this Youth Conservation Corps, can be good. I do not believe anybody can argue with its purposes, so, therefore, we should limit our consideration to the policies proposed by the bill. I want to take a moment or two to talk about those policies to see if we can get more perspective as to what we intend, and I would like to have answers from the chairman of the committee or from any other member of the committee who wants to provide me with these answers. It is my understanding from reading the bill that this bill is not intended to be a fun summer camp, but it is intended to be by and large a work program.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is correct. There is wide latitude given to the Departments of Interior and Agriculture to motivate the youngsters with needed conservation work.

Mr. WAGGONNER. It is my further understanding that, because this is not final legislation but is legislation which provides for a pilot program, in coping with the problems of selecting just 3,000 youngsters for this pilot program there will be some leeway or latitude given to the committee who will lay down the guidelines, but it is basically intended that they give consideration to the country as a whole and to the youth of every strata. Is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, because every State in the Union has national forests administered by the Department of Agriculture, and we have the National Parks administered by the Department of Interior throughout the country.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I asked that question, and I am pleased with the gentleman's answer, because we in Louisiana have these facilities too.

At first blush it would appear to me some criticism could be directed toward the fact that those who are without need are accorded the same treatment that those with need are accorded, but on second glance it seems to me this is entirely wise, because when we review the problems of our youth today, it is quickly evident that the lack of understanding and problems of our youth are not limited to the indigent alone. So I am glad we are giving this opportunity to all our youth regardless of their strata of life, to give them an opportunity to understand some of these resources and make their contribution to their future. It is not intended, is it, that we would utilize the $3.5 million to be made available on an annual basis to provide facilities, to build initially new facilities? Is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. Only for personnel, because for this pilot program we have adequate facilities now available to us through the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior.

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman I yield my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, 1 additional minute.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I have one other question. We are providing a pilot program for 3,000 youngsters which authorizes the appropriation of $3.5 million a year. Is it intended that this $3.5 million pay the total cost of the operation of the program, for such things as whatever salaries are involved, let us say, and whatever transportation is involved, and whatever food and clothing are provided, and whatever medical care is required, for example?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. If my arithmetic is correct, the cost of this program in its entirety will be about $1,166 per youngster per year.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. This does not seem exorbitant to me. I believe we will reap many times that benefit in the years to come. I support the legislation because it is at least worth a try.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania 1 minute of my time.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I do so for several reasons.

First, as our distinguished colleague from Louisiana has pointed out, this is a program which is available to all the youth of America. The problems of youth are not confined to those who are underprivileged. The fact of the matter is a lot of the problems we are having in this country come from the youth of this country who are overprivileged.

It might be a very good idea to let some of our young people know that there is such a thing as hard work, that there is such a thing as the opportunity to make a daily contribution for a period of 3 months in the summer to bettering one's own physical condition and to bettering some sections of the country and to giving a contribution to one's country.

One of the important things we should recognize is that this is not a military operation. This is an operation that will be conducted probably in some of the

areas that have been closed by the OEO, where we have facilities and where we have operated camps similar to the CCC camps. This is the kind of proposition that should be made available.

Someone has come to me and said that we should not have this program, because it might be a duplication. No program that I know of is going to be duplicated by this program.

The other day we passed a program for living history in the parks, to allow the Park Service to use certain youths for work in our national parks. The important thing is that those young people are going to contribute their time and their energy. The only thing we provided for in that bill was to provide some transportation and some medical expense, if there were any.

Very frankly, we must realize there are vast areas of this country which are in Federal ownership, which need looking into, which need to have trails built in them. This is where these young people will work. This is where they can contribute the most. This is where they can make a contribution which will be lasting.

I doubt if there is any Member of this body who has not been in a national forest or in a State forest or in an area that still has some of the benefits of the CCC camps which were built and operated in the middle 1930's. This proved to be one of the best things the Government has ever done, and I am sure that these will follow the same pattern.

I urge that with an amendment increasing the age to 16 that this bill will pass.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

I believe some confusion has reigned in the House, in trying to compare those programs with the Civilian Conservation Corps. That is quite erroneous. That was not a child's program; that was a man's program. I am sure if the facts could be developed, they would not allow them to participate at the tender age of 14 years, and particularly boys and girls.

In the program at that time there was the same considered evaluation, that eligibility had to be the same as working for WPA. This was an unemployment program, a poverty program.

I cannot help but believe that we are going to end up funding nothing more than a huge recreation program, particularly when we bring in all the socioeconomic groups in the country.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970. I believe this proposal to be a challenging and constructive effort to direct the energies of American youth into productive channels—the preservation of our national resources.

I can see the wonderful results of enacting this bill by looking at my own district. In the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, there are at present only 1,630 campsites—not nearly enough for the 8-percent rise in visitors to the park each summer. If just seventy young people work in the BWCA, the number of available campsites could increase to 3,175 over 5 years. And those campsites now in use could be improved.

A second reason for passing this bill is the strong demand for employment we hear this summer from our Nation's youth. They need work. They need money for their education. They need the experience of producing tangible results through their own efforts. They need to be occupied for the summer. And we need them.

I support this legislation because since 1959 I have strongly advocated programs to provide work experience for young people and in the 81st and succeeding Congresses I authored legislation to create a streamlined junior version of the CCC. Three times, we succeeded in getting this legislation reported out of the Education and Labor Committee, but each time it was deadlocked in the Rules Committee.

Finally, in 1964, President Johnson included the YCC proposals in his antipoverty program as the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps, respectively, and both proved to be successful.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this new proposal, for the benefit of our national parks, forests, and recreation areas, and for the education and experience which our youth so desperately need. This program of work for young people is a healthy sign of constructive action in one area, youth, that certainly demands action.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 15361 which establishes a 3-year pilot program employing about 3,000 youths between the ages of 14 and 18 during the summer on public lands.

Back in 1964, 1965, and 1966, I introduced similar legislation when I was a Senator in the Rhode Island General Assembly. My bill was designed to establish a Youth Conservation Corps to develop Rhode Island's natural resources.

I am gratified that the Education and Labor Committee of the House has seen fit to act favorably on this legislation. This bill is particularly worthwhile for it will have the twofold effect of helping some of our youths and also protecting our natural resources. This bill acts to complement our many other employment programs in the United States. All of these bills are designed to benefit the labor force and thus the whole economy.

I hope my colleagues will support this bill.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my support for the establishment of the 3-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps. The benefit from this modest annual investment of $3.5 million in our Nation's youth and in our conservation efforts will far exceed the actual cost.

It is my belief that the merit of such a program by far outweighs the expense. The benefits that will be derived are many and varied. They differ from those benefits derived from either the Job Corps civilian conservation centers or the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. For example, whereas the Job Corps is restricted to 14- to 21-year-old disadvantaged male youths, the proposed program includes all youths between 14 and 18. A further difference is that the emphasis of the Youth Conservation Corps will be on conservation of land and resources rather than on education and training.

With the ever-increasing pressures on our lands, forests, and parks, there is an urgent need to intensify efforts directed toward preservation. Such a program as this can be an immense aid. The participants will have the responsibility of both improving and maintaining our resources. There can be, for example, increased reforestation and watershed construction.

In addition to the value of the program to our conservation efforts, there will be manifold benefits for the enrollees. First of all, of course, they will have the opportunity for meaningful work, since they will be helping to preserve a vital part of our Nation.

Also, their participation will be highly educational. They will develop an appreciation and understanding of conservation. The inclusion of participants of both sexes, from ages 14 to 18, regardless of race or economic background, gives rise to a unique opportunity for developing cooperation and tolerance, two traits much needed today.

Our experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930's demonstrated the effectiveness of young people in conservation efforts. Youths, at even the age of 14, are quite capable of giving worthwhile contributions in this area. Their ability to help has been proven in times of emergency, such as flooding or tornado destruction.

The benefits that will be derived from the passage of this bill is necessary to the future well-being of our Nation. We must continue in our efforts both to preserve our national resources and to better educate our youth for the problems of tomorrow. By adopting this bill, I believe that we will be taking important steps toward accomplishing both.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the Youth Conservation Corps created by H.R. 15361 is an attractive and worthwhile concept. The Corps seeks to benefit both youth and conservation, and I intend to vote for it. Certainly, both of these subjects have been primary concerns of mine.

However, in supporting this bill, I am mindful that it is not an entirely satisfactory piece of legislation. I hope that the record made today by the debate on H.R. 15361 will serve to make it clear where some of the potential problems lie, in order that the program may thereby be benefited.

My first concern is the failure of the bill to provide adequate protection for the youths who would participate in the Youth Conservation Corps. Specifically, I should like to see language added to section 3(b) of H.R. 15361 making clear that, when the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee determines the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps, it precludes the assignment of Corps members to forest firefighting.

My concern in this regard stems from past history. For a number of years, the youths assigned to Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers, which are operated by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior pursuant to interagency

agreements with the Department of Labor—and, prior to the delegation of Job Corps to the Labor Department on July 1, 1969, with the Office of Economic Opportunity—were used for fighting forest fires.

These youths were sent into dangerous situations, for which they often had insufficient training. They received no pay for their efforts, even though the professional firefighters alongside of whom they worked were being paid the high wages which such dangerous and strenuous work warrants. There was always some question as to whether these youths were "volunteers" or whether they were "encouraged" to go out and fight these fires, either by their supervisors or by their own enthusiasm for excitement.

However they got to the fireline, the fact remained that they were engaged in dangerous work. This danger was made very clear in August of 1968, when seven Los Angeles County juvenile probationers assigned to similar work were killed fighting a brush fire in the San Gabriel mountains. These youths were not in Job Corps, nor where they under the direction of Job Corps. But their tragedy heightened the concern about Job Corps' utilization of Corpsmen for firefighting.

In light of this concern, the headquarters personnel of Job Corps undertook to reexamine their policy. They did so despite the views of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture, which saw this firefighting as helpful and worthwhile.

While the Department of Labor's child labor regulations did not preclude the use of youths as firefighters, the arguments were strong for discontinuing the practice. One argument was based on the Los Angeles tragedy. Another was based on the fact that several States as well as Puerto Rico set 18 as the minimum age for employment of minors in jobs either injurious to health, or involving logging-type operations—Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Utah. The Maryland provision by implication precludes actual firefighting by minors under the age of 18. And in Wisconsin, minors under 18 are precluded from working as firemen, volunteer or otherwise, except in emergencies.

A third factor entered into Job Corps' considerations when a bill was introduced in the 1969 California State Legislature session which amended the California Welfare and Institutions Code so as to limit the use of youths under the age of 18 for fire suppression work. The bill allowed wards in the State under age 18 to be assigned to fire suppression work only if: First, the parent or guardian of the youth had given permission for such labor; second, the youth had received training equivalent in number of training hours to that received by persons in apprenticeship for firefighters; and, third, all other available manpower had been used.

In light of all these factors, Job Corps has recently adopted a new regulation concerning the use of Corps members in forest-fire fighting. Section 712 of the Civilian Conservation Center Administrative Manual now provides that only volunteers may be assigned to this work. Moreover, no volunteer under the age of 18 will be accepted. In addition youths who do participate in firefighting must be graduates of a fire suppression training course, and they must be paid at the rates received by professional firefighters.

None of these protections embodied either in the California bill or Job Corps' regulation are contained in H.R. 15361. And, in light of the Department of the Interior's and the Department of Agriculture's resistance to the Job Corps regulation, it is doubtful that such a regulation will be adopted for the Youth Conservation Corps, which is to be run by an interagency committee, two-thirds of the members of which will be representatives of these two agencies.

So, one problem with H.R. 15361 is that it leaves open the door to sending untrained boys and girls into dangerous forest fire situations.

A second problem concerns the troika administration contemplated. To carry out the purposes of H.R. 15361, a Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee is to be established, composed of representatives of the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and the Interior.

As I said earlier, the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior operate Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers. And many of the problems these centers have experienced stem from the bureaucratic tangle of a multiagency effort. I would hope that this tangle is avoided with regard to the Youth Conservation Corps.

A third problem with the Youth Conservation Corps concerns transportation costs. I am aware that section 3(b)(3) of H.R. 15361 contains language specifically directed at limiting these costs:

> That to minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

I am also aware that the Legislative Reference Service report prepared on H.R. 15361 at the request of the Committee on Education and Labor states this restrictive language would prevent long-distance transportation, which was supposedly conducted by the Job Corps which it describes as follows:

> One of the causes of disillusionment with the Job Corps has been the busing of youngsters across the country from Florida to Oregon and Oregon to Florida.

And the report goes on to maintain that "such unnecessary expense would be prohibited" by the language of H.R. 15361.

First, there are no Job Corps centers in Florida. There was one, briefly, in St. Petersburg, and this was a small center limited to women. Second, the history of Job Corps transportation has never involved major transportation except from the Southeast to other areas, this being because most enrollees come from that region, which has very few Job Corps centers.

Finally, I would note that this argument is misleading in pointing to the restrictive language in regard to transportation and claiming that this is a distinction from Job Corps' authorizing legislation. In fact, section 106(d) of title I of the Economic Opportunity Act, which authorizes Job Corps, contains similar language. And the history of Job Corps is a history of high transportation costs.

But most importantly, I would note that if this language in H.R. 15316 is read so as to encourage or force the operating agencies of the program to limit transportation expenses, the entire eastern seaboard, with its teeming ghettos, will suffer, since there are few closeby areas to which youths from this part of the country can be sent.

Thus, I would very much hope that the restrictive language concerning transportation not be read so stringently as to penalize the youths who reside east of the Mississippi. They deserve, perhaps even more than many of the youngsters who already live in relatively open areas, a chance to receive the benefits which the Youth Conservation Corps can provide.

My final concerns regarding H.R. 15361 center around the concepts it opens up. I would very much hope that the intelligent awareness of both the needs of our youth and the needs of our environment which this bill represents are picked up and vastly expanded.

I would note, for example, the terrible problem of unemployment afflicting the teenagers of the country. In April of this year, the unemployment rate among black teenagers stood at 32.7 percent. They desperately need help—they need jobs and they need skill training.

Thus, while H.R. 15361 addresses one of the disadvantages which so many of our youth experience, it should also serve as a wedge to foster greater awareness of the as yet unmet needs which remain. For example, the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program desperately needs additional funding, As I said on the floor this past May 25:

> The disadvantaged youth who are eligible for Neighborhood Youth Corps urgently need the opportunity to participate in it. They have been consistently rejected from the mainstream of our society and our economy, and to deny them even the bare minimum opportunity which this program offers is simply unjustifiable.

For lack of funding, Neighborhood Youth Corps cannot accept the 227,000 youths in its summer program who need the money and the experience. For this reason, I urged on May 25 that an additional $100 million be provided for the program this summer. And to that end I have introduced H.R. 18068.

Not only is Neighborhood Youth Corps starving for funds, Job Corps is, as well. And Job Corps certainly is a program which meets the conservation function proposed by H.R. 15361, as well as providing skill training and remedial education. I would point to section 106(e) of the Economic Opportunity Act, which specifically states:

> Assignments of male enrollees shall be made so that, at any one time, at least 40 per centum of those enrollees are assigned to conservation centers . . . or to other centers or projects where their work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, development, or management of public natural resources or recreational areas.

The youth of our country need help. The Youth Conservation Corps may be one answer, but certainly Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps are also answers. And they should receive the funds which they need, so that they may help youngsters desperately seeking a chance to help themselves.

Finally, I find very worthwhile the aim of serving the needs of conservation, as the Youth Conservation Corps proposes to do. But, the ecology of our cities is in dire straits, and here, too, youth can participate. Provide money for them to build vest pocket parks. Provide money for youths to work on rehabilitating old buildings. Provide money to maintain city parks. Provide money to clean up shorelines. Provide money to build neighborhood pools. In every one of these endeavors, youth can participate. And, what is more, they will have the benefit of being able to use and enjoy the fruits of their own work, done in their own neighborhoods and cities.

In sum, the Youth Conservation Corps is a step. It is a pilot program, and we shall see how it works out. There are pitfalls; hopefully they will be avoided. But, in addition, there are many steps yet to be taken. And they must be taken quickly. Our children are impatient, and rightly so.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 15361, the Youth Conservation Corps Act. This measure provides the opportunity for an imaginative experiment in tackling the conservation and environmental problems of Federal lands through the use of dedicated young people between the ages of 14 and 18.

This legislation authorizes the expenditure of $3.5 million a year for a 3-year demonstration program on Federal lands. The young people who participate in the program would improve publicly owned lands by planting trees, making campground improvements, building trails and constructing soil erosion works.

In addition to the much needed work in the environmental field and the involvement of young people in the project, this bill would relieve some of the pressure from higher unemployment for young people. Some experts have predicted unemployment among young people at a rate of between 17 and 20 percent this summer, an alarming statistic at best.

I support H.R. 15361 as a meaningful pilot program which can benefit our Nation in several areas while we work for a conservation policy which will benefit future generations of Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth, representing all segments of society, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of natural resources of the United States by the youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established a Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee composed of representatives of the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor who shall administer a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions who have attained age fourteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee may employ, without regard for civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purposes of providing gainful employment, generating understanding, and developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States.

(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. (a) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee shall be composed of six persons. The Secretaries of the Departments of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor shall each designate two persons to serve on the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee, with one, at least, of the two designees being an employee of the respective department. Each member of the Interagency Committee shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary appointing him. The Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, and Labor, in consultation, shall name the Chairman of the Interagency Committee.

(b) The Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee shall:

(1) designate the public lands upon which members of the Corps can be effectively utilized in conservation work, and coordinate Corps efforts with those holding jurisdiction over the respective public lands;

(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided,* That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) arrange for transportation, lodging, subsistence, other services and equipment for the needs of members of the Corps in fulfilling their duties: *Provided,* That whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities (including abandoned military installations) shall be utilized for the purpose of the Corps, *And provided further,* That to minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

(4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members;

(5) give employment preference for temporary supervisory personnel to primary, secondary, and university teachers and administrators and university students pursuing studies in the education and natural resource disciplines;

(6) prepare a report, indicating the most efficient method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resources, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

(c) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support staff.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE REPORTS

SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Interagency Committee shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed $3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. PERKINS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 2, line 16, strike the word "fourteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sixteen".

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, judging from the comments I have heard this afternoon, I think there is some merit to this legislation if these young people will actually do some work and if they are involved in conservation work so that it will be of benefit to other people as well as themselves. However, it is hard for me to believe that any of you who have children 14 years of age would want them to go to live in a camp with some 18-year-olds. Now, there is a lot of difference between children 14 and 18 years of age and a lot of difference between children who have been close to their homes and those who have been roaming the streets for a long time. For that reason I think it would be better to change the minimum age from 14 to 16. It is quite acceptable that 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds be put together. If we are only talking about 3,000 of them, then let us find out if this program works with the 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds before we start taking care, as one of my colleagues said, of them at the tender age of 14 or 15.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota that personally I well understand his argument and for that reason there is no objection to his amendment. Person-

ally I accept the amendment. I think it would be a good point to make if 16 years of age, particularly in view of the small number of enrollees the funding authorizations permit.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

I may also remind my colleagues of what the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) said in referring to the CCC camps. Young men, not 14-year-olds, were in CCC. There would not have been the results from the CCC camps if they depended on 14- or 15-year-olds. In fact, I certainly would never have wanted my children in those camps when they were 14 years old, judging from the things that I know went on there. To permit 14-year-olds to go in there I think would have been completely wrong. No matter what you do there will always be some difficulty, but with proper supervision I believe we can handle those who are in the age group of 16 to 18 years old. Therefore, I hope that all of my colleagues will support the amendment I have offered.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. The thing that intrigues me is how this committee voted out the bill with an age of 14 and now it is marching half way down the hill to age 16. How did this bill ever get out of the committee with the 14-year age limit?

Mr. QUIE. I will answer the gentleman from Iowa. I did not like the idea myself and I voted against the bill in the committee, but sometimes I am outvoted there and some of my other colleagues are, too. That is what happened in this case. Evidently a majority of the committee wanted it at the age of 14 through 18 and evidently the chairman of the committee feels the same way I do.

Mr. GROSS. I have heard most of the debate this afternoon and I have heard nearly everyone give unqualified support for it at age 14 to 19. I did not hear anyone oppose it, much less the chairman of the committee. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and all of the rest of them said that this was a good bill, and I did not suppose you would come in here and march half way down the hill, in the way that you have, on the matter of age.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to my colleague from Iowa that sometimes items are classed as good, better, or best, and it would be better, I believe, if you change the age from 14 to 16.

Mr. GROSS. Well, they capitulate easily in the Labor and Education Committee.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. ZWACH. I thank the gentleman for yielding and wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my colleague from Minnesota. It is my opinion that with the adoption of the amendment which the gentleman has offered we will have a lot of good potential in this legislation and I believe it should be passed.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. GREEN OF OREGON

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: Page 3, on line 25, after the word "arrange," insert the following: "directly or by contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for five years."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding when the bill was pending in the committee that it would be possible for a public school district or a private organization such as the national Boy Scouts and the national Girl Scouts as well as other organizations to conduct a program which might run for any period of time up to 90 days—it might be for 2 weeks or a month or a longer period of time.

I explained a few moments ago the very successful program which is run by the Portland school district and the gentleman from Louisiana has told me of the very highly successful program that is run in his State.

It seems to me we should make the language abundantly clear—and the main handler of the bill has told me that he does not think it does at this time—that we do intend to make it possible to contract with the school district or such an organization which has been in existence for 5 years so that fly-by-night organizations would not be involved and in this way these organizations could carry out programs which do meet the main objectives of the program.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes, I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. The gentlewoman is exactly correct. We did discuss this, as a matter of fact, before the bill was perfected. The gentlewoman from Oregon was going to offer an amendment to this effect in the committee but, unfortunately, she was involved in other matters which were pending before the committee and the bill came out and she did not have an opportunity to offer this amendment in the committee. So, the gentlewoman is absolutely correct. We had discussed this.

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

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me compliment the gentlewoman for offering the amendment. In fact, I feel she has made a contribution and I, certainly, on the part of the committee, want to accept the amendment.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank both of the distinguished gentlemen.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon for offering this amendment. This is what I had in mind in the very beginning when we were talking about the various organizations that are affected by this bill. The one we overlooked, the distinguished gentlewoman has now included and that is the taxpayers of this country.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMEND OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATTA: On page 2, strike out lines 8 through 22, and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corps'). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age fourteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ during the summer months without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary."

On page 3, strike out lines 1 through 14, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECRETARIAL DUTIES

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall:

Page 4, line 23, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)".

Page 5, line 3, strike out "Interagency Committee" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretarial".

Page 5, line 5, strike out "Interagency Committee" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture".

Page 5, line 16, strike out "Youth Conservation Corps Interagency Committee" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture".

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, it is to strike the Interagency Committee, and to lodge the carrying out of the programs in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture and to delete the Department of Labor; am I correct?

Mr. LATTA. That is correct. The amendment does carry out the agreement that was reached before the Committee on Rules to make the program strictly a conservation program, and not a manpower training program. That is the reason for deleting the Department of Labor.

I would hasten to point out, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has already adopted an amendment dealing with the age limits, and I will offer an amendment to make the age limits in my amendment correspond to this amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will yield further, let me state that in the original Civilian Conservation Corps the Department of Labor was not involved, except at one time in the recruiting. And inasmuch as we are including today the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior to administer the program and giving them the latitude that they need to come up with the best pilot program possible, I would accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, subject to the correction of the age, which amendment he will offer in a moment.

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman is correct.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA TO HIS AMENDMENT

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATTA to his amendment: Section 2, line 7, strike out "fourteen" and insert "sixteen".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) to his amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. Do I understand the correction to be 16 through 18?

Mr. LATTA. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 4, strike paragraph (5), lines 11 through 15, and redesignate paragraph (6) as paragraph (5).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) is recognized.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the reason why I propose to strike this is not to prohibit the teachers, the administrators and the university students who have the capability to seek temporary supervisory jobs but rather if a person who had substantial capabilities of working in conservation work, for instance, somebody who might have been previously employed by the U.S. Forest Service and wanted to spend the summer in work but was not in a school system could have an equal chance for that type of work.

I would expect the Forest Service and the Park Service to look on those teachers as the ones who are available at that time who had some competence in this work. But I do not believe we ought to give preference to them as though this bill were something to protect their right to hold jobs. I think they ought to be considered with every other type of person who had the capability.

The most important part, it seems to me, is the Forest Service and the Park Service determine the capability of a person to be a supervisor.

I know that in some cases in the Western States a number of teachers spend their summers working out in the forest lands. In other parts of the country, since the way this bill is drafted, you could eventually include any kind of public land—that same capability does not exist with the teaching profession and does not necessarily exist with the students from institutions of higher education.

As was indicated before, this hopefully is not going to be a recreation program.

I would prefer we just leave it to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to make the determination of which personnel could handle this job most effectively.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would just want to ask if you would agree that the situation has changed considerably in terms of surplus teachers and that now we do have a decided surplus of teachers and if we leave in the words that they shall be given preference, we are liable to end up with all employees in all of the camps exclusively teachers and it would be much better to have a cross section—people who are experts in conservation, ecology, forestry, wildlife management, and so forth.

Mr. QUIE. I would say, I believe the gentlewoman is abolutely correct. But I stated I had no objection to teachers—I just want to make certain that others have an equal chance with teachers to get a job.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I rise in support of this amendment because it does seem to me highly desirable not to have supervisors—exclusively teachers. But certainly I would hope that many teachers who have had a lifetime of preparation and make a profession of working with young people would be a part of it.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes because I think the issue is pretty well decided. But I must oppose this.

First of all, because I feel that the people who are given the preference in education—an employment opportunity—are indeed the best people to deal with these young people who will be involved.

Second, I wish the gentleman had not gone quite so far with his amendment. I think maybe I could have been able to support it then. I definitely think university students pursuing studies in education and national resources disciplines ought to be given some preference.

I think this entire program affords us a very wonderful opportunity to begin some environment studies. I speak of the types of studies where young people who are involved in resource management will begin to get ideas for education in the ecology. Today we have very few programs in ecology, ecological education, and I think we need not only programs but we are going to need people to teach and to run these programs. I think the program we have before us today furnishes an excellent laboratory for these young men and women to get the ideas which will later become the curriculums and the programs which will turn out to be hopefully environmental education types of curriculums. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

I would not be nearly as opposed, however, if purpose were given to students studying in the natural resource field.

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

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

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman that the Forest Service and the Park Service have summer hiring programs for 18-year-olds and above, college students, and the ones who have this capability could be utilized for this type of program as well as working on the trails. There is nothing to prevent the Forest Service and the Park Service from hiring students who are studying in the fields of ecology and environment. But the program could easily go further, if they were utilized in that way, rather than as you proposed.

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman agree with me, so we can establish some legislative history here, that it is extremely important that people involved in the studies of the natural resources, the natural resource disciplines and ecological students would be very excellent people, assuming that their other qualifications were also good, that they would be excellent people to be involved in this program because of what I said earlier, in developing ecological studies?

Mr. QUIE. I think the gentleman is correct. It would be very worthwhile during their college years if they had an opportunity to work with other supervisory personnel in this type of program. But I do not think they should be primarily teachers, for, if there is a large number of them, nobody else would be hired.

Mr. MEEDS. I thank the gentleman. I still oppose the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Washington keeps referring to this Youth Conservation Corps as a training program. I hesitate to list this program as such. In my humble opinion, I think it would be better termed recreation program than a training program. However, along the same lines, as far as supervisory personnel is concerned, I think the gentleman from Washington would be wise to accept this amendment, because I can predict here and now that there will be difficulty in finding capable supervisory personnel who will take this job for 90 days during the summer months.

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

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

Mr. MEEDS. I hate to disagree with the gentleman, but we have this type of

program going in Washington State right now, in the Olympic National Park, not only a program which takes in 250 young people, but one for which we have 3,000 applications. There are a number of teachers and advisers, and they always have many, many more applications for those jobs than they can possibly accept.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, if I may continue, I point out once again the cost estimates that appear on page 20 of the hearings. The center staff salaries of a 200-man center are estimated at $406. Do you really believe you are going to get capable staff personnel to travel to some remote area and be employed in a supervisory capacity for less than $100 a week? I seriously doubt that it is possible. You cannot hire them for that amount of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to direct a question to the chairman of the full committee or to the gentleman from Washington, the primary author of the bill, as to how they would define or explain gainful employment. The term appears on line 4, page 1, and on line 20, page 2.

I specifically would refer to a pilot program. I may say my enthusiastic support of this bill is based on the fact that I would hope we could have several different types of pilot projects. It would seem to me—and I would say this in preface so the chairman would know what I was directing my question to—that if we had one pilot project that had 18-year-old boys for 90 days, they might well be paid $2 an hour or whatever the people decided was required. On the other hand, if a school system decides they want to rotate during the summer and take out three different groups of people for a month, or, as the gentleman from Louisiana suggested, the program in his State which operates to take them out for 3 or 4 weeks, and they decide they do not want to give any particular salary, there might be this leeway in terms of the actual money received.

Would the chairman of the committee interpret it to mean, on page 3, when we are giving authority to determine the rates of pay and hours and other conditions of employment, coupled with the arrangement for transportation and lodging and subsistence, that in one pilot project they might not pay anything in reference to real wages, and that certainly in another pilot project they might well establish a wage of $2 an hour?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentlewoman, taking the first part of her question first, that we use the words "gainful employment" of American youths, and "gainful employment" for the purpose of providing gainful employment, and so on, as just one of the purposes of this legislation. It is a conservation bill. We do not mean that giving youngsters remunerative employment is either the sole or most important purpose. We intend this to be a conservation bill and to give the two departments wide latitude in administering the bill and in reaching appropriate rates of compensation. I think if we remove the words "gainful employment" we would make it impossible to effectively carry out the program. Enrollees should be paid for the conservation work they perform, but this rate, consistent with the demonstration characteristics of the bill could vary from project to project, although the wisdom of such might be questioned.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then as I understand the chairman, he is saying that gainful employment does not require a dollar remuneration for every person who is engaged in this program?

Mr. PERKINS. "Gainful employment" may not be on a dollar-per-hour basis. It may be on some other basis, taking into account the type of work, the quality of work that the youngsters are engaged in, but we intended youths to have opportunities for gainful employment in the area of conservation in the programs offered.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. So if I understand the gentleman, I fully applaud the goal of my colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS), and I certainly want the emphasis on this legislation to be on conservation, and that no programs would be involved in this or would be undertaken that were otherwise. That was the primary goal—conservation.

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. This is our goal here.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. But do I understand the chairman to say, then, that gainful employment does not necessarily require a dollar remuneration for students who are involved?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. Under that authority of the bill, pay of enrollees is not required, but I do not see any enrollee not being compensated under any demonstration project I can now visualize.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. It does not require that?

Mr. PERKINS. It would not absolutely require a dollar remuneration.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. So a Girl Scout organization or a school system could have a rotating program and the emphasis would still be on conservation or cleaning up the forest or building parks, but no pay would be required?

Mr. PERKINS. No pay is absolutely required, but I do not believe that it is contemplated that enrollees will serve without dollar remuneration.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. And they would not have to be paid a salary?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

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

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of my Chairman, when we talk about "gainful employment" as is stated in the hearings on page 20, the estimate is that boys and girls will be paid $80 a month.

If it is based on the figure stated by the gentlewoman from Oregon, it would be $2 an hour.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that we set out general purposes in the legislation, giving the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture wide latitude, and purposely so, to develop pilot programs. We do not intend to restrict the Departments, to make sure that they pay everyone the same. They may pay less for certain types of conservation work. They may have different programs requiring different compensation.

Mr. SCHERLE. If they are going to pay them $20 a week, of course that is $80 a month, under what has been stipulated here, and if they are going to pay them on the basis of $2 an hour, that means that simply all they will work, as gainful employment for pay, is 2 hours a day.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say that this is an estimate. There is no doubt in my mind that there will be variances from the estimate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. If the bill passes, will these new-found employees be working on Federal or State lands, or both?

Mr. PERKINS. We provide in the bill that they shall be working on Federal lands, but we further provide that a study shall be made with a report back to the Congress as to how we shall work it out with the States on a State-Federal basis, where we have State parks. All the funds here will go on Federal lands.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentlewoman from Oregon spoke of rotating. Do I correctly understand she suggests these youths be rotated or that the programs be rotated? To what would the rotation apply?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have in mind a program that will be run by a school district, where they would decide they would take out a group of youngsters between the ages of 16 and 18 or 19, whatever the final age limit is, and that they might have this group out for 30 days at a camp, and then bring those youngsters back and take out another group for the next 30 days. It would not be babysitting or recreation or fun programs. Indeed they would learn about conservation and they would have an opportunity to be out in the national forests. They would do work in terms of cleaning up the parks, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Would not transportation eat up the money very rapidly? This is not intended to benefit the west coast exclusively, is it? Would not transportation costs of rotating on that basis eat up the funds very quickly?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If my friend would yield further, on page 4 I was glad to note that they correct one of the great deficiencies of the Job Corps program, because the gentleman from Washington made certain that to minimize the transportation costs the Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible. If we are going to have only 3,000 youngsters under this pilot program

we are not going to be transporting children across the country, as we have done in previous programs.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, the gentlewoman does recognize that there are a lot of empty beer cans to be picked up in this eastern part of the country, too, in various public places.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Any person who had full vision or even partial vision would agree with the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman. I see here the start of still another costly program to further socialize this country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: On Page 3, line 24, after the semicolon, insert the following:

"*Provided further,* no Corps members shall participate in firefighting activities."

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the assignment of members of the proposed Youth Conservation Corps to firefighting. Forest fires represent a tremendous peril to life, and I do not believe that boys and girls, 14 to 18 years of age or 16 to 18 years of age, for that matter, as the amendment would have it, should be exposed to this peril. The language I am offering would protect them from that danger.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that a very serious accident involving the deaths of seven teenagers took place in Los Angeles County in August 1968. Teenage probationers under the juvenile delinquency program in California had been assigned to fighting brush fires. Let me read from the Los Angeles Times of August 25, 1968:

A scoring blast of fire swept through a funnel-like canyon Saturday and killed seven teenage firefighters and an adult foreman as they battled a huge brush fire in the San Gabriel Mountains.

Mr. Chairman, I simply offer this amendment in order to try to prevent a similar tragedy occurring with respect to the young people under this program.

Thereafter, Los Angeles County prohibited the use of juvenile probationers to fight forest fires, and a bill was introduced in the California Legislature providing that youngsters under the age of 18 could not participate in fire suppression work unless specific conditions were met:

First, that the parent or guardian of the youth give permission for such labor; Second, that the youth receive training equivalent in number of training hours to that received by persons in apprenticeship for firefighting; and third, that all other available manpower is being or has been used.

If the committee desires to offer these conditions as an amendment to my amendment, it would be acceptable to me. Of course, I am sure that it is not necessary to point out that my amendment would not prevent Corps members from taking whatever action is necessary for self protection in an emergency.

It may be argued that under this bill the problem is taken care of because the interagency committee has the power to determine conditions of employment, but I might point out that the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior are both responsible for operating Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers, and both departments used members of the Job Corps for forest firefighting. This continued until a regulation was adopted by the Job Corps last year which banned this practice.

This regulation in section 712 of the Civilian Conservation Center Administrative Manual, provides that no youth under the age of 18 can participate in firefighting. Moreover, the Job Corps regulation provides that for youths 18 years of age and older to participate, they must be graduates of a fire suppression training course; they must be volunteers; and they must be paid at standard firefighters' rates.

None of these protections exist in the pending bill, and in view if the reluctance of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture to accept the regulation that was adopted by the Job Corps, it is doubtful that similar regulations would be issued to protect youngsters under this program.

I urge support of this amendment in order to protect prospective Youth Conservation Corps members who otherwise might be assigned to firefighting duty and run the risk of a tragic accident. At the very least, the committee should consider language similar to that which was introduced in the California State Legislature.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

I would hate to see the day come in this country when we would enroll youngsters in a conservation program and then prohibit them from fighting fires.

One of the things that made the CCC boys earn the lasting gratitude of the Nation was their work in fighting forest fires. Insofar as I am concerned this should be one of the functions of the new corps. Youngsters 16, 17, or 18 years of age need to know more about protecting our forests.

If we undertake to tie the hands of these youngsters so that they could not even defend themselves, I think this Congress would be derelict in its responsibility.

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

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

Mr. MEEDS. Would the gentleman agree with me that under the proposed amendment if members of this new Conservation Corps were in their own camp and a forest fire broke out, they would be prevented from protecting their own camp from that fire?

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly agree with the distinguished author of the bill.

There are certain fundamental things we want to teach children in this country.

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

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

Mr. SCHERLE. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think it is probably more dangerous to send them to college today than it would be for them to fight forest fires in the forests.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I want to say to my colleagues that it will be a sad day when a man goes out in the woods and cannot build a fire trail that is a part of fire fighting or the repairing and taking care of it. I would hate to see the fact that if a dormitory caught fire, they would have to stand there and see it burn. I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MRS. GREEN OF OREGON

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: On page 1, line 4, strike out "gainful."
Page 2, line 20, strike out "gainful."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with some of my colleagues and since the chairman of the full committee has already said that in his judgment the legislation would allow the school districts or Girl Scout organizations or Boy Scout organizations to have programs where there would be no dollar remuneration per hour but that the subsistence and transportation, et cetera, would be the benefits which they would receive, it seems to me would be better in terms of establishing the legislative history to strike out the word "gainful" in both places so that it would be clearly established that the intent of the House was to allow a pilot program where they would receive remuneration—the enrollees involved—at so many dollars an hour, but that they might have another pilot project which might be of a shorter duration with the emphasis still solely on conservation and ecology and yet not pay them an hourly wage. This is the purpose of the amendments and I think requires no further explanation. I would hope that the amendments would be adopted.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, with the striking of these two words in these very delicate places, the gentlewoman from Oregon has just turned this from a conservation employment program into an education, bird-watching program.

I think that the intent of this legislation, clearly from the outset, was to provide gainful employment in the preservation and conservation of our natural resources and that the primary intent was not to provide educational experiences for young people. We gave some

ground on the bill earlier, but if we give more ground on this, we will find ourselves right out the window with the original intent and purpose of this bill. However, I thought that the gentlewoman from Oregon supported it when we came in here, but we are going to end up with a program far different than the kind of civilian conservation program which we came in here originally to pass through this body. I would hope the amendment would be defeated.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then I must assume that the gentleman from Washington is in disagreement with the gentleman from Kentucky on what gainful employment means.

Mr. MEEDS. Your assumption is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. All right. This, Mr. Chiarman, if my colleague will yield further, is perhaps the reason that the House should exercise its will and decide whether this indeed is a program where every single person must be paid, even though the National Girl Scouts Organization or the public school system of Portland plans 3 or 4 weeks programs with the entire conservation purpose of the bill exclusively in mind; namely, that the emphasis must be on conservation and ecology. I do not want this referred to as just an education program. I want it to be a work program.

However, if my colleagues recall the year-round Job Corps program, with its conservation campus, was sold on the basis of being patterned after CCC. I have never understood this bill to be another program to be run by the Federal Government and serving the same purpose as the Job Corps conservation camps. CCC programs were year-round programs or 2-year programs with education as a major part of them.

The bill says "up to 90 days." The House just agreed that school districts and established organizations might well have contracts for 4-week projects, for example.

I believe, for many young people, 4 weeks would provide a very valuable experience and I do not believe the Federal Government in all instances must pay every enrollee under all circumstances. They do provide transportation, subsistence, and so forth.

In some cases wages would and should be paid for a 3-month full-time enrollment for 18-year-olds. For 16-year-olds for 1 month—wages may or may not be desirable. Flexibility for pilot pograms is essential.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield back my time?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I will, Mr. Chairman, and I thank you for yielding.

Mr. MEEDS. I would just like to say that I do not agree with the gentlewoman from Oregon about this. It is my feeling that if we keep going and talking about the Camp Fire Girls and the Girl Scouts pretty soon we are going to have a program entirely different than what we came in here to pass, and that was to provide a program for young men and women from the ages of 16 to 19 of gainful employment in the conservation of our natural resources during the summer period, and not some program for the Girl Scouts or a school system—although I think some of these can be worked in.

But I would hope we would continue to use the words "gainful employment" so we can continue the effect of this program.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), because she has done nothing more with her amendments than explicitly state what the chairman said the bill contains. And I would urge the Members of the House to vote affirmatively.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN). I certainly regret that we have developed a misunderstanding. It is my judgment that the language in the bill will permit the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior to develop a different scale of pay for various conservation projects. I do not visualize that any circumstance will justify a pilot project for which enrollees will not receive a wage, a salary, or some form of dollar remuneration for the conservation work they perform. Conservation work is valuable to the Nation, and one lesson youth should learn from the program is that this Nation recognizes its value. Not to pay youngsters for conservation work would negate this concept.

To strike from the bill the concept of gainful employment departs 180 degrees from the direction the author of the bill and the committee took in bringing the bill to the floor. It makes a mockery of our efforts to pattern it from the valuable experience of the CCC program. We want young people to be doing something that enriches the Nation's natural resources. That is in itself a gainful experience. But when we strike the word "gainful" from employment we are just tearing down the concept of great value we assign to protecting the natural resources that we intended to be developed in this pilot program.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Members in this Chamber to oppose this amendment, because it will destroy the bill.

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

I am glad the gentlewoman from Oregon offered this amendment because I thought that the meaning of the word "gainful" got awfully confused here for a while.

However, I find that I cannot agree with the amendment because if this program is going to work, you have to permit the young people to earn some money in return for the good work that they do.

I think the organizations that want to develop volunteer effort to clean up the debris in the park lands and to plant some trees in the local park lands, ought to be encouraged to do so. But we should not call upon the Forest Service or the Park Service to become engaged in this type of activity themselves.

I think what this ought to be, now that we have the 16-, 17-, and 18-year-olds, is an opportunity for young people who want to get employment for the summer time to be able to do it in conservation work out in the forest which will be for the betterment of the rest of our citizenry and that it should be gainful employment is an important part of it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Let me give you an example. If a school district has a program where they take youngsters out for a month for the exact purposes which the bill has, that is, for conservation purposes; is the gentleman saying that it would be better to require that every youngster be paid so much an hour rather than the funds might be used to take a larger number of youngsters out over a period of time and do the same work?

Would my colleague also agree that by striking out the word "gainful," it does not prohibit the agency that is running it from paying any of the people that they want to pay? They can by leaving the word "employment" in those pilot programs where they want to pay the enrollees so much per hour, they certainly are entitled to do it under the language, even if the amendment were adopted.

But it would allow a little more flexibility so that if there were a program run by a school district, they would not be required in that particular instance and that particular pilot project to reimburse them—beyond providing transportation, housing, and subsistence.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentlewoman that the Forest Service or the Park Service would be about the same way as you and I are if a young college student works for us in the summertime and we do not pay anything for their remuneration.

The more you pay them, the more they are encouraged and you know you only have control over that student if you pay him yourself. That is why I believe we should only ask the Forest Service and the Park Service to be engaged in conservation.

I think if a local school has a program where young people and students go out for 30 days, I think that is great. But I think they ought to work that program themselves and they ought to hire those teachers where they have that program in the summertime themselves.

We have the summer program here of conceivably 3,000 young people who are going to be engaged in it and I think it ought to be more akin to what we had on the old Civilian Conservation Corps. It ought to approximate or be more akin to the kind of work that the 18-, 19-, and 20- and 21-year-olds are doing more in college right now for the Forest Service and the Park Service, to look at this and help conservation and to reduce that age somewhat as they are engaged in those two services at the present time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Does the gentleman want all the programs to be 90-day programs?

Mr. QUIE. I would prefer them to be 90 days, but I am not going to say it has to be that. I think it would work better if they hired students where they spend 90 days in the summertime operating that way and we allow the Forest Service and the Park Service to develop the rates of pay. If they can secure them at a lower rate than the minimum wage, I think that is up to them.

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

Mr. Chairman, I seldom take the floor to speak on a piece of legislation before the House but I think it is most important that I do so today.

It was my understanding that this legislation was going to be patterned after the Civilian Conservation Corps of the early 1930's.

With this amendment before us it will no longer be patterned after that most excellent organization. I envisioned this as a pilot project that perhaps eventually can become a civilian conservation corps. When that happens, then the legislation passed today, if we pass it without the amendment, will go down in the history of this country as perhaps the best piece of domestic legislation passed by this Congress.

I say that because the legislation passed that made possible the Civilian Conservation Corps is, in my opinion, the best piece of legislation that has ever been passed by the Congress of the United States affecting the domestic situation of our great country.

I say that, my colleagues, because I went to a CCC camp. I can assure you that had I not that opportunity, I would not be a Member of Congress today. I can also assure you that hundreds of men who went to CCC's would not be today the respected citizens of their communities had they also not had the opportunity of going to the Civilian Conservation Camp.

Yes, I remember getting up at 6 o'clock in the morning and going out into the forests to fight forest to build roads, and bridges, plant trees and on occasions fight forest fires. We did the things that were necessary to reforest the land, in our beloved State of California, but others were doing the same thing throughout the country. I remember going to the Civilian Conservation Camp not because I was poor or not because I came from the slums of East Los Angeles, but because the CCC camps were dedicated to the preservation of the forests and the conservation of the land, and this gave us purpose and pride.

It was the pride that I had in being a member of the Civilian Conservation camp that perhaps made it possible for me to acquire a feeling of belonging and of service to my fellow men, a feeling that I still possess as a Member of this Congress. It was the type of leadership, discipline, and organization that was engendered in me that made it possible for me to save from my $30-a-month pay the money that was necessary to go on to an institution of higher learning.

These are the things that the CCC camps did for me and has done for hundreds of men who are now respected citizens of the United States of America. This is what I believe can happen if we pass the legislation as it was written, for I can envision a program that will become the CCC of this decade.

The one very troublesome aspect of this legislation is that the program provides for only 3,000 young people. I wish it were 3 million. I wish we could take 3 million youngsters from an atmosphere of idleness and put them into the busy atmosphere of the Civilian Conservation Corps. In that way, we would be able to get them out of the trouble that can come in an atmosphere of idleness, that can only lead to the destruction of the human spirit, ending eventually in the correction institutions of our land.

I believe that this is a most important piece of legislation and that it must be enacted by this House without the amendment that is before us at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon.

The amendments were rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, 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. 15361) to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1063, 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.

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. SCHERLE. 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, 256, nays 54, not voting 119, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—256

Abbitt	Anderson, Ill.	Beall, Md.
Abernethy	Anderson, Tenn.	Bell, Calif.
Adair	Andrews, N. Dak.	Bennett
Adams	Annunzio	Biester
Albert	Aspinall	Bingham
Alexander	Ayres	Blanton
Anderson, Calif.	Baring	Blatnik
	Barrett	Boggs
	Berry	Boland
	Bevill	Bolling
	Biaggi	Bray
	Blackburn	Brooks
	Blatnik	Brotzman
	Boggs	Brown, Calif.
	Boland	Brown, Ohio
	Bolling	Broyhill, N.C.
	Bray	Broyhill, Va.
	Brooks	Burke, Mass.
	Brotzman	Burlison, Mo.
	Brown, Calif.	Burton, Calif.
	Brown, Ohio	Button
	Broyhill, N.C.	Byrnes, Wis.
	Broyhill, Va.	Caffery
	Burke, Mass.	Carter
	Burlison, Mo.	Casey
	Burton, Calif.	Celler
	Button	Chamberlain
	Byrnes, Wis.	Chappell
	Caffery	Clark
	Carter	Clausen, Don H.
	Casey	Clay
	Celler	Cleveland
	Chamberlain	Cohelan
	Chappell	Collier
	Clark	Conte
	Clausen, Don H.	Corbett
	Clay	Coughlin
	Cleveland	Culver
	Cohelan	Daniel, Va.
	Collier	de la Garza
	Conte	Dennis
	Corbett	Derwinski
	Coughlin	Donohue
	Culver	Dorn
	Daniel, Va.	Downing
	de la Garza	Dulski
	Dennis	Duncan
	Derwinski	Dwyer
	Donohue	Edmondson
	Dorn	Edwards, Calif.
	Downing	Edwards, La.
	Dulski	Eilberg
	Duncan	Evans, Colo.
	Dwyer	Feighan
	Edmondson	Flood
	Edwards, Calif.	Flowers
	Edwards, La.	Foley
	Eilberg	Ford, William D.
	Evans, Colo.	Fountain
	Feighan	Fraser
	Flood	Frelinghuysen
	Flowers	Friedel
	Foley	Fulton, Pa.
	Ford, William D.	Fulton, Tenn.
	Fountain	Fuqua
	Fraser	Galifianakis
	Frelinghuysen	Gallagher
	Friedel	Garmatz
	Fulton, Pa.	Gettys
	Fulton, Tenn.	Giaimo
	Fuqua	Gibbons
	Galifianakis	Gonzalez
	Gallagher	Gray
	Garmatz	Green, Oreg.
	Gettys	Griffiths
	Giaimo	Grover
	Gibbons	Gubser
	Gonzalez	Gude
	Gray	Hanley
	Green, Oreg.	Hanna
	Griffiths	Hansen, Idaho
	Grover	Hansen, Wash.
	Gubser	Harsha
	Gude	Hawkins
	Hanley	Hechler, W. Va.
	Hanna	Heckler, Mass.
	Hansen, Idaho	Helstoski
	Hansen, Wash.	Henderson
	Harsha	Hicks
	Hawkins	Hogan
	Hechler, W. Va.	Holifield
	Heckler, Mass.	Hosmer
	Helstoski	Howard
	Henderson	Hungate
	Hicks	Ichord
	Hogan	Jarman
	Holifield	Johnson, Calif.
	Hosmer	Johnson, Pa.
	Howard	Jonas
	Hungate	Jones, Ala.
	Ichord	Jones, N.C.
	Jarman	Jones, Tenn.
	Johnson, Calif.	Karth
	Johnson, Pa.	Kastenmeier
	Jonas	Kazen
	Jones, Ala.	Kee
	Jones, N.C.	Keith
	Jones, Tenn.	Kluczynski
	Karth	Koch
	Kastenmeier	Kuykendall
	Kazen	Langen
	Kee	Latta
	Keith	Leggett
	Kluczynski	Lennon
	Koch	Lloyd
	Kuykendall	Long, Md.
	Langen	Lowenstein
	Latta	Lujan
	Leggett	McCloskey
	Lennon	McClure
	Lloyd	McCulloch
	Long, Md.	McDade
	Lowenstein	McFall
	Lujan	McKneally
	McCloskey	Macdonald, Mass.
	McClure	MacGregor
	McCulloch	Mahon
	McDade	Mailliard
	McFall	Marsh
	McKneally	Matsunaga
	Macdonald, Mass.	May
	MacGregor	Meeds
	Mahon	Mikva
	Mailliard	Miller, Calif.
	Marsh	Miller, Ohio
	Matsunaga	Mills
	May	Minish
	Meeds	Mink
	Mikva	Mizell
	Miller, Calif.	Monagan
	Miller, Ohio	Montgomery
	Mills	Moorhead
	Minish	Morgan
	Mink	Morse
	Mizell	Morton
	Monagan	Mosher
	Montgomery	Moss
	Moorhead	Murphy, Ill.
	Morgan	Myers
	Morse	Natcher
	Morton	Nelsen
	Mosher	Nichols
	Moss	Obey
	Murphy, Ill.	O'Hara
	Myers	O'Konski
	Natcher	Olsen
	Nelsen	O'Neill, Mass.
	Nichols	Patman
	Obey	Patten
	O'Hara	Pepper
	O'Konski	Perkins
	Olsen	Pettis
	O'Neill, Mass.	Philbin
	Patman	Pickle
	Patten	Pike
	Pepper	Pirnie
	Perkins	Poage
	Pettis	Poff
	Philbin	Preyer, N.C.
	Pickle	Price, Ill.
	Pike	Pryor, Ark.
	Pirnie	Pucinski
	Poage	Purcell
	Poff	Quie
	Preyer, N.C.	Railsback
	Price, Ill.	Randall
	Pryor, Ark.	Rees
	Pucinski	Reuss
	Purcell	Rhodes
	Quie	Roberts
	Railsback	Robison
	Randall	Rodino
	Rees	Rogers, Colo.
	Reuss	Rogers, Fla.
	Rhodes	Rooney, Pa.
	Roberts	Rosenthal
	Robison	Rostenkowski
	Rodino	Roth
	Rogers, Colo.	Roybal
	Rogers, Fla.	Ryan
	Rooney, Pa.	Sandman
	Rosenthal	Satterfield
	Rostenkowski	Saylor
	Roth	Sebelius
	Roybal	Shipley
	Ryan	Shriver
	Sandman	Sikes
	Satterfield	Sisk
	Saylor	Slack
	Sebelius	Smith, Calif.
	Shipley	Smith, Iowa
	Shriver	Snyder
	Sikes	Springer
	Sisk	Stafford
	Slack	Staggers
	Smith, Calif.	Stanton
	Smith, Iowa	Stephens
	Snyder	Stokes
	Springer	Stubblefield
	Stafford	Stuckey
	Staggers	Sullivan
	Stanton	Symington
	Stephens	Talcott
	Stokes	Taylor
	Stubblefield	Teague, Calif.
	Stuckey	Thompson, N.J.
	Sullivan	Thomson, Wis.
	Symington	Tiernan
	Talcott	Udall
	Taylor	Ullman
	Teague, Calif.	Van Deerlin
	Thompson, N.J.	Vander Jagt
	Thomson, Wis.	Vanik
	Tiernan	Waggonner
	Udall	Waldie
	Ullman	Wampler
	Van Deerlin	Watts
	Vander Jagt	Whalen
	Vanik	White
	Waggonner	Whitehurst
	Waldie	Widnall
	Wampler	Wiggins
	Watts	Williams
	Whalen	Wilson, Bob
	White	Wright
	Whitehurst	Wyatt
	Widnall	Wydler
	Wiggins	Wyman
	Williams	Yates
	Wilson, Bob	Young
	Wright	Zablocki
	Wyatt	Zion
	Wydler	Zwach
	Wyman	
	Yates	
	Young	
	Zablocki	
	Zion	
	Zwach	

NAYS—54

Andrews, Ala.	Devine	Martin
Arends	Dickinson	Mayne
Ashbrook	Eshleman	Michel
Belcher	Fisher	Mize
Betts	Flynt	Price, Tex.
Bow	Foreman	Quillen
Brinkley	Frey	Reid, Ill.
Buchanan	Goodling	Scherle
Burke, Fla.	Griffin	Scott
Burleson, Tex.	Gross	Skubitz
Camp	Haley	Smith, N.Y.
Clancy	Hall	Steiger, Wis.
Clawson, Del	Hull	Teague, Tex.
Collins	Kleppe	Vigorito
Colmer	Kyl	Whalley
Crane	Landgrebe	Winn
Davis, Wis.	Lukens	Wold
Denney	Mann	Wylie

NOT VOTING—119

Addabbo	Bevill	Brock
Ashley	Biaggi	Broomfield
Baring	Blackburn	Brown, Calif.
Barrett	Brademas	Burton, Utah
Berry	Brasco	Bush

Byrne, Pa.	Hagan	Ottinger
Cabell	Halpern	Passman
Carey	Hamilton	Pelly
Cederberg	Hammer-schmidt	Podell
Chisholm	Harrington	Pollock
Conable	Harvey	Powell
Conyers	Hastings	Rarick
Corman	Hathaway	Reid, N.Y.
Cowger	Hays	Reifel
Cramer	Hébert	Riegle
Cunningham	Horton	Rivers
Daddario	Hunt	Roe
Daniels, N.J.	Hutchinson	Rooney, N.Y.
Davis, Ga.	Jacobs	Roudebush
Dawson	King	Ruppe
Delaney	Kirwan	Ruth
Dellenback	Kyros	St Germain
Dent	Landrum	Schadeberg
Diggs	Long, La.	Scheuer
Dingell	McCarthy	Schneebeli
Dowdy	McClory	Schwengel
Eckhardt	McDonald, Mich.	Steed
Edwards, Ala.	McEwen	Steiger, Ariz.
Erlenborn	McMillan	Stratton
Esch	Madden	Taft
Evins, Tenn.	Mathias	Thompson, Ga.
Fallon	Melcher	Tunney
Farbstein	Meskill	Watkins
Fascell	Minshall	Watson
Findley	Mollohan	Weicker
Fish	Murphy, N.Y.	Whitten
Ford, Gerald R.	Nedzi	Wilson, Charles H.
Gaydos	Nix	Wolff
Gilbert	O'Neal, Ga.	Yatron
Goldwater		
Green, Pa.		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Carey with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Horton.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Roe with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Dellenback.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Conyers with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Kirwan with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Nix with Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Corman with Mr. Goldwater.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Hutchinson.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Eckhardt with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Fascell with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.
Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Steiger of Arizona.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Steed with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
Mr. Kyros with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Roth.
Mr. Nedzi with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Pelly.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Long of Louisiana.
Mr. Hagan with Mr. Jacobs.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. King.
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Riegle with Mr. Conable.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1063, the Committee on Education and Labor is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. PERKINS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PERKINS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1076 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 15361, as passed, as follows:

"POLICY AND PURPOSE

"SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth, representing all segments of society, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of natural resources of the United States by the youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

"SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corps'). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ during the summer months without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary.

"(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

"SECRETARIAL DUTIES

"SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall:

"(1) designate the public lands upon which members of the Corps can be effectively utilized in conservation work, and coordinate Corps efforts with those holding jurisdiction over the respective public lands;

"(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

"(3) arrange directly or by contract with any public agency or organization or any private non profit agency or organization which has been in existence for five years for transportation, lodging, subsistence, other services and equipment for the needs of members of the Corps in fulfilling their duties: *Provided*, That whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities (including abandoned military installations) shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps, *And provided further*, That to minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

"(4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members;

"(5) Prepare a report, indicating the most efficient method for initiating a cost-sharing youth conservation program with State natural resource, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

"(b) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support staff.

"SECRETARIAL REPORTS

"SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

"AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

"SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed $3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act."

The motion was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 15361) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENT'S NONEXISTENT HOUSING MESSAGE

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, a White House spokesman admitted the President of the United States "goofed" when he attacked the Congress on the so-called Emergency Home Financing Act.

I regret that the President, himself, has not seen fit to personally admit his errors of fact uttered in a Friday afternoon press conference.

At that time, the President said:

Ladies and gentlemen, on Feb. 2, I sent to the Congress a message asking for enactment of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. You will note that I described this as the "Emergency" Home Finance Act of 1970.

Four months have passed and the Congress has yet failed to act.

In presenting Secretary Romney to you today, I should point out that he recommended to me four months ago that this legislation be sent to the Congress. It is time to act. Secretary Romney has talked to me on several occasions since Feb. 2, urging action.

The truth is, of course, that the President was talking about a nonexistent Presidential message. He even purported to quote from this nonexistent message.

The only thing that happened on housing on February 2 was the opening of hearings in the House Banking and Currency Committee. And this session was called the "Emergency Home Financing Hearings" and they were launched because the President and the administration had failed to come up with anything—not one item—to deal with the crisis in home financing. The hearings were designed to overcome the administration's massive apathy about housing.

Those of us on the Banking and Currency Committee would have been delighted if we had had a Presidential message of support for home financing on February 2. But we had no message of any kind and if the administration was talking about an "Emergency Home Financing Act" it kept this fact a deep secret.

Yet the President on Friday afternoon had the temerity to stand up before the Nation's press, the television cameras and the radio microphones and say:

I sent to the Congress on Feb. 2 a message asking for enactment of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970.

Unfortunately, the major news programs that night—on the Columbia Broadcasting System, the National Broadcasting Co. and the American Broadcasting Co.—carried film clips and tapes from that press conference. In each news segment the President was talking about his February 2 message—the nonexistent message—and repeatedly he claimed that "4 months have passed" since the message. On and on the claims went and I am sure before the night was over, millions of American people were convinced that the Congress was delaying on something that the President had sent it in February.

The next day, many of the major newspapers around the Nation accepted the President's statement at face value. Front page stories were printed claiming the Congress had delayed 4 months on a nonexistent message.

On Sunday, the Washington Evening Star, in a story under the byline of Shirley Elder, printed the real facts—the fact that no such Presidential message existed. The Washington Evening Star took the trouble to ask the White House for a copy of the message which the President touted so long and so loud Friday afternoon.

The White House obviously could not produce a nonexistent message and as the Evening Star reports, "somebody goofed."

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful that we have a Washington Evening Star. I place in the RECORD a copy of the article by Shirley Elder:

"SOMEBODY GOOFED" ON HOUSING DRAFT

(By Shirely Elder)

President Nixon is in the awkward position of having denounced the Democratic-controlled Congress for failing to act on an administration housing proposal that never existed.

On Friday, Nixon, with HUD Secretary George Romney at his side, told reporters at the White House:

"'Ladies and gentlemen, on Feb. 2, I sent to the Congress a message asking for enactment of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. You will note that I described this as the 'Emerigency' Home Finance Act of 1970.

"Four months have passed and the Congress has yet failed to act . . .

"In presenting Secretary Romney to you today, I should point out that he recommended to me four four months ago that this legislation be sent to the Congress . . . It is time to act. Secretary Romney has talked to me on several occasions since Feb. 2, urging action."

As one White House aide reluctantly conceded yesterday, "somebody goofed."

There was no White House message to Congress on Feb. 2, urging enactment of an emergency housing bill. There was a budget message. It touched briefly on housing, pointing to a need for 600,000 new units. It said nothing about specific legislation.

The House Banking and Currency Committee did begin hearings Feb. 2 on legislation designed to boost the housing industry but no administration position was offered. A spokesman for the committee said Romney, head of the Housing and Urban Development Department, was invited to present a White House view, but was unable to attend a session until Feb. 24.

At that time, Romney still could offer no definite legislative plan. Romney spoke convincingly of the need for housing and the problems, mostly because of the high cost of money.

The housing secretary told the committee that "legislation is being prepared" to provide government support of the mortgage market and to strengthen lending institutions. He did not say when the legislation would be ready.

On March 5, the first administration proposal, for a $250 million subsidy to savings and loans associatons from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, was introduced in the House by Banking Committee Chairman Wright Patman of Texas and the committee's top Republican, Rep. William Widnall of New Jersey. The idea originally had been outlined by Bank Board Chairman Preston Martin.

On March 6, Senate Housing Subcommittee Chairman John Sparkman of Alabama cosponsored with Sen. Wallace F. Bennett, R-Utah, a similar bill—aimed at reducing interest rates—and hearings began in the Senate.

Although the housing situation generally was referred to as critical and the necessary action considered an emergency, nothing was formally called the "Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970" until the Senate committee polished up a final version of the bill April 7 in what was described as a bipartisan effort.

On April 16, the Senate passed the bill 72 to 0. In its final form, the measure would make up to $10 billion available for the sagging housing market. Included was a plan by Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., to help middle-income families buy homes.

In addition to the $250 million interest rate subsidy on home mortgages, the Senate bill also would reallocate about $2 billion of unused funds from the Government National Mortgage Association to support FHA and VA loans.

On April 28, for the first time, a HUD official let it be known that the administration was in favor of the Senate bill.

PATMAN IS CHIDED

In a letter to Patman, HUD Undersecretary Richard C. Van Dusen urged swift House action. On the same day, Widnall introduced his own bill, identical to the Senate version, and chided Patman for delaying a vote.

On April 29, Rep. William A. Barrett, D.-Pa., chairman of the housing subcommittee, noted the Senate bill had only two sections dealing immediately with the mortgage crisis—the $250 million subsidy and the Proxmire plan for 7 percent mortgages to middle-income home-buyers.

On May 26, the House committee approved its own bill. There are some differences from the Senate version—an additional $1.5 billion for GNMA, for instance, instead of a reallocation of funds. A Patman plan to set up a National Development Bank with $4 billion for low and moderate income housing, was rejected by the committee.

Patman will ask Rules Committee clearance Tuesday for the bill and it is tentatively scheduled for floor debate on Thursday.

NO SIGN OF MESSAGE

As of yesterday, a committee spokesman said there has been no sign of a presidential housing message or a White House bill. Patman has made no secret of his irritation at what he feels are administration delays.

"Four months have passed," Nixon said Friday, "and Congress has yet failed to act. A bill has passed the Senate. It is now tied up in the House Rules Committee. We are hopeful that next week the House Rules Committee will act and that the House itself will act."

When first asked what happened, Gerald L. Warren, an assistant White House press secretary, said: "If the President did say that, he misspoke himself. . . . That sometimes happens."

On reflection, Warren said he thought Romney must have made the statement, not Nixon, but he referred inquiries to another press aide, Bruce Whelihan.

Whelihan noted that the budget, sent to Congress Feb. 2, did mention housing. He then said something about the Justice Department sending a bill to Congress "a few days after Feb. 2." But when asked what the Justice Department had to do with it, Whelihan said he'd check around and call back later.

Later, Whelihan acknowledged that no housing legislation had been submitted to Congress but he said Romney's testimony was supposed to accomplish the same thing. Romney, he said, was "translating the President's budget message . . . the point of view that the situation is an emergency."

The firmness of the President's statement, Whelihan said, can only be traced to some sort of communications breakdown between HUD and Nixon's office.

Mr. Speaker, the White House press aides are quite cynical about the whole

episode. They casually remark that "somebody goofed" and they probably are running around congratulating themselves on having fooled the Washington press corps with the Friday afternoon press conference.

The problems of the press and the White House are not my immediate concern, but I am disturbed when a major issue like home financing is so casually treated at the highest levels of Government. The White House statement is either a purposeful effort to mislead or it is an indication of how little knowledge the administration has about what is going on concerning housing legislation.

Throughout the hearings called by the House Banking and Currency Committee in February, we attempted to excite the administration's interest in home financing legislation, something that would put a new source of funds into the country's most depressed industry.

It was not until the closing hours of this month-long hearing that we were able to have administration witnesses before us, and when they appeared they were far short of specifics. There was no mention of any Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970.

There was, however, a great deal of frenzied—and at times emotional—testimony against various home financing proposals before the committee. The word had obviously been passed to block any Democratic-sponsored legislation until the administration could find out what it was doing.

The administration's negative position killed the effectiveness of the February hearings, and in March and April, the Senate put together a package which it then called the "Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970." This package, which I understand was sponsored by various members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, passed the Senate on April 16. This was not the administration's bill; it was a bill put together in the Senate. At this point, the administration did start supporting the Senate bill, which was called the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. It was not the administration's Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 which simply does not exist.

On April 28, I received a communication from the Under Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development urging action on the Senate bill. Many members of the Banking and Currency Committee did not feel that the Senate bill went far enough in providing a new source of funds for housing. Many of us felt that it was critical that a major new source of funds be included in any legislation bearing the title, "Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970."

We revised the Senate bill and introduced a new bill, H.R. 17495, which included a $4-billion National Development for Bank for low- and moderate-income loans and a greatly expanded funding for Ginnie Mae special assistance programs. A National Development Bank, by tapping pension funds and foundations, would have provided funds for at least 200,000 new low- and moderate-income housing units around the Nation and would have established a permanent source of financing for this type of housing.

The bill drafted by the Democrats in the committee also included provisions which would have allowed the Federal Reserve to authorize the commercial banks to use a portion of their cash reserves to invest in housing mortgages. This, too, would be an important new source of funds. The committee moved rapidly to a markup session on the legislation beginning on May 12. The administration immediately sent up a new and even more frenzied opposition to the housing proposals contained in the legislation..

Operating through Robert Mayo, who was then in great favor at the Budget Bureau, the administration attacked the proposals to establish a National Development Bank—the major source of new funds in the bill. The Republicans also attacked the new funds for Ginnie Mae and fought bitterly against the use of the commercial banks' cash reserves for housing.

The Republican opposition delayed the markup session and they finally succeeded in knocking out title V, the National Development Bank. We will, of course, attempt to restore this section when the bill reaches the floor.

Despite the Republican opposition to these new features, the committee moved forward with the bill and completed work on the markup on May 26. We suspended the rules of the committee so that the report on the bill could be filed with the House on Saturday, May 28. On June 1, I wrote the chairman of the Rules Committee asking for a hearing on the legislation.

We will be heard on this legislation tomorrow, Tuesday, and it is my understanding that the leadership plans to bring the bill up later in the week if a rule is granted.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has been outlandish on this home financing legislation. It has been dragging its feet on anything that has represented a meaningful source of new funds for housing. It has become enthusiastic only when there has been a subsidy involved for the lenders. A subsidy for the lender seems to strike an important nerve within the administration.

Perhaps the subsidy to the lenders will be of some help in the housing crisis but I would like some assurance that the home buyer will benefit directly from this governmental outlay.

In all of its various press releases, the administration centers most of its attention on a $250 million subsidy to the savings and loan industry. This was originally proposed by Preston Martin, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

The administration has made some outrageous claims about what this legislation would do for housing. As a result, I wrote the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Mr. Martin, on June 4, asking for a report on his proposal and particularly for any details that would substantiate the administration's claims concerning the construction of low- and moderate-income housing.

Mr. Speaker, that was on June 4, and I have yet to receive a reply from Mr. Martin. Mr. Martin is a member of the administration which is claiming that it is doing everything to get early consideration of home financing legislation. Yet, Mr. Martin continues to withhold this information which I told him was needed for the floor consideration of the home financing bill. Perhaps President Nixon can hold a press conference to chide his own Home Loan Bank Board Chairman.

I place in the RECORD a copy of the letter that I sent to Chairman Martin on June 4:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 4, 1970.

Hon. PRESTON MARTIN,
Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you know, H.R. 17495 was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee has applied for a hearing before the Rules Committee.

Concerning that portion of the bill which, if enacted, would authorize the appropriation of $250 million to the Home Loan Bank Board to subsidize savings and loan associations, to—using your words—"lower the interest charged by such banks on member borrowers," I would like to have your answers to several questions concerning this associate program before the bill is brought up on the House Floor.

I have had the opportunity to read your testimony before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, but I find nothing in this testimony which provides any detail as to how this program would operate. The following questions are addressed to this specific point:

1. How will you assure that the subsidy given to an individual savings and loan association will be used exclusively to maintain within that association previous borrowings from the Home Loan Bank System?

2. What procedure will you use to assure that the subsidy will be used to facilitate the home mortgage financing of low- and moderate-income families?

3. What regulations and follow-up do you propose to issue which will assure that the subsidy will, in fact, in whole or in part be passed on to the borrower of funds, rather than to be kept by the savings and loan as an institution?

In meeting the desires of the House Banking and Currency Committee, as stated in its report, that "The committee expects the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to report semiannually to the Congress on its actions taken under this title, and on the income of families assisted with advances subsidized with these funds," I will appreciate having your immediate reply to this letter.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, what we have in an administration which thinks it can build houses and mold public opinion through gimmicks.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the President will review the transcript of his Friday news conference and that he will hold another news conference to set the record straight. I am sure that he has received bad advice and perhaps all of the shuffling in the Cabinet is partially responsible. The Washington Star quotes an administration source as saying that there is "some sort of communications breakdown between HUD and Nixon's office."

In the public interest, I hope that this communications breakdown is repaired so that we do not have more misleading press conferences. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of a transcript of the President's news conference remarks which my office obtained from the White House Saturday morning. I also place in the RECORD a copy of a statement which I issued in reply to his charges:

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT RICHARD NIXON, FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 1970

Ladies and gentlemen: On Feb. 2 I sent to the Congress a Message asking for enactment of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. You will note that I described this as the "Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970."

Four months have pasesd and the Congress has yet failed to act. A bill has passed the Senate. It now is tied up in the House Rules Committee. We are hopeful that next week the House Rules Committee will act and that the House itself well may act.

In presenting Sec. Romney to you today, I should point out that he recommended to me four months ago that this legislation be sent to the Congress. He then said that there was an emergency insofar as housing finance was concerned.

For four months on this emergency legislation there has been no action and now we have what I would describe as a crisis insofar as financing for housing needed by hundreds of thousands of people across the country.

It is time to act, even at this late date. Sec Rom has talked to me on several occasions since Feb 2, urging action. He will be glad to answer your questions with regard to the provisions of the legislation; what we hope it will accomplish, even at this late date.

We hope that the Emergency Act of four months ago now will become legislation within the next two weeks or so, as it well might.

STATEMENT OF WRIGHT PATMAN, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, JUNE 12, 1970

President Nixon has blocked—not just delayed—legislation which would put new sources of funds into homebuilding.

Repeatedly, President Nixon and his one-time Budget Director, Robert Mayo, and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney have opposed any plan which would put a meaningful source of funds into housing. Instead, they have insisted on various gimmicks to provide subsidies, not to homebuyers, but to lenders.

The Administration's latest efforts have been centered in an all out opposition to a proposal to establish a National Development Bank to provide home loans for low and moderate income families. They have opposed efforts to require pension funds and foundations to make additional investments in housing mortgages.

The Administration's all out opposition, delivered while the Committee was marking up the Emergency Home Finance Bill, defeated the Development Bank proposal and eliminated the major source of new funds in the bill.

The Administration also opposed Democratic proposals for an additional $1.5 billion in special assistance housing funds. The Democrats passed this provision over the Administration's opposition. The Administration also opposed a proposal which would allow the Federal Reserve to authorize the investment of commercial banks' cash reserves in housing. This provision also prevailed over Republican opposition.

Despite the negative attitude of the Nixon Administration, an attempt will be made on the Floor of the House of Representatives to restore the National Development Bank so that there may be a new source of funds to finance housing at reasonable interest rates for low and moderate income families.

It is regrettable that the President of the United States, who is backing hundreds of millions of dollars of loans to a $7 billion railroad corporation, is unwilling to back a program for additional housing loans for needy families.

There has been no delay in the Emergency Home Finance Act with the exception of that created by constant negative reactions from the Administration. The Banking & Currency Committee completed action on the Emergency Home Finance Act on May 26 and unanimously suspended the Committee's rules to allow an early report of the legislation. The report was filed on Saturday, May 28, and on Monday morning, June 1, a hearing was requested before the Rules Committee. We are now scheduled to go before the Rules Committee on Tuesday (June 16) and it is my understanding that the leadership will bring the Bill to the Floor sometime next week.

THE HOUSING BILL

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency would not yield to me following his observations and comments concerning the statements of the President of the United States.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me say that there has been a bill which was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency which has languished without action by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It has been reported by the gentleman's committee for a number of weeks and I regret that it has not been pushed before the Committee on Rules by the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I will be glad to yield, even though the gentleman would not yield to me at the time I respectfully asked him to do so.

Mr. PATMAN. My time has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I appreciate the interest of the great minority leader. I have been pushing the bill. The only thing we lack is a rule, which we have been trying to get all this time. We immediately applied for a rule; and, as the gentleman knows, we cannot consider the bill until we get a rule.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The only trouble with the gentleman's argument is that he was not up there demanding action be taken by the Rules Committee. He submitted a pro forma request and did nothing to push any harder than the usual request, despite the emergency situation.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. I conferred with the chairman.

PRESIDENT'S ATTACK ON HOUSE UNWARRANTED

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's attack on the House of Representatives is obviously a politically motivated effort to camouflage his administration's dismal record in housing. In January 1969, housing starts stood at a 1.9 million annual level. They have since plummeted to 1.1 million. Congress last year provided the President with $2 billion to support the mortgage market. He has failed to utilize that authority. The Congress also granted the President authority to reallocate credit from nonessential uses to housing. President Nixon, upon signing this legislation, announced that he would never use it. He continues to disdain its use.

The House Democratic leadership has almost daily been importuned by spokesmen for the administration demanding speedy enactment of the postal reform legislation. This legislation has as its objective the extrication of the administration from a crisis situation of its own making. We have done everything within our power to assure expeditious action on the postal reform bill. The Committee on Rules has acted promptly to clear the bill for the floor and it is programed for next Tuesday. In light of its efforts to cooperate with the President, the House of Representatives is ill-served by the President's intemperate and unwarranted allegations.

THIRTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, June 15, marks the 30th anniversary of the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States. In June 1940, the Army of the Soviet Union invaded the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and ever since, the history of that region has been scarred by that tragic experience.

The Soviets were bent on the systematic destruction of these three states and demanded their complete subservience. In order to insure the success of their objectives, the Soviets ordered massive deportations and executions which resulted in the deaths of thousands upon thousands of innocent people.

In a few short months, the death toll exceeded 100,000, and yet, the Soviet effort to bend the will of the Baltic people to communism did not slacken. Inhabitants of entire villages—including men, women, and even little children—were rounded up, herded together under miserably overcrowded and unsanitary conditions, and shipped on trains east to Siberia. Many died in slave labor camps and others were scattered throughout various parts of the Soviet Union with the brutal intention of obliterating their national identity.

Because the unfortunate plight of the Baltic States had long been a source of deep concern to me, one of my first acts upon becoming a Member of Congress in 1965 was to introduce a resolution in behalf of the Baltic people. The case for passage of such a resolution, calling upon the President of the United States to direct the attention of world opinion to denial of the rights of self-determination for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, was clear. On June 21, 1965, the resolution passed the House of Representatives, and subsequently, on October 22, 1966, it passed the U.S. Senate.

It is appropriate today, on the 30th anniversary of the invasion of the Baltic States, to recall to my colleagues the contents of that resolution which passed the House unanimously. The resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. 416

Whereas the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

Whereas all peoples have the right to self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, cultural, and religious development; and

Whereas the Baltic peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been forcibly deprived of these rights by the Government of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union, through a program of deportations and resettlement of peoples, continues in its effort to change the ethnic character of the populations of the Baltic States; and

Whereas it has been the firm and consistent policy of the Government of the United States to support the aspirations of Baltic peoples for self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas there exist many historical, cultural, and family ties between the peoples of the Baltic States and the American people: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the House of Representatives of the United States urge the President of the United States—

(a) to direct the attention of world opinion at the United Nations and at other appropriate international forums and by such means as he deems appropriate, to the denial of the rights of self-determination for the peoples of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and

(b) to bring the force of world opinion to bear on behalf of the restoration of these rights to the Baltic peoples.

It is imperative that we who are free strive to encourage the spirit of liberty in those states still held captive by the Soviets. The people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have not renounced their hopes for freedom and independence. Their will to struggle and fight for the liberty they cherish so highly continues as strong as ever. It remains the responsibility of those of us in the free world to champion the righteous cause of independence for the Baltic nations.

Today, let us honor the memory of those unfortunate victims of Soviet brutality, and let us rededicate ourselves to the still unresolved cause of the Baltic States. Only by continuing to stress and support the case for Baltic freedom in every available forum can we hope to finally make Baltic freedom a reality.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE BY STATUTE

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, soon the House will consider the profoundly complicated, constitutional question of lowering the voting age to 18 years by Federal statute.

This action, recommended by the Senate as an amendment to the important Voting Rights Act, suggests that the States no longer have an interest in determining the age of franchise for their citizens.

Constitutionally, I am convinced, the Congress can lower the voting age by statute only upon the rather conclusive showing that there is no "state interest" of any modern significance involved in the question.

KATZENBACH AGAINST MORGAN REJECTED AS AUTHORITY

I say this because I have concluded that the rationale of Katzenbach against Morgan cannot apply to voting age qualifications established by a State. When a State sets the minimum age for voting at, let us say 19 years, it establishes no rule of law which—though apparently within the tolerance of the 14th amendment—permits invidious discrimination in its application and thus is intolerable under the equal protection clause.

Voting age qualifications are determined without regard to race, creed, language ability, or other constitutionally infirm restrictions upon the exercise of the franchise. Thus, to my mind, a voting age set by State statute or State constitutional provision cannot be a denial of equal protection within that State as the term is commonly understood, and judicially interpreted.

The Senate action usurps traditional State power to set voting age limits, a State power unchalleged since 1789 under our Federal Constitution. In fact, my research indicates that while hundreds of constitutional amendments have been introduced in Congress to lower the voting age over the past decade, no single Senator or Congressman has had the temerity before to suggest in bill form that it could be done by Federal statute.

ONLY 1 HOUR TO CONSIDER AND ACT

The Senate has suddenly adopted, on the floor in amendment form, a course of action that has been universally regarded as unconstitutional for 182 years.

Now the House must act. I understand we will have 1 hour to consider this profound question, going to the very core of our Federal structure. We must decide without the benefit of hearings, without the benefit of appropriate investigation, without the advice of first-rate constitutional authorities across the country.

We have the informal opinion of the dean of the Yale Law School that the Senate action almost surely is unconstitutional. Others, I have read and heard, have suggested the Supreme Court may well view the decision of Congress as controlling—even over the mandate of article I, section 2, and other less direct provisions of the Constitution.

I think it improper to prognosticate upon whether the Court, as it is presently constituted, would reject or accept the Federal voting age statute if enacted.

It is the unavoidable responsibility of Congressmen, as well as of Supreme Court Justices, to read and study and interpret the Constitution. We have no carte blanche privilege to pass legislation that is clearly unconstitutional so long as the Court sits and rules either with us or against us; we have an affirmative duty to seek out constitutional authority permitting Federal action upon each and every issue before this body.

IS STATE INTEREST INVOLVED?

If Katzenbach against Morgan cannot provide constitutional authority for a Federal voting age statute—as I believe it cannot—then the remaining consideration is the question of "State interest."

Do the States retain any justifiable or demonstrable or substantial interest in establishing the qualifications for voting in elections? Do they have a legitimate local interest in the question, or is it simply an anachronism from 18th-century America that is better forgotten or ignored in a modern, living constitution for a forward looking, vigorous Nation?

It would seem that the litmus test of state interest would be State action. Are the qualifications for voting debated in State legislatures? Are the pros and cons of the question actively considered by Governors and legislative councils and the people themselves in referendum? Is the issue alive and well at the State level—or has it stagnated from disinterest and disregard?

State interest in questions traditionally left to the States can best be ascertained by study of how those questions are dealt with locally—whether they are considered on the merits, or the victim of disuse and decay in a changing society.

The material I will insert for the benefit of all Members at the close of these remarks illuminates the depth at which the qualifications for voting are actually considered by the States, the traditional and constitutional repository of this power.

I think it almost unnecessary to say that no overriding nationwide interest, requiring a balancing and rejection of traditional State interests, is involved here.

It is of no constitutional significance to a voter in California that one may vote at 18 years in Georgia. It is of no constitutional significance to an 18-year-old in Georgia that his contemporary in California must wait for 3 years to exercise the franchise.

The equal protection clause of the 14th amendment applies to intrastate questions of discrimination, not interstate questions. It is as simple as that, and the unfortunate action of the other body has forced the House to face up to this rather well established principle of constitutional law.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT APPROPRIATE NOW

Mr. Speaker, we come to the question of lowering the voting age by constitutional amendment. Gallup polls since the middle 1950's have indicated that the great majority of the people favor lowering the voting age by constitutional amendment.

I think it fair to say that a majority of the Congress favors lowering the voting age. I think it fair to say that a majority of my constituents in Kansas favor lowering the voting age.

I therefore announce that I will support a constitutional amendment which would lower the voting age to 19 years throughout the country. This would require the acquiescence of three-fourths of the State legislatures under our Constitution.

If such a constitutional amendment is approved by the Congress, I will work for its early ratification to the best of my ability.

I consider 19 years the appropriate age for voting. When one has attained the age of 19, he usually has been out of high school for about 1 year. He has begun his career, either in college or the Armed Forces, or in the labor force. He often has married and settled down; most likely, he has paid Federal income taxes for the first time. He has changed his pattern of life, left the family circle, and thought about establishing his own family.

I honestly and sincerely believe that the 3.8 million 18-year-olds in America, most of whom are in their last year of high school, could benefit from an additional year of experience in life before exercising the highest duty of the citizen in a representative democracy.

I think it is in the national interest to extend the voting privilege to those 19 years of age, and older, but I feel the age limit should be set no lower at the present time.

THE CONSTITUTION MUST BE RESPECTED

Just as electors are expected to respect their constitution, so also are Congressmen. It would be an easy thing for some, perhaps, to ignore the mandate of their constitution and extend the franchise to those over 18 by Federal statute. But I cannot support such an action, for I feel that the precepts of our Constitution are our best defense against arbitrary government.

The proponents of this action seek commendable ends by means that do violence to the Constitution, and thus the issue before Congress will not be 18-year-old voting at all. The merits of the question will not be a major factor in resolving the issue.

The Congress, first and foremost, must decide the question of constitutionality before it even considers the appropriateness of 18-year-old voting.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I insert material prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on recent State action on the question of lowering the voting age.

I hope all Members will carefully consider this material before making their decision on the Senate amendment to lower the voting age to 18 by Federal statute. Almost all Members will see that their constituents have been working with the issue at the State level for a long, long time.

That is where the issue belongs, absent a constitutional amendment ratified by three-fourths of the States.

The material follows:

PART I: STATE ACTION SINCE 1960 TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE

ALABAMA

In 1961, H. B. 124 was introduced in the Alabama House of Representatives to reduce the voting age to 18. It died in committee. In 1963, S. B. 58 and H. B. 745 were introduced to reduce the voting age to 18 but no further action was taken on either measure. The same fate resulted for S. B. 240, the 18-year-old vote amendment introduced in the 1965 legislative session.

The Senate on July 27, 1967 passed 22 to 10 S. B. 24, which would have lowered the voting age to 20. Passage came on a motion to reconsider after S. B. 24 had initially failed (19–9) to receive the necessary votes. S. B. 24 died in House Committee.

ALASKA

No bills introduced in 1965 to lower the voting age. It is at present 19 and has been since Alaska entered the Union in 1959. In 1969 the legislature passed an amendment to lower the age to 18. It goes to the voters for action in 1970.

ARIZONA

In 1962, H. C. R. 8, to reduce the voting age to 18, received a favorable vote in the House on March 6, but was subsequently returned to committee. In 1964, H. C. R. 27, lowering the voting age to 18, was introduced without any subsequent action thereon. H. C. R. 7, introduced in 1965, would have lowered the voting age to 18, but no further action occurred on it. There was no action in 1966 on H. C. R. 12, or H. B. 253, both of which proposed lowering the voting age to 18. Four proposals were introduced in 1967 to lower the voting age to 18—H. B. 204, H. B. 214, H. C. R. 6, and H. C. R. 7—but all died in committee.

In 1968 four voting age bills were introduced, all to lower to 18 (S. B. 18, S. C. R. 1, H. B. 76, H. C. R. 5), and all died in committee.

CALIFORNIA

No resolutions or bills were introduced in the 1961 legislative session. During the 1963 session, Constitution Amendment proposal 24, introduced in the Assembly, would have lowered the voting age to 18. It died in committee.

No bills introduced in 1964 or 1966. In 1965, H. Res. 389, to appoint an interim committee to study the right to vote, including the voting age, died in committee, as did A. C. A. 14, a lower voting age amendment (no age shown). In 1967, three bills to lower were introduced, A. C. A. 36 (no age shown), A. C. A. 14 (19), and A. C. A. 64 (no age shown). All died in committee. In 1968, A. C. A. 17 and A. C. A. 24 (no age shown) also died in committee. S. C. A. 8, which appears to have been a voting age proposal, was defeated in the Senate. In 1969, the California Constitutional Commission recommended lowering the voting age to 19.

CONNECTICUT

In 1961, H. Res. 15, to lower the voting age to 18, was introduced in the House, without further action thereon. No action was taken during the 1963 session on H. Res. 25, an 18-year-old vote proposal. H. Res. 12, to lower (no age shown), died in committee in 1965. An additional proposal may have been introduced in 1967 but the journal is not clear in this regard. The Connecticut Constitutional Convention rejected an 18-year-old vote proposal in 1965. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* for May 23, 1969, reports that the Connecticut legislature approved an 18-year-old vote proposal which will go on the ballot for voter approval in November 1970.

DELAWARE

The State legislature passed a 19-year-old vote amendment in 1969. If repassed by the legislature in 1970, or 1971, it will take effect as Delaware does not require electorate approval of amendments to the constitution.

FLORIDA

In the 1963 session no proposals to lower the voting age were introduced. S. J. R. 58, to lower to 18, was introduced in the Senate during the 1965 session without subsequent action. H. J. R. 675, an 18-year-old vote proposal introduced in the House during the 1965 session, was ordered from committee with recommendation that it not pass. No vote was taken on H. J. R. 675.

In 1966–67, H. J. R. 451 and H. J. R. 2426, to lower to 18, and H J. R. 168, to lower to 19, died in committee. The new constitution of Florida, voted in 1967, retained 21 as the voting age.

GEORGIA

The voting age in Georgia has been 18 since 1943. (See part two of this report.)

HAWAII

Legislative proposals to lower the voting age (it is now 20) have been introduced since at least the 1961 session, according to a pamphlet on proposed amendments to the Hawaiian Constitution. In 1967, the Hawaii Legislature approved the convening of a Constitutional Convention subject to voter approval at a referendum (the voters previously expressed approval of such a convention in the fall election of 1966). The calling of the convention was once more approved by the voters and it convened and worked from July until November, 1968. The issue of lowering the voting age was debated at the convention and a proposal to lower the age to 18 was put on the ballot in 1968.

The electorate, November 1968, specifically rejected that part of the new Constitution which would have lowered the age from 20 to 18. This was the only part of the proposed Constitution the voters rejected. The vote was 72,930 (yes), 80,660 (no).

In 1969, the legislature approved an 18-year-old vote amendment. The voters will pass judgment in 1970.

IDAHO

We have no record of any action in the Idaho legislature through the 1963 session.

ILLINOIS

During the 1961 session two proposals to lower the age to 19 were introduced in the Senate—S.J.R. 16 and S.J.R. 18—without further action thereon. During that session an 18-year-old vote proposal was introduced in the House—H.J.R. 4. It died in committee. H.J.R. 22, a 19-year-old vote resolution, was reported favorably from committee and voted on June 20, 1961, in the House. The vote was yea, 92, nay, 68, less than the two-thirds approval required by the Constitution.

In 1963 no proposals were introduced relative to lowering the voting age. In the 1965 session an 18-year-old vote resolution was introduced in the House (H.J.R. 32) and a 19-year-old vote resolution in the Senate (S.J.R. 23). Both died in committee.

In 1967, H.J.R. 5 and H.J.R. 39, to lower to 19, died in committee.

INDIANA

The *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* for April 7, 1967, states that the 1967 session of the Indiana Legislature adjourned without taking action on proposals to lower the voting age. No other information could be found on the fate of such proposals in the Indiana Legislature.

IOWA

S.J.R. 13, an 18-year-old vote proposal introduced in the 1961 session, died in committee, H.J.R. 3, also proposing to lower the vote to 18, received an indefinite postponement. There is no record of any proposals being introduced in the 1963 session.

According to the April 7, 1967 *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, the Iowa House, by a vote of 38–80, rejected during the 1967 session a proposal to lower the voting age (no age figure given in the report).

KANSAS

During the 1961 session, an 18-year-old vote resolution (S.C.R. 4) died in committee. A similar proposal introduced in the 1963 session (S.C.R. 15) also died in committee. There is no record of any proposal being introduced during the 1965 session.

S.C.R. 8 to lower to 18, died in committee in 1967. In 1968, S.C.R. 36, to lower to 19, died in committee while H.C.R. 1065, to lower to 18, was unfavorably reported.

KENTUCKY

The voting age has been 18 in Kentucky since 1955 (see part two of this report).

LOUISIANA

In 1968, the House defeated, 64 to 28 (6 short of the necessary 70), a bill to lower the age to 20. As originally introduced the measure would have lowered the age to 18, it was amended to age 20. (*The Times-Picayune*, July 5, 1968).

MAINE

In March 1963, as reported in the *National Civic Review*, the Maine Constitutional Commission recommended lowering the voting age to 20; the Legislature did not act on this recommendation.

During the 1963 session, H.P. 431 (L.D. 636), a proposal to permit those 18 years old to vote if they passed an examination in U.S. history, government, and economy, was reported from committee with recommendation that it not pass. The report was a divided one but the House sustained the majority recommendation, as did the Senate.

During the 1965 session, H.P. 433 (L.D. 562), to lower the voting age to 18, was reported with recommendation that it not pass. The House accepted this report. It also upheld do-not-pass recommendations for H.P. 376 (L.D. 478), a 20-year-old voting amendment, and for H.P. 255 (L.D. 325), a 19-year-old voting amendment.

In the Senate in 1965 S.P. 153 (L.D. 394), a proposal to lower the voting age to 20 (originally 18, but amended to 20), was passed 27–3 on May 20. In the House, S.P. 153, was defeated (yeas 83, nays, 62) when it failed to obtain a required two-thirds approval on May 19.

In a 1966 session, no proposals to lower the voting age were introduced.

In 1969, the legislature passed a 20-year-old amendment. The voters will render their verdict in 1970.

MARYLAND

In the 1963 session, S. B. 78 and H. B. 133 were introduced to lower the voting age to 18. They died in committee. So did S. B. 184, and 18-year-old vote resolution introduced in the 1964 session. In 1965, H. B. 232, a proposal to submit an 18-year-old vote amendment to referendum, died in committee. S. B. 48, to lower to 18, introduced in the 1965 session, was unfavorably reported from committee. That report was sustained in the Senate by a vote of 23–6.

The Constitution submitted in 1968 for the approval of Maryland voters included a provision for voting by persons 19 and older. It was defeated by the voters 283,050 to 366,575.

In 1967, H. B. 164, to lower to 18, died in Committee. In 1969, a 19-year-old amendment was defeated in the House 73–61, after receiving initial approval 93–36. The Senate had earlier given its approval to 19-year-old voting 30–8 (March 6, 1969).

MASSACHUSETTS

A special report of the Legislative Research Council, prepared in 1968 under directive of S. No. 934 (1967), found that between 1943 and 1967, 91 measures to lower the voting age were introduced in the Massachusetts legislature: 86 to lower to 18, 3 to 19, and 2 to age 20.

"In some instances, the committee on Constitutional Law reported the bills favorably and one bill, Senate, No. 19 of 1955, was ordered to a third reading by the joint legislative convention. However, none of the bills were passed, and there did not appear to be any formidable support for these proposals prior to 1967."

In 1967, the General Court, in joint convention, approved House, No. 2537, reducing the voting age to 19. That approval was confirmed again by the General Court in 1969. It will be submitted to the voters in 1970. If the voters approve, the age will be lowered to 19, effective 1972.

(See above, the table of State action on voting age proposals for a recapitulation of the voting age bills introduced in Massachusetts.)

MICHIGAN

In 1964, S. Res. 88, to create a special committee of five Senators to study the issue of a lower voting age and its ramifications, was adopted in the Senate. The House adopted a similar proposal that year, H. Res. 110.

In 1965, the Senate adopted S. Res. 166, which continued the five-member committee to study the issue of a lower voting age. In 1966, however, the Senate did not act on S. Res. 319, a resolution to appoint an interim committee to study the legal ramifications of a lower voting age.

In the 1966 elections, the Michigan voters defeated a referendum to lower the voting age to 18 by a vote of 1,267,872 to 703,076.

MINNESOTA

In the 1965 legislative session, three 18-year-old vote proposals were introduced but died in committee. They were S.F. No. 792, H.F. No. 271, and H.F. 1397.

In 1967, five voting age proposals, S.F. 36 (18), S.F. 47 (18), S.F. 571 (19), S.F. 900 (18), and H.F. 56 (18), died in committee.

In 1969, the legislature approved an amendment lowering the age to 19. This proposal will be on the ballot November 1970.

MISSISSIPPI

Legislative Journals for Mississippi indicate that no proposals to lower the voting age were introduced in the 1961, 1962, or 1966 sessions. These were the only Journals available.

MISSOURI

In 1961, H.J.R. 5 (H.J.R. 10), to lower the voting age to 18, passed the House on February 28 by a vote of 84–52. It died in the Senate.

In 1965, H.J.R. 10, to lower the voting age to 18, was defeated in the House on March 10 by a vote of 54–104.

MONTANA

There is no record of action in the Legislature during the 1961 session.

The Senate approved a 19-year-old vote proposal in 1967 but it died in the House.

In 1969 approval was given to a 19-year-old amendment. The House approved the measure 84–17 and the Senate 46–7. It will be submitted to the voters in 1970.

NEBRASKA

The Journals for 1960, 1961, 1963, 1965, and 1966 indicate that no proposals to lower the voting age were introduced in the unicameral Nebraska Legislature.

The *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* for April 7, 1967, reported that the 1967 session of the Legislature approved a 19-year-old-voting age amendment which was submitted to the voters in a 1968 referendum. In 1968 the proposal to lower the voting age to 19 was defeated 246,672 to 255,051.

The legislature in 1969 approved a 20-year-old vote amendment. This proposal will be submitted to the voters in 1970.

NEVADA

No voting age resolutions were introduced in the 1961 or the 1963–64 sessions. In the 1965 sessions, S.J.R. 3, to lower the voting age to 18 (as recommended by Governor Grant Sawyer), was reported from committee without recommendation. It passed the Senate on March 31, 1965, by a vote of 11–6 (in Nevada a proposed amendment must receive approval in two consecutive legislatures and then be submitted to the voters). In the House, a floor amendment to change the age from 18 to 19 was defeated. The resolution was also defeated by a 12–17 vote.

Scholastic Teacher, May 2, 1969, reports that the Nevada legislature approved an 18-year-old voting age amendment. It must reapprove in 1971 to place the question on the 1972 ballot.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

No voting age resolutions were introduced in either the 1961 or 1963 sessions. In the 1965 session, C.R. 3, to lower the voting age to 18, was defeated in the House June 21, 1965.

In 1967, H.C.R. 13, to lower to 18, was killed by the House on recommendation of the committee.

NEW JERSEY

No voting age resolutions were introduced in the 1960, the 1962, the 1963, or the 1965 sessions. In 1961, A.C.R. 40 would have lowered the age to 20. It died in committee. In 1964, S.C.R. 7 proposed a referendum on lowering the voting age to 19. It died in committee.

In 1966, A. C. R. 9 (or 4), a 19-year-old amendment, died in the Senate (which probably means it passed the House).

In 1966, the legislature approved an 18-year-old amendment. The vote in the Senate was 30–0. We have no record of the vote in the Assembly. The voters rejected the proposal decisively in November 1969.

NEW MEXICO

Scholastic Teacher, May 2, 1969, reported that the New Mexico legislature was considering voting age proposals with a good probability of action before adjournment. However, no final action was taken.

NEW YORK

No action was taken on the following resolutions to lower the voting age to 18 introduced in the 1960 session of the legislature; (in the Assembly) 90, 1398, 2509, 3257; (in the Senate) 987, 1968. Also introduced in 1960 was a 19-year-old vote resolution (169 in the Assembly) on which no action was taken.

No action was taken on the following 18-year-old vote resolutions introduced in the 1961 session: (in the Assembly) 17, 362, 734, 1450, 1662, 1688, 1928, 2380, 2627, 4510; (in the Senate) 147; 1119. Nor was any action taken on a 19-year-old vote resolution (271) and a 20-year-old vote resolution (2402) introduced in the Assembly.

No action was taken in the 1962 session on the following 18-year-old vote resolutions: (in the Assembly) 158, 724, 1078, 1121, 1290, 1530, 1533, 2142, 2185, 2810, 3297; (in the Senate) 302, 819. Nor was action taken on a 19-year-old vote resolution (401 in the Assembly).

In 1963 no action was taken on the following 18-year-old vote resolutions introduced in the Assembly: 110, 217, 452, 664, 1956, 1970, 2063, 2116.

No action was taken on the following 18-year-old vote resolutions introduced in the 1964 session: (in the Assembly) 69, 265, 480, 882, 1326, 1646, 2759, 2831, 3058, 3261; (in the Senate) 531.

No action was taken on the following 18-year-old vote resolutions introduced in the Assembly in the 1965 session: 81, 414, 474, 1296, 1552, 1663, 2595, 3069.

The *National Civic Review* noted in its May 1966 issue that in February 1966 the Assembly approved a measure to lower the voting age to 18. The Senate Majority Leader announced, however, that the Senate would take no action on the resolution in view of the Constitutional Convention to be held in 1967.

The issue of lowering the voting age was considered during the 1967 Constitutional Convention. On July 17, the Convention delegates defeated a proposed voting age of 19 by a 165–8 vote, and a proposed voting age of 20 by a voice vote. They then voted 102–76 to maintain the voting age at 21. On July 18, the delegates gave initial approval to a provision in the Constitution stipulating 21 as the voting age but authorizing the legislature to lower that to as low as 18. Once the age was lowered, it could not then be increased. The vote of approval was 95–83. On September 7, 1967, the delegates gave final approval to this provision by a 139–30 vote after defeating an attempt to lower the voting age to 20 (97–60) and defeating an attempt to eliminate the Legislature's power to lower the voting age (92–67).

The voters of New York, however, rejected the proposed Constitution at the November 1967 election by a 3–1 margin.

The *New York Times* indicates that 18-year-old voting age amendments were killed by both House and Senate committees in 1969.

NORTH CAROLINA

There were no voting age proposals introduced in the 1961 session of the legislature. In 1963 S. B. 57 and H. B. 107, to lower the voting age to 18, were introduced. H. B. 107 was reported unfavorably; no vote was taken on the report. S. B. 57 died in committee. No proposals were introduced in the 1965 session.

NORTH DAKOTA

The April 7, 1967 *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report* notes that the Legislature approved a 19-year-old voting age amendment, which went to the voters in a September 1968 referendum. It was rejected, narrowly, 59,034 to 61,813.

OHIO

No action was taken during 1961 on proposals to lower the voting age to 18 (S. J. R. 9, H. J. R. 6) or a proposal to lower to 19 (H. J. R. 17). S. J. R. 23, an 18-year-old vote resolution introduced in the 1963 session died in committee. The Ohio legislature passed a 19-year-old vote amendment in 1969, which was rejected in November of that year by the voters, 1,274,334 against to 1,226,592 for.

OKLAHOMA

No proposals were introduced in the 1963 session to lower the voting age.

In 1965, S.J.R. 24, to lower to 19(?), was reported by committee but died on the calendar. In 1967, S.J.R. 12, to lower to 19, passed the Senate 35–7, March 7, 1967, but died in the House Committee. S.J.R. 10, to lower to 19 for members of the armed forces or veterans, died in committee.

OREGON

The April 1962 *National Civic Review* reported that the Oregon Constitutional Revision Commission, on February 23, 1962, recommended retaining the 21-year-old voting age.

No voting age proposals were introduced in the 1963 session. In 1965, H.J.R. 43 would have lowered the voting age to 18. It died in committee.

The Oregon Senate rejected an amendment to lower the voting age (presumably to 18) in 1967. As reported in the April 7, 1967 *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, the vote was 12–17.

The legislature passed a 19-year-old vote amendment in 1968. It goes to the voters in November, 1970.

PENNSYLVANIA

In the 1963 session, S.B. 809 and H.B. 337, to lower the voting age to 18, died in committee. The same fate awaited S.B. 6, and S.B. 11, 18-year-old vote resolutions introduced in 1964.

H.B. 72, an 18-year-old vote proposal introduced in the 1965 session, was approved by the House, 149–55, on January 4, 1966. The Senate failed to take action on H.B. 72. S.B. 27 and S.B. 157, to lower to 18, were introduced in the Senate in 1965 but died in committee.

It was noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 6, page 7894, that the Pennsylvania House had passed a 19-year-old vote bill and, earlier, that the Senate had passed an 18-year-old vote bill. The differing measures died in conference.

RHODE ISLAND

A Constitutional Convention was held over a three-year period (1965–67) in Rhode Island. Newspaper reports do not indicate whether serious consideration was given to lowering the voting age. More than 200 proposals were submitted for consideration at the convening of the Convention and it is possible that a lower voting age was among them. The final document as approved in September 1967 did not contain any provision pertaining to a lower voting age. (Note: Due to negative prospects for adoption of the new charter, it was not submitted, as planned, to the voters in the 1967 fall elections. Plans now call for reconvening the Convention to make certain alterations in the document. There is no indication that any consideration might be given to debating a lower voting age.)

SOUTH DAKOTA

No voting age proposals were introduced during the 1961, 1963, and 1964 sessions.

TENNESSEE

No voting age proposals were introduced in either the 1961 or 1963 sessions.

In 1967–68, S. J. R. 13, a voting age amendment, died in committee. In November 1968, the voters rejected a referendum proposal to allow the Constitutional Convention to consider lowering the voting age to 18.

TEXAS

No voting age proposals were introduced during the 1961 or 1962 sessions. In 1963, H. J. R. 12, to lower the voting age to 18, was amended on the House floor to change the age limit to 19 but defeated ultimately by a vote of 92–51. A vote of 100 is required in order for an amendment to pass the House.

UTAH

No voting age proposals were introduced in either the 1961 or 1963 sessions.

VERMONT

There is no record of any voting age proposals being introduced through 1966.

In 1967, H. 370, a bill to provide that any attempt to lower the voting age to 18 in 1968 must be preceded by notification at town meetings, died in committee.

VIRGINIA

During the 1966 session, S. J. R. 33 and H. J. R. 4, to lower the voting age to 18, died in committee. In 1968, S. J. R. 7, to permit voting by those 18 and older serving in the armed forces, and S. J. R. 45, to lower to 18, died in Senate committee. H. J. R. 59, to lower to 18, died in the House committee. In 1969, the Virginia legislature, after giving thought to permitting an 18-year-old amendment on the ballot, decided not to submit the question to the voters.

WASHINGTON

In 1961, S.J.R. 29, an 18-year-old vote resolution, was introduced but died in committee. The same fate occurred to S.J.R. 3 and H.J.R. 2, 18-year-old vote resolutions introduced in the 1963 session.

In 1965, H.J.R. 10, to lower to 19, was favorably reported from committee but did not come to a vote. H.J.R. 22, to lower to 19, died in committee. In 1967, H.J.R. 14 and H.J.R. 26, to lower to 18, died in committee. S.J.R. 15, to lower to 18, with floor amendment to make 18 the age of majority, was defeated 25–20, March 6, 1967.

WEST VIRGINIA

H.R. 83, an 18-year-old resolution introduced in the 1963 session, died in committee.

WISCONSIN

During the 1963 session, 435, A, an 18-year-old vote referendum proposal, was approved by the Assembly, April 17, 1963, by a 54–38 vote. The Senate refused to concur in the Assembly's action. The Senate postponed action on 116, S that same year. It proposed to revise the statutes to lower the voting age to 18.

WYOMING

Scholastic Teacher, May 2, 1969, reports that the Wyoming legislature passed a 19-year-old vote proposal. It will be submitted to the voters in 1970 and, if approved, become effective in 1972. The *National Civic Review*, April 1969 (p. 165) reports that the Wyoming Senate amended this 19-year-old proposal to deny the ballot to any male with long hair. This provision, however, was not retained.

PART II: STATE ACTION TO LOWER THE VOTING AGE, 1943–60

(NOTE.—This L.R.S. Report was reprinted in an Appendix to hearings held in 1961 on the nomination and election of the President and Vice President and on qualifications for voting. The full citation to the document is given below.

(U.S. Cong., Senate Comte. on the Judiciary. Subcomte. on Constitutional Amendments Nomination & Election of President and Vice President and qualifications for voting Appendix to hearings . . . pt. 4. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1961. p. 859–866.

(The following is a study prepared by Walter Kravitz, Government and General Research Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, dated March 28, 1961.)

INTRODUCTION

Since the introduction in the 78th Congress, 1st session, of House Joint Resolution 39, calling for a constitutional amendment to extend the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older, at least 47 State governments have dealt with the matter of lowering the voting age in one way or another. This report presents a State-by-State survey of such action, followed by a summary of the most important of these.

The information has been compiled from a variety of sources. A completely thorough and exhaustive study would require examination of every State journal of the period under consideration. Few of these are available to us, and it would take many months to check those that are. We have, nevertheless, spot-checked some State journals when provided with specific leads from other sources.

Undoubtedly, we have caught only a fraction of the instances in which bills were introduced only to die in committee. But we have included, we believe, every major State action in this field, especially every instance in which the matter was put to a referendum.

Except for West Virginia, specific age qualifications for voting are embodied by all States in their constitutions; any change, therefore, requires, a constitutional amendment.[1] Wherever pertinent, the method of amendment is explained below.

ALABAMA

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. We have no record of any action since 1943.

ALASKA

The State entered the Union in 1959 under a constitution approved by a 2 to 1 majority of the voters on April 24, 1956. All citizens 19 years of age and older are entitled to vote.

ARIZONA

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. We have no record of any action since 1943.

ARKANSAS

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. In the same year, the lower house approved the resolution 84–68, but the senate voted it down, 37 to 15. We have no word of any action since 1943.

CALIFORNIA

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. We have no record of any action since 1943.

CONNECTICUT

Proposals to lower the voting age to 18 were introduced in the legislature in 1955 and 1957. In both years the responsible house committee rejected the measures.

DELAWARE

In 1949 a bill to lower the voting age, H.B. 103, died in committee. In 1951 another house bill was similarly handled, while a senate measure, S.B. 187 was favorably reported but not acted upon. In 1953 a proposal to amend the constitution by lowering the voting age to 18 was passed by the lower house 30–1; the senate did not act. An identical measure, S.B. 31, was passed by the senate by a vote of 16 to 1 in 1955 and receiver a 11 to 12 majority in the house, but the latter was less than the required constitutional majority and the bill failed.

FLORIDA

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It was defeated. In 1951, five resolutions to the same effect were introduced. One, H.J.R. 71, received the required three-fifths constitutional majority of the house, by a vote of 77 to 13, on April 18. On April 25 the measure failed in the Senate 9–29. In 1953, three bills were introduced; none gained committee approval. S.J.R. 204, in the legislature of 1955, passed the constitutional test in the senate on April 26 by a vote of 26 to 10, and on the following day a reconsideration motion was defeated, 13–24. In the house the measure was approved by the committee and put on the calendar, but never came to a vote. Measures to lower the voting age introduced in 1957 and 1959 were either pigeon-holed or reported unfavorably.

GEORGIA

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It was passed by the senate on February 11, and by the house on March 3. The electorate ratified the amendment on August 3, 1943, by a majority of better than 2 to 1: yes, 42,284; no, 19,682.

[1] West Virginia's constitution bars minors, the word being defined by statute.

HAWAII

The State entered the Union in 1959 under the constitution of 1950, which lowered the voting age to 20.

IDAHO

Measures to lower the voting age were introduced in both houses in 1951, and were defeated. In 1959 a proposal to amend the constitution so as to lower the voting age to 19 received the necessary vote of two-thirds of all members of each of the two houses, voting separately. A referendum was accordingly held at the next general election, that of November 1960. The measure was defeated: yes, 113,594; no, 155,548.

ILLINOIS

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. Similar resolutions were pigeon-holed in both houses in 1945, 1947, 1949, 1951, and 1953. In 1955 and 1957 resolutions were brought to the floor of the house, but both were defeated.

INDIANA

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. Constitutional amendments must secure majorities in each house in two successive legislatures, plus a vote by the electorate, in order to succeed. A proposal to lower the voting age was passed by the legislature in 1945, but apparently failed in the next legislature. In 1953, a proposed amendment to give the vote to those 19 years of age and older was passed by both houses, but it was rejected by the 1955 legislature.

IOWA

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. Similar resolutions were pigeonholed in 1949, 1953, 1957, and 1959.

KANSAS

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee, as did similar measures in 1945, 1947, and 1949. In 1951, another resolution received the vote of a majority in one house, 69–50, but failed to get the required two-thirds vote. In the 1953, 1955, 1957, and 1959 legislatures other resolutions were introduced; none went beyond a second reading.

KENTUCKY

An amendment to lower the voting age was introduced in the legislature in 1946 but was never reported out of committee. In 1948, 1950, and 1952, similar proposals were released by the committees only to die or be defeated on the floor. In 1954 the legislature approved, by the required three-fifths of the members elected to each house, a proposal to submit to the voters a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18. The referendum took place on November 9, 1955, and the amendment passed, by a 2 to 1 margin.

LOUISIANA

A proposal to lower the voting age was introduced in the legislature as H. 3 in 1946. It was favorably reported from committee but, on June 21, failed in a floor vote, 32–39. Of three similar measures introduced in the same session, two died in committee and the other was buried in the calendar. In 1948, a proposal to amend the constitution to lower the voting age to 18, H. 101, was reported favorably on June 3, and received a majority vote of the house, 48–39, on June 7. The State constitution, however, requires a constitutional two-thirds vote for amendment, so the measure failed. In 1950 H. 739, and in 1952 S. 27, both proposing a lowering of the voting age to 18, died either in committee or on the calendar.

MAINE

Proposals for a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 were introduced to the legislature in 1943, 1945, 1947, 1951, and 1953. No action was taken on any of them. In 1957, a similar measure was unfavorably reported by the committee and the house upheld the report, 77–34, on April 26.

MARYLAND

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. A similar proposal died in the house of delegates in 1953. In the following year, 1954, the same measure managed to reach the senate floor, where it was defeated by a vote of 14–14. Th State's constitution requires a favorable three-fifths vote of all members of each house to place a proposal on the ballot. In 1957 another attempt to lower the voting age was smothered in committee, despite the support of Governor McKeldin. In 1959 the proposal was reintroduced and, on March 6, was approved by the senate judicial proceedings committee. Three days later, in a test vote, the senate gave the bill a 16–11 majority, but on March 11 it reversed itself and defeated the measure, 15–14. A similar proposal was denied clearance, during the same year, by the house judiciary committee.

MASSACHUSETTS

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the general court in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. Similar proposals were reported favorably but did not come to a floor vote in 1951, failed in committee in 1952, and were again reported favorably but did not come to the floor in 1953.

In his annual message of January 6, 1954, Gov. Christian Herter endorsed the move to amend the constitution to extend the vote to 18-year-olds. In the same year the proposal reached the floor of the senate, but was defeated. In 1955, a similar measure was taken as far as the joint session of the general court, only to fail. In 1956 the State's Governor again recommended lowering the voting age and the matter was again taken as far as a joint session, where it was defeated. In 1958 there was a favorable committee report, but no further action. In 1959 the joint session of the general court again rejected the proposal.

MICHIGAN

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It was defeated. In 1953 four measures were introduced; all died in committee. In 1954, H. J. R. "B," a proposal to lower the voting age to 19, was reported favorably. On the floor the resolution received a 54–38 majority, but failed for lack of the required constitutional two-thirds. Measures introduced in 1955, 1957, and 1959 all died in committee.

MINNESOTA

Constitutional amendments to lower the voting age to 18 were introduced in the legislature in 1943, 1947, and 1949. They were all either defeated or pigeon-holed in committee. In 1953, a similar measure was put to a vote in the house, on March 3. The vote was 63 to 62 in favor, but the measure was nevertheless lost because it did not receive a majority vote of the total house membership. In the same year, a similar senate proposal died in committee.

MISSISSIPPI

In 1953 one senate and two house proposals to amend the constitution so as to lower the voting age died in committee. One house resolution was reported, but was not brought up for a vote. On March 4, 1954, the senate rejected a measure designed to lower the voting age to 18.

MISSOURI

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. We have no record of any action since 1943.

MONTANA

In 1951, S. 96, a proposal to lower the voting age, was defeated in the senate by a vote of 22 to 26. In 1957, H.B. 41, which proposed lowering the voting age to 18, passed the house 72 to 19, but was rejected by the senate.

NEBRASKA

Two proposals were introduced in the legislature in 1943 to amend the constitution so as to lower the voting age to 18, L.B. 345 and L.B. 382. Both were lost by postponement. In 1945, a similar measure, L.B. 129, was postponed by a vote of 28 to 10. In 1953, L.B. 201, another proposal, failed to get on the general file. In the 1957 session, L.B. 27, to lower the voting age to 18, died in committee.

NEVADA

A joint resolution was introduced in the assembly in 1953 to lower the voting age. It passed that body by a vote of 25 to 18. In the senate the proposal died in committee.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. A similar proposal, S. 6, was defeated in the Senate in 1951.

NEW JERSEY

A constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 was introduced in the legislature in 1943. It died on the calendar. In 1953, a similar measure, Con. Res. 6 died in committee. In his annual message to the legislature in 1955, Governor Meyner urged that the voting age be lowered to 18. We have no record of any legislative action.

NEW YORK

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It was favorably reported and approved by the assembly, 77–59, but the senate failed to vote on the measure. In 1953 a similar proposal, S. 453, was defeated in the senate. The New York Times, on January 21, 1954, reported that Governor Dewey, at a news conference, expressed doubt about the advisability of lowering the voting age. In 1957, Governor Harriman urged the legislature to lower the voting age to 18. A proposal to lower it to 19 was introduced in the legislature but received no action. Governor Harriman repeated his recommendation in his 1958 annual message, without result.

NORTH CAROLINA

The senate defeated a bill to lower the voting age by a vote of 15 to 30 in 1951. We have no record of any other legislative action.

NORTH DAKOTA

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. In 1953 a similar proposal was defeated.

OHIO

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. The Congressional Digest, in its March 1954 issue, page 72, state that "several measures have been defeated on the floor during the past 19 years." In 1958, two proposals to lower the voting age to 18 died in committee, one in each house. In 1959, according to the New York Times, June 12, 1959, the house passed a resolution to lower the voting age to 18, and sent the measure to the senate. Apparently the latter body never acted on the proposal.

OKLAHOMA

A constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 was introduced in the legislature in 1943. It died in committee. The 1951 session of the legislature passed H.J.R. 9, to amend the constitution to lower the voting age to 18, by the necessary constitutional majorities, and the proposal was put to a referendum in November 1952. It was overwhemingly defeated: no, 639,224; yes, 233,-094. No proposals to lower the voting age have been submitted in the legislature since 1952.

OREGON

A constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 was introduced in the legislature as H.J.R. 1 in 1943. It died in committee. A similar measure, H.J.R. 7, suffered the same fate in 1953. In 1955, a senate-initiated resolution, S.J.R. 1, passed the senate on March 24 by a vote of 21 to 9, but the measure died in the house committee. Two resolutions in 1957 and one in 1959, all designed to lower the voting age to 18 or 19, were pigeonholed in committee.

PENNSYLVANIA

A constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18 was introduced in the legislature in 1943. It died in committee. According to the *Congressional Digest* of March 1954, page 72, two bills to lower the voting age, S. 1 and H. 8, died in 1953, "as have other earlier measures since 1943." On May 24, 1957, the house of representatives approved, by a vote of 159 to 1, a measure to reduce the voting age to 18. The senate had previously passed the bill unanimously. Under the State's constitution, passage by the next legislature was required before the matter could be put to a referendum. Apparently the 1959 legislature did not take the necessary affirmative action.

RHODE ISLAND

A measure to lower the voting age was defeated in the legislature in 1953. We have no record of any other action.

SOUTH CAROLINA

In 1953 the legislature rejected a proposal to lower the voting age. In his 1954 annual message to the legislature, Governor Byrnes recommended that the State constitution be amended to give 18-year-olds the vote. We have no record of any other legislative action.

SOUTH DAKOTA

This State is unique in having twice rejected by referendum proposals to lower the voting age to 18. A measure passed by the legislature in 1951 was submitted to the voters in 1952. It lost by 685 votes: no, 128,916; yes, 128,231. The legislature rejected a similar amendment in 1954, but in 1957 it again chose to put the question to the electorate. On November 5, 1958, the proposal was decisively defeated: no, 137,942; yes, 71,033.

TENNESSEE

In 1957 the legislature acted favorably upon a resolution to submit to the people a proposed amendment to the constitution to lower the voting age to 18. The State's amending process requires that two successive legislatures approve a measure before submission to a referendum. In 1959, instead of reapproving the 1957 proposal, the legislature called a constitutional convention to consider, as one of its four topics, the lowering of the voting age to 18. The convention met in Nashville on July 21. On July 30 the convention vote, 60–33, to leave the constitutional age provision unchanged. It also voted, 58–35, against reducing the minimum to 18, and rejected two proposals to reduce the vote age to 20.

TEXAS

A constitutional amendment was introduced in the legislature in 1943 to lower the voting age to 18. It died in committee. A similar bill was similarly treated in 1945. In 1949 H. J. R. 6 was favorably reported by the committee, but was then recommitted by the house. We have no record of any other legislative action.

UTAH

In 1943 and 1953 constitutional amendments were introduced in the legislature to lower the voting age to 18. All died in committee. In 1955, a similar resolution, H. J. R. 3, was passed by the house, 40–18, but was rejected by the senate committee. In 1959, another proposal, S. J. R. 6, was similarly disposed of by the senate committee.

VIRGINIA

Proposals to amend the constitution so as to lower the voting age to 18 were introduced in the legislatures in 1954, 1956, and 1958. All died in committee.

WASHINGTON

Two proposals to amend the constitution so as to lower the voting age to 18 were introduced in the legislature in 1943—H. J. R. 9 and S. J. R. 6. Both died in committee. In 1945, as H. J. R. 2, the proposal was favorably reported and, on February 23, received a majority vote, 49 to 48, in the House. Since this fell far short of the required constitutional two-thirds vote, the measure was lost. Similar measures died in committee in the legislative sessions of 1947, 1949, and 1953. In 1955, another proposal to lower the minimum to 18, H. J. R. 3, was recommended by the committee and passed the house with the required constitutional vote, 71 to 28, on February 15. In the senate the measure was pigeonholed in committee and a motion to discharge the committee and put the resolution on the calendar lost 28 to 18, on March 8. In 1957, three resolutions were introduced: H. J. R. 3, and S. J. R. 3 to lower the minimum of 18 and S. J. R. 27 to lower it to 19. H. J. R. 3 was twice reported favorably by the committee but the proposal was never brought to the floor. In the 1959 session each house received a resolution and in each the resolutions died in committee.

WEST VIRGINIA

Constitutional amendments to lower the voting age to 18 were introduced in the legislature in 1943, 1945, 1951, and 1953. In the first three sessions the measures died in committee. In 1951, on March 6, an attempt to discharge the committee in the House failed, 40 to 48. In 1953 the House committee reported favorably, but no further action was taken. We have no record of legislative action after 1953.

WISCONSIN

A constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18, was introduced in the legislature in 1943. It was adopted by the assembly as J. R. 30 by a vote of 55 to 29, but failed to gain clearance from the Senate committee. In 1945, a similar resolution was rejected by the assembly committee. In 1947, under the designation Jt. Res. 18, A, the proposal to lower the voting age passed through an intricate maze of parliamentary maneuvers ending in a 48–44 vote to pass. The majority not being a constitutional one, the measure failed. In 1951 an 18-year-old voting age proposal was rejected by a Senate committee, and in 1953 an assembly measure to lower the limit to 19 was unfavorably reported.

WYOMING

In 1951, Gov. Frank A. Barrett asked the legislature to lower the minimum voting age to 18. A measure was introduced and defeated. We have no record of any other legislative action.

Summary

Table I lists the five States in which the question of lowering the voting age has been

put to the electorate. In two, Georgia and Kentucky, the question was approved. In three, Idaho, Oklahoma, and South Dakota, it was defeated.

Table II lists the 14 States in which, in addition to those in Table I, at least one nouse of the legislature has approved a proposal to lower the voting age by the required constitutional majority.

TABLE I.—REFERENDA RESULTS

State	Age	Year	Result
Georgia	18	1943	Adopted.
Idaho	19	1960	Defeated.
Kentucky	18	1955	Adopted.
Oklahoma	18	1952	Defeated.
South Dakota	18	1952	Do.
Do	18	1958	Do.

TABLE II.—STATES IN WHICH AT LEAST A SINGLE HOUSE OF THE LEGISLATURE HAS VOTED AFFIRMATIVELY

State	Age	Year	Action
Arkansas	18	1943	Passed in house, defeated in senate.
Delaware	18	1953	Passed in house.
	18	1955	Passed in senate; lacked constitutional majority in house.
Florida	18	1951	Passed in house; defeated in senate.
	18	1955	Passed in senate.
Indiana	18	1945	Passed both houses; failed in next legislature.
	19	1953	Passed both houses; failed in next legislature.
Montana	18	1957	Passed in house; defeated in senate.
Nevada	18	1953	Passed in house.
New York	18	1943	Passed in assembly.
Ohio	18	1959	Passed in house.
Oregon	18	1955	Passed in senate.
Pennsylvania	18	1957	Passed both houses; failed in next legislature.
Tennessee	18	1957	Passed both houses; failed in constitutional convention.
Utah	18	1955	Passed in house.
Washington	18	1955	Passed in house.
Wisconsin	18	1943	Passed in assembly.

NEW COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION SHOULD BE VOCATIONAL EDUCATOR

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I call upon the new Secretary of HEW and President Nixon to consider appointing a vocational educator as new U.S. Commissioner of Education.

It occurs to me that much of the disturbance in our high schools today is the result of the disenchantment by young people in the curriculum that they get in the schools and that much of the unrest in our colleges can be traced to the failure of the high school programs.

Our Nation will reach a trillion-dollar gross national product before this year is over, and then in the next 9 years we will reach a $2-trillion GNP.

With the enormous manpower needs of America coupled with the disenchantment of many of our youngsters in their present school programs, it occurs to me that the appointment of a vocational educator as U.S. Commissioner of Education can make a significant move toward bringing together the needs of basic education—teaching youngsters the verbal skills and teaching them how to read and write and do their arithmetic—and at the same time give them occupational orientation by preparing them for the world of work.

Until we adopt a national goal to give every American youngster graduating from high school a marketable skill upon graduation, we will continue to see generation after generation of young people walking around aimlessly and hopelessly looking toward the future.

One of the great tragedies of our time is the thousands upon thousands of these men and women who graduate from high school in this country, who, when they go into the world of work, are totally unprepared for gainful employment. For that reason I hope that the President will name a vocational educator as the new U.S. Commissioner of Education.

I would not presume to tell the President who to select but may I call attention to Dr. Rupert Evans, who until recently was dean of the school of education at the University of Illinois at Champaign. Dr. Evans is a basic educator, but is also one of the most highly respected scholars among vacational educators. He is a member of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. I believe he would be an excellent choice for U.S. Commissioner of Education.

ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS FOR RECEIPT OF THE GOLD STAR INSIGNIA

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

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with this opportunity to speak in behalf of my bill, H.R. 10772. The purpose of the bill is to reestablish the eligibility standards for receipt of the Gold Star insignia which prevailed prior to the enactment of Public Law 89–534.

Before this time, it was the practice to award the pin to the next of kin of any serviceman who died in the line of duty. A narrow criterion prevailed after 1966, and the award was made only in cases where the serviceman's death occurred in Southeast Asia, because he was assumed to be involved in "military operations involving conflict with an opposing force."

My interest in proposing a change in the legislation to allow the earlier standards to also prevail developed out of correspondence I had with Mrs. Alice Hopseker, who was the department president, Department of New York, American Gold Star Mothers, and with the commander of the Onondaga County, N.Y., Veterans Council, Mr. Robert Srogi. Both Mrs. Hopseker and Mr. Srogi had been the recipients of a sufficient number of inquiries about the unavailability of the pin to ask for my help. I want to commend these two citizens for their interest and their perseverance in attempting to aid others who called on them for help.

I feel that the issue here is a simple one. I believe that the Gold Star insignia should be a symbol of the Nation's remembrance to the families of decreased servicemen, who died in the line of duty, and I do not believe that there should be any criterion but this.

RIGHT TO REFRAIN RECOGNIZED AS VITAL ISSUE IN POSTAL REFORM BILL

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, an increasing number of newspapers and other publications throughout the United States have come to recognize compulsory unionism as a vital part of the pending postal reform bill. They include the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the Lynchburg, Va., News, the Williamsport, Pa., Grit, the Dallas Morning News, the New York Daily News, the Philadelphia Bulletin, as well as the current issue of U.S. News & World Report.

I am herewith inserting for the RECORD copies of editorials or comments from all of these publications:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat June 6, 1970]

NO POSTAL UNION SHOP

In its eagerness to get postal workers back on the job, the Nixon Administration made an error which Congress probably will have to correct.

It reportedly agreed to a provision in the postal reform bill that would allow unions to press for a union shop. The Post Office wouldn't have to grant such a demand, but if it came to arbitration, there could be a ruling in favor of compulsory unionism.

Even though the proposed new postal corporation would have a certain independent status it undoubtedly will require heavy federal subsidies and its employes will still be, for all practical purposes, federal employes.

This then would set a dangerous precedent and make it a virtual certainty that all federal employes could ultimately be compelled to join a union to hold their jobs.

It has been official government policy for years that no federal employe shall be compelled to join a union.

There is no justification for changing the policy despite heavy union pressure. Congress must protect federal employes' right to join or not to join a union by eliminating this provision.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, June 6, 1970]

POSTAL REFORM BILL ENCOURAGES COMPULSORY UNIONISM

We don't have filibusters any more. We have "extended debate."

The Nixon Administration, trying to stave off a final disposition of the Cooper-Church Amendment that would cut off any funds to our allies as well as to our own troops for fighting in Cambodia after June 30, has been quite happy to see everybody oratory-happy in the long, hot Senate afternoons. If the U.S. can make a great success of it in Cambodia before withdrawing our ground forces at the end of the month, the dove Senators will look both churlish and foolish if they reward the victory of tying the President's hands in Southeast Asia for the future. A Cooper-Church success in depriving the Commander-in-Chief of the right to use money to protect the country would boomerang at the polls if any disaster befell U.S. forces as they are being extricated from Southeast Asia.

However, if the Administration has wel-

comed "extended debate" on Cambodia, it isn't going to like the same sort of "stretch-it-out" talk that is promised when the postal reform bill comes to the Senate floor. As the postal reform bill is now constituted, it would permit post office employee unions to bargain collectively with the Federal government, or any public postal authority, for a compulsory union shop. Postmaster General Winton Blount has made a deal with AFL–CIO President George Meany on the union shop issue in order to get labor support for the rest of her reform package. The deal is the more egregious because two Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon himself, have issued executive orders in the past proclaiming that federal employees should have the right to join or to refrain from joining unions as they see fit.

The White House would like to see the postal reform bill go through without calling the attention of the nation to the fact that Nixon is sanctioning a bug-out on his own words and those of Jack Kennedy. But the White House isn't going to have its way.

At least twenty Senators are up in arms over the attempt to saddle the country with compulsory unionism for federal workers. Senator Fannin of Arizona, who is running for re-election, heads the opposition to the Blount sellout, and the crunch will come when his colleagues are forced to vote on his amendment, which would knock the compulsory feature out of the postal reform legislation. Before the vote comes, Senator Tower of Texas, Senator Baker of Tennessee, Senators Hruska and Curtis of Nebraska, Senator Holland of Florida and Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania will all have had their say in support the right of postal employees voluntarily to decline union membership. They will be joined by other Senators; after all, there are nineteen Right-to-Work states that have their own laws against union compulsion. And some of the Senators are prepared to talk well into the summer even though "extended debate" thereby become a filibuster.

On the House side of Capitol Hill there has been a bitter exchange between Democrat David Henderson of North Carolina, who is Number Two man on the House Committee for the Post Office and Civil Service, and Democrat Morris Udall of Arizona, the Number Four man. Udall has broadcast a letter accusing the National Right-to-Work Committee of inspiring a mail campaign against the Blount plan. Henderson, in a counter-letter, has said that Udall is deliberately trying to confuse the issue. But whoever or whatever has inspired the mail campaign, it has resulted in more recent mail than anything besides the Cambodia issue. And the letters have been ninety per cent against Winton Blount. The country is apparently ready for a filibuster, too.

The instincts of the opposition to Blount are good. If the AFL–CIO could have six or seven million public employees, plus their dues, delivered into their hands by compulsion, it would turn our whole governmental bureaucracy over to one pressure group. Why go to the bother of organizing a Labor Party if you can get your way from Republican Winton Blount and Republican Richard Nixon?

[From the Williamsport (Pa.) Grit, May 24, 1970]

PUBLIC STAKE IN UNION POWER PUSH

Little wonder an aroused public has been bombarding congress with messages opposing the compulsory unionization of postal workers. There are serious implications in this move, including a further extension of union influences over government harmful to the public interest.

The postal legislation now being considered in Washington is linked with the crippling postal strike of some weeks ago. The walkouts across the nation resulted from failure to grant long-overdue wage increases to post office workers. With postal services in knots, the administration finally moved to correct the inequity, but promises reportedly made to achieve a settlement have yet to be ratified, including a package of post office reforms which provides for compulsory unionization of postal employees.

If this provision is enacted by congress the protection of 750,000 postal workers against forced unionism would be removed. Further, if this protection is breached for postal employees it could lead to forced unionization of all federal workers, who are now shielded by presidential order against compulsory unionism.

And this would not be all. In states such as Pennsylvania that do not have so-called right-to-work laws banning forced unionism, strong efforts are being made to unionize public employees on state and local government levels. These efforts would gain tremendous news support from a union breakthrough in postal legislation. In time, compulsory unionism would be a way of life for public employees on all levels of government everywhere.

And at what price? The public would be even more at the mercy of union leaders. Governmental services could suffer through strikes. Union bosses would also get a multi-million-dollar windfall in the form of dues from government employees, paid by the public in taxes, that could be used to defeat candidates for public offices not to their liking.

Such power over public employees, elected officials, or legislative and other public bodies is intolerable in a free society. Congress must not invite and encourage it by rubber-stamping compulsory unionization for postal workers.

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 28, 1970]

RIGHT TO WORK MENACED

Texas Rep. Graham Purcell says he'll fight to delete the compulsory unionism provision of the post office reorganization bill—and he's right to do so. Compulsory unionism is not justified in any free society—much less the government.

The administration supports the provision as perhaps the price that must be paid for getting the bill through at all, but to do that is to abandon the freedom-of-choice policy that Kennedy and Johnson upheld, and which Nixon originally supported.

Joining a union ought not to be the price of federal employment, which is what the organization of the postal workers will come down to. The provision is not for a closed shop—meaning you have to join the union first—but for a union shop, which means you can come in as nonunion but must join as the price for keeping your job.

The bill may jeopardize states with right-to-work laws, like Texas.

If Texas applied its right-to-work law to postal employes, unionized workers would be likely to charge "unequal protection of the laws" in federal court, arguing that a federal law ought to apply with equal force to all postal workers and that nonunion members weaken bargaining.

It's hard to believe that the courts would allow state laws in effect to amend a federal statute. A defeat of right to work on the postal worker issue would harm right to work everywhere, most severely in areas of federal employment. If the postal workers get union shops, it's a safe bet that other civil servants will, too.

[From the New York Daily News, June 8, 1970]

THE POSTAL REFORM BILL

The postal reform bill will surface on the floor of the House this week after percolating through the congressional machinery for more than a year. Let's hope there will be no such lengthy delays in according its final approval.

Postmaster General Winton Blount believes that the bill as now written preserves all the essentials sought by the Nixon administration when it set out to divorce postal operations from politics and shift them to a public corporation.

The Post Office then would be run as a business—which it is—instead of serving as a plaything for political hacks.

Operating on the old basis, mail handling costs zoomed, efficiency plummeted and morale among postal employes sagged to the point where service was crippled by wildcat walkouts a few weeks back.

The system desperately needs new men, new equipment and new ideas to scour away the rust deposited during years in indifference and neglect. The administration's plan, we feel, would do just that.

One note of caution, however: Some labor bosses want to use the postal reform measure to break down the barriers that prevent unions from fastening the union shop yoke on federal employes. They must be thwarted.

As matters now stand, government workers are free to join—or not join—unions according to their own desires. That right of free choice must be preserved.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, May 29, 1970]

POSTAL REFORM

As if repenting for past misdeeds, a U.S. Senate Committee proposes severing all ties between Congress and the agency it has consistently mismanaged—the Post Office.

The Senate Post Office Committee's version of postal reform—an independent rate-setting commission—is even bolder than the Nixon Administration's.

Where the Administration would tolerate a veto of new rates within 60 days of an announcement, the committee would eliminate the veto altogether.

This leaves the Senate in conflict, for the moment at least, with the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, which set a rate veto deadline of 90 days in legislation reported to the floor last month.

After generations of ruinous political meddling in Post Office affairs, the Senate version deserves the most careful consideration.

The success of the Post Office as an efficient, solvent institution rises or falls on this single question of veto over postal rates.

To retain the veto, as the House proposes, is to further encourage just what reform is supposed to prevent:

Congressional interference in pay rates, promotions and the dispensing of postmasterships.

It would also sacrifice much of the momentum which reform achieved at such terrible cost last March, in the postal strike.

There is, of course, no limiting the power of Congress to intervene in what the Senate committee calls "extraordinary situations"—an obvious "flouting" or disregard of the public interest. However, Congress would exert continuing and quite proper influence on the five-member agency charged with the rate-setting.

The members would be subject to Senate approval.

One other provision, however, in both Senate and House versions, promises confusion and the most virulent kind of politics.

It would permit postal unions to negotiate with the postmaster-general for a union shop in states without right-to-work laws.

Negotiation failing, either side could put the question to binding arbitration.

This hardly squares with Mr. Nixon's declaration less than a year ago that no federal employee should be forced to join a union to keep his job.

Both House and Senate bills need careful revision as they reach the floor—and Congress

steels itself to cutting the ties which has bound it to the Post Office for so many disastrous years.

[From U.S. News & World Report, June 22, 1970]

"UNION SHOP" COMING FOR GOVERNMENT WORKERS?

A bitter fight is shaping up over the role, and power, of unions in the Federal Government. A postal-reform bill has raised fears that all federal workers might have to join a union some day.

Opponents of the "union shop" began a congressional battle in mid-June to block extension of compulsory unionism to employees of the Government.

The immediate question is whether legislation to reform the Post Office should allow unions to negotiate with postal authorities over a contract clause requiring employes to join the bargaining agent and pay dues in order to retain their jobs.

An open door? Foes of the clause contended that the door also is being opened to a "union shop" for labor organizations in other parts of the Federal Government. An executive order now says that federal employees have a right to join unions or refrain from joining.

Supporters of the postal legislation argued that its labor section would only apply to Post Office employes the union-security rules in effect for industrial workers under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, unions and employers can agree to a "union shop" contract forcing all employes to become union members after being hired.

However, that Act also provides that where a State has enacted a law barring the "union shop" the State law will override the federal statute. Nineteen States have these "right to work" laws.

The current debate over compulsory unionism broke out first in the House, but Senators were preparing for an extended argument later.

In the House, the formal fight began on June 9 in a hearing before the Rules Committee, as it prepared to send the Post Office reform measure to the floor for full debate.

Basic provisions of the bill were in line with Nixon Administration proposals for converting the Post Office Department into an independent establishment within the executive branch.

Also included in the measure were labor provisions based on an agreement signed by George Meany, AFL–CIO president, and Postmaster General Winton M. Blount. That April 2 pact—with seven postal unions—came after "wildcat" strikes of postal workers in several cities.

It was agreed then, and the House Committee bill would write it into law, that postal workers could select union bargaining agents through machinery of the National Labor Relations Board.

Also, a postal union could bargain with the proposed new postal service on wages, working conditions—and a "union shop."

Compulsory arbitration. Another clause sets forth that, if negotiations deadlocked, the unsettled issues would be decided by a board of arbitrators. The board's terms would be binding on both sides.

The measure would bar strikes by postal employes, just as walkouts of federal employes now are outlawed.

In attacking the reform measure's labor section, opponents contend that the issue of compulsory unionism could end up before an arbitration board, which might order a "union shop."

Or, officials of the postal service might agree to compulsory unionism.

On June 4, Postmaster Blount stated that it is "utter nonsense" for opponents to claim "that the Administration advocates and the postal reorganization bill proposes that there be a union shop in the postal service."

Mr. Blount said that the Taft-Hartley Act compels employers to negotiate over this issue, and this same rule would be applied to the service.

But, the Postmaster General added, there would be no requirement that the service agreed to the "union shop." He said the "right to work" laws in 19 States would bar such a provision for workers in those areas. Mr. Blount further explained:

"The Administration has never agreed that there should be a union shop for the Post Office Department, nor does it now."

The reform bill contains an exception for members of religious groups which do not believe in joining unions. A postal worker in such a case would be allowed to pay the U.S. Treasurer an amount equal to union dues—in the event a "union shop" is installed.

If compulsory unionism does come to the postal service, other employes not now in unions would be compelled to join the union holding bargaining rights for their unit.

One of the foes of the "union shop" proposal—Representative David N. Henderson (Dem.), of North Carolina—pointed out that orders of the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon Administrations barred compulsory unionism for federal employees.

Mr. Henderson said he would seek to amend the Committee's bill to continue this protection in the new service.

"Pay dues to work." During arguments before the Rules Committee, Representative B. F. Sisk (Dem.), of California, contended that the Committee's plan would, "for the first time in history," create a postal system under which "a man must pay dues to work for his Government."

Defending the bill, the chairman of the Post Office Committee—Thaddeus J. Dulski (Dem.), of New York—said that nearly all postal workers now belong to the 11 unions in the Department.

Mr. Dulski said any "union shop" that was negotiated would not apply in the "right to work" States. However, Rules Committee Chairman William M. Colmer (Dem.), of Mississippi, said the Supreme Court might hold that the federal law overrode the State statutes.

On the same day the Rules Committee hearings opened, Labor Secretary George P. Shultz was asked for his opinion on the "union shop" proposal. He was speaking at the National Press Club in Washington.

Secretary Shultz declined to comment about the postal legislation, but did say that "as far as the federal civil service is concerned, it seemed to me to be a mistake to say that in order to work for your Government, you have to join any particular organization, whether it's a union or any other organization."

Even before the Senate scheduled its debate on the postal measure, Senator Paul J. Fannin (Rep.), of Arizona, launched an all-out attack on the bill. He indicated that he and other Senators plan extended speeches about the compulsory-unionism feature.

Mr. Fannin said that members of Congress are receiving many complaints from voters about this provision.

WIRETAPPING, FEAR OF VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL LIBERTIES, AND S. 30—THE ORGANIZED CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1969

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the first official report covering an entire year—1969—of Federal and State operation under the electronic surveillance law, enacted as title III of the 1968 Safe Streets Act, recently was published by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. The report should lay to rest the spurious claims, earnestly advanced when the electronic surveillance measure was pending in the Congress in 1968 and now raised against the District of Columbia crime bill, that court-supervised electronic surveillance would be ineffective, would unduly invade individual privacy, and would violate constitutional rights. Indeed, the report establishes in great detail that wiretaps and bugs can be conducted under strict judicial supervision in such a fashion to be extremely productive of admissible evidence and yet have an impact on individual privacy.

An article in the current issue of the Reader's Digest—June 1970, page 81—draws upon that report and adds case histories of some exemplary surveillances, including the historic heroin investigations in Washington, D.C., last summer. In that investigation, the magazine article and the official report reveal, the use of court-supervised electronic surveillance was crucial in breaking a large narcotics ring and securing the arrests of two Mafia members, a major local heroin wholesaler, a corrupt District of Columbia policeman, and more than a score of other criminals. Only through the use of wiretaps was it possible to reach higher into the criminal organization than the local operators, and therefore to conduct the first major heroin raid in years in the District. Further, those excellent results were obtained with a minimum of invasion of privacy, since nearly 5,600 of the almost 5,900 conversations overheard during the wiretaps were incriminating.

I insert the Reader's Digest article at this point:

THE LEGAL WEAPON THE MAFIA FEARS MOST

(By George Denison)

One June morning in 1969 two men dressed in gaudy resort attire strolled into the Miami International Airport terminal and casually slipped into public phone booths in the midst of a crowded concourse. As they talked for hours on the pay phones, an FBI agent concealed in a large packing crate filmed them, and other FBI men recorded their conversations. While the agents listened, the men, well-known big-time gamblers Martin Sklaroff and his father Jesse, gave out odds on major-league baseball games and a heavyweight fight to bookmakers in ten major cities across the country.

A month earlier, confidential informants had alerted the FBI that the Sklaroffs were operating a nationwide bookmaking network. Agents following them discovered that they spent several hours each day brazenly conducting their business in their busy air terminal. An attorney with the Justice Department's Organized Crime Task Force in Miami promptly asked for and got Attorney General John Mitchell's approval of an application to tap the phones the Sklaroffs were using.

On June 17, U.S. District Judge W. O. Mehrtens issued an order permitting the FBI to listen to the Sklaroffs' telephone conversations for a seven-day period in order to prove that they were in fact relaying gambling information. Agents then attached the wiretaps, overhearing some 200 calls during a six-day stretch.

Government lawyers took the wiretap evidence—indicating the existence of a million-dollar business involving thousands of bookmakers and gamblers—to U.S. Commissioners in Miami and other cities, and obtained search warrants. On July 3, FBI agents searched the Sklaroffs at the airport telephones, seizing their records and notes. At the same time, equally effective raids were conducted in seven other cities.[1]

The efficient detective work that exposed this gambling syndicate was made possible by a potent new law-enforcement tool: legal wiretapping and bugging. Authorized by Congress in June 1968, this weapon is now being put to increasing use by federal and local police officials against the forces of organized crime. "We are finding that electronic surveillance gets results," reports Sen. John McClellan (D., Ark.), whose Senate Criminal Law Subcommittee supervises the new statute. "We simply cannot combat organized crime effectively without it."

OF BUGS AND HOODS

Widespread fear of official snooping, at times justified, has made the use of wiretaps (interceptions of telephone conversations) and bugs (hidden microphones) an emotionally charged issue for more than 40 years. Since 1928, the Supreme Court has labored to determine whether electronic surveillance violates the Fourth Amendment's ban on "unreasonable searches and seizures." By the early 1960s, Court decisions had spelled out these rules: federal officers could tap phones, but could *not* us as evidence in court any information so gained (on the other hand, state and local law-enforcement officers could); they were prohibited from bugging if a physical trespass of the suspect's property took place.

A few states, notably New York, had already adopted court-supervised systems of electronic surveillance and moved against the Mafia. Says New York County District Attorney Frank S. Hogan: "It permitted us to undertake major investigations of organized crime. Without it, my office could not have convicted such top figures in the underworld as Charles 'Lucky' Luciano, Louis 'Lepke' Buchalter, Joseph 'Socks' Lanza, John 'Dio' Dioguardi and Frank Carbo."

In addition, New York's experience showed that wiretapping, in part because of the expense and the great number of police it requires, was used in a limited number of situations. For example, between 1950 and 1959 the New York County District Attorney's office handled more than 343,000 criminal matters; yet wiretaps were installed in only 219 investigations. This is in an area including nearly two million people and 2.4 million telephones—hardly the indiscriminate use that many civil libertarians feared.

USES AND ABUSES

Unfortunately, federal use of electronic eavesdropping techniques has not always been as circumspect, providing ammunition for the opponents of all electronic surveillance. Just within the past year, transcripts of the recorded conversations of alleged Mafia leaders Simone DeCavalcante, Angelo De Carlo and others were made public in federal court. Chilling details of mob activities in New Jersey ranging from loan-sharking to murder filled the nation's newspapers. The disclosures served to educate the public—yet the hard fact remains that the FBI obtained these and other tapes through illegal bugging during the early 1960s.

Such corner-cutting practices were stopped by President Lyndon Johnson in 1965 when he issued an executive order barring all federal eavesdropping except in national security cases. In 1967 the U.S. Supreme Court, concerned with the specter of government agents invading the privacy of law-abiding citizens, held that New York's wiretap law was unconstitutional. But, in so doing, it laid out guidelines for statutes that would avoid unreasonable searches in the future. A year later Congress, carefully adopting the safeguards suggested by the Supreme Court, launched a frontal attack on organized crime; it authorized official wiretapping as part of the Crime Control Act of 1968.

BATTLE IS JOINED

Under the new statute, a federal judge (or a local judge in states that enact their own law following the pattern set by Congress) may authorize a wiretap or bug for a strictly limited period of up to 30 days—but *only* when "normal investigative procedures have been tried and failed" and when the probability exists that evidence of a serious crime will be uncovered. Although the law is only two years old, official electronic surveillance is proving itself to be a valuable law-enforcement weapon. The latest figures reported to Congress show that 263 arrests have already resulted from the first 174 wiretaps under state statutes, while the 30 federal wiretaps and three bugs have led to 137 arrests.

To see the law in action, consider these major current cases:

Detectives assigned to the Bronx (New York) County District Attorney's office had been working for months to discover who was behind an elaborate counterfeit-check-cashing scheme which had bilked the First National City Bank of $118,000. Then, in August 1968, a new series of fraudulent accounts totaling $318,000 was uncovered. By duplicating stolen corporation checks and then depositing them in banks in the name of a fictitious business, a criminal ring was preparing to make a major haul. One Carmine Apuzzo, a man known to the police, was identified as the individual who had opened the fake accounts. He was put under around-the-clock surveillance.

Apuzzo, in turn, led detectives to the other conspirators, headed by Carmine La Via and Warren King, a pair of ex-convicts. Since Bronx District Attorney Burton Roberts lacked sufficient evidence to try the identified members of the ring, he sought a wiretap order from a New York Supreme Court judge on November 21. As Roberts explained in the application: "In order to apprehend the masterminds of this operation and those persons peripherally dealing with the subjects of this investigation, eavesdropping is an indispensable tool."

The judge approved the request for a 20-day period, and detectives tapped the telephones at King's house and La Via's apartment. Two-man teams listened to each phone conversation while others covered all movements of the suspects. Finally the break came. On December 11, 1968, King was overheard arranging to pick up a packet of stolen securities.

With this solid evidence in hand, a judge issued a search warrant, and a battery of Bronx detectives followed and arrested La Via and King, who held stolen credit cards and $75,000 in stolen stocks and bonds. Faced with this, the two men also confessed to the bank frauds. King, La Via, Apuzzo and four lesser accomplices pleaded guilty and were convicted.

In Washington, D.C., undercover agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, aided by informants, began making "buys" of heroin as part of a systematic drive to locate large-scale wholesalers of illegal dope. One informant bought large quantities of high-quality heroin from one Lawrence "Slippery" Jackson on eight different occasions during the summer of 1969.

To find the wholesaler supplying him with narcotics, an order to tap several phones used by Jackson was obtained from Federal Judge William B. Jones on July 9. Within days, agents listening in a nearby apartment building overhead Jackson saying that he had paid $130,000 to the "Italians." Using a dial recorder, agents traced the calls of one of Jackson's accomplices to a New York restaurant where Carmine Paladino, identified as a member of the Mafia in 1963 Senate hearings, made his headquarters. Soon afterward, Paladino was spotted meeting with Jackson outside a downtown Washington hotel.

In early August, Washington Metropolitan Police officer Carl W. Brooks, already suspected of being part of the ring, phoned to warn Jackson that the "Feds" were after him. Then Paladino called from New York to tell Jackson that he was coming to Washington again on August 18 and bringing his "niece" (a code word for cocaine). U.S. Attorney Thomas Flannery drew up arrest warrants, and Paladino and Jackson were seized as they met at a shopping center. Another suspect, Mafia member Enrico Tantillo, was captured in a Washington apartment, where agents found half a kilogram of cocaine.

In all, seven members of this ring were indicted in December and now await trial for violating federal narcotics laws. This dramatic action moved Senator McClellan to speak out: "When one series of wiretaps can bring to book two members of La Cosa Nostra, a major wholesaler, a crooked policeman and an assorted group of other criminals, never again should anyone doubt that wiretapping is necessary to break the back of organized crime's exploitation of our people."

Reinforcements Required. These opening shots in the war on organized crime show that electronic surveillance, with proper safeguards, can be effectively used by our police. So far, however, only 13 states have adopted the necessary wiretap-authorization laws.[2] A combination of apathy, concern over invasion of privacy and outright Mafia influence has held up progress elsewhere. In Illinois, for example, federal authorities have amassed evidence showing that the Chicago Cosa Nostra threw money and manpower into a major lobbying and bribery effort to block wiretrap legislation in 1965. Illinois is still without such a law.

Clearly, more must be done, now:

The 37 legislatures that have not yet enacted court-supervised electronic-surveillance programs following the constitutional guidelines set out in the federal law must move promptly to do so. States such as Illinois, California, Pennsylvania and Ohio, which were among those listed as centers of mob activity by the President's Crime Commission, have a particularly urgent need for such laws. Nevertheless, in only 4 of the 37—California, Michigan, Ohio, Louisiana—is there a good possibility that a wiretap law will be passed this year. You can help by writing your legislators, urging their support for this vital legislation.

Federal use of wiretaps and bugs against organized crime should be vastly increased. President Johnson flatly refused to implement the 1968 law, and even now, because of a lack of trained manpower, the Nixon Administration is severely limiting its use. A Justice Department source reveals that fewer than 20 investigations involving electronic eavesdropping on organized criminals have been authorized.

More are needed. "Conventional law-enforcement tools are not enough, by themselves, to turn the tide against the entrenched forces of organized crime," says

[1] The Sklaroffs and other suspects are now under indictment for violation of federal gambling laws.

[2] Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Wisconsin.

G. Robert Blakey, a former Notre Dame law professor currently serving as chief counsel to the Senate Criminal Law Subcommittee. "If we can't use bugs and wiretaps to get the Mafia, then we can't get them at all."

FALLS OF THE OHIO

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 rise to urge my colleagues to approve H.R. 13971, to enable the States of Indiana and Kentucky to proceed with the development of the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park. This bill will preserve a scientific, historical and recreational wonderland on a series of islands in the Ohio River and along the shores of Clarksville-New Albany-Jeffersonville, Ind., and Louisville, Ky.

On September 24, 1969, our colleagues BILL COWGER and GENE SNYDER, representing districts bordering the Ohio, and ROGER ZION, representing the southwestern Indiana district bordering the Ohio, joined me in introducing H.R. 13971. On October 22, 1969, our Senate colleagues JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and MARLOW COOK from Kentucky and VANCE HARTKE of Indiana joined BIRCH BAYH in introducing an identical bill, S. 3060, in the Senate.

The Bureau of the Budget informs me ratification of this interstate compact will promote the administration's program emphasizing the development of State and interstate parks.

The Federal Government will incur no cost by ratifying this interstate park compact.

This bill will enable Indiana and Kentucky to develop as a park an area that has invaluable resources, among them these:

GEOLOGICAL

As a geological area, the Falls of the Ohio has received the top priority rating given for preservation purposes. The fossil corals at the falls form the world's largest such display exposed for observation purposes. Though no collecting is allowed in this top priority preservation area, the fossil corals are presently inadequately guarded being at the mercy of anyone with a hammer and a wish to take home a few souvenirs. Fine specimens of fossils from the falls are deposited in museums, universities, and private collections throughout the world. Approximately 900 nominal species of fossil corals have been based on specimens from the falls area.

ORNITHOLOGICAL

The migratory birds that pause and nest on the islands at the fa'ls are an unmatched display of birdlife so far inland. Yet within the past 6 years poachers with guns have killed many of the birds and have driven off others. James Audubon made more than 200 sketches of birds in the falls area. In recent years, 75 species of birds have been recorded at the Falls of the Ohio.

ARCHEOLOGICAL

The archeological sites at the falls are among the best in the entire country. They cover 4,000 years during which settlements were made, captured, and rebuilt. Yet the scooping up of highway fill material from borrow pits there and the dumping of trash proceeds incessantly.

HISTORICAL

It was at the falls, on Corn Island, that George Rogers Clark arrived in 1778 and trained his fewer than 200 ill-equipped troops for his heroic conquest of the vast Northwest. The families his men left behind founded Louisville, and Clark himself founded Clarksville across the river by 1784 as the first American settlement in the new territory. Clark moved there later, to a point of land overlooking the falls he loved so well.

Just below Sand Island was a crossing of the ancient buffalo trace, used by vast herds of bison and, earlier, by mastodons on their way to the salt licks of Kentucky. The pioneer route famous as the Wilderness Road followed in general the old buffalo trace from Cumberland Gap in southeastern Kentucky to its end at the Falls of the Ohio.

The Ohio River also supplied abundant muscles at the falls so that Indians of the archaic cultural stage settled there about 4,000 years ago. Later, the woodland Indians lived in the area. The Mississippian culture arose with the advent of pottery and agriculture and continued in the vicinity until the white man arrived.

RECREATIONAL

The Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park would include an estimated 1,000 acres of land and water, the largest recreational open space left in the heart of the Louisville metropolitan area. Picnic, boating, swimming, and fishing facilities will be developed by the Falls Area Preservation Committee and the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Commission. Camping, hiking, and wading possibilities abound. On the Indiana side of the falls area a museum and amphitheater are expected to be constructed. An outdoor drama covering the life of George Rogers Clark, whose life was closely related to the Falls of the Ohio, could utilize the amphitheater.

The Corps of Army Engineers foresaw the scenic possibilities of the falls area, and provided a base for a two-lane drive on one section of levee extending nearly 1½ miles. Hopefully, the two-lane drive will be constructed as part of the overall park program.

Dr. Donald J. Munich, Jeffersonville dentist, and graduate geologist, has been working for at least half a dozen years as chairman of the Falls Area Preservation Committee exploring all possibilities for preserving the falls area and protecting its many assets. Due to his efforts, as well as the efforts of many other interested citizens living in Indiana and Kentucky, the two legislatures have created the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park Commission to develop and operate the park.

Under our Constitution we must grant our consent to the agreement of Indiana and Kentucky before commissioners can be appointed, funds appropriated, and development of the park begun. If we delay in granting our consent until the 92d Congress, the 1971 Indiana Legislature may well put over appropriation of funds to develop the park until it again convenes in 1973. In this day of environmental emphasis, development of the last remaining recreational area in the heart of the Louisville metropolitan area cannot wait until 1973.

I have long believed southeastern Indiana has a great recreational potential that must be developed. The Congress can assist in that development by granting its consent to the Falls of the Ohio Interstate Park compact.

CUBA! PANAMA! WHY OMIT FROM THE NIXON DOCTRINE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in my long continued studies of Latin America and U.S. policies relating thereto, I read the February 18 declaration by President Nixon on "U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970's" with more than perfunctory interest, and noted its failure to mention the two gravest problems of the Americas—Cuba and the Panama Canal.

In previous addresses by me, in and out of the Congress, I have dealt at considerable length with these two subjects and expressed some very definite views, as will be shown by examining my volume of addresses on isthmian canal policy questions—House Document No. 474, 89th Congress—and other addresses subsequently made. In them, I have described the Caribbean as our "fourth front" in the current struggle over world power, Cuba as a Soviet beachhead dominating the Atlantic approaches to the canal and serving as an operating base for the subversive infiltration of Western Hemisphere countries, and the Panama Canal as the "key target" for Soviet conquest of the Caribbean. Moreover, Cuba is now the principal source for the "export of terror" in the United States.

As to such hostile activities, it should be stated that all the terrorism and bombing recently prevalent in our country have a common origin in the often stated long-range Soviet policy for the eventual destruction of the United States as the only effective obstacle to Communist world domination. As we may expect these nefarious practices to increase in volume and gravity, they must be dealt with adequately and summarily.

President Nixon's action in retaining in the Department of State as his advisers on Latin American affairs those who were responsible for the suicidal policies of preceding administrations, has caused much wonder and concern on the part of an ever-growing body of American citizens. The question now being asked in various parts of the Nation is: "Why has he not cleaned out the State Department as he promised to do in his campaign?" As to this task, there are qualified officials in our Government who could identify the individuals concerned with irrefutable and objective documentation.

Mr. Speaker, with rare exceptions, the mass news media of the United States,

in the reporting and evaluation of the problem to the south of us, has utterly failed, and by this failure has rendered a gross disservice to the security of our country and the Western Hemisphere.

Fortunately, the Nation does have some astute, courageous and well-informed editors and publicists with the combination of ability and vision to see what is transpiring and to give adequate expression of their views. Two recent examples of such writings are an article by Harold Lord Varney, president of the Committee on Pan American Policy of New York, and an editorial in the March 23, 1970, issue of the Chicago Tribune.

In the article, which was issued as a pamphlet for special distribution among leaders of the Nation, Mr. Varney stresses the omission of Cuba and Panama in the Nixon doctrine, portrays Castro as the Soviet's "stand-in" in Cuba, and shows how little Panama has humiliated the United States. In the editorial, its author stresses the way that Cuba is being used as a training ground for the export of guerrilla warfare revolutionaries to all parts of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States. In fact, most of the confusion and strife in the world today is the result of Communist strategy and tactics. We certainly cannot afford to let its force strike at Panama, which country's history shows it to be a land of endemic bloody revolution and chronic political instability.

These two countries have pursued through the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations, and are now pursuing with the Nixon administration, policies that have been serving Soviet power in the Western Hemisphere and that have been, and still are, absolutely destructive of the best interests and independence of both of these Caribbean countries.

The Nixon administration, like the others just mentioned, has altogether ignored the most dangerous questions that have thus arisen and with equal failure has sought to sweep these crucial matters "under the rug." The perils involved are entirely too great for such concealment. President Nixon, no less than his near predecessors, is failing in forthrightness and courage in adequately dealing with these problems of the most difficult and vital character:

For what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? (St. Mark 8:36).

This profound Biblical text applies with compulsive force in the present situation with respect to both Cuba and Panama. What does it profit to liberate nations in the Far East and yet, by inaction, to permit Soviet takeovers in Cuba and Panama? The policies now obtaining under the supervision of a continued unrealistic and timid State Department will, if allowed to continue, drive us lock, stock and barrel, from the isthmus, with the loss of the Panama Canal and its indispensable protective frame of the Canal Zone into the ravening maws of Soviet power. Here I would stress again what I have stated many times previously, that the only guarantee for the independence of Panama is the presence of the United States in its control of the zone territory and canal.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to this vital angle of the isthmian problem, I would urge prompt action on the pending Canal Zone sovereignty resolutions, which, starting on October 27, 1969, the birthday of Theodore Roosevelt, have been sponsored by more than 100 Members of the House and were referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Because of the timeliness and pertinence of the indicated article and editorial, I quote both as parts of my remarks and commend them for reading by all Members of the Congress and others concerned with the security of the United States and the Western Hemisphere, especially those engaged in the formulation or implementation of our Latin American policies.

The article follows:

CUBA, PANAMA—WHY ARE THEY LEFT OUT OF THE NIXON DOCTRINE?

(By Harold Lord Varney)

Statesmen of the over-cautious school have long depended upon a sort of ostrich policy to purchase time. Such statesmen, faced by a situation of unusual risk or difficulty, simply pretend that the situation doesn't exist. Sometimes this ploy works, but not often.

Richard M. Nixon has now been President for a relatively short time, but already he is giving indications that he intends to try the ostrich act. He is embarking upon an elaborate Latin American program which pretends that a Cuba and a Panama crisis do not exist.

On Feb. 18th, President Nixon proudly unwrapped a 40,000-word declaration entitled, "U.S. Foreign Policy for the 1970s". Already, it is being hailed as the "Nixon Doctrine". It contains a lengthy section on the Western Hemisphere. But perused, even with Mr. Buckley's "jeweler's eye", the reader will find not a single mention of the nightmarish and overhanging threat of either Cuba or Panama.

Even to the most unsophisticated, an attempt to reconstruct U.S. hemispherеic policy, which overlooks Cuba and Panama, would seem as futile as Henry L. Mencken's classic example of the man who rakes leaves in a hurricane.

In Mr. Nixon's case, the omission is particularly heart-breaking because millions of Americans voted for him in 1968 in the confident belief that he would move speedily to clean up these two poisonous situations. His past utterances had led them to this belief. Obviously, they were mistaken.

Why are Cuba and Panama important?

History will record that our failure in these two nations was the greatest Latin American disaster of the 8-year Kennedy-Johnson era. Each represented profound humiliations to the American people that no self-respecting American could find tolerable. They were threats to American safety. The Johnson administration passed them on to Mr. Nixon—unsolved and unexpunged. A peculiar obligation binds Mr. Nixon to clean up the Cuba pigsty, because he was elected in 1968 on a Republican platform which pledged the party to policies based upon the Monroe Doctrine.

But his silence speaks louder than words.

It would be easy, although profitless, to excuse Mr. Nixon on the ground that he has been badly briefed. It is a notorious fact that the President has turned over much of his foreign policy planning to a think-tank headed by Professor Henry A. Kissinger. Mr. Kissinger, a former functionary of the Council on Foreign Relations, and ghost-writer for Nelson Rockefeller, is a strange bird to be hatched in a Republican administration. But there he is—Mr. Nixon's McGeorge Bundy.

Professor Kissinger, and not President Nixon wrote the declaration. It isn't the style of the Nixon who unmasked Alger Hiss. The whole labored document reeks of the stench of academic midnight oil, burned by Professor Kissinger's bright young men. It is a confusing grabbag of all the pedantic ideas on foreign policy, now floating around in the books and theses of the prevailingly popular Ph.Ds.

When the President greeted the several hundred press correspondents who gathered in the East Room of the White House for a briefing on the declaration, he unintentionally revealed its source by his throw-away line.

"I do say that I commend the report to your reading", he said. "It is worth reading. I have read it myself."

But now that he has released this Nixon-Kissinger Doctrine, he is stuck with it. Unless he speedily supplements it with a positive declaration of U.S. policy in both Cuba and Panama, it must be assumed that he intends simply to prolong the toothless Johnson-Kennedy line. We will continue to temporize.

Had President Nixon perpetrated this surprising oversight at any other time, the effects, while serious, might not have been dangerous. Today, this evidence of Mr. Nixon's indifference, and procrastination will be an open invitation for all of American's ill-wishers in the hemisphere. The statement could not have been worse timed.

For while we dallied, the anti-gringoists in the hemisphere have been unceasingly active. At the very moment that Mr. Nixon released his declaration, Chile's Foreign Minister Gabriel Valdes was circulating among all the Latin American nations the proposal that they should give diplomatic recognition to Castro's regime in Cuba. The Government-owned LA NACION, in Santiago, was urging that Chile take the lead-off steps to such recognition. Of course, such a move, on the part of South American nations would be a direct repudiation of the "quarantine" policy against Castro which the U.S. persuaded the O.A.S. to adopt in 1964. It would be the shaking off of U.S. leadership in the hemisphere (which is obligatory to us under the Monroe Doctrine).

The Chilean move was not a unilateral one. It was preceded by an attempted reinstatement of Castro's Cuba as a member of the O.A.S. as the recent Caracas meeting of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council. Cuba was expelled from the O.A.S. in 1962. This action would delouse him.

The sponsor of the Caracas gambit was President Eric Williams of Trinidad-Tobago, a life-long Socialist and critic of the U.S. It was supported, not only by Chile, but also by Venezuela. Before Mr. Nixon's eyes, the structure of U.S. leadership against Communism is visibly crumbling in Latin America. His evasive position on Cuba and Panama in his current declaration is encouraging the debacle.

Let us briefly review the backgrounds of the present Cuba and Panama crises.

CASTRO—RUSSIA'S STAND-IN

Few Americans fully realize that there would not be a Castro problem in Cuba today were it not for the spinelessness of the policy-makers in Washington. That Castro survives in Cuba, after 11 years of Cuba agony, is a shame which will haunt America for all the years to come.

What we have refused to face, all along, is the unpleasant fact that the Cuba problem is a problem, not primarily of Castro, but of Soviet Russia.

Castro himself is a pigmy. That he has endured for 11 years, despite the detestation

of all except the lumpen proletariat of Cuba, is solely by grace of Russia. He has been the linchpin of Russia's Western Hemisphere strategy for the eventual Communization of the United States.

Like North Vietnam, in Asia, Castro's Cuba is the obedient pawn in the grand scheme of Moscow to encircle and enfeeble the United States. While Castro rules in Havanna, Russia commands a staging point in this hemisphere for her eventual struggle with the U.S. for world mastery. Because this is so important to the Russian world plan, Russia has been willing to pour out $2 billion during the last few years to prop up the rickety Castro establishment.

Only a catatonic leadership in Washington could ignore the brazen effrontery of Russia's presence in Cuba. Not even the appearance last year, for the first time in history, of a Russian fleet in Western Hemisphere waters, broke through the smug complacency of Washington. The flotilla, comprising eight ships—a guided missile cruiser, two guided missile destroyers, submarines, submarine tenders and oilers—was an open demonstration that Soviet Russia now regards itself as a Western Hemisphere power. It nullifies the Monroe Doctrine.

The size of the Russian military and naval establishment in Cuba is still largely a closed book to our Washington leaders, reminiscent of the Kennedy scorn of Senator Keating's revelation of the IBM bases in Cuba, in the early months of 1962. The testimony of anti-Castro Cuban refugees who have reached the U.S. since the 1962 confrontation, strengthens the suspicion that, thanks to Kennedy's surrender on the on-site inspection demand, the missiles were never removed. One refugee, the Cuban architect Lorenzo Medrano who, before his escape, had charge of the camouflaging of missile sites under Castro, has given convincing evidence that the missile equipment was housed underground, instead of being loaded onto Russian freighters for removal. Medrano, who was stationed at the San Julian missile base, had the task of laying out an elaborate disguise of landscape camouflage to conceal the continued bases from U.S. aerial detection.

But we do not need to depend upon the testimony of refugees to know that Russia still has missiles in Cuba. Pentagon intelligence discovered a year ago that three Soviet-built SAM ground-to-air missile launchers had been installed in Punta Gorda, in northeastern Cuba, and three more sites were under construction.

But even more dangerously, Russian submarines now roam at will over offshore U.S. Atlantic points, working with electronically equipped Cuban and Russian fishing trawlers. Their home base is Mariel, ten miles from Havana, with its submarine pens. U.S. Navy heads are closely watching the new Russian Y-Class submarines, each of which carries 16 missiles. When and if some of these subs are transferred to Cuban waters, they need not even use Cuban bases, but will be serviced at sea by Cuban-based tenders. The Y-Class submarine, like our Polaris, can be placed within firing range of any Atlantic American city.

The fearful souls in Washington, and in the "peace" organizations, who tremble over the possibility of offending Russia, are the pathetic sleep-walkers of today. Russia is already here, installed in bristling presence in Castro's Cuba. It will remain here, Monroe Doctrine or not, as long as we continue coexistence with Castro.

While Russia treats this island as its staging area for the eventual crisis with the U.S., Castro is busy at work with his Moscow-given assignment to erode Latin America through his Havana-based Latin America Solidarity Organization. While the new "Nixon Doctrine" contemplates the continuance of peaceful progress in the Americas, Castro's LASO trains and subsidizes fanatical-minded youths in each country to wreck it. The LASO is a brutally effective device to keep the pro-American populations in Latin America continuously off-balance.

But Castro's ace-card in his psychological offensive against the U.S. is the fathomless gullibility of the American "Liberal" himself. Castro's ability to recruit hundreds of American students to visit Cuba this year, and to provide unpaid labor for his sugar harvesting, reveals once more the existence of a sizable pro-Castro youth fifth column in the U.S. His attempt to turn the 3,000,000 Puerto Ricans against the U.S. through his sponsorship of the Puerto Rican independence movement, is a blow at another vulnerable American point. As a result of the clever identification of Castroism with the U.S. black and youth causes, it is probable that the whole McCarthy wing of the non-Communist Left would snap into line to back any serious move to end the present porous Cuba "quarantine". A recent polling of the 150,000 readers of the New Republic, a moderate "Liberal" magazine, showed that 86.3% favored the reestablishment of U.S. diplomatic relations with Castro. A more disquieting sign was the recent action of the World Council of Churches, at Canterbury, which voted a resolution, with only two "Noes", calling for the restoration of U.S. diplomatic relations with Cuba. In such disunity of the American people on the Cuba issue, Castro confidently hopes to avert a positive Washington stand.

All this public irresolution and confusion on Castro could be transformed into vigilance if President Nixon would speak out unmistakably on Cuba. He has not done so in his "Nixon Doctrine".

PANAMA—THE MIDGET THAT HAS HUMBLED WASHINGTON

America's Panama problem is simpler than Cuba, but its urgency is perhaps greater.

This tiny fly-speck on the Latin American map has actually defied and humiliated the United States, and has gotten away with it. The crisis in Panama has arisen because three successive predecessors of President Nixon have been too irresolute to say "No" to the ragtag Panama City mob. Because we have quibbled and temporized, the Panama jingoists have actually proposed to strip us of American-owned territory—the Canal Zone. We are in hot water now because President Johnson, in a weak moment, agreed to sign a new treaty with Panama which surrendered the Canal Zone.

The situation is not of Mr. Nixon's making. Indeed, while still in private life, the new President declared, on Jan. 16, 1964, that the U.S. should not "retreat one inch" in its refusal to surrender the Zone. But he is surrounded by Republican advisers, notably Robert B. Anderson and John N. Irwin, who helped President Johnson draft the infamous new Panama treaties which are still pending.

Two recent steps which his administration has taken indicate alarmingly that Mr. Nixon is not thinking in terms of a clean-up of the Panama mess.

First, he appointed, as the new U.S. Ambassador to Panama, Robert M. Sayre. Sayre, so far from being the strong man that is needed, was actually a member of the team which under Anderson and Irwin, drafted the give-away new treaties which Johnson accepted in 1967. His selection, over the advice of such Panama-wise legislators as Daniel J. Flood, is a frightening sign.

T- weaken the U.S. case further, Assistant Secretary of State Charles A. Meyer declared on Jan. 27th that the pending Johnson treaties will serve as a "basis for the continuation of a process to seek permanent solutions to U.S.-Panama relations in reference to the Canal." Behind this discreet diplomatic language there is the unmistakable revelation to Panama that the Nixon administration is going to negotiate, not reject, the preposterous Panama demands. We are going to discuss the surrender of American soil, under duress.

We need not stress that the growing contempt for the United States which is now endemic in much of South America feeds upon such examples of Washington incapacity to defend its own. The image of a strong, resolute America, already tarnished by our feebleness in Cuba, and our retreat before the expropriations of Dictator Velasco in Peru, will suffer an irrecoverable blow if we back down before a Communist-recruited mob in Panama City. This is why Panama is so vital to the United States, even beyond the security importance of the Canal and its Zone.

That the Nixon-Kissinger declaration contains no mention of Panama, is a shocking sign of Washington gutlessness. President Nixon knows better.

That the Nixon Doctrine has not really thought through the actual Latin American problem is apparent in its stress upon equal partnership, rather than American leadership in the hemisphere. With Soviet Russia moving in, by stealthy steps, the need for confident U.S. leadership is the No. 1 imperative of the situation. Our obligation to protect the hemisphere under the Monroe Doctrine gives us this primacy. We cannot surrender it, to placate the jejune demands of the Fulbrights and the Churches, without abdictating our whole role in the hemisphere.

The future which the Nixon Doctrine proposes is not the future that the American people were led to believe they would achieve under a Republican administration. It is the future of a "Little" America—not a "Great" America. We cannot accept it.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 27, 1970]

WHAT ABOUT CUBA, MR. PRESIDENT?

As we said in an editorial Thursday, the alarming increase in urban terrorist bombing made it imperative for President Nixon to request new federal legislation providing severe penalties, including death, for this kind of murder. It is regrettable, however, that Mr. Nixon failed even to mention communist Cuba, where many if not most of the terrorist bombers are trained.

The Detroit News, in a copyrighted story Sunday, said it had been informed by a high Canadian government source that most of the 500 young Americans now in Cuba, ostensibly as cane cutters, are in fact learning revolutionary warfare in a camp 30 miles east of Havana. This source said the Canadian government obtained its information from friendly consulates in Havana.

In an open letter to President Nixon, the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba asserts that hundreds of American youths are in Cuba, receiving guerrilla warfare training with revolutionaries from all parts of Latin America in 43 camps. Former Ambassador Spruille Braden is chairman and Paul Bethel, who was a foreign service officer in Havana before we severed diplomatic relations with the Castro regime, is executive director of this committee.

The committee notes that Verde Olivo, Castro's military journal, published a statement by Julie Nichaman, one of the alleged cane cutters, saying American youths in Cuba "have a new determination to bring back to our brothers and sisters a dedication to destroy the imperialist monster from within, just as the rest of the people of the world are destroying it from without." The statement was accompanied by a photograph of Miss Nichaman exhibiting rings that were said to have been made from American

planes shot down in Viet Nam and given to her by her Viet Cong comrades.

Ralph Featherstone and William H. Payne, black terrorists who were killed in Maryland when a bomb they were transporting exploded accidentally, had been trained in Cuba. Payne liked to be called "Che," after the late guerrilla leader, Ernesto [Che] Guevara. Featherstone had a letter in his pocket from Cuba, signed Roberto and addressed to Companero Rolf [Comrade Ralph]. He also carried a crude letter addressed "To Amerika," saying: "Dynamite is my response to your justice. Guns and bullets are my answer to your killers and oppressors and victory is my sermon in your death."

Cathlyn Wilkerson and Kathy Boudin, fugitives from justice, who fled from a New York townhouse which had been converted into a bomb factory after an explosion in which three of their fellow terrorists were killed, had been to Cuba. Miss Boudin had been identified on the Havana radio as a member of the American Vinceremos brigade of "cane cutters." Three of the seven defendants in the recent Chicago riot-conspiracy trial had been to Cuba.

The Free Cuba committee reminds Mr. Nixon of his statement in the 1968 campaign that Castro's regime "must be made to understand that it cannot remain forever a sanctuary for the export of terror to other lands." Yet Castro is exporting terror to other lands, from Tierra del Fuego to the Canadian border. The ambassador and the military and naval attaches of the United States were killed by machine gun fire in Guatemala City in 1968. Our ambassador to Brazil and American diplomats in Guatemala and the Dominican Republic have been kidnaped and threatened with death to effect the release from prison of communist revolutionaries.

If the Nixon administration cannot stop the export of revolution to Latin America, it could at least stop the free movement of American revolutionaries to and from Cuba. Most of them travel thru Canada, which, like Britain and some of our other allies, carries on trade with Cuba, thus making a mockery of the Nixon administration's claim that it is "isolating the Cuban regime economically, politically; and psychologically."

AWARD OF MERIT CITATION TO HONORABLE JACOB H. GILBERT FROM NATIONAL COUNCIL OF SENIOR CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of calling the attention of the Members to a significant award which has just been received by one of our esteemed colleagues, the Honorable JACOB H. GILBERT, from the National Council of Senior Citizens. This award of merit was presented to him on June 12, 1970, in recognition of his dedicated efforts and work in behalf of our senior citizens. Inasmuch as Congressman GILBERT is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I have occasion to know at firsthand his effective work for social security benefit increases and other improvements in the Social Security Act. He is highly deserving of this very fine award, and at this point in the RECORD I include a copy of the award along with a copy of the very significant acceptance speech which Congressman GILBERT made, entitled "Meeting Basic Responsibilities."

The documents follow:

AWARD OF MERIT CITATION TO CONGRESSMAN JACOB H. GILBERT

Congressman Jacob H. Gilbert (D., N.Y.) helped win Medicare and has zealously worked for Social Security improvements, higher annuities for retired civil servants, more and better housing for the poor and disabled and other humanitarian legislation to make life better for the disadvantaged elderly.

He is chief sponsor of legislation—H.R. 14430—with 50 other cosponsors in the House of Representatives to raise Social Security benefits 35 per cent by 1972, boost the Social Security minimum to $120 a month, abolish the premium payment for Medicare doctor insurance and make a dozen other significant improvements in the Social Security and Medicare programs.

Congressman Gilbert has been a dedicated servant of the aged, infirm and handicapped throughout his 10 years as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have publicly commended him for the concern he has shown for the elderly poor and low income members of minority groups.

In addition, he has been a leading supporter of clean air and clean water legislation and consumer protection.

This Award of Merit is presented Congressman Gilbert for his effective representation in Congress for the poor, infirm and elderly.

MEETING THE BASIC RESPONSIBILITIES

(By Representative JACOB H. GILBERT)

Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you very much for this award. Many of us in the Congress have been working many years on behalf of senior citizens and it is gratifying to know that we are finally approaching minimum standards of living for our aged.

As author and sponsor of the bill to provide a 50% increase in Social Security benefits over several years, we have seen my first step realized within the last year. Last year the House Ways and Means Committee and the Congress approved a 15% increase in benefits and this year the House has approved a 5% increase in benefits.

This is far from being enough, but it is progress. I feel as former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Wilbur Cohen does—that my 50% bill will be passed by Congress within the next few years.

Now, what we have done is to increase substantially the benefits for our retired workers. From 1960 up to the present, the cost of living has risen by an alarming 27.4%. In that time, the Congress—including the latest 5% increase—has voted increases of 40% in Social Security benefits. From 1940 up to the present, the cost of living has risen by 166% while the increase in benefits voted by Congress for the Social Security recipient totals 235%.

Even so, we have not done enough, yet. Today an average retired worker receives benefits of $97.30 a month. An aged couple receives $158.50 today compared with the $114.00 in 1960. We have increased benefits considerably, but people trying to survive in today's world on $158.50 a month will not live very well.

There is no excuse that our retired workers, people who have contributed so much to the advancement of these United States, cannot live out their golden years in decency and security. My bill is designed to see that they can. I call upon all of you—particularly the National Council of Senior Citizens who contributed so much work to see the benefits of the last year realized—to work with all the Members of Congress so that we can pass my bill and several other proposals which will make life bearable for our senior citizens.

I have several other bills I have introduced in the last session and I would like to speak briefly about those. One bill is the Senior Citizens Skills and Talent Utilization Act of 1970.

For years the Congress felt it had done its job when it increased the monthly Social Security check, or if it approved any Federal funds to assist senior citizen housing. It is my belief that we in the Federal Government not only have the obligation, but the responsibility, to do much more.

My bill is designed to take the senior citizen—the person who has given his life to bettering this Nation—and put him to work on a part-time basis today to help rebuild our cities, our neighborhoods, and help mold our youth. Under my bill, senior citizens would be paid to work in their neighborhoods, at playgrounds, at schools, in recreation centers, or in other areas where they have some basis or expertise. The purpose of the bill was to provide the senior citizens with additional money so they could live decently, while at the same time using those skills and abilities and the wisdom learned through hard-won lessons to help revitalize communities we live in.

I have another bill which I consider just as vitally important in another area. This is my bill to assist people who do not need to be hospitalized, but cannot necessarily help themselves at home. This bill would provide Federal funds to bring assistants into the home so that those senior citizens might enjoy the dignity of recuperating at home among comfortable and familiar settings. I am concerned about the people who can care for himself, but who may not be able to carry heavy loads, such as shopping bags. There is no reason why this person is not capable of remaining at home, with some minimal assistance.

Those are just a few of my proposals. They are all important, and I would think that in time Congress will pass them all. I think Congress will act faster if organizations such as yours continue intensive lobbying campaigns on behalf of the senior citizens. I assure you that my intention in the years that follow is to keep on working in behalf of the senior citizen. I know your value. I know what you have done for this Nation, and I know that if this Nation utilizes the senior citizen properly, he can make as deep an impression in his golden years as he did in earlier life. The Nation will be better for it.

I thank you.

REMARKS BY HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK TO GRADUATING STUDENTS OF THE JOHN W. McCORMACK MIDDLE SCHOOL

(Mr. McCORMACK, at the request of Mr. ALBERT, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD remarks made by telephone to the graduating students of the John W. McCormack Middle School on Friday, June 12, 1970.

REMARKS MADE BY TELEPHONE TO THE GRADUATING STUDENTS OF THE JOHN W. McCORMACK MIDDLE SCHOOL ON FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 1970

Assistant Principal John Callahan; reverend clergy; Principal Nicholas G. Bergin; School committeeman "Jim" Hennigan; Associate Superintendent Thomas Meagher; Assistant Superintendent Bernard Shulman; Members of the Faculty and Teaching Staff of the John W. McCormack Middle School; distinguished guests and your parents and loved one;—Ladies and Gentlemen and Friends:

While I must be in Washington today due to important official matters requiring my presence here, I am very happy, through the means of the telephone, to be present with you in spirit and voice, and to congratulate each one of you personally upon this memorable day in your lives. I am sharing with you the happiness of this important day, and offering to you a few of my thoughts and suggestions on this occasion.

This day as you all realize, marks a turning point in your life. I share with you your sense of achievement and I congratulate you for your perseverance and dedication. This day of victory belongs to each and every one of you. You have laid the foundation for a useful and satisfying life. Now it is incumbent upon you to build on this foundation not only to make this a better world for you as an individual but to improve the world for your fellow man.

This should be your goal—work toward it and happiness and satisfaction will follow.

I was extremely pleased to hear that all of this year's graduates of the John W. McCormack School have made the decision to attend high school. This is indeed a monumental decision, showing vision and determination on the part of each individual.

It shows vision since you have come to the realization that in today's highly competitive and complex world, education is no longer a luxury but a necessity. It indicates determination since each one of you has decided not to squander your life in petty pursuits but to make the sacrifices necessary to make this a better world.

As I have stated several times in the past, America's greatest natural resource is its youth. And, there is no better investment that America can make than in the education of its children and youth.

History shows that education has been a powerful influence upon lives of individuals and of nations; and instrument with which to help yourself, and a means to help others as well. But this is true, only if you utilize education properly. Education must not be an end in itself but rather, a means to a greater end—the preservation and improvement of the values which we all cherish. This responsibility upon you is immense for not only the future of America but the future of democracy itself rests entirely with you.

The years lying immediately ahead are crucial years. They will be years of physical and intellectual growth. The principles learned at home and in church will be put to a test. But, you will emerge from this myriad of confusion and frustration if you direct your energies, your talents, and your desires to what is best for yourself and best for your country.

During this period you must all prepare yourself for the journey of life; you must commit yourselves now to a course that will strengthen you for the trials and opportunities of life; you must strengthen your family ties while expanding your religious convictions. Do this and success will follow.

We look to you to redeem what is wrong in our national past and to build what will be great in our national future. Let it be said that your generation, with God's help, used its wisdom and generosity to turn America's dreams into reality, and its despair into hope. Use justice, generosity, and idealism to build an America which you will be proud to hand over to your children, and you children's children.

To the parents and guests of this historic third graduation; To Mr. Bergin and the faculty of the John W. McCormack school, I extend to you my hearty congratulations. I share with you the joy and pride that we all feel for this graduating class of fine young Americans. I am sure I speak for them in expressing their appreciation for the help, inspiration and encouragement that Mr. Bergin and members of the faculty have given to our most priceless heritage, our children.

Finally, let this be your wish;—That you may look back upon this graduation with the conviction that you have treated all persons with honesty and goodwill,—That you have put your heart into your work;—That you have done your best.

In conclusion, I extend again my congratulations to the principal and the faculty, and to all of the graduating students, and my very best wishes for your future happiness and success.

EMERGENCY HOME FINANCE ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at President Nixon's statement last Friday that the Congress has failed to act on the administration's emergency home finance bill. The President stated that he recommended 4 months ago that this legislation be sent to Congress and reiterated a number of times that Congress was stalling on providing needed assistance for the depressed housing industry.

I know of no administration recommendation of February 2 that the President was speaking about. I saw no administration recommendation until Preston Martin, Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, came before the banking and currency committee in late February with a brief description of a program to subsidize Federal Home Loan Bank advances to member savings and loan associations. As I recall when the Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported out S. 3865, which was nothing but a pulling together of various proposals that had been pending before the committee for some time, the administration at that time said that this was their emergency home finance proposal. The Democratic members of the Banking and Currency Committee have been actively trying to assist the mortgage credit market and the housing industry since the early part of this year with little assistance from the administration. Time and again our proposals for providing long-term assistance to the mortgage market have been opposed by the administration.

The Subcommittee on Housing, of which I am chairman, acted expeditiously in a 1-day executive session on May 7 approving for full committee action H.R. 17495. This bill, I believe, contains not only immediate assistance for mortgage lending institutions, but provides long-term programs of guaranteed funds for the mortgage credit market.

I am sorry to see the President again using such an important issue, providing housing for all our citizens, as a political whipping post. The blame, Mr. Speaker, is not on Democratic Members of Congress, but on the Republican administration which has not provided the leadership in ways and means of aiding the housing industry.

The Subcommittee on Housing last week completed 2 weeks of hearings on pending housing legislation. We heard from numerous witnesses in both the private and public sector who stated that the housing industry was not in a recession, but in an "acute depression." I certainly hope that the administration will cooperate with the Congress in aiding and assisting the prospective homeowning public to purchase and own homes.

WHEAT REFERENDUM—1970

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin, as required by law, will soon announce the date of the wheat referendum. Statute requires the referendum to be held before August 1.

Should Congress fail to pass legislation to replace the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 in this session, the permanent statutes relating to agriculture will become fully operative, and the decision of the growers in the July wheat referendum will be final.

As I have stated on numerous occasions, both in Kansas and here in Washington, I would consider failure to enact a "Farm Program for the 1970's" a disaster of the first magnitude. Without new legislation, U.S. wheat farmers will lose about $1 billion or more in income if the wheat referendum is approved. They will lose about $1.5 billion or more if the wheat referendum is not approved.

There is every reason to believe that the wheat referendum would fail passage, for numerically the 15- to 30-acre wheat farmers in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere outnumber the commercial wheat farmers of the Great Plains. These small, eastern wheat farmers have voted down a wheat referendum before; they probably would vote it down again.

The permanent statutes relating to agriculture were drafted for another time. Conditions under which wheat farmers struggle to survive have radically changed since the permanent legislation was put on the books. Should Congress irresponsibly permit our farm programs to revert to outdated solutions for current problems, a depression in American agriculture could result. We all know that a depression in agriculture has triggered other depressions, including the great depression of the 1930's, and we certainly cannot permit that to happen again.

Feed grains farmers will suffer almost as much as wheat farmers if no new legislation is passed this year. Under permanent law, feed grains producers would have the opportunity to take out loans at 50 to 90 percent of parity as the Secretary determines will not increase CCC stocks.

Since there are no provisions for diversion acreages and diversion payments under permanent law, the loan rate will be driven down quite rapidly. In a year or 2 under permanent law, the loan rate would be driven to the statutory minimum, or 50 percent of parity.

The millions of acres now in feed

grains diversion would be utilized to produce surplus stocks of feed grains, and that surplus under the law would require the Secretary to reduce the loan price to discourage further production.

Mr. Speaker, clearly these conditions are intolerable. The Congress cannot permit the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 to lapse without adequate replacement.

Representatives of the administration and members of the Agriculture Committee have been negotiating in good faith to develop a farm program for over a year and a half. Recent developments in committee have stalled progress in these negotiations. I urge all Members of Congress to face up to their duty to the American agribusiness community and to the national economy, and work diligently for meaningful legislation during the next few days and weeks.

Members of Congress and industry representatives must put aside unworkable plans and unattainable goals. Together, the Congress, the administration, and the agribusiness community must arrive at a compromise position that will meet budgetary requirements and the vital needs of the national economy. Together, we must work for a bill, not an issue.

I implore all Members of Congress who understand and have concern for our economy to work for progress in farm legislation.

ADDRESS BY ADMIRAL RICKOVER

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include testimony given by Admiral Rickover before the subcommittee.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Special Subcommittee on Education was most fortunate in hearing a long-term and most respected friend, Adm. H. G. Rickover, U.S. Navy. Admiral Rickover is a man of independent mind and large vision. His work in atomic submarines and ships has been of enormous value to our country. The pursuit of his specialty has also given him a practical point of view in regard to our educational system. The young men who operate those ships must be highly educated and trained.

Admiral Rickover has also had a lifetime of interest in all aspects of education. In pursuit of that interest he has studied, researched, and traveled extensively. In 1963 he published a book, "American Education: A National Failure," which described his conclusion that our educational system was greatly in need of reform.

In testimony offered before the Special Subcommittee on Education on June 10, Admiral Rickover observed that our country spent $65.8 billion on education last year, more than all the rest of the countries of the world. He noted that we are simply not getting results proportionate to our investment.

So much of what the admiral had to say seems to be of value to all of us that I insert his statement in the RECORD in its entirety:

STATEMENT BY VICE ADMIRAL H. G. RICKOVER, USN, BEFORE THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1970

Let me say first off that I lay no claim to up-to-date expertise in the matters you have under consideration. It is years since I have had time in the evenings or on weekends to concern myself actively with American education. My interest has not lagged; I keep myself informed and my files replenished, but my regular work has expanded so greatly that I am left virtually without leisure. My last book—*American Education: A National Failure*—which was published in 1963 in effect marks for me the end of extensive research, writing and talking on the subject.

That I should be kept aware of the state of American education is however assured by the very nature of my work which depends on men with intelligence and technical expertise of a high caliber. For this reason, a large part of my time and that of my senior technical people goes into careful selection of personnel. Young people volunteering for the Naval Reactors Group of the nuclear Navy are tested in a series of personal interviews both for innate capacity and scholastic achievement. Several thousand college and Annapolis graduates have been seen by us over the last twenty years. For those accepted, I have set up schools training them for the exacting technical work of our organization. It was for not a few of them their first exposure to a truly rigorous course. What they learned in our schools shows clearly that they could have achieved far higher scholastic levels during their previous years of schooling had the educational system offered them the intellectual challenge we provide.

It was my dissatisfaction with this state of affairs that first drove me to investigate whether European school systems might be doing better by their able youth and so have something to teach us. We, after all, are newcomers in a field pioneered by Europe which has had a much longer tradition, both in free universal elementary schooling and in publicly supported higher education. For something over a decade, comparison of school systems, curricula, and examinations here and abroad was my principal extra-curricular activity. In three books and numerous speeches, I described English, Dutch, Swiss, and Russian schools in some detail. On a number of occasions, I was given an opportunity to test the scholastic achievements of European graduates of lycee-type academic secondary schools—to observe the way they respond to the questions we ask our young interviewees in the Naval Reactors Group. Leaving entirely out of consideration their truly impressive command of foreign languages, which admittedly is quite essential to the "educated" European and perhaps less so to us, I found to my profound regret that at the end of *12 years* of schooling, the "academically able" products of European school systems compare very favorably indeed with ours at the end of *16 years*. In other words, they accomplish as much in ¾ of the time needed here, plus a competence in at least two foreign languages, far beyond anything normally found among American youth of equal ability—one of the reasons incidentally why we buy so much less real education per tax dollar than anyone else. Much of it pays for inefficiency rather than—as the educationists would have us believe—for better education for greater numbers.

Rich as we are, the amount of money that can be extracted from the taxpayer is not unlimited; I see no excuse for allowing continued inefficiency to keep costs needlessly high. Far more disturbing, however, is the loss of the best learning years of those of our young who have the desire and the capacity to prepare for the higher professions. They are the people whose services we so badly need and so often lack. Consider the chronic shortage of doctors—50,000, I believe, at the moment—and this despite the fact that we import large numbers of foreign-trained physicians!

This is bad enough. But how can we excuse the poor performance of the schools for those at the opposite end of the talent scale? My comparison studies also revealed that other school systems do far better than ours when it comes to imparting literacy and what the English call numeracy to children of below average ability. We are at present being urged to embark on a major national campaign to wipe out illiteracy by the end of the 1970's. That it still persists in this country is a disgrace not of American society but of the educational estal ishment. In my opinion, our schoolmen fail the least able of our children for basically the same reasons they do badly for the most able. These reasons, I submit, need to be examined before one can make a proper assessment of the part the Federal Government should take in subsidizing education.

To consider them all would take too much time. They can, however, be traced to certain basic assumptions about education that for something over half a century have dominated the educational establishment—assumptions that, in my opinion, are the root cause of low scholastic achievements at all levels of our school system. With your permission, I will present a summary of my views in this matter.

Of educational systems, as indeed of any large and complex enterprise, one can say categorically that *purpose, priorities, and personnel* are the prime factors determining efficiency. Critics of American education, myself included, have over the years expressed dissatisfaction with the competence of those staffing our educational establishment. I should like to leave this aside and concentrate on priorities and purpose.

The old adage that "no man can serve two masters" applies equally to men grouped in organizations; they cannot function effectively if they pursue contradictory purposes. It is the purpose for which an organization has been created that is or should be its "master." The single most important reason why American schools do not "educate" as well as they should is that they muddle along in a welter of ill-defined goals, without a clear order of preference based on importance, merit and urgency. This is the natural result of their confusion about the basic purpose of public school systems, indeed of formal schooling itself.

To clarify this purpose, one needs to go back to the beginning and ask *why we and all other advanced nations* are today maintaining at public expense vast establishments devoted to the education of our children. It might be argued that this leads into philosophical speculations and we are too pressed for time to bother about philosophy. I suggest on the contrary that the question is eminently practical and that no amount of money will bring about genuine improvement unless it is answered.

If we then ask why in *all* civilized nations education is considered as much a public responsibility as, say, the administration of justice or maintenance of domestic peace and tranquillity, or defense of the country against foreign aggressors, then the answer is—sheer necessity. Social progress raises educational requirements, and most families cannot meet these by their own efforts alone. Let me elaborate:

In primitive societies children are educated by untrained adults—parents, relatives, neighbors. In the language of American progressive education, they "learn by doing," by working alongside adults. Their classroom is the home, the workshop, the community.

This casual ad hoc education suffices when, to succeed in life, one needs only modest competencies lying almost wholly in the sphere of physical prowess and manual skill; these a child can acquire by a sort of informal apprenticeship to the adults about him. But as society advances, the competencies people need shift from the physical and manual to the intellectual. New occupations arise which require more intensive, more theoretical training than can be obtained through apprenticeship alone. Rarely are parents themselves able to meet these higher educational requirements since they call for systematic study under expert instruction, in other words formal schooling.

Let me illustrate this by showing what happens to education when there is a shift from oral to written communication. The transition may be the result of contact with a literate civilization, but normally it occurs because a society's intellectual wealth has grown to proportions that can only be contained and preserved in written records. Whatever the cause, the impact of this cultural advance is far greater than that of the most spectacular modern technical innovations, for instance the change-over from human and animal to jet propelled transportation.

It is greater because anyone can step into a plane without further ado and travel wherever he likes, if he but has the money to buy a ticket. The shift from oral to written communication however necessitates acquisition of an intellectual skill—reading and writing—that the less able or the poorly taught have difficulty mastering. It is a skill moreover that parents cannot as a rule teach their children; few have the ability to do so and most lack the time. Even today and even in our own country, with all the marvels of technology around us, adults have to work all day to provide for their family's livelihood. Parental deficiency can only be made up by engaging the services of qualified teachers. But many parents of young children cannot pay the requisite fees.

The immediate result is to set children apart early in life. For a minority, parents can buy formal schooling; the majority must go without. The resultant inequality affects human beings more adversely than inequality of wealth. Except for certain backward areas of the world, those unable to read—and write and cipher—are today barred from their own heritage—a deprivation no one suffered when society was still at the stage where the wisdom of the past was transmitted by word of mouth. No lack of material possessions equals the deprivation caused by having an impoverished mind. It freezes a man in place. The literate, the well-educated move forward, leaving him ever farther behind. The vicious cycle closes: poverty bars the child from schooling; lack of schooling deprives him of the chance to acquire the competences he needs to function effectively in his society; incompetence condemns him to poverty, and so on. Only universal free and compulsory schooling to the point of literacy and numeracy can break the cycle.

Some of our rebellious young are talking wildly of compulsory schooling as the enslavement of the young by the old, and of the schools paid for by the hard-earned tax dollars of the adults as "prisons", many seem to have the odd notion that when life was simpler, the young were freer. Paradoxically, most preindustrial societies where life is indeed simpler are well aware that formal schooling is the concomitant of civilization, and that they must have it if they are ever to catch up with the advanced nations—as nearly all of them seem anxious to do. As for this irksome business of adults insisting on instructing their children, it goes on there to the disgust of the young, even as it does here.

Indeed, most so-called primitive societies might well look askance at our own failure to impress upon children the responsibilities of adulthood. Their view is that adulthood must be "earned"; the young must prove they have matured and are ready not merely to claim the rights but also to take on the duties of adult members of society. Far from escaping the "indignity" of examinations, our young would find that in these simpler societies they would often have to pass arduous tests before being initiated into the adult community. Life is too hard, too precarious; the community is too dependent on everyone contributing to its survival and prosperity, to give untrained young people adult rights before they are able to handle them responsibly. The specific skills the young must acquire vary a great deal in time and place, but the principle of adulthood as representing competence and responsibility is the same always and everywhere. At a given level of civilization, literacy and numeracy become the indispensable minimum everyone must have to be a self-sustaining, contributing member of his society. Hence, universal free schooling—a new idea in its time but one that has amply proved its value.

Nothing so becomes modern man as his willingness to shift the burden of paying for a child's formal schooling from those who put him into the world on to the community at large. Since time immemorial, parentage was held to impose the duty not only to feed, clothe, house one's children and take care of their health needs, but also to prepare them for life by training them for the tasks of adulthood. In Europe, where this idea first took hold, society rarely accepted the burden out of pure generosity. Some additional factor was needed to give the necessary impetus. The factor which first brought action was religious: bible reading was deemed so essential a part of Protestantism that universal literacy was indispensable in a Protestant country.

They have a saying in Europe that the Reformation was "the cradle of popular education." It is an historic fact that publicly financed school systems first made their appearance in Continental states whose princes followed Luther's urging to provide universal schooling; to do so, he argued, was their bounden duty as Protestant heads of state. Catholic princes soon followed the Protestants. If nothing else, the intense rivalry between Catholic and Protestant states would have made this imperative. The first public school system appeared in 1559, the first compulsory attendance law in 1607. A large area was on its way to universal literacy when Prussia made elementary education compulsory in 1717.

By the end of the 18th century, a new factor entered the picture. Standing armies replaced mercenary troops and factory workers took over from handicraftsmen. Literacy among workers and soldiers so enhanced the prosperity and power of nations that enlightened governments throughout the West began to consider free and universal elementary schooling well worth the money it cost the taxpayer. Much thought, and care, and talent eventually went into building up the European "common schools" which have long since been compulsory, with attendance virtually 100%. They are the intellectual "floor" so-to-speak, upon which all higher education rests, the minimum education acquired by everyone, the reason why for generations Europe has been universally literate, with only the severely retarded failing to master the three "R's."

Concentrating on a few subjects—the mother tongue, arithmetic, geometry, history, civics, nature study, some music and art, physical training and more recently also a foreign language—they impart a more impressive body of knowledge and skill than we commonly assume. We are misled by different nomenclatures and statistics which we do not factor in the longer school day, week and year in the European schools and their concentration on teaching the indispensable basics. This explains in large part why as much is learned in three years there as in four years here, so that their compulsory school period of 8–9 years corresponds to 11–12 years in our system. Of their common schools, a noted European educator remarked that they turn out—at age 14–15—"youngsters with a real comprehension of their destiny and environment, already equipped with a sense of freedom and a command of verbal expression and communication for which adolescents of other areas may well envy them."

The coming of democracy reinforced these other factors, two considerations being uppermost: first—and in our own country certainly strongest—the determination that every child ought to have an equal chance at developing his innate capacities; second—more strongly abroad than here—recognition that when government is the servant of electoral majorities, the very fate of the nation demands—as the saying goes—that every effort be made to "educate the sovereign."

Historically, socialization of the costs of higher education—that is, university and university preparatory—came later. It was the need for professionally qualified persons that led to public support—at first only partial, today complete—in a number of European countries and in Soviet Russia, but not as yet here. Technological advances always require more educated talent than the well-to-do alone can provide. Early in the 19th century, even the most hierarchic nations adopted the maxim of the "career open to talent" and began to subsidize higher education.

The nation that has the schools rules the world, said Bismarck. In his time, Germany had the world's best system of *public* education; free at the elementary level, inexpensive at higher levels. Many thousands of American college graduates matriculated in German universities to obtain the graduate professional education then unavailable in America. Not until late in the 19th century did the range of American education extend beyond bachelor degree level. For that matter, we also lagged behind Germany and other Continental states in establishing universal free and compulsory *elementary* schooling.

The Puritans had brought with them the European parish school, but we did not begin in earnest to establish state systems of common schooling until the mid-19th century. The last state law requiring attendance was passed in 1920, just two centuries after Prussia's 1717 act. As late as 1929, the compulsory school attendance period in one of our states was but three years! Popular legend notwithstanding, public education is neither a uniquely American nor a specifically democratic phenomenon. Like the schools themselves—all of them, from kindergarten to university—it was invented by Europe, not by the United States. And vexing as it is to have to admit this, not by parliamentary or democratic countries but by absolute monarchies.

I stress this because the standard argument of the educational establishment when confronted with higher achievement levels abroad has always been that we alone educate "all" our children, and the way we do it is in the American tradition and so intimately intertwined with our unique way of life that comparisons are irrelevant.

When I first became interested in education, the fashion was to counter every criticism with the flat assertion that we had "the best schools in the world"—an excellent public relations technique since it takes

the wind out of the case the critics make. I spent a dozen years of such leisure time as I could find after a 70-hour work week to find out where we stood in comparison with countries at similar levels of civilization. Though I was chiefly interested in comparing achievements here and abroad among young people who have the ability and desire to pursue studies above the elementary level, I was struck at once by the fact that universal literacy has long been taken for granted abroad. Difficult as it was to come by hard facts, illiteracy statistics being generally fudged, I could readily see that illiteracy lingered on here. To call the inability to read simple phrases "functional" illiteracy may take the sting out of a word that has no place in a civilized country but a rose is a rose by any other name.

That we have several million adult illiterates and a quarter of our school children fall into the functionally illiterate category is now admitted by the educational establishment. I have yet to see one statement conceding that this sets us off from other civilized countries, that it may have something to do with the way we go about educating our children, and that—just conceivably—we might consider investigating how others do it successfully before we spend still more billions of tax dollars on costly experiments, research projects, gimmickry and the like; I gather that more than half the Federal educational subsidies go into things of this kind. The futility of most of these projects has been well documented in a careful study by Dr. Roger A. Freeman, Special Assistant to the President, which was inserted into the Congressional Record, April 24, 1969, by Representative John M. Ashbrook. Perhaps you would like to include it in your Committee report as well.

Elsewhere, the introduction of universal, free, compulsory elementary schooling automatically wiped out illiteracy. Our educationists have blown up the simple business of learning to read into an extraordinarily difficult and complex task, and thrown much of the blame for their own failure on parents and society. European and Japanese—and Russian—children learn to read and write even when they come from the poorest segments of the population—and poverty abroad is a good deal grimmer and more widespread than here. They learn the three "R's" even though there are no books in their homes and their hardworking parents have no time to read them bed-time stories or help with their arithmetic homework! They are carried through the elementary schools without costly "compensatory" pre-school programs reaching even farther back towards infancy.

It is nothing short of fantastic that currently the whole nation is being urged to join the campaign and help the schools win for every American child the "right to read" by 1980 or thereabouts—180 years after Iceland became wholly literate, 120 years after Germany and 60 years after Japan reached that goal! The schools, we are told, need the support of the media, the entertainment world, the sports world, the publishers, and business; there must be programs training students and mothers to serve as volunteer part-time teachers—I am quoting statements coming from the highest HEW echelons. And this despite the fact that last year we invested some 65 billion dollars in education—over 53 billion for public and over 12 billion for private and parochial education—of which some 38 billion goes to the elementary-secondary school sequence in the public and 4.5 billion in the private sector. This works out to $830 per child in the public and $770 in the private schools. In a report to the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress last October, Dr. Freeman brought out the astonishing fact that "with only six percent of the world's population, and between ¼ and ⅓ of developed resources, the people of the United States are now investing in education almost as much—and possibly as much—as *all of the other nations combined.*" I think he is justified in his conclusion that "nothing testifies more eloquently to the American faith in education than the priority which the people have granted it, in financial terms." So much for the current accusations by the schoolmen that illiteracy is a *failure,* not of the *educational* system but of the *society at large.*

The expression that every child must be given the "*right*" to read, reveals a basic flaw in the thinking of the educationists going back to the take-over of the school system by Dewey and the progressives, for whom education was a species of "*consumer good*" to be shared out equally, and who therefore thought it "*democratic*" to promote pupils *automatically* and grant them diplomas with high sounding names if they had merely sat in their classrooms the requisite number of years, never mind *what* they studied and *how much* they learned.

Progressive education was the first manifestation of the invasion of American life by the social sciences at the turn of the century. Before that, we had a school system somewhat less rigorous, less developed, but otherwise not unlike that of Europe. Before students could enter schools above the elementary level, they had to give proof of certain academic achievements. Even in my youth, high schools still taught basically the same subjects as the lower middle schools abroad, and colleges corresponded to the upper grades of the academic secondary schools ending with the European baccalaureat—won after 12 years instead of 16 years as with us. We never liked to "overwork" our children. But the progressive educationists introduced the concept of a "democratic" right to higher education and diplomas, not being content with equality of educational opportunity since this at once revealed the inequality of academic talent. As a result, we are the only advanced country where academic degrees have no fixed value but depend on the institution granting them. Worse still, in order to "hold" children in school beyond the elementary years, the progressives offered them a smorgasbord of easy courses and invited them to plan their own study program, proclaiming all the while in the name of democracy, that there is no hierarchy among subjects—homemaking being as valuable as history, driver training as mathematics, shop as foreign languages.

The freedom given children to plan their own course of study is part of the progressive belief that schools must be child-centered—a fantastic concept when you think it through. How can a child, born ignorant, know what it needs to learn? How can we leave him to his own devices and refuse him the loving guidance that trains and educates him for adulthood? By what tortured thinking have progressives come to believe that democracy in the classroom ought to turn the teacher from an instructor who imparts knowledge to the ignorant into a "resources" person who is merely a senior comrade in a group engaged in studying what the children have agreed would be fun to study? How could an intelligent man like Dewey declare that the school must, "in the first place, itself be a community of life in all which that implies", and that "the measure of worth" of schools "is the extent to which they are animated by a social spirit"? A school cannot do its job if it is to be made a replica of the community with children exercising their "democratic" rights to determine how it is to be run and by whom.

The whole point of formal schooling is that a series of difficult intellectual skills essential to modern life cannot be imparted by anyone but professionally qualified teachers. Dewey's insistence—carried even further by his disciples—that the child's interest must be the determining factor in planning curricula led to substitution throughout our educational system of know-how subjects for solid learning. It also led to the widespread tendency of the schools, instead of developing their intellectual capabilities, to instruct students in the minutiae of daily life—how to use cameras, telephones, and consumer credit, how to be popular and attract the opposite sex and the like—which are easily acquired elsewhere. The less able to tend to remain stuck in immediate experiences and unable to move forward to abstract concepts and ideas. Those with impoverished home backgrounds, in particular, are deprived of the tremendous intellectual heritage of Western civilization which no child can possibly discover entirely by himself; he must be exposed to this heritage, led to it. We get such grotesqueries as the following recommendation by a state education commission: As part of their work in history, it was suggested that high school students should be asked to "make studies of how the last war affected the dating pattern of our culture."

Equally pernicious has been the insistence of Dewey and the progressive educationists that each child should be taught only what will be "useful" to him. In a broad sense, all education must of course be "useful" to the student; otherwise, it would serve no purpose. If Dewey's idea were interpreted as meaning that the child should be taught to make the best use of his mind, this would in truth be the most "useful" education one could impart to him. In practice, the test of "usefulness" has been interpreted in a narrower sense. The teaching of a foreign language, for example, has been considered useful only if it was actually spoken in the community. As for literacy and numeracy, their "usefulness" seems not to have impressed progressive educationists.

William H. Kilpatrick, Dewey's chief disciple, has probably influenced educational ideas and practices more than anyone else. His biographer reports that Kilpatrick felt "it is the child and the children who should originate tasks and purposes. The best and richest learnings result only when self-propelled interests are being carried out . . . For that reason he wanted no curriculum set in advance, nor he did want teachers to 'sell' or foist subject matter on the child." He feared that if standards of academic achievement were set, "there is the ever-present and inherent danger that the child will be coerced, and coercion 'seldom builds desirable *habits*' ". Of arithmetic, he is quoted as saying: "I find a lot of people who don't use arithmetic; and I don't think that life would be any *richer* for them if they used it . . . They just don't need it"; of modern languages: "for the average student it [is] a great waste of time. In terms of rich, vital interests that might lead to individual growth, languages offer meager possibilities."

This was entirely in accord with the views of his mentor. Of literacy, Dewey once said: "What avail is it . . . to win ability to read and write if in the process the individual loses his own soul; loses his appreciation of things worth while, of the values to which these things are relative." No wonder, the principal of a junior high school some years ago publicly challenged the prime purpose of schools, which is to make our children literate, with the statement that, "we shall some day accept the thought that it is just as illogical to assume that every boy must be able to read as it is that each one must be able to play the violin, that it is no more reasonable to require that each girl shall spell well than it is that each one shall bake a good cherry pie."

These quotations from the founders of progressive education and their immediate successors illuminate how drastic is the deviation from the traditional purpose of formal schooling they brought about in our school system. Their philosophy still predominates in the educational establishment though public outrage seems to have con-

vinced the schoolmen that literacy is indeed a goal that should be uppermost in designing the program of our elementary schools.

We have tried hundreds of experiments in the last fifty years and are planning many more for the future to discover new ways of improving the educational performance of our less able children. I have often thought we might consider adding one experiment that has the advantage of having proven itself—in contrast to the others which remain speculative. And that is to set up demonstration elementary schools deliberately patterned after some school abroad with approximately the same kind of pupil population, as measured by family status. It would be easy to do this with an inner city London school; more difficult but rewarding with an inner city Parisian school. For balance and to parallel the situation in Appalachia and other rural poverty pockets, a Swiss country school.

I would suggest that it be an entirely voluntary experiment, with no attention whatever being given to socio-political considerations. Calling such a school English, French or Swiss might help protect it against attacks from opposite schools of education, for everything done in them could be blamed on the respective foreign countries, thus insuring a measure of domestic tranquility while the experiment goes forward. Ten years would be a good test period, at the end of which it could be decided whether to continue or end the experiment. The cost would be minimal since it is no more—probably less—expensive to teach the basic elements of learning than to run a fun-and-games school or install complicated teaching machines and the like. The quality of learning has so little to do with the buildings in which it takes place that any ordinary schoolhouse would be suitable. We have plenty of competent elementary school teachers who would love to try their hand at a carefully structured, curriculum-centered program, fully approved by the parents. Children could always drop out and go into the regular schools if they disliked hard work. Foreign teachers could easily be obtained for it would be a most challenging task for them. We need have no false pride for we have given much in our turn to the people of Europe.

Everyone knows that the essence of freedom is choice. These schools would for the first time give parents and pupils a choice between schooling for intellectual growth and schooling for democratic living, life adjustment, and the like.

The moment seems propitious, since we are being urged to take part in a mammoth campaign to wipe out illiteracy, and that is assuredly one task European elementary schools know how to accomplish. Since the Federal Government currently spends vast sums—more than half its total education subsidies—on experiments designed to upgrade the educational achievements of our less able children, surely a tiny fraction could be spared for a handful of such demonstration schools!

Fourteen years ago, I suggested similar demonstration schools patterned after the European lycee which is university preparatory, ending in the European baccalaureat. There are several types of these lycees, stressing the classical languages, or modern languages, or mathematics and science, but all providing a good liberal education at college level. Most of them are free or very inexpensive and all are day schools. They are to be found in one form or another in virtually every town over 10–15,000. A lower middle school is found in smaller communities from which the transition can be made to the lycee—around age 15–16—sometimes with the loss of a year or so. The whole sequence cuts 3–4 years from ours, this of itself making graduate and professional education available at lower cost. They are schools frankly patterned to the educational needs of the upper quarter or so of the ability range, and for this reason American educationists decry them as "aristocratic" or "class" education. Since they run parallel to secondary schools for less academically gifted children, and transfers are possible, they provide a wide choice of well-structured sequential courses that, from the standpoint of intellectual growth are infinitely better than the American system of comprehensive schooling with options of academic subjects for the college-bound.

We copied the college from England at a time when—unlike the Continent—she had no public education, schooling being either very expensive and thus reserved to the rich, or based on charity and therefore often of very modest quality. The college was definitely for the rich. The pattern—as in the college-preparatory schools—was the boarding school, always far more expensive than a day school. England, moreover, did not follow the reforms of the Continent which in the 19th century transformed the medieval university—a combined undergraduate and graduate institution—into a purely graduate teaching and research institution, the undergraduate course leading to the B.A. being transferred to the academic secondary schools.

Now that we are developing community colleges that are often day schools, it would not be too difficult to set up a few experimental schools combining a strictly academic high school and college program into a single lycee type day school that would admit only students capable of meeting its rigorous standards. We already have Advanced Placement Programs eliminating part of the freshman or sophomore year. This could gradually be built up if it found acceptance. If such schools were supported by small federal subsidies to pay for a higher caliber of teachers—they would have to be college professors as they are abroad—we would again offer our young a choice, and allow those who wish to work as hard as students do elsewhere to get to the end of their professional education a few years earlier—as many surely would want to.

The opposition to these schools by the educational establishment is fierce, the very idea being rejected as "undemocratic", "class" "aristocratic"—a "dual" system unacceptable because it would allegedly raise an intellectual "elite". Australia is at least as "democratic" and "classless" as we are, yet the dual system is the pattern there. Switzerland cannot be called "aristocratic", but it follows the pattern. Democratization of education elsewhere means eliminating the factor of "ability to pay"; we alone—or rather educationdom here—insist that "ability to learn" must also be eliminated. So we hand out academic rewards like vaccination certificates and prevent our able young from moving through the long years of preparation for the higher professions at their own proper speed.

The progressive educationists who invented the comprehensive school at the turn of the century were convinced that in a democracy the schools must be primarily engines for social change in the direction of closer personal bonds between children from varied home backgrounds. To them, the most important quality needed by the electorate was a sense of brotherhood which they believed could be developed only by keeping all children in comprehensive schools until they branched off into different programs training them for their vocations or professions. This means twelve years spent doing what able youth abroad complete in eight; it means adding the expensive college, because what is learned abroad before 18 years of age must here be learned thereafter—six or so years crammed into four. Add to this the fact that we invest in higher education $3,000 per student in the public and $4,000 in the private sector—to which must be added the fees paid by students themselves—a vastly larger sum than lycees cost abroad, and their advantage seems obvious.

The idea of all children going to school together, getting acquainted with people of different backgrounds is attractive and persuasive to many men of good will. It is quite feasible in the first 4–6 years if elementary schools follow a well structured program. But it makes no sense thereafter because then the natural inequalities of intellectual endowment make themselves increasingly felt. The least able cannot follow the course, the average get along all right, the most able are bored. Separate them and all will learn more and be happier to boot. Keep them together for twelve long years and the result cannot be anything but poorer scholastic achievements for all, compared to what each group is capable of attaining if educated by itself.

Nature has made us the species with the greatest range in levels of innate capacity and *therefore* of attainable competencies. To disregard the imperatives of nature is futile, as we are just beginning to recognize in the sphere of environmental pollution. As Horace said: ". . . you may drive nature out with a fork, but she will always return (*naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret*). Children differ enormously in "educability", the term we apply to the capacity to learn and become competent, to profit from personal experience as well as from the experience of others transmitted through books and word of mouth. It is the one human capacity that *can* be measured with fair accuracy by intelligence tests, much as they are currently in disfavor. And it is the one which enables a child to profit most fully from formal schooling. One look at the normal IQ curve shows that there is a natural pattern that can be roughly stated as ¼ below, ¼ above, and ½ average. Whether tests are given or not, any rigorous course will show up the divisions. To set up separate school sequences for them is therefore not difficult. Europeans accept the need for separate secondary schooling and concentrate on making the separation fair and accurate, allowing as many chances for correction in placement at later dates as possible. We might at least consider trying their system in a few experimental schools, open to all who can qualify and, of course, paid for by the taxpayer.

I submit we can afford neither the illiteracy of our least able nor the needless stretchout in education of our most able young. Alongside the existing school system which seems to suit the average reasonably well, we ought to provide for those who are not average some alternate educational road that takes account of their own abilities and inclinations.

Our efforts to provide schooling that disregards the natural inequalities in educability found in any representative group of children vitiate the main purpose of formal education. This, as I said before, is to supplement the education a child normally receives at home with instruction by professionally qualified teachers. To try to run a school like a community goes counter to the realities of life in a civilized country. To reduce a teacher to the status of a "resources" person and let the children plan the curriculum misreads the whole point of formal schooling. Once the primary purpose of education is re-established, other school activities will find their proper place in the order of priorities, and the real business of educating the young can proceed at its proper pace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. CORMAN, for Monday, June 15, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr.

ALBERT), for today and tomorrow, on account of illness.

Mr. KYROS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HATHAWAY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. STUCKEY), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (at the request of Mr. SISK), for today, Monday, June 15, through Thursday, June 18, 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. CAMP), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. POFF, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. HAMILTON, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLS, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GROSS and to include an article announcing that the U.S. flag again flies in Rhodesia.

Mr. ASPINALL immediately prior to the passage of H.R. 15012 on the Consent Calendar today.

Mr. SKUBITZ (at the request of Mr. SAYLOR), immediately prior to the passage of H.R. 15012 on the Consent Calendar today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMP) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROBISON in three instances.

Mr. MESKILL.

Mr. MORTON.

Mr. LANGEN.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. SHERLE in three instances.

Mr. SMITH of California in two instances.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. MORSE.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.

Mr. SNYDER in two instances.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. BOB WILSON in four instances.

Mr. HALPERN in five instances.

Mr. BUTTON in two instances.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. LUKENS.

Mr. COLLINS in three instances.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin.

Mr. WYDLER.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. MICHEL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANIEL of Virginia) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BARING in three instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. FOLEY in three instances.

Mr. MAHON in two instances.

Mr. ROYBAL in eight instances.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in four instances.

Mr. HOWARD in four instances.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. BLATNIK.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. MURPHY of New York in two instances.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. SLACK in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in two instances.

Mr. REUSS in six instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri.

Mr. COHELAN in two instances.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD in two instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. CHAPPELL in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. OLSEN.

Mr. STUCKEY.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. ABBITT in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in three instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. OBEY in six instances.

Mr. WRIGHT in two instances.

Mr. HANNA.

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. 710. An act to designate the Mount Baldy Wilderness, the Pine Mountain Wilderness, and the Sycamore Canyon Wilderness within certain national forests in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3889. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for two years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2012. An act to amend the act of October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 1205), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey a tract of land to Lillian I. Anderson;

H.R. 9854. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the East Greenacres unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12860. An act to establish the Ford's Theater National Site, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14300. An act to amend title 44, United States Code, to facilitate the disposal of Government records without sufficient value to warrant their continued preservation, to abolish the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following days present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 11, 1970:

H.R. 11102. To amend the Public Health Service Act to revise, extend, and improve the program established by title VI of such act, and for other purposes.

On June 12, 1970:

H.R. 4204. To amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to include prisoners of war captured during the Vietnam conflict, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 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:

2126. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a report on the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, together with the Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress and a copy of the annual report of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board; pursuant to law; to the Committee on House Administration.

2127. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to terminate and to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy to take action with respect to certain leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in the Santa Barbara Channel, offshore of the State of

California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2128. A letter from the General Manager, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a list of the nonprofit educational institutions and other organizations, in which title to equipment was vested by the Commission pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 85-934 for 1969, pursuant to section 3 of the act; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2129. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the opportunity for savings by improved selection of air carriers for transporting military cargo, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2130. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report demonstrating that improved guidance is needed for relocating railroad facilities at water resources projects being constructed by the Corps of Engineers (Civil Functions), Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 11157. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prescribe the manner in which a witness in a Federal proceeding may be ordered to provide information after asserting his privilege against self-incrimination and to define the scope of the immunity to be provided such witness with respect to information provided under an order; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1188). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 16516 (Rept. No. 91-1189). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 17138 (Rept. No. 91-1190). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 11766. A bill to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (Rept. No. 91-1191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 12943. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, to extend for 3 years the authority to make appropriations to carry out such act (Rept. No. 91-1192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KASTENMEIER: Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 279. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain joint newspaper operating arrangements; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1193). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1933. An act to provide for Federal railroad safety, hazardous materials control and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 10634. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 18059. A bill to preserve and stabilize the domestic gold mining industry and to increase the domestic production of gold to meet the needs of national defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 18060. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code to provide rates of pay for postal field service employees in certain areas and locations in accordance with private enterprise pay rates in these areas to assist in recruitment and retention of postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GARMATZ (by request) (for himself, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. LEGGETT):

H.R. 18061. A bill to facilitate the transportation of cargo by barges specifically designed for carriage aboard a vessel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 18062. A bill to provide for certain minimum payments to States from receipts derived from national forests located with such States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 18063. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 with respect to the repayment period of insured student loans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 18064. A bill to amend the insured student loan provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965 with respect to insurance of interests on defaulted loans in the hands of purchasers thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAYNE:

H.R. 18065. A bill to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 18066. A bill to authorize the maintenance of Bayou Castine, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. ERLENBORN, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. JONES of Alabama, and Mr. FINDLEY):

H.R. 18067. A bill to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 18068. A bill making an additional appropriation to carry out summer employment programs for youths under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and to be available until September 30, 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mr. RODINO):

H.R. 18069. A bill to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 18070. A bill to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 18071. A bill to establish the Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco and Marin Counties, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois (for himself and Mr. DULSKI):

H.J. Res. 1256. A joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning September 20, 1970, and ending September 26, 1970, as "National Machine Tool Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.J. Res. 1257. Joint resolution to authorize the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States to settle certain claims of inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for death and injury to persons, and for use of and damage to private property, arising from acts and omissions of the U.S. Armed Forces, or members thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.J. Res. 1258. Joint resolution to authorize an ex gratia contribution to certain inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands who suffered damages during the Second World War, and to establish a Micronesian Claims Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 1259. Joint resolution to extend the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to July 30, 1970; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 660. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the establishment of a suitable memorial in honor of Richard King Mellon; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 1081. A resolution to stop funds for war in Cambodia, Laos, and to limit funds for war in Vietnam; 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. MAHON:

H.R. 18072. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Manuel Fernandez-Tavera and their children, Rafael, Eduardo, Manuela, and Anna Fernandez Vidal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Res. 1082. A resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 17853) entitled "A bill for the relief of Carlo Bianchi & Co., Inc.," to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

403. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the State of Illinois, relative to amending the Social Security Act regarding rehabilitation sites for the mentally ill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

404. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to amending the Social Security Act to provide certain treatment for the mentally ill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

405. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative certain benefits for the mentally ill under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

508. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Gushikawa City Assembly, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, relative to removal of poison-gas weapons from the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

509. Also, petition of the Gushikawa City Assembly, Okinawa, Ryukyu Islands, relative to U.S. military personnel stationed on Okinawa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

510. Also, petition of the board of commissioners, Newport, Ky., relative to exempting the *Delta Queen* from the provisions of the safety-at-sea law; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BREAKTHROUGH IN CANCER RESEARCH

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable scientists of our time, a man who may be on the verge of a breakthrough in cancer research, is 76-year-old Dr. Leonell Strong, who among his own peers is hailed as an unsung hero of medicine.

Six years ago, Dr. Strong retired after many years as a genetioist at the Yale School of Medicine and later as head of the animal experimental laboratory at Roswell Park Institute in New York State, the oldest cancer research lab in the world.

He came to La Jolla to join the Salk Institute for Biological Studies, had a falling out with Dr. Salk, and a couple of years ago became involved in a lawsuit in which Dr. Strong won damages.

He then established his own laboratory in Sorrento Valley under auspices of a nonprofit foundation, pouring all of his life savings into the lab in order to continue research with mice for which he has become world famous.

During a half century's research, Dr. Strong has become acknowledged as the world's foremost authority in the study of cancer through the use of inbred strains of mice. His colonies of mice have been the source of such animals used in labs throughout the world. His first major contribution to cancer research was development of a unique strain of mice in which tumors grew spontaneously, rather than being transplanted—mice in which cancer was conveyed from one generation to the next.

Now he has developed a liver extract which when applied to mice, has resulted in virtually 100 percent elimination of cancerous tumors in nine generations of mice. Clinical experiments with human beings at Roswell Park Institute may be the next step after scientists there isolate the active ingredient in the liver extract. The reason we are calling attention to Dr. Strong's work tonight is that it is on the verge of being shut down completely for lack of financial support at the very moment when this distinguished scientist may be on the threshold of an important discovery in the battle against cancer, right here in San Diego County.

Up to now, Dr. Strong has struggled to maintain his laboratory with modest Federal Government funding; his own life savings, now exhausted; and public contributions of more than $25,000 raised when his financial plight was publicized primarily in the San Diego Independent.

But the financial well is running dry, the Government has refused another grant, and he has just enough to keep going through June, after which he will have to phase out the lab in Sorrento Valley, kill the 13,000 mice, and close the book on a lifetime of dedicated research.

Desperate attempts are being made by San Diego friends of Dr. Strong to convince the National Institute of Health to continue its support of his lab for at least another 12 to 18 months—the time Dr. Strong, still mentally vigorous at 76, believes he needs for positive proof of immunity against cancer provided by the liver extract. But unless a miracle occurs, the Leonell Strong Laboratory appears doomed to shut down. It would be a sad culmination of a distinguished career during which—and few people know of this—Dr. Strong was nominated for a Noble Prize in Medicine, though he did not win the award.

The miracle has happened to keep alive the remarkable cancer research by Dr. Leonell Strong, the distinguished scientist whose laboratory in Sorrento Valley, near Del Mar, has been threatened repeatedly with shutdown.

During the last 2 nights on these commentaries, I have told of the world-renowned studies by Dr. Strong of malignant tumors in mice—studies that now may be reaching a breakthrough that could unlock some of the mysteries of cancer.

A liver extract which Dr. Strong has been injecting into some of the 13,000 mice at his laboratory has demonstrated the capability of inhibiting the growth of tumors from one generation to the next, to the point of complete elimination in the ninth generation.

The liver extract is now being evaluated in the world's oldest cancer research laboratory, the Roswell Park Institute in Buffalo, N.Y., for possible clinical use on human beings. Meanwhile, Dr. Strong must continue his experiments for the most complete scientific confirmation.

Although Dr. Strong's research has been supported in the past by the American Cancer Society and the National Institutes of Health, a cutback in availability of research funds has dried up these sources. He has exhausted his own life savings to keep his laboratory open. With financial aid no longer available, he faced a complete shutdown, and extermination of the thousands of specially inbred mice by the end of June. And now, the miracle.

Five minutes after I mentioned this last night, a Coronado woman called to offer $5,000—enough to keep the lab open through July, another full month. But Dr. Strong must maintain his laboratory for several more months, to insure the fullest exploration of what appears to be a significant attack on cancer. If you feel that you would like to help Dr. Strong in this endeavor, you may send whatever donation you can afford to Leonell C. Strong Research Foundation, 10457 Roselle Street, San Diego, 92121.

There have been many disappointments in the fight against cancer; this may be another one, but can we afford not to give it the fullest chance to succeed?

POSTAL REFORM

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 15, 1970

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of all my colleagues, especially in view of the business schedule for tomorrow, a commentary by Nicholas von Hoffman in today's issue, June 15, of the Washington Post. This article is one of the most cogent I have seen on the subject of postal reform and gives some of the background information as to how this so-called reform has been lobbied to the floor of this House. I hope every one of my colleagues will read it carefully before the House begins its consideration of the so-called postal reform bill.

The article follows:

POSTAL "REFORM"

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

The pressure is rising to pass the Post Office Reform Bill. People support anything called reform, especially these days when action of any kind is beyond our enfeebled representatives.

One of the main arguments for this bill is that it will "take the Post Office Department out of politics." Politicians and politics being held in the high regard they are, any proposition to get rid of them always wins near unanimous assent.

Alas, experience teaches us that it is impossible to get politics out of anything, not merely because politicians are tenacious fellows and like to hang in there close to the boodle, but also because politics, realistically defined, is the business of deciding and carrying out policy, and you can't run anything without doing that. What this bill