

ciation, would probably visualize a kind of combination Rotary Club and general store, a roadside place for square dancing and peddling eggs.

And if he happened to meet Fred V. Heinkel, MFA's long-time president, the urban business magnate probably would be less than awed. Heinkel, born 71 years ago in a tin-roofed farmhouse in Jefferson County, still speaks with the accent and vocabulary of outstate Missouri. He does not fit Madison Avenue's image of the man in the executive suite.

But all this simply proves that illusion and reality are not the same, and that provincialism is not limited to the provinces. For unless the big city businessman is a very big businessman indeed, he is not as big a businessman as Fred Heinkel. And unless his business is one of the nation's largest, it is dwarfed by MFA.

A STATEWIDE GIANT

MFA, which Heinkel has headed since 1940, is a statewide giant with annual sales exceeding \$500,000,000. That figure does not include the revenues of three insurance companies, all MFA-affiliated and all having Heinkel as their chairman, with total assets of more than \$100,000,000.

That puts MFA in the same league with Pet, Inc., recently listed by Fortune Magazine as number 181 in total sales among American corporations. It makes MFA much larger than Brown Shoe Co., Granite City Steel Co., or Falstaff Brewing Corp.

One measure of MFA's size—and therefore of Heinkel's power—is that it is the largest customer of the St. Louis-San Francisco (Frisco) Railway and the second largest customer of the Missouri Pacific Railroad.

The association has 152,000 members, all of them farmers or producers of agricultural products, and more than 6000 employees. Its operations include the manufacture of fertilizers and feeds, production of hybrid seed corn, meat packing, poultry and egg processing, and the operation of service stations, farm supply outlets, and giant grain elevators.

MODEST BEGINNING

Things were not always so grand, either for Heinkel or for MFA.

MFA was organized during World War I, when farmers in different parts of the state began to form small clubs for a combination of social and economic purposes. The first such club was founded in 1914 in Chariton County by seven farmers who discovered that they could save money by pooling their orders for supplies.

The club idea spread rapidly as its ad-

vantages became more apparent, and soon the clubs were organized into rural exchanges. The exchanges pyramided into cooperatives, and in 1917 a farm journal editor named William Hirth called for a convention at which MFA was formed as a "federation of cooperatives." Hirth became the association's first president.

Under Hirth's leadership, Missouri farmers organized a joint livestock shipping association, creameries, poultry dressing plants and feed production businesses. They continued to save money, and to make money, and MFA grew.

FACED RESISTANCE

There was some resistance from established business at first. A boycott by large packing houses unwilling to accept cattle shipped by the farmers was ended only after MFA appealed to President Warren G. Harding for help.

Without much interruption, however, MFA grew steadily.

"A lot of people want to know why we're so big and diversified," Heinkel said recently. "Well, you look at Missouri and you see it has one of the most diversified agricultural industries in the country. To serve our farmers, we have to be diversified."

"We were born out of necessity, and we've grown out of necessity."

Necessity was never more acute than in the 1930s, when the Depression threatened farmers everywhere and made even cooperative ventures risky. A group of farmers in California, Mo., for example, bought a carload of bran in Kansas City. By the time the car of bran was delivered to the farmers, its value had dropped so far that the cooperative was almost bankrupt.

But most cooperatives survived, and so did MFA—with growing membership.

CALLED FROM FARM

In 1940, when the association's annual volume was about \$55,000,000 and membership was about 32,000, Hirth died. Heinkel, an unpaid MFA vice president operating a farm near Catawissa, Mo., (in Franklin County) was called in to take over.

The following year he was elected to his first one-year term as MFA president. He has been reelected annually ever since, with increasing predictability, and with passage of time has become as much the patriarch as the president of the association.

"As a friend of mine used to tell me," Heinkel said last week during an interview at his plush offices in Columbia, "I came out from between the corn rows to run the organization. But MFA itself was very small

when I became president. It wasn't as big a jump as it would be for somebody today."

As both a cooperative and a federation of smaller cooperatives, MFA does not have shareholders. Its purpose is not to make money but to save money for its members, but sometimes equities are dispersed to patron members on the basis of how much business they do with MFA.

SPINOFF COMPANY

Several years ago MFA spun off an independent organization, Midcontinent Farmers Association, as a vehicle for public relations, public affairs and lobbying.

"As time passed and things got more complicated, the lawyers said we shouldn't try to do legislative work with our business organization," Heinkel explains. "That's why we started Midcontinent."

Other spinoffs were MFA Mutual Insurance Co., MFA Life Insurance Co. and Countryside Casualty Co., which employ more than 600 persons in Columbia, which is home base for all MFA operations.

A few years ago, to combat what it considered inadequate services provided by what Heinkel calls "big international grain corporations," MFA helped finance a huge new elevator near New Orleans. The elevator now handles 10,000,000 bushels a month.

The elevator has been a partial success, according to Heinkel, "certainly volume-wise—but it's been a little difficult to make money on it."

A NEW PHILOSOPHY

MFA had a reputation years ago for being somewhat secretive about its dealings. With the operation as big as it is now, however, Heinkel has adopted a new philosophy.

"I'm inclined to tell people everything they want to know," he says.

Behind the bigness, there remains the rather unique fact that MFA is the agency of a large number of comparatively small farmers. To help the family farm, which Heinkel says is "still the most efficient production unit that's been found in the world," MFA continues to experiment with such things as a telephone pig auction, which connects Ozark pig breeders with markets in four states.

To Heinkel, all such things are "examples of what farmers can accomplish when they act cooperatively."

"I remember the first time I met Mr. Hirth, when I had just joined the MFA in 1917," Heinkel says. "I remember what he said to me: 'You young fellows are going to have to fight this battle differently than your fathers fought it,' he said."

"Well, we've worked at doing that."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 16, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Ted G. Matkin, St. Stephen United Methodist Church, Troy, Mo., offered the following prayer:

O God, in whose strength nations rise, by whose grace they endure, and before whose judgments nations pass away, in humility we bow before Thee, Creator, Sustainer, and Judge of all!

We pray this day for our Nation and our world, and especially for these here assembled who bear the burden of great responsibility, by whose deliberations and decisions the destinies of us all are determined.

Grant them, O God, vision to recognize the things that matter most, wisdom to discern between right and wrong, perseverance to see that tasks begun are completed, humility to seek Thy way

and to be led by Thy spirit, love, that they may be among their fellow men as those who serve.

Grant us these gifts, O God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 759. An act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Washoe Tribe

of Indians certain lands in Alpine County, Calif.;

S. 1520. An act to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers; and

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to create a commission to study the bankruptcy laws of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14685) entitled "An act to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, in order to improve the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the United States, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the

Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 26. An act to revise the boundaries of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah;

S. 27. An act to establish the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Arizona and Utah.

PRESIDENT'S POWER TO IMPOSE TARIFFS ON IMPORTED OIL TAKEN AWAY

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon in the last few minutes of deliberation on the trade bill of 1970, the Ways and Means Committee adopted a hastily considered amendment which takes away from the President the power under the national security clause to impose tariffs on imported oil. This action freezes in a program which costs the American consumer \$4.5 to \$7 billion per year, under the Government's own figures.

This ill-conceived action puts the slimy hand of oil on the trade bill converting it into a gargantuan of greed.

I am ashamed of the trade bill and the process under which it was conceived and developed. It is ugly, it is oppressive, it is Rosemary's baby.

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

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio.

I read this in the press today and I think this is one of the most dastardly things that the Committee on Ways and Means could have done.

The consumers of this country have been opposed now for about 11 years to this phony mandatory restriction on crude oil and they have been paying about \$5 billion a year in extra costs as a result of these artificial prices.

From the statement that came out in the Washington Post today about a former Secretary of the Treasury, he was one of the key architects in drafting this mandatory restriction, and it should put the Committee on Ways and Means on guard that, if anything, they should repeal the mandatory restriction entirely and not compound the problem.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE) and commend him for his long and persistent efforts in behalf of the consumer and the taxpayers of America.

Mr. CONTE. After all the good that it could have done for our domestic industries they have gone ahead and impaired this bill because of some greedy oil producers.

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

OIL IMPORT QUOTAS

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was present in the Committee on Ways and Means yesterday when this oil amendment was adopted.

Unfortunately, the vote was taken very quickly and we were not able to bring our troops together.

I do not think I am violating the rules as to the executive session, but a request was made that a rollcall be postponed for 2 weeks. I know there is an expression in this life—Who worries about their enemies when we have friends that are helping us out?

When this vote was taken yesterday, we were only able to gather five votes against the amendment. There was no reason for a rollcall vote on it yesterday and we could have postponed it for 2 weeks. I do not know what the parliamentary situation is now, but I imagine under the rules that the ones who voted in favor of the amendment would have to make a motion for reconsideration.

I hope we are not locking the door after the horse has been stolen. I regret that the vote was not postponed because more than likely we could have garnered enough votes in committee to block the amendment. But when the vote was taken at that time, we only had five votes to oppose the adoption of the oil amendment. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, we can change this.

I know that there are a great many people who are trying to freight this bill down with a lot of amendments so that the legislation can be killed, and I am not going to be baited into that position. We have got to keep that trade bill alive, bring it through the House, and make our effort to knock out the oil amendment if we can. But I hope we will not be put into the position where the shoe workers of this Nation, the textile workers, the electronic workers, those engaged in the fishing industry, and those engaged in manufacturing sporting goods, and others are going to be injured by no legislation at all.

There is a lot riding on this bill. I have had 22 years of legislative experience and I know the methods of killing legislation. I am not going to be baited into a position where we are going to allow this bill to fall by the wayside.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENTS

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

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, the Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled hearings on all resolutions providing for equal rights amendments on Wednesday, September 16. Because of the heavy schedule of the Judiciary Committee and the intervening recess, a prior date could not be chosen. All Members of the House who desire to testify on these resolutions providing for equal rights will please notify the executive director of the Judiciary Committee.

THE DEPLOYMENT OF THE SS-9

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS), has kindly called my attention to remarks that he made last Tuesday on the floor of the House with regard to the the U.S. MIRV and the Soviet SS-9's. Apparently this was in relation to a statement I made the day before on the floor of the House on the same subject.

I do want to make it clear that I did not charge, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) apparently understood me to charge, that the decision of Soviet Russia to initiate new SS-9 site construction had come as a direct response to our decision to deploy MIRV. I merely stated certain facts, and I was interested to see that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) in his statement did not quarrel with those facts. I especially stressed the fact that for a 9-month period, from August last year until June this year, the Soviets did not make any new SS-9 missile site starts, and they did not resume that activity until after we had started deploying the MIRV.

I know very well that the deployment of MIRV goes back a long way in terms of the decision of the Pentagon and congressional action, but it was my position and that of many others that, in view of the apparent restraint on the part of the Soviet Union on new SS-9 starts, the MIRV deployment timetable should have been reexamined and serious consideration should have been given to deferring the MIRV deployment at least temporarily. Whether the Soviets would have responded in time to such restraint I cannot say, but I believe we should have gone far enough to find out.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CHAIRMAN RISES ABOVE PARTISANSHIP

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, by some quirk I am on the mailing list of the Democratic national chairman, Lawrence O'Brien, and recently I received a letter from him.

I would like to share it today because Mr. O'Brien has risen above partisanship and is offering the support of his party to the President. Let me read the letter:

DEAR MR. SCHERLE: If ever there was a time for good Democrats to help it is now.

Mr. Speaker, the grammar is bad but the words are very true. The letter continues:

I could give you many reasons why, but I have answered the party's call because of mainly two: One is President Nixon. The other is Vice President Agnew.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot fault that reasoning. These are two of the finest, most able men in the Nation.

Whichever reason you choose, please send in your membership contribution today and become a card carrying member of the Democratic party. The future of Richard Nixon depends on it.

Now, there, Mr. Speaker, I disagree a little with Mr. O'Brien. I believe that Democrats, like Republicans, should put the future of their country first, but even so, Mr. O'Brien's concern for President Nixon indicates a wonderful possibility—that he and the Republican Party can work together for the good of our country in 1972 and will do so by reelecting President Nixon and Vice President AGNEW.

ACTION TAKEN BY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON OIL QUOTA SYSTEM

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

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, perhaps some of the heat that was exhibited here on the floor regarding what the House Ways and Means Committee did yesterday stems from an article in the Washington Post this morning. Mr. Frank C. Porter, who is a very able and accurate reporter, did make, I think, a couple of errors.

Here he says, "Oil import quotas were frozen into the foreign trade bill yesterday by the House Ways and Means Committee." This is not what happened in the Ways and Means Committee. Quotas were not frozen into the bill. Further on he says the existing system which "could be removed by a stroke of the President's pen" could not be removed if the Ways and Means action passed.

This is not what happened. What happened was that the committee denied to the President under the national security provision of the act the power to go to tariffs. If the Congress so elects it can go to tariffs, though in my view this would be most unwise. I do think this will help clarify the record, because I think there is some misapprehension as to exactly what the committee did.

CITY OF CINCINNATI WELCOMES PRESIDENT AT ALL-STAR GAME

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the city of Cincinnati on Tuesday night had its cup running over. Southern Ohioans enjoyed the first all-star game in many years and celebrated the magnificent new stadium.

But especially we were proud of the attendance of our President in recognition of the event, and of the universally warm reception given to him as our Chief Executive who is uniting the country by the fact that, despite the overpowering and isolating nature of his responsibilities, he remains one of us. In these difficult times of ever-arriving crises, it restores confidence to see the Nation and its leader able to relax in and thrill to the best baseball ever.

The tremendous reception Dick Nixon received on arrival in the city and at the stadium were overwhelming testimony to the admiration of Americans for and to their warm affinity with, the man they have chosen as their President.

It was a reassuring and thrilling experience for all who were there and for the millions who viewed it throughout the Nation. Yaz and Pete Rose may have starred on the field, but Dick Nixon had the nod with the fans in the stands.

THE DEPARTURE OF MR. HUNTLEY

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine carries an article this week called "Chet Heads for the Hills." In my opinion 14 years too late.

In leaving, Mr. Huntley, who has hidden behind sly innuendo and a false front of rugged honesty, finally shows his true colors. Since his vicious and supercilious bias against the President has already been commented on at length, I would merely like to call to my colleague's attention one of Mr. Huntley's inadvertent confessions.

He says, and I quote:

I'm running away to think. Maybe where there's clarity of air, there's clarity of thought.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, for 14 years there has been a complete lack of clarity of thought when Mr. Huntley has been on the air. His departure can be nothing but an improvement.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14685, TO AMEND THE INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL ACT OF 1961

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14685) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended, in order to improve the balance of payments by further promoting travel to the United States, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 218]

Anderson,	Clark	Gray
Tenn.	Clay	Hawkins
Ayres	Conyers	Ichord
Baring	Cramer	Kirwan
Berry	Crane	Long, La.
Bray	Dawson	Lujan
Brock	Diggs	MacGregor
Burke, Mass.	Edwards, La.	Martin
Burton, Utah	Farbstein	Matsunaga
Caffery	Gallagher	Meskill
Chappell	Garmatz	Murphy, N.Y.
Chisholm	Gilbert	Nix

Ottenger
Pepper
Pollock
Powell
Quillen
Rarick

Roudebush
Ryan
Stuckey
Teague, Tex.
Tlerrnan
Ullman

Watson
Watts
Weicker
Wilson,
Charles H.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). On this rollcall 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14685, TO AMEND THE INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL ACT OF 1961

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the conference report before the unanimous consent is sought, and tell us whether the areas in which we have receded in favor of the Senate and whether the Senate additions to the bill as passed by the House would be considered germane under the rules of the House, and what the additional cost to the taxpayer is?

Mr. STAGGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STAGGERS. I will answer the gentleman's last question first.

Every part adopted, in my opinion, is germane. I am sure it is.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say this: There are three principal changes in the bill as it passed the House. First we changed the composition of the commission. We had eight Government members on our side and seven from private life. On the other side they had 15 private. We thought the public agencies which have an interest in tourism should be represented on this commission, and we left them on. That would be the Departments of Transportation, Interior, Commerce, and State. We thought they should be on there because they have always been involved in this. So some of them were left on.

There is another change. On the Senate side they authorized \$2.5 million for this study, which will take about 2 years to complete. That amount was cut in half. That meant approximately \$1 million, because it was finally settled at \$1.25 million.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statements. I will advise him that I have read the conference report and statement of the managers on the part of the House in detail. With regard to that last paragraph in the report on authorization of appropriation, I would like to ask this further question. It seems to me the function of a commission like this over a stipulated period of time, by a set number of people, could well be figured out as to the necessary authorized appropriation; based on the number of vacancies and time to be spent

and per diem allowance, et cetera, and come up with a definite authorization. It ought to be either \$250,000 as it was when it passed the House, or it ought to figure out to \$2.5 million. Actually, the conferees settled on the \$1.25 million instead of 10 times that which passed the House. This is in the area of five times that which passed the House. In other words, from a quarter of a million up to one million and a quarter. What is the rationale on the basis of pay, per diem, expenses of staff, et cetera, for a 2-year study?

And, what is expected to be appropriated and actually expended from the Treasury in order to accomplish the International Travel Act?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I will answer to the gentleman. I would like, if I may, to go back to one point and say that there is another change in this conference report and then I shall answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. HALL. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. STAGGERS. We accepted a provision in the Senate bill that authorized an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Tourism to head this department, and I will explain why in just a moment. However, getting back to the gentleman's question, the other body came with their staff and said that in their opinion the \$2.5 million was needed and should be authorized and tried to justify it to us. We cut that in half. In cutting it in half, we said that they are going to have to go to the Appropriations Committee and justify their budget before they can get any part or all of it. We did agree on that principle to cut it in half. They will have to come in and make the justification as to how they will spend the money. In other words, we said that we would go as far as one-half on that basis to make it \$1,250,000.

Mr. HALL. I must say to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia that I am delighted that they did cut this outrageous authorization 10 times the amount of what they calculated in the House of Representatives, and of the people that would be required, in order to accomplish this International Travel Act. As far as authorizing any amount and expecting it to be justified and spelled out before the Committee on Appropriations, thank goodness, they do a good job in that respect, but more often than not, these authorizations become floors instead of ceilings, and we work up instead of down. I just wish we had stuck to the basis of whatever it was anticipated it would cost.

Mr. STAGGERS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

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

Mr. HALL. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If I may ask the gentleman from West Virginia a question, what is meant by the italicized language on page 3 of the report which states:

Determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other countries at the present time and to the year 1980;

How does one determine the travel needs of the people of the United States and foreign visitors for a decade ahead? What kind of language is this to be placed into a bill? How does anyone know what economic and other conditions are going to be for a period of 10 years ahead?

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

Mr. HALL. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) that that is a good question. It would be pretty difficult to do, as the gentleman says, to project anything along that line. That is one reason why we insisted that we have some Government members on this Commission who have been in the travel promotion area and who know what they are talking about. They should be able to speak with authority when the Commission meets.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Missouri will yield further, what are the needs of the people of the United States with respect to travel for 10 years—a decade—and what are the needs of foreigners with respect to travel for the next decade? I find this kind of language unfathomable. I do not know what you mean or what you are aiming at except to expend Federal funds when you talk about the needs, and I emphasize needs, of the people to travel for 10 years in the future.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, although I am opposed to the conference report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 14, 1970, pages 24031-24033.)

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER 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 174, nays 208, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—174

Adams
Albert

Anderson,
Calif.

Andrews,
N. Dak.

Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Barrett
Bennett
Bingham
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Boiling
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Mass.
Burton, Calif.
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Carey
Carter
Casey
Celler
Clark
Clay
Cohelan
Corman
Culver
Daddario
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Dulski
Eckhardt
Edwards, Calif.
Eilberg
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Flood
Ford
William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis

Gaydos
Gettys
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gubser
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harrington
Hathaway
Hays
Helstoski
Hicks
Hollifield
Howard
Hungate
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keith
Kluczyński
Koch
Leggett
Lowenstein
Lukens
McCarthy
McClary
McClure
McDonald,
Mich.
McFall
Macdonald,
Mass.
Madden
Mailliard
Meeds
Melcher
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Minish
Mink
Mollohan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Nedzi
O'Hara
Olsen

O'Neill, Mass.
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Pryor, Ark.
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reuss
Rodino
Roe
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rosen, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
St. Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Scheuer
Schwengel
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stokes
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Symington
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tunney
Udall
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Walde
White
Wiggins
Wilson, Boh.
Wright
Wyatt
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—208

Abbott
Abernethy
Adair
Addabbo
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Betts
Bevill
Biaggi
Blester
Blackburn
Blatnik
Bow
Brademas
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson, Tex.
Burlison, Mo.
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Camp
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Cleveland
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett

Coughlin
Cowser
Cunningham
Daniel, Va.
Davis, Wis.
Delaney
Dellenback
Denny
Dennis
Dent
Devine
Dickinson
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Foreman
Fountain
Frey
Goldwater
Goodling
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gude
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanna
Harsha
Harvey

Hastings
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Hogan
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Jacobs
Johnson, Pa.
Jones
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kee
King
Kleppe
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lloyd
Long, Md.
McCloskey
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
McKee
McMillan
Mahon
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
May
Mayne
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize

Mizell	Riegle	Taft
Monagan	Rivers	Talcott
Montgomery	Roberts	Thomson, Wis.
Morton	Robison	Vanik
Myers	Rooney, N.Y.	Wampler
Natcher	Rostenkowski	Watkins
Nelsen	Roth	Welcker
Nichols	Rousselot	Whalen
Obey	Ruppe	Whalley
O'Konski	Ruth	Whitehurst
O'Neal, Ga.	Saylor	Whitten
Pettis	Schadeberg	Widnall
Pike	Scherle	Williams
Pirnie	Schmitz	Winn
Poage	Schneebell	Wold
Podell	Scott	Wolff
Poff	Sebelius	Wylder
Price, Tex.	Shriver	Wylie
Pucinski	Sikes	Wyman
Purcell	Skubitz	Yates
Quie	Smith, Calif.	Yatron
Rallsback	Smith, N.Y.	Zion
Randall	Snyder	Zwach
Reid, Ill.	Steiger, Ariz.	
Rhodes	Steiger, Wis.	

NOT VOTING—49

Ayres	Garmatz	Pollock
Baring	Gilbert	Powell
Berry	Gray	Quillen
Bray	Hawkins	Rarick
Brock	Hébert	Reifel
Burton, Utah	Ichord	Roudebush
Caffery	Kirwan	Ryan
Chappell	Long, La.	Stuckey
Chisholm	Lujan	Teague, Tex.
Conyers	MacGregor	Tiernan
Cramer	Matsunaga	Ullman
Crane	Meskill	Waggonner
Dawson	Murphy, N.Y.	Watson
Downing	Nix	Watts
Edwards, La.	Ottinger	Wilson
Farbstein	Passman	Charles H.
Gallagher	Pepper	

So the conference report was rejected.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Ayers.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Rarick.
Mr. Kirwan with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Downing.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Powell.

Messrs. HAMILTON, NATCHER, ANDERSON of Tennessee, FLOWERS, WHITTEN, BROTZMAN, CLEVELAND, BROWN of Ohio, EDMONDSON, and COLMER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORT ON THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a report on the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

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

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16916, OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 16916) making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 15, 1970.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, we are considering today the conference report on the education appropriation bill that passed the House in April. You will recall, after the difficulties we had last year, that everybody agreed, in both Houses, and urged, especially the educators in the districts back home, that Federal appropriations for education should be enacted much earlier in the year than they have been in the past. So we took the education bill as a separate bill to expedite it and to permit the budget people, the administrators and the school people in the districts back home to know where they were, and not be as confused insofar as dollars are concerned, as they certainly were last year.

Mr. Speaker, the education appropriations bill that passed the House in April amounted to a total of \$4,127,114,000 or \$319,590,000 more than the President had requested.

The bill, as it passed the Senate in June, added \$816,000 more than the House bill of April.

Now to be fair, Mr. Speaker, we should hasten to add, and we do, that the Senate bill included two items totaling \$159,300,000 which were requested by the President, but were not considered by the House.

In conference, and it was a conference, and we understand that legislation is the art of compromise, we were seeking a compromise between the House bill of \$4,127,114,000 and the Senate bill of \$4,782,871,000.

The conference agreement is \$4,420,145,000 which is \$362,726,000 under the Senate bill and \$293,031,000 over the House bill.

Now I will just briefly mention the major items which were in conference and describe how they were settled.

For impacted area aid, the House bill

included \$440,000,000, and the Senate bill included \$673,800,000, or an increase of \$233,800,000 over the House bill. We have agreed upon a total figure of \$551,068,000. This will provide:

First, 100 percent of entitlement for "A" children in hardship school districts where they represent more than 25 percent of total enrollment;

Second, 90 percent entitlement for all other "A" children; and

Third, 65 percent of entitlement for "B" children.

We think this is a much more equitable method of distribution than a flat percentage of entitlement for both "A" and "B" children.

The total amount that we have agreed upon for impacted area aid is \$111,068,000 over the amount in the House bill and \$122,732,000 under the amount in the Senate bill, and it is \$126,068,000 over the budget request.

For elementary and secondary education, the budget request was \$1,614,693,000 which the House increased to \$1,808,968,000.

The Senate further increased the amount to \$1,898,168,000, or an increase of \$89,200,000, and of that increase, \$38 million was agreed to in the conference.

Mr. Speaker, for "Higher education," the budget estimate was \$857,525,000. The House bill provided \$899,880,000. The Senate further increased it to \$1,046,670,000, or an increase of \$146,790,000.

In conference we agreed to \$68 million of that increase. Most of the increase that we agreed to—and this will interest you, Mr. Speaker—is for grants for construction of public community colleges and for the NDEA student loans which I know you favor.

The other major item which we considered in conference was the President's request for \$150 million for emergency assistance to school districts which are being desegregated this fall. The Senate bill included the full \$150 million requested by the President. That item had not been considered by the House.

After considerable negotiations—and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, it was considerable—we agreed upon one-half of the President's request for \$75 million. None of us believes it would be possible to spend the full \$150 million wisely and effectively in the time remaining before the school opening in September, even though we endorse the President's desire to help those schools.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. With regard to the amount of money included in this conference report for the purpose of assisting local school districts with problems in connection with integrating the schools, can the gentleman tell me whether the applicants for such assistance will have their applications approved or acted upon first by the State departments of education, or will they be acted upon first in the Education Office in Washington, D.C.?

Mr. FLOOD. I am aware of the concern of the gentleman from Georgia. He has discussed the subject with me. Let me read this language so there will be

no mistake as to the attitude of the managers on the part of the House:

So far as the House managers are concerned, we are anxious that these funds be made available to qualified local educational agencies as quickly as possible in order to be of assistance when schools open in the fall of 1970. Toward this end, we strongly urge that maximum use of State educational agencies be made by the Office of Education in the review and approval of project applications. In this way the administrative process can be expedited.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, that statement, if followed by the administering agency in Washington, will be extremely helpful to the districts which may have these problems and will facilitate, in my judgment, appropriate use of the funds to the end that the President has said they should be applied and to the end, I understand, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has indicated they will be applied.

But is there anything in this legisla-

tion or in this appropriation bill that would prevent the Federal Education Office from approving an application from a non-educational local agency, for example, from a militant organization that wanted to participate in these activities, and giving them money under this appropriation so they could be a force in the administration of it in the local areas?

Mr. FLOOD. I understand. May I suggest under all the circumstances, including the gentleman's last question, that to change the language would be gilding the lily.

Mr. LANDRUM. The gentleman, if he will yield further, always disarms even his friends with his eloquent and colorful language. Nevertheless, I do want to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman for saying that insofar as his committee and the managers on the part of the House are concerned, they would hope this money could be allocated to the State departments and have the approval at the State departments of education level.

Mr. FLOOD. I did not think anybody could say it any better than I could.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the general provisions in the House bill which were stricken by the Senate, the well-known Whitten and Jonas amendments, we followed what we thought was a mandate of the House and tried to get them restored to the bill. We were able to persuade—and that is an understatement—the Senate conferees reluctantly to put the Whitten amendments, that is, sections 209 and 210, back in the bill; however, we had to give up on the Jonas amendment, section 211.

These are the highlights of the conference report, Mr. Speaker, and I think the committee and the managers on the part of the House did an excellent job under all the circumstances, because this is a can of worms. We did considerably better than a 50-50 split, no matter how we look at it.

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to insert a table showing in detail the results of the conference.)

The table referred to follows:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971 (H.R. 16916)—NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY
CONFERENCE SUMMARY

Agency and item	1971					Conference agreement compared with—			
	1970 enacted ¹	Budget estimate ²	House bill	Senate bill	Conference agreement	1970	Budget 1971	House	Senate
School assistance in federally affected areas	\$520,581,000	\$425,000,000	\$440,000,000	\$673,800,000	\$551,068,000	+\$30,487,000	+\$126,068,000	+\$111,068,000	-\$122,732,000
Elementary and secondary education	+1,614,397,900 (1,693,108,000)	1,614,693,000	1,808,968,000	1,898,168,000	1,846,968,000	+232,570,100	+232,275,000	+38,000,000	-51,200,000
Advance appropriation, 1972		1,339,050,000					-1,339,050,000		
Education for the handicapped	85,000,000 (100,000,000)	95,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	105,000,000	+20,000,000	+10,000,000		
Vocational and adult education	419,046,000 (442,816,000)	440,046,000	490,446,000	497,946,000	494,196,000	+75,150,000	+54,150,000	+3,750,000	-3,750,000
Higher education	850,913,000 (899,374,000)	*857,525,000	899,880,000	1,046,670,000	967,880,000	+116,967,000	+110,355,000	+68,000,000	-78,790,000
Initial funding of programs				4,500,000					-4,500,000
Education professions development	117,249,500 (129,237,000)	136,100,000	135,800,000	105,000,000	135,800,000	+18,550,500	-300,000		+30,800,000
Teacher Corps	(0)	(0)	(0)	40,800,000	(0)				-40,800,000
Community education	67,213,250 (89,381,000)	59,446,000	71,636,000	101,794,000	85,040,000	+17,826,750	+25,594,000	+13,404,000	-16,754,000
Research and training	80,325,000 (82,108,000)	118,329,000	105,325,000	90,077,000	90,077,000	+9,752,000	-28,252,000	-15,248,000	
Educational activities overseas (special foreign currency program)	1,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	+2,000,000			
Salaries and expenses	44,685,000	46,733,000	46,107,000	45,164,000	45,164,000	+479,000	-1,569,000	-943,000	
Student loan insurance fund	10,826,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	+7,174,000			
Payment of participation sales insufficiencies	2,918,000	2,952,000	2,952,000	2,952,000	2,952,000	+34,000			
Emergency school assistance		*150,000,000		150,000,000	75,000,000	+75,000,000	-75,000,000	+75,000,000	-75,000,000
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority, Office of Education	*3,814,154,650 *(4,016,034,000)	5,305,874,000	4,127,114,000	4,782,871,000	4,420,145,000	+605,990,350	-885,729,000	+293,031,000	-362,726,000
Consisting of—									
Regular appropriations	*3,814,154,650 *(4,016,034,000)	3,966,824,000	4,127,114,000	4,782,871,000	4,420,145,000	+605,990,350	+453,321,000	+293,031,000	-362,726,000
Advance appropriation, 1972		1,339,050,000					-1,339,050,000		

¹ 1970 appropriations are adjusted to be comparable to the 1971 estimates and to reflect the limitation contained in section 410 of Public Law 91-204. Where a 1970 appropriation has been reduced in the administration of this limitation, the amount carried in the Act (adjusted for comparability) is shown in parentheses directly under the reduced figure. Includes supplemental appropriations.

² Includes amendments contained in H. Doc. 91-285 and S. Doc. 91-80 and a proposed supplemental for fiscal year 1970 contained in S. Doc. 91-83.

³ Proposed for separate transmittal.

⁴ Includes an advance for 1970 of \$1,010,814,300 appropriated in 1969 bill.

⁵ Includes budget amendment of \$9,300,000 (S. Doc. 91-80) which the House did not consider.

⁶ Included under "Education professions development."

⁷ Proposed supplemental for fiscal year 1970 (S. Doc. 91-83) which House did not consider.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority member (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, you will all recall that when we brought this bill before you in April, it was over \$300 million over the budget, but it provided sufficient increases in the sensitive areas to prevent our getting completely rolled for considerably higher amounts as we were on last

year's bill. That, to some, was bad enough and now coming back to you with a conference report that is \$453 million over the President's budget has caused some of you to raise additional questions.

I must confess that I find myself very distressed that this second or third appropriations bill to go to the President for his signature is in the neighborhood of a half billion dollars over his request, and I suspect it might be tempting for the President to veto it in view of the

very serious fiscal situation we find ourselves in today, particularly so when there are several other appropriations bills waiting in the wings that in the aggregate are several billion dollars over the President's budget requests.

Our timing is somewhat unfortunate in the sense that this is one of the first bills, as I said, but then, we had always planned on getting early action on this education measure so that our school districts and institutions of higher learn-

ing throughout the country would have some advance notice before the fall term begins as to just what sums would be available.

I have no idea what the President's view will be with respect to this particular bill, although it is fair to state that those in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including the Secretary, are fairly pleased with what action has been taken, and the President will be urged to sign the bill. I hope he does, for we have worked hard to bring about this compromise and you all know that it is absolutely essential that there be a give and take in a conference of this kind. Your conferees fought hard for the House position at every turn of the road.

I believe both the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Missouri will be very interested in knowing that in the Office of Education there was a request for 88 new positions. We felt that 50 of them should be allowed in the House. In the interest of compromising, where the Senate had no positions allowed, we agreed to their position. So there are 88 requested positions which will go unfilled in the Office of Education.

So far as the Jonas and Whitten amendments are concerned, I made the point on the floor when the bill was originally here in April that I was opposed to the Jonas amendment definitely but that the so-called Whitten amendments did not really change basic law nor did they really require a change in HEW requirements, and for that reason I had no serious objection to the Whitten amendments.

As the chairman indicated, as a part of the overall package we deleted the Jonas amendment and kept the Whitten amendments and went along with \$75 million of the \$150 million request to assist these school districts around the country to speed their integration plans.

The chairman has very ably touched on the most significant items that were in disagreement and had to be compromised, and I shall not repeat what he said with respect to the impacted aid item, for that has been very adequately covered.

In the elementary and secondary education item, it should be noted that in the equipment and minor remodeling, NDEA title III the House carried a figure of \$20 million, the Senate added another \$59,200,000 and we compromised this out at \$50 million.

In dropout prevention, ESEA, title VIII, our House bill carried \$8 million and the Senate version called for \$15 million, and we agreed on \$10 million as the compromise. There were several other items in this category where the Senate was over our figure but they receded.

Now, in the field of vocational and adult education, there was no difference between our bills in the \$346,336,000 for basic grants to the States, but the Senate had a reference to part C of the Vocational Education Act, which requires the States to earmark 10 percent of the amount for research. I personally have some misgivings about forcing each and

every State to spend an arbitrary figure of 10 percent for research and innovation, but that figure happens to be in the enabling legislation. I personally think there is a great deal of room for improvement and with all our technological advances and requirements for the future, we have to update our vocational education and training programs. We would like to give it a try for at least a year and see what can be accomplished, but we want to also make it clear that we do not mean by our action in agreeing to it this year that we expect to allocate and earmark that amount in the future for research. It certainly does not have to be a continuing thing at that level, but in this amount it will surely give it a big shot in the arm nationwide.

The chairman covered the item of educational opportunity grants, NDEA student loans, and college work-study items. We in the House have been more impressed with the loan approach than the outright grant to the student, and we maintained this position in our conference.

In the foreign language training and area studies the House bill carried \$6 million, but by the time the bill got to the Senate, there was a budget amendment bringing this item up to \$15,300,000, and the Senate provided for the full amount. Personally, I would have gone along with the higher figure, but it was quite obvious among our House conferees that my views were not shared by the other Members and the final figure arrived at was \$8 million. There are those who argue that we already have too many language teachers in the country who cannot find jobs, but there is a definite problem in our institutions of higher learning, for in the more exotic languages there are so few students taking the subject matter. The classes are small, sometimes only five or six students, and obviously the class is a losing proposition to the university. However, as a national resource I do not think we can summarily say that there is no need for Federal subsidy for classes of this nature.

Our House bill carried no money for grants for the construction of public community colleges and technical institutes, although there is all kinds of testimony in the record by administration witnesses in support of the community college concept. The Senate provided last year's figure of \$43 million and the House receded to the Senate figure. The Senate also had added grants for construction of other undergraduate facilities in the amount of \$28 million, but they receded on that item.

On the Teachers Corps item we retained the House figure of \$30,800,000 as against the \$10 million increase in that amount in the Senate bill.

Educational broadcasting facilities ends up being way over the budget that came in at \$4 million. You may recall your House committee boosted the figure to \$6 million, the Senate carried a figure of \$15 million and we compromised at \$11 million.

Other than the item for increased positions of which I made reference to earlier, there is only one item where the

Senate figure was below the House figure, and that was in research and training, and your House conferees, much more willing to economize than the other body, was quick to recede to the Senate's lower figure, although I must confess from a personal point of view, I have some reservation about our having cut so deeply in this experimental and research area.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that pretty well covers the specific items that are in need of explanation at this time and would be happy to answer any questions Members might have about our conference report. As I said, we did our darndest for you in the hope of getting the kind of bill that will satisfy most on both sides of the aisle and also acceptable, even though it may be with grave reservations with the higher figure, by the President.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding for a question.

Reverting back to the gentleman's statement about the conference report in the amount that is over and above the budget estimate, will the gentleman advise the Members whether or not there is a mandatory spending clause in this, as there has been in other reports which have been over the budget, the so-called Yarborough amendment in the other body?

Mr. MICHEL. No, sir; there is not.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. McCCLORY. As I understand it, with respect to category A pupils, as to impact aid, if they are 25 percent or more of the population where the students come from, and the parents reside on the military base, there is a 100 percent entitlement?

Mr. MICHEL. That is correct. And that is about a \$8.8 million item that would take care of that category of schools.

Mr. McCCLORY. And 90 percent with regard to the balance of category A?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. McCCLORY. And then category B is a flat 65 percent. Is that correct?

Mr. MICHEL. That is exactly correct.

Mr. McCCLORY. Do I understand that these payments will be made, or are you suggesting by your response to the last question that perhaps the payments under this formula would not be made?

Mr. MICHEL. Well, there is no reason for me to make such a statement that they would not be made, because we have provided the money here for it. It is clearly understood on the part of all parties concerned that it would be made under those terms.

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, under the conference committee report, impacted school aid to the 28 affected school districts in my congressional district will be reduced by more than \$570,000 below the amount to which these same schools were entitled under the formulas used last year.

The application of 65 percent to cate-

gory (b) pupils may be fair insofar as some school districts are concerned. Indeed, this percentage may be excessive in many school districts.

Let me observe that the conferees have agreed to a larger figure than was voted by the House for category (b) pupils.

Furthermore, it is my hope that improvements will be made in the calculation of impacted school aid to the end that those school districts most adversely affected by students whose parents are employed at Federal institutions may be compensated—adequately.

It would be a sufficient answer if the Federal properties paid an amount equivalent to the real estate taxes.

In the absence of such an agreement, a way must be found to resolve the inequities which exist in the present method of providing impacted aid. I will continue to work to achieve that result.

Mr. DON. H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

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

Mr. DON. H. CLAUSEN. What was the final compromise figure?

Mr. MICHEL. It was \$551 million. The House version, you recall, was \$440 million. So there is a \$111 million increase.

Mr. DON. H. CLAUSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report, because under this conference report we are simply going to perpetuate fiscal irresponsibility on the part of the Congress of the United States.

I know that we were all surprised when President Nixon presented a Federal budget for fiscal year 1971, a proposed budget, calling for the expenditure of over \$200 billion, the largest Federal budget in the history of this country. I was pleased at the time that the budget called for a \$1.3 billion surplus but I was disappointed that the surplus was not greater.

However, it has become quite apparent from legislation passed by the House in both appropriation and authorization bills that our deficit for the fiscal year 1971, this fiscal year which started July 1, is now going to be somewhere between a \$10 and \$15 billion deficit.

I am for education, and I believe every Member of this House is for education. The President's budget proposed an expenditure of \$3,966,824,000 for education and I am for spending this sum of money for education. This is far and away the largest sum of money that the Federal Government has ever spent for education. This conference report calls for a total expenditure for education of \$4,420,145,000, which is an increase of over \$453 million over the budget.

What is this going to mean to our economy? First let me explain to you that we now owe over \$374 billion. The debt now has to be refinanced every 3 years. That means in this fiscal year we are going to be refinancing over \$110 billion in maturing Federal obligations that are carrying interest rates of 4 or 5 percent. To refinance these obligations

we are going to pay a minimum of 8½ percent.

That means that this year the interest on the money we owe is going to exceed \$20 billion and within 2 years the interest on the money we owe is going to exceed \$30 billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, this is going to be a never-ending annual item. We wonder why there is not more money in our economy for housing and for all the other things that people want. The reason for this is that the Federal Government is soaking up all of the money out of the capital market, the money market, just like a sponge.

Mr. Speaker, we have GNMA, FNMA, and countless other Federal agencies competing in the money market with our Treasury Department in borrowing money and this forces up interest rates to their present alltime high.

We do not have this \$453 million over the budget. This and other overexpenditures are going to require the Treasury Department to go out into the open money market and borrow money at a minimum of 8.25 percent.

I say to you that unless we start to live—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) would yield to me some additional time?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members of this House that unless we start to adopt sound fiscally responsible procedures and reduce Federal spending that what we are doing is fueling the fires of inflation, bringing our economy ever closer to the brink of complete failure and disaster, and setting the stage for a large increase in taxes for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the defeat of this conference report.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, we have all been through the Whitten amendments, time and time again. They are still with us, although I am pleased that the Jonas amendment has been eliminated.

Sections 209 and 210 are essentially the antibusing provisions previously introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN), with one major exception. The current version would be operative only with respect to "any school or a school district which is desegregated as that term is defined in title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964."

Title IV provides:

As used in this title . . . "desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but "desegregation" shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

It is my understanding that adoption of sections 209 and 210 would not impose additional limitations in the enforcement of title IV. Where a school district has acted to separate children on the basis of race, color, or national origin,

subsequent assignments to undo that separation are not assignments "in order to overcome racial imbalance" as that term is used in title IV. A school district which previously established schools on a racial basis does not achieve a desegregated status—is not assigning students "without regard to their race"—until it has achieved the constitutionally required unitary school system.

I hope that what I have said clarifies the legal effect of sections 209 and 210.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my friend and colleague, Chairman Flood and the other conferees for their work on the Office of Education conference report. They have done a remarkable job of assimilating and coordinating the views of this body with those of our colleagues in the Senate. I am especially pleased that the job was done with great care and precision and with speed, because we all realize the importance of releasing the funds necessary for the Office of Education to function.

It appears that the total dollars appropriated are adequate, and will allow the Office of Education to pursue its work of improving and perfecting our Nation's educational system.

I was pleased that the conferees saw fit to delete the pernicious Jonas amendment from this bill. It is heartening that we will no longer run the risk of jeopardizing the effort to end unconstitutional racial segregation in our schools. The future of the country and the education of generations of American citizens would most certainly have been threatened by this detrimental and unconstitutional language.

I am quite disturbed, however, that the conferees have not deleted the Whitten language. But as I pointed out in previous debate on this appropriations bill, a careful and thorough reading of this language indicates that it has no legal effect. Its purpose is to impede the Federal effort to end unconstitutional segregation in our schools. It was for this reason that I originally opposed the Whitten provisions. However, this version of the Whitten provisions will not restrict the obligation of the Federal Government to enforce the nondiscrimination requirements of the Civil Rights Act.

The precise legal effect of this new version of the Whitten amendments, sections 209 and 210, is clear. I have had skilled lawyers interpret this language. They have concluded that nothing in these provisions removes or interferes with the obligation of the Federal Government to enforce title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

I discussed this point in my remarks during the floor debate over the House version of the Office of Education appropriations bill. At that time, I stated:

For a desegregated school system, as provided in sections 209 and 210, must be read as a unitary school system. My understanding of the language is that a desegregated school system has met the constitutional requirements in this area of assuring equal opportunity.

The objection to sections 209 and 210, therefore, goes to the fact that they are calculated to deceive. The prohibition, although qualified, against busing and

assignment of students is bound to confuse parents and school officials alike. The requirements of the law remain. But these sections will lead people to believe that no effective remedy to meet those requirements is imposed. It is irresponsible legislation, and I urge the House to strike these provisions. Desegregation as used in title IV of the Civil Rights Act has been judicially interpreted to mean desegregation in accordance with constitutional requirements. The new Whitten language which would subject title VI activities to the title IV definition of "desegregation" would have virtually no effect on the policies and enforcement activities of HEW with respect to title IV. Desegregation as defined in title IV of this act is coextensive with the duty imposed upon school districts by the 14th amendment and by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The language is mischievous, confusing, and poses yet another hindrance to proper enforcement of the law. These sections serve only to raise false hopes of relief for those who want out of a sticky situation, but the fact still remains that these provisions cannot alter the constitutional obligation to desegregate and to desegregate now.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the only effect of these provisions is that they are calculated to deceive and to confuse. But in the final analysis, the requirements of the law remain and make the effect of this language negligible. I have been informed that officials at HEW have concurred in this view and feel that the constitutional requirements for ending segregation can remain fully effective in spite of the Whitten language.

I urge my colleagues to give approval to this conference report so that the Office of Education can proceed with the business of education.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate that today when we vote on the conference report on the Office of Education appropriations bill for fiscal 1971, that I pay tribute to Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., the former Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I was delighted when President Nixon chose Dr. Allen to be U.S. Commissioner of Education because Dr. Allen had an outstanding record as an educator and as a chief State school officer.

For 13 years before coming to Washington, at the beginning of the Nixon administration, Dr. Allen served as Commissioner of Education for New York State. His record in leading that formidable education system bespoke of his high administrative capabilities and his firm commitment to improving our Nation's schools and colleges.

No doubt, President Nixon's campaign pledges in 1968 concerning American education encouraged Dr. Allen to come to Washington and persuaded him that this administration would assign a high priority to education.

It became increasingly evident, however, that the administration strongly opposed sufficient funding and rejected new initiatives for educating America's

youth. Yet Dr. Allen persevered as the U.S. Commissioner.

Despite the delays he faced in gaining approval for his plans from the White House.

Despite inordinate political pressure for the appointment of key aides at the Office of Education.

Despite recurrent opposition from the White House to his recommendations of outstanding educators and persons prominent in education for staff positions at the Office of Education, Dr. Allen was committed to being as effective as possible.

When asked in May about whether he would resign his post, he said "No," that he would remain a while longer.

DISMISSAL NOT SURPRISING

Yet it is not surprising that the administration on June 10 requested Dr. Allen's resignation.

For on three issues of overriding importance to our Nation, Dr. Allen stated that administration policy was not in the best interests of our educational system.

First, Dr. Allen talked about the benefits to be derived from integrated schools, and he announced his intention in line with the Constitution and the law, to press for the integration of all schools regardless of the reasons for their previous segregation. He thereby advocated a much broader policy of desegregation than had President Nixon in his statement of March 24.

Second, three times Dr. Allen stated publicly that the administration's budget proposals for education were inadequate. On May 5, for example, he wrote to President Nixon saying that he could not "defend, for a third year, insufficient funds for education."

Third, Dr. Allen was deeply concerned—and so he spoke out—that President Nixon's move into Cambodia would have disastrous effects on education throughout the country.

In each of these instances, Dr. Allen's position was stated without compromise—but also without rancor. Dr. Allen sought in each case to be persuasive with his thoughtful judgment about how best to sustain and improve the quality of education in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that the administration could not abide Dr. Allen's candid judgments on school desegregation, funds for education, and the effects on American education of U.S. involvement in Cambodia is doubly dismaying: First, because the Federal Government has lost a highly qualified and respected educational leader; and second, because the administration has again demonstrated that political considerations are foremost in formulating its educational policies.

UNDERSTOOD YOUTH

But, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Allen's dismissal is particularly unfortunate for yet another reason.

In a commencement address at Notre Dame University on June 7, Dr. Allen chose the theme "Does Anybody Hear?"

In his remarks, Dr. Allen maintained that increasingly Americans are hearing "the real meaning of youthful protest and concern." And he challenged Notre Dame's graduating students to "grow

into a renewal of our society through the political processes of democracy."

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret Dr. Allen's dismissal because he was one of the few individuals in the administration who understood the gap of confidence between the administration and young people. Moreover, he understood the breach of confidence which was rapidly growing between the administration and educators across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I would add that—true to his own admonition to students at Notre Dame—Dr. Allen carried out the duties of his office with great regard for the processes of democratic government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Dr. Allen's commencement address at the University of Notre Dame—to which I referred—and his statements on his dismissal, on school desegregation, and on Cambodia be included in the RECORD at this point:

DOES ANYBODY HEAR?¹

(By James E. Allen, Jr.)

It is an honor to be here today to participate in your 1970 Commencement exercises. Notre Dame is one of our great universities and the steadfast allegiance to excellence that continues to be demonstrated here in these tumultuous times is a hopeful augury for the future of higher education everywhere.

You look, I am sure, with great pride upon the national leadership which has been exerted by your President, Father Hesburgh, not only in affairs of higher education but also particularly in Civil Rights. The value of his service cannot be overestimated, and both as an educator and a citizen, I am grateful for his understanding and support, and for the wisdom and the dedication he has brought to the great issues of our day.

The members of this graduating class do not, I surmise, want or expect the usual kind of commencement congratulations. Although this ritual is invested with all the tradition accumulated in its long history beginning in the Middle Ages, the message on campuses throughout the Nation this year cannot with any sort of realism be the accustomed bland, patriarchal felicitations but must reflect the conflicting moods and problems within our society.

The symbolism of the hundreds of commencement exercises taking place across our Nation in these spring weeks will be as varied as the institutions themselves and the students they serve. But one symbolic interpretation that is certainly no longer apt is that of commencements as a line of demarcation between the life of the "campus" and the life of the "world." Clearly emerging from the current period of travail in higher education is the knowledge that this separation no longer has, if indeed it ever had, any reality or validity. Our college and university students are no longer waiting in the wings—they are on stage, ready for action. The question that must concern all of us is what part they are going to play.

Some of you may have seen or read about the current Broadway play "1776." This witty and perceptive drama is concerned with the creation and adoption of the Declaration of Independence. John Adams, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin are a determined trio, bent on ensuring that liberty and justice for all shall in this document have a secure, inalienable foundation.

But the fight is not easy, and in one scene John Adams stands alone on the stage which has been darkened to hide the assembly room

¹ Before Annual Commencement Exercises at University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana, Sunday, June 7, 1970.

where he has been arguing and pleading his cause, with a spotlight focusing on his figure, bent with weariness, and on his face, lined with discouragement. He muses on his fears for this Nation aborning, and in mounting anguish over his inability to convince his fellow representatives of the people, calls out "Does anybody out there hear?"

Now, almost two hundred years after those historic days, there is another scene—not on stage, but in a dormitory room, perhaps, or in a local campus gathering place. A record playing—it begins with a young voice quietly asking "Does anybody hear, does anybody hear?" and goes on repeating that question with an increasing volume of sound and of despair, anguish and frustration that mounts to a crescendo that tears the heart.

Though so different and so far apart in time, these two questions are very much the same. Inherent in John Adams' cry was his concern that we should set for ourselves as a beginning Nation a course dedicated to principles of liberty and justice for all; and inherent in the question of youth today is a concern that we have not stayed firmly enough on that course at home and abroad and that we have not kept true faith with the principles upon which our Nation was founded.

WHAT ARE STUDENTS REALLY SAYING?

More and more the voice of youth is being raised, and it is vital not only to listen but to attempt to hear what is *really* being said. It is all too easy to hear only the harsh, shrill, unreasoning voice of the small numbers who see violence, terrorism, and destruction as the only way to change. Their frustration is understandable, but their choice of means is indefensible not only because it is wrong, morally and legally, but because it is self-destructive and foreign to the very goals they espouse.

Speaking also, however, and in far greater numbers, are the voices of those who still hope to be able to effect change peaceably, but who are equally strong in their dedication to change and to bringing our actions more in accord with our principles. They share the sense of powerlessness arising out of the realization of a loss of control over life in our huge technological-industrial-bureaucratic machine. They question the extended state of adolescence and the resulting separatist youth sub-culture that society has forced upon them where they are kept from real positions of power and decision-making on issues that they consider vital to their lives both now and in the future.

They know that if they "play the game," they can count on a fair measure of material comfort and security, but they find little of value in a secure place in a dehumanized society where their talents will be used to perpetuate those elements which they feel require reform and renewal.

They sense that their society is on a collision course with its ideals and that nothing short of a drastic shift in values and structure will avert disaster. But they also believe that if they were to opt for riots, arson, vandalism and terrorism, they would be creating an even greater danger to society, and that those few elements who attempt to destroy the system, most seriously contribute to the anxieties and the hostility of other elements of society.

The end result of destructive protests is a tendency to destroy the liberal or vital center of our society and to polarize it into two extreme groups, intensifying and igniting deep-seated fears and hatreds of broad segments of our population. Such an atmosphere encourages the forces of repression and reaction throughout society. It could threaten all of the social reform of the past four decades, destroying, perhaps for our lifetime, the optimistic hopes that our open society was truly progressing toward a more perfect one with its great institutions and

ideals intact. The legendary 1984 could arrive a decade earlier and the irony would be that this Orwellian Nightmare would have been helped to reality because of the same young idealists who would most deplore it.

George Bernard Shaw understood the danger when he wrote that "revolutions have never lightened the burden of tyranny; they have only shifted it to another shoulder." The history of the twentieth century seems to warn us that this shoulder would be more likely totalitarian than democratic, more demagogic than benevolent, and that the liberal values of tolerance, patience, good temper, respect for the rights of opponents, and non-violent resolution of problems through the political process would become things of a distant, nostalgic past.

The majority of our students and our young speak for the constructive way of change that can avoid such hazards. Theirs is, I believe, the true voice that should be heeded.

These young people do *not* want to destroy their universities, they do *not* want to destroy their society or to harm their country, but they do want to participate, to be accepted and respected for their concern and their willingness to work for what they believe. They want to get on with the unfinished business of the older generation—achieving a lasting peace, promoting racial harmony, protecting the environment, building and preserving livable communities, improving and expanding educational opportunities.

I am, of course, only guessing when I say these things about youth. I am obviously far beyond that 30 year point of credibility which could make me a somewhat authentic spokesman. But let me share with you what I hear when I listen to the voices of youth.

STUDENTS' CONCERN FOR EDUCATION

About their education and their concern for its direction and quality, I hear something like this.

What does it mean to educate? A tough old question, that. The dictionary says that to educate is "to develop the faculties and powers by teaching, instruction, or schooling." Not much help: *which* faculties and *which* powers? And what about "develop"?—free development, or are their restrictions a result prefigured? What if the society which supports the universities does not like what one of its students proves capable of being? What if that student or a teacher starts asking hard questions of his society? Furthermore, what if he *demand*s answers? What if he refuses to do what the society expects him to do, and what if he tells you exactly why he refuses to do it? What if he takes what you have to teach him and turns it around against you and asks: why have you not *lived* what you would presume to teach? What if he pushes *beyond* what he is taught, beyond where his teachers envisioned he would and should go, so that there is no understanding of where he is going and what he is doing?

If that is what *can* result from the development of human faculties and powers, and from letting each one among us become all he is capable of being, then what kind of society can permit this risk in its conception of education?

Can you teach a man to reason critically and also tell where and when he may and may not do so? Can you teach a man to reason critically and not also expect him—more, ask him—to turn that same power upon *everything* you have taught him, all your values, your principles, your vision of what human society should be? Can you educate for anything but this power of critical reasoning? And if you do, is it still education? Or is it indoctrination? This word is not intended as a bogey, but in its meaning of teaching or inculcating a doctrine, prin-

ciple, or ideology. Most education is indoctrination. Most education is conceived as the putting of information into the student. It is akin to stuffing tomatoes into a can. But is this what education *should* be?

Is to educate to provide a society with the kind of members it wants to ensure the stable continuation of itself on its own terms? Or is to educate to develop in the individual the power to keep him not only in but *beyond* his society, the power to make him live *critically* in that society so that it is, not stable, but fluid, always moving, evolving, always—yes!—a little chaotic? For if a man is reasoning critically he will never be at rest: that is, he will never harden over, he will never be silent, he will never be stunted and he will watch for any other man who would presume, in the name of anything, to stunt him in any part of himself.

Education should fundamentally concern only two people: the student and the teacher. Anyone else whose presence is considered necessary to make the university work is subordinate to these two and must remain so. The power working between the student and the teacher is the only power that can exist in a university, the *only* power that can define the university and hold it together.

Here is an example of that power.

The student has the *duty* to bring all of what he knows, or surmises, questions and envisions to bear upon any man who would (however well-intentioned) say to him: "I have something to teach you." The student must say, "Go ahead; but you'd best be good."

On the other hand, the teacher has the duty to bring everything he knows, every bit and scrap of what he is, all that he says and does, to bear upon one who would presume to say to him: "I want to learn." And if a student should challenge the teacher, on what or how he teaches, or on the relationship between what he says and what he does, the teacher must say to him: "Go ahead; but you'd best be good."

Who, it could be asked, in either situation, will judge the outcome? Who else but the student and the teacher: a student *knows* a good teacher. And a good teacher has never been one with whom his students have always agreed. But he will be one who, if he is challenged and cannot meet that challenge, will shut his mouth and listen. And when and if he speaks again, it will be because he has put his dogma (using the word non-pejoratively) on the line and questioned it; because he is always ready to do that, because that readiness, that obligation, is somewhere very near the heart of learning and teaching.

If those are the only rules, then no one, regardless of his age or other straw armor, will have power except that which is in the stuff of what he says and thinks. In a university of students and teachers and no one else, you have leadership not power. No one in the university (indeed, no one claiming to be involved in education) could crouch under any carapace of power. No one. Each man would have only the power of what he says and thinks. And if that is all you have, there is no hiding. You do not have to occupy the office of a man who has no power over you. You can seek him out and call him to account. Every day, if necessary. He will have to answer your questions, and, as I said before, he will have to be good.

I must confess that one voice has been predominant in these ideas about education which I have presented. Not every student would perhaps agree with these particular ideas, but I do think they represent the yearning of students for a more personalized university that recognizes the essential individuality of the learning process. They are the answer, in his words, that I received from my son when I asked him what should be the theme of a speech of a 1970 Commencement.

Is such a view of a university visionary and idealistic? Perhaps so, but it must be sought, for as your President has said, the university is "an open community that lives by the power of reason" and that it "can prevail only when the great majority of its members share its commitment to rational discourse, listen closely to those with conflicting views, and stand together against the few (and I would add, the many) who would impose their will on everyone else."

YOUTH'S VIEW OF SOCIETY

Now what do I hear youth saying about their society and the place of the university in that society? The message seems clear—first, that they will no longer accept the injustices that negate our democratic principles, and second, that they will no longer respect, support, or honor a university that stands aloof from the problems and the challenges of not only encouraging, but leading in the achievement of constructive social change.

This message, if it is, as I believe it to be, authentically representative of the views of youth, leads directly to the question of what the continuing role of youth is to be.

In logical progression this question must lead to a further one—namely, "How serious is youth about social change?" There are many who believe that the social concern of youth today is a fad, the "in" thing, ephemeral, and likely in some cyclical fashion to be supplanted by a "return" to more traditional enthusiasms.

Perhaps a brief review of the development of the concern of this younger generation will help to judge the depth of their commitment.

It was the great civil rights movement that first sparked widespread activism beginning with the historic sit-ins by black and white students in 1960, followed throughout that decade by other sit-ins, freedom rides, voter registration drives, as the students lent their support to a movement that culminated in passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Students were also instrumental in bringing the issue of poverty and hunger to the forefront of the American mind and conscience. Throughout the late sixties students were in the vanguard of the peace movement which grew to overshadow the causes of race and poverty as youth issues in the United States.

With the beginning of the seventies, the students found another issue: the quality of life and our decaying environment. They poured their energies and enthusiasms into Earth Day and made it an encouraging success.

Their contributions have been invaluable in awakening a lethargic people and in stirring them into action. But what now comes next? Certainly, none of the problems that has aroused youth can be abandoned or considered as solved. The pattern of past action has, however, been one of going from issue to issue as a succession of neglected problems competed for action.

I can understand this kind of movement. Today's intelligent, idealistic students see a Nation which has achieved the physical ability to provide food, shelter, and education for all but has not yet devised the social institutions to do so. They see a society built on the principle that all men are created equal but that has not yet assured equal opportunity in life. With the fresh energy and idealism of the young, they are impatient with progress that seems to them so indefensibly slow. They want to accelerate social change, and they feel, it seems, that they must jump from issue to issue in order to highlight all the societal inadequacies and unmet promises of America.

Too often during the turbulent sixties, youth picked up an issue and ran with it. But before they reached the finish line, they switched tracks. What we need for the 70's

and the 80's are the long distance runners for the social change and new social inventions so urgently needed.

That this concept is beginning to prevail within the ranks of youth is indicated by a gradual change from mass rallies and demonstrations essentially *ad hoc* toward more organized and permanent structures that can coordinate and concentrate activities. The real doers and movers among youth seem to be taking de Tocqueville seriously by establishing new organizations to ensure that the ideas behind their crusades stand a fighting chance in a Nation of joiners and self-interest politics. They are establishing their own youth and citizen lobbies. Utilizing the existing political techniques they are also gaining some historical perspective and a new vision of de Tocqueville's optimistic picture of American democracy. Like the brilliant French genius of 135 years ago, these new generation leaders have a "lively faith in the perfectability of man and judge that the diffusion of knowledge must necessarily be advantageous, and the consequences of ignorance fatal: they consider society as a body in a state of improvement, humanity as a changing scene, in which nothing is, or ought to be permanent; and they admit that what appears to them today to be good, may be superseded by something better tomorrow."

This new youth pattern of organization and national offices backed up by local grass roots political participation is one of the most hopeful signs in this troubled spring of 1970.

I trust they will become viable organizations infused with a democratic spirit and representative of the best of our society.

Strengthened by this kind of internal order and direction, I would hope that the move outward which is now being demonstrated in an upsurge of student political involvement would make widespread, positive political action the main arena of future youth participation. One measure of the unused opportunity here is the statistic showing that the age group from 21 to 25 has one of the poorest voting records of any segment of society, with only approximately 50 percent voting in the last national election.

If the students are really determined to understand the political process and to work in the nitty gritty of politics, they can do enormous good in the causes they so ardently espouse, for in the final analysis, good government, social reform, and social justice can only be lastingly achieved through the political system.

STAYING POWER

More and more students are rejecting the prophets of flamboyant rhetoric for the political precincts. As in past student crusades, the open question is whether they will be able to sustain the enthusiasm and the necessary constructive approach in such groups as the Movement for a New Congress, the National Petition Committee, or the Continuing Presence in Washington, and others.

Not long ago a student came up to one of my young assistants and said, "I hope the Government does something about pollution soon because I've given six months of my life to this environment movement." Would that problems could be solved so quickly! But the remaking of a society is a task that cannot be measured in months or even years, but must encompass the commitment of a whole lifetime.

Some students will be turned off, I fear, by the sheer drudgery and dullness of some aspects of the political process—canvassing, petitioning, endless checking, stuffing envelopes, mimeographing and the rest. Some will find it hard to accept that those who toil within the system in routine, unspectacular fashion contribute to a better society as mightily as do the more flamboyant, self-styled revolutionaries.

I hope the young will cultivate their staying power, for the young political activists can be the new agents of change who can revitalize our politics. They can prove that there is still vitality and hope in the methods and norms of democracy; that a participant-oriented political society can be created in which pluralism, trust, and optimism can prevail.

The emerging willingness of youth to direct its activities to working within the political system is the real hope of succeeding in the effort to preserve and extend democracy while simultaneously moving toward fundamental social change.

Such an effort will, of its very nature, be disruptive, making this decade a time of unrest and even of peril. But what I hear from the youthful voices of today is the promise of the possibility of a new Renaissance, a development of a new humanism in which this younger generation and those to come will make their decisions and base their actions on values primarily concerned with the dignity of man and the quality of life.

As our young people seek to participate earlier and more actively in the shaping of their world, the American people should recognize that the universities and colleges mirror both the weaknesses and the yearnings of society at large. Eric Erikson, a renowned student of youth, has noted that young and old achieve mutual respect when "society recognizes the young individual as a bearer of fresh energy and he recognizes society as a living process which inspires loyalty as it receives it, maintains allegiance as it extracts it, honors confidence as it demands it."

In conclusion then, let me say that the answer to the question of "Does anybody hear?" is increasingly a "yes," and that more and more people are at last beginning to hear the real meaning of youthful protest and concern. You remember the old story of the donkey and the stick—first, you had to get his attention. Well, youth has certainly succeeded in getting the attention of a society that has been dangerously complacent and slow to move. With attention gained, I hope the young people will continue to be goads to our national conscience and that their crusading spirit will not diminish but rather grow into a renewal of our society through the political processes of our democracy.

STATEMENT BY JAMES E. ALLEN, JR., IN CONNECTION WITH HIS DISMISSAL BY THE ADMINISTRATION, JUNE 11, 1970

At five o'clock yesterday afternoon at a meeting in his office, Secretary Finch informed me that he had been directed to request my resignation as Assistant Secretary for Education in HEW and United States Commissioner of Education. I have this morning submitted my letter of resignation to the President.

Much of my experience as Commissioner of Education has been rewarding and satisfying, but difficulties and conflicts have been apparent from the beginning of my tenure. Foremost among these have been the serious frustrations and discouragements in trying to carry forward the drive to eliminate racial segregation in the schools and to obtain a priority for education at the Federal level commensurate with its importance and its urgent needs. Of special concern also has been the inordinate influence of partisan political considerations in the matter of appointments to positions in the Office of Education. A further serious difficulty in carrying out the responsibilities of the Office has been the frequent and often lengthy delays in securing from higher levels the action necessary for proceeding expeditiously with the plans and the work of the Office.

With regard to my statement about the Cambodian situation, I understand fully the position of the Administration. The decision

to respond as I did to the question raised at a recent meeting of Office of Education personnel was a very difficult one for me to make. Since this issue has so profoundly affected the education community and the youth of the Nation, I believed that I could not refrain from publicly expressing my views.

I regret that I shall no longer be directly involved in the many excellent projects and programs that are underway in the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and in other developments such as the proposed National Institute of Education. I particularly regret that I shall not be able to press officially for the nationwide Right to Read effort and I hope that the commitment which has been made to that effort will be honored by effective and vigorous action.

It has been a privilege and satisfaction to work with the many people in the Government and throughout the country who are dedicated to the improvement and support of education and I am grateful for the opportunity that was given me to try to serve the needs of education in our Nation in these trying times.

STATEMENT BY JAMES E. ALLEN, JR., U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION, ON THE OBLIGATION OF THE EDUCATOR WITH RESPECT TO SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Equal educational opportunity is the principle upon which our educational system is founded and must be the goal of all of our efforts. No child whatever his race can be expected to learn or accept the fundamental values of American society when those values are openly denied in his own school.

In the present period in our nation, the greatest single barrier to progress in achieving this goal is the continuing existence of racially segregated schools. No one can deny that this is probably the most sensitive and serious problem ever faced in the development of American education. But undeniable also is the fact that despite the complex social and economic causes of segregation and the enormous difficulties involved in eliminating it, segregation in our schools simply makes a mockery of the concept of equal educational opportunity.

When confronted with an issue that has such deep emotional and social impact, it is natural to seek the easiest and least disruptive means of dealing with it. But with the issues of desegregation and integration, it is inescapably evident that, when considered in fundamental terms, there is no way, no argument as to means, no sophistry or evasion whereby the principle of equality of educational opportunity can be made to accommodate the continuing existence of segregated schools in a democratic society—no matter how difficult the problems involved in eliminating them may be.

It follows therefore that every educator dedicated to the principle of equal educational opportunity for all must accept his responsibility to work unstintingly for the elimination of school segregation and do everything he can to achieve educational integration.

The social, economic and humanitarian implications of integration are, of course, a part of the reason for the desegregation of our schools, but the primary objective of integration is educational—the conviction that equal educational opportunity will be best achieved by providing for all children quality education in an integrated setting.

More and more research evidence, more reports are pointing out that not only is separation by race or class within a democracy inherently wrong but that the health of our democracy cannot thrive as long as such separation continues. This condition affects all elements of life in our society—school, housing, employment—and all levels of government and all sectors of society

bear a responsibility for it. But education has, I believe, a particular responsibility because of its unique formative influence which comes into play so early in the life of the individual. Continued segregation can only weaken the fabric of our society. All our children must live in a multi-racial world and the school is a natural place in which to introduce them to that world.

The public schools exist in order to educate the individual and to make an educated populace in a free and open society. When a condition exists which stands in the way of both of these goals, it is the obligation of all those responsible for the public schools to do everything within their power to correct it.

All educators throughout the nation, therefore, should not only persevere in their efforts to eliminate segregation in our schools, but should take the lead in helping the public to understand the values that are at issue, the harmful educational effects of segregation on all our people, and the necessity for its elimination if the public schools are to serve equally well all the people of America.

It is the educator who must see to it that debates about means such as busing, neighborhood schools, district boundaries, etc., are not allowed to obscure the ends being sought. He should help his community to understand that in seeking to eliminate segregation we are acting in faithfulness to the fundamental principle of equality of educational opportunity.

It is clear that the conscience of the nation is troubled. This, I believe, is a most hopeful sign that we shall eventually emerge from the thicket of controversy which now ensnares us and find a way to accomplish the integration which we know must exist if our public schools are to reflect and reinforce the democratic principles of our nation.

I am fully and sympathetically aware of the critical nature and the diversity and complexity of the problems school officials face in their efforts to eliminate segregation in their respective communities and areas. I am also aware of and commend the courage and tenacity of purpose demonstrated by so many educators which have brought about significant progress in all parts of our country. Action at the Federal level is, of course, important and can help, but alone it cannot effectively eliminate segregation—the ultimate responsibility must be accepted and acted upon by the educational leaders and the people of each State and of each community.

In the position of national leadership which I occupy, I shall continue to emphasize the educational value of integration, and the educational deprivation of segregation regardless of cause.

STATEMENT BY JAMES E. ALLEN ON CAMBODIA

Obviously, my professional competence cannot include questions of this sort. Thus any opinion that I have is only a personal one, like that of most other citizens. I find it difficult to understand the rationale for the necessity of the move into Cambodia as a means of supporting and hastening the withdrawal from Viet Nam—a withdrawal that I feel must be accomplished as quickly as possible.

What concerns me most now is what our responsibility is in dealing with the disastrous effects that this action has had on education throughout the country and on the confidence of millions of concerned citizens in their Government.

ADDRESS BY DR. JAMES E. ALLEN, JR. (ANNUAL MEETING, EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES, DENVER, COLO., JULY 8, 1970)

Mr. Speaker, I also include Dr. Allen's first major address after resigning from the Office of Education—delivered at the annual meeting of the Education Com-

mission of the States in Denver on July 8—also in the RECORD. In this speech, Dr. Allen provides a candid assessment of the massive needs today at every level of the American educational system and an eloquent plea for a higher national priority for education:

THE MISSING INGREDIENT—A SENSE OF URGENCY

(By James E. Allen, Jr.)

Exactly one year ago I was doing just what I am doing tonight—speaking to the Annual Meeting of the Education Commission of the States.

This is a case of history repeating itself—with one small difference.

In opening my remarks last year, I said "This is my first meeting with you since becoming United States Commissioner of Education." This year I open by saying that this is my first meeting with you since becoming a former Commissioner of Education.

Since June 10, I have become a new member of a growing group—the five percent of unemployed—and before proceeding further I want to say that I have copies of my *vitae* with me and I shall be available for interviews immediately following this banquet.

It is not my intention tonight to try to assess my experience as Commissioner of Education. I shall be doing this, but later, after a period of reflection and in the perspective of time.

There are, however, several important initiatives taken by the Administration in Washington during the past year which I should like to review briefly with you.

The National Institute of Education.—a proposal to create a highly visible, and much needed, national center of planning for educational research and development. Legislation to create the NIE is now before the Congress.

Experimental Schools.—a new program designed to test major new innovations in education. Initial funds are included in the FY 1971 budget for the Office of Education.

The President's Commission on School Finance.—a study group now underway whose mission is to analyze the fiscal plight of the elementary and secondary schools, public and private, and to seek new methods of finance which will ensure greater equity, adequacy, and stability in the pattern of school support within our Nation.

The Right to Read Goal.—a nationwide effort to ensure that by the end of this decade no boy or girl shall be leaving school without having acquired the skills and the desire to read to the full limits of his capability. The success of this effort depends heavily upon the launching of the National Reading Council, still awaiting appointment by the President. The primary function of this Council will be to arouse the Nation to the importance of eliminating reading deficiencies, to coordinate the effort, to mobilize resources and forces, and to provide the extra technical and financial assistance required. I fervently hope that the commitment made by the President to the Right to Read effort will be honored by strong and effective action.

The Proposed Emergency School Aid Act of 1970.—calling for \$1.5 billion over a two year period for assistance to school districts in eliminating segregation in education, *de jure* and *de facto*, and for achieving the educational advantages offered by desegregation. The enactment of this legislation is of the utmost importance if the Federal Government's commitment to desegregation is to become something more meaningful than commitment merely to legal compliance.

Reform of the Impacted Aid Program.—an effort to eliminate long existing inequities in the distribution of Federal funds to school districts with Federally-connected student population.

Review of Title I.—a comprehensive effort

to improve the effectiveness of this largest of the ESEA programs by building into its administration at Federal, State and local levels better techniques for management, accountability and evaluation.

Career Education.—a legislative proposal for making formula grants to the States for the purpose of meeting the added costs of developing vocational programs in new careers primarily through community colleges and other types of pre-baccalaureate degree operations.

Higher Education Proposals.—including expansion of educational opportunity grants and subsidized student loans for lowest income groups; creation of a National Student Loan Association to ensure the continuing supply of loan funds; establishment of a National Foundation for Higher Education to stimulate reform and to maintain quality in higher education.

The Reorganization of the Office of Education.—designed to strengthen the role of the Office in planning and evaluation and as an advocate of improvement and relevance in American education.

These are all initiatives and plans which deserve your support and the support of the entire education community as well as the public. But as yet these important initiatives are just that. They have a long way to go before they bring results. Each individual and group concerned with education must assume a responsibility for following the progress of these measures and insisting that they be adequately funded and properly implemented.

As important as these initiatives are, however, they can, in terms of the broad perspective of educational needs in our country, be viewed as but beginning steps in providing the basis for achieving the improvement and reform so necessary. They fall far short of providing solutions for such long-standing problems as these:

URBAN EDUCATION

Each year our city school systems slide closer and closer to disaster. Yet each year finds only piecemeal attempts to deal with the problem, and the all out attack that can ultimately restore health to our city schools remains still in the discussion stages.

SCHOOL DISTRICT REORGANIZATION

There are nearly 20,000 school districts in the United States. This is many too many, and the continuing existence of such a surplus is an anachronism, relating not to present-day requirements but to a bygone era with simpler needs and goals.

Because we insist on clinging to outmoded organizational and management patterns, hundreds of thousands of children are denied equal educational opportunity, hundreds of millions of dollars are inefficiently expended, and human and material resources are unnecessarily duplicated and poorly utilized.

THE FEDERAL STRUCTURE FOR EDUCATION

Anachronistic also is the present Federal structure for education.

I am more than ever convinced that education should not be coupled with any other department of government, and that it must have the separate status that allows for sharp and undivided focus on its policies and support.

The time is here for serious attention to be given to devising the best means for making such a change. The new structure could be a separate Federal Department of Education, with a cabinet-level officer as its head, or perhaps a Federal department headed by a National Board of Education responsible for policy development and for the appointment of the chief administrative officer. Whatever the means, the objective should be to minimize partisan political considerations and the influence of vested interests and to provide for the continuing implementation of plans and programs that

will reduce the disruptions caused by changes in the Administration.

The need for a change in the structure for education at the Federal level has been talked about for years but with education now so big and complex and becoming increasingly a national concern and a growing Federal activity, the effort to give education separate status at the highest level in the government can no longer be postponed.

ADEQUATE FINANCING FOR EDUCATION

Education in America faces serious financial problems. The difficulty stems not from the lack of ability to finance education adequately but from a continuing reliance on sources of revenue and methods of distribution designed for past needs and goals.

Therefore, it is hoped that the President's Commission on School Finance will quickly and forthrightly direct its attention to the proper role of the Federal government in the support of education, recognizing first that more Federal support is inevitable, and second, that a system should be devised for Federal aid which will incorporate three basic ways of allocation—*general aid*, adequate to provide a solid base of support on which the States and localities can build; *categorical aids*, designed to meet special or short-term nationally recognized needs (e.g. the disadvantaged, the handicapped, etc.); and *research and development funds*, to ensure the continuing discovery, testing, and dissemination of new and better approaches to educational practice and management.

HIGHER EDUCATION

A major part of any consideration of adequate financing of education must include the particular needs of higher education. This is the principal growth area of the 70's and rapidly rising costs are creating financial problems for colleges which threaten both the stability and the viability of many institutions.

A positive first step toward helping these institutions would be Federal funds linked to offsetting the difference between actual per student costs and the tuition paid by students receiving Federal student aid subsidies.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Despite our knowledge that as much of a child's intellectual development occurs in the first five years as in the next thirteen years of his life, there has been little general movement to extend public education's responsibility to these early years.

Here again, the efforts have been piecemeal and unless there is a strong move to accelerate the acceptance of this responsibility, it is likely that this step so fundamental to sound education and to the equalization of educational opportunity will suffer the same delay that has so often in the past stood in the way of new departures.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The whole area of vocational education has received tremendous attention during the past decade. As a result, much excellent legislation has been enacted and many new approaches have been created. But in too many school systems, vocational education still limps along under the constraints of the traditional "shop-home economics" concept.

The broader concept of career education—education for competence—is far from a reality on anything like a nationwide basis. An important factor in delaying the spread of this concept is a Federal policy of financial aid for vocational education and manpower training which tends to emphasize post-school remedial action rather than adequate, realistic, in-school preparation. This policy should be promptly corrected.

NO COLLECTIVE SENSE OF URGENCY

This list of major needs could go on and on. Those omitted are absent not on grounds

of lack of importance but rather on lack of time.

These are, as I said earlier, not new problems. We have been aware of them for a long time. But considering that we have just had three decades of unprecedented concentration upon the problems of education—three decades of a growing recognition of the importance of education, it is dismaying that such a list of major problems so far from solution can still be compiled. WHY?

There are, of course, many reasons, but to me one stands out as the prime villain—that is the lack of a sense of urgency about the needs of education. This is the missing ingredient—and my experience of the past year has strongly reinforced my conviction that it is the absence of this essential motivating force that is most seriously standing in the way of solutions to the problems.

Surely this Nation has both the means and the ability to provide good education for all—missing in the will to insist upon their full application.

Now, I know, of course, that there is a sense of urgency in many groups and with many individuals, but there is no *collective* sense of urgency sufficiently widespread and intense to force at all levels—local, State and national—the full mobilization of resources that would bring results.

The files of this Nation, in high places and low, are replete with speeches, papers and reports whose opening paragraphs extol the virtues, the importance, the necessity of education—calling it the heart of, the foundation of, the source of, the best hope of all good things. But with succeeding paragraphs most of these documents move into the "yes, but" areas—into the ring-around of rationalization that has educators saying "We could do it if we had the money," the public saying "We'd give the money if the schools were better," legislators saying "Support for education has no political clout"—and meanwhile too many children still wait for the better schools everyone is saying they need.

Where is the "savage rage" of which Alfred North Whitehead spoke? What we are talking about is not some remote, disembodied endeavor—we are talking about the lives of children and youth, their hopes, their aspirations, their rights. How can we continue to tolerate the endless rationalization of delay that denies opportunity to so many?

In a way education is the victim of its success. It is difficult to generate indignation or to gain widespread appreciation of the seriousness of the conditions and the needs when the education now being provided is adequate for many and outstandingly good for some. The most serious failures of education tend to be localized—in the slums of the cities, in impoverished rural areas, among minorities and the poor—remote from the experience of the average citizen. Furthermore, the broader effects of educational failure—manpower deficiencies, unemployment, crime, poverty, alienation—appear mostly as statistics that tend to blur their direct connection with education and that do not in any highly visible fashion touch the lives of most people.

For too many people, education's needs are somewhere out there—someone else's problems—nothing to be stirred up about personally. Hence, no widespread public sense of urgency.

A HIGHER PRIORITY FOR EDUCATION

It follows, therefore, that vigorous leadership is essential for the creation of a sense of urgency. But here we face that dilemma inherent in a democracy—namely, that leadership tends to be a response to opinion, a reflection of the public state of mind. Thus, a low priority for education in the minds of the people—a low priority in national affairs.

But surely among the leadership of this Nation, there should be the perspective about

education, the broad understanding of its needs that would generate a compelling sense of urgency to be communicated vigorously to the people.

The educational failure of any affects all, and any indifference, complacency or rationalization that continues the delay in getting at the solutions of education's problems is a disservice to all.

This is a dangerous time for education—paradoxically because of the desirable interest, insufficient though it is, that is being displayed. Plans and proposals abound, but an honest appraisal of our efforts too often sees great motion, but so much of it a kind of "running in place" that we are, instead of moving out and broadly affecting education, too often merely digging ourselves a deepening rut and comforting ourselves by calling it "innovation and change."

Education must have a higher priority than it is now given, especially at the Federal level, and those in positions of leadership from the President on down have an obligation to nurture and demonstrate unrelentingly the sense of urgency that can bring action now.

The demonstration of this leadership at the national level is of particular importance now as the Federal government is increasingly playing a formative role in the development of education. The main responsibility for education still remains at the State and local level but it is only with strong Federal support that our States and localities are going to be able to solve many of their most pressing and distressing problems—problems such as urban education and segregation—which stand as the greatest barriers to meeting our acknowledged obligation for the provision of equal educational opportunity.

The Education Commission of the States was created to provide a new focus of power for education. It is unique in its cross-section of membership, in its alliance of education and government, of citizen and professional, and in its opportunity to be a powerful force for creating this sense of urgency both in the public and in government.

To date this power which you possess has not reached even a fraction of its potential. I urge you to assume the mantle of national leadership and to use your power to secure in fact the priority for education which it has always been accorded in words.

The forces of education have been too patient, too willing to wait. We have perhaps been too inclined to assume that our own assessment of education's importance would naturally prevail with everyone else.

DeWitt Clinton in 1826 said that "The First duty of Government and the surest evidence of good Government is the encouragement of education."

This duty is not being neglected, but certainly it is not being carried out either in full honor to the adjective "first" nor in compliance with that principle of our government that recognizes the obligation of providing equality of educational opportunity.

Let us then dedicate ourselves anew to supplying the missing ingredient of a sense of urgency, let us be possessed by it, and let us make ourselves heard wherever there is a reluctance to take whatever action is necessary to carry out fully and unstintingly this first duty of good government.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DANIEL FLOOD, chairman of the conference, and the members of the conference, for accepting amendment No. 13 which inserts language proposed by the Senate citing part one of the Vocational Edu-

cation Act which requires 10 percent of the amounts allocated to the States for basic vocational education grants to be used for research.

I am most pleased that the House conferees have accepted the Senate language. This action by the House conferees will provide the Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Research in the Office of Education with some \$17,000,000 for research into new methods and techniques for updating vocational education in this country.

Congressman FLOOD and his fellow House conferees, have performed an enormous service to the people of this country by accepting the Senate language.

It was my privilege to sponsor the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments, and after very exhaustive hearings on this legislation, it became crystal-clear to myself and my committee, that vocational education can not meet the changing needs of American technology in the 1970's and 1980's, if we do not have an extensive input of new concepts for teaching vocational education. My committee wrote into the act the mandatory 10-percent set-aside of all basic State grants for vocational education to be used for research, because we realize that it is only through such research that we can put into proper perspective the vocational education needs of this country.

The United States will reach a trillion-dollar gross national product this year and then, in the next 9 years, that figure will double to a \$2 trillion economy by 1980. Unless our schools can train young Americans to fill the labor needs of this enormous growth in our economy, we will see or whole existence seriously jeopardized.

It is my sincere hope that the Office of Education will not divert these funds from the Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Research, but rather, make all of these funds available to the Division so that the necessary input of new concepts can be generated.

I congratulate the conferees for writing into their report the caveat that—

The conferees are agreed that this provision is adopted on a trial basis for 1 year, and the results will be reviewed before a decision is made to include it in next year's appropriation bill.

The provision by the conferees will strengthen the hand of the Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Research to assure that only the more promising programs shall be funded for research. It imposes a serious obligation on the Division, but I have every confidence that in a year from now, we will see research emanating from this Division which will give American vocational education new dimensions of promise and achievement.

I am most pleased that the distinguished Senator from Washington, Mr. WARREN MAGNUSON, had brought the Senate language to the conference, and that he was able to reach agreement with our representative, Congressman FLOOD, on this very important amendment.

Up to now, I have always heard com-

plaints that no funds were available for research, and therefore, new programs could not be generated. I am pleased that with the action being taken by this House today, these funds will now be made available, and we can make a most significant step forward in bringing the needs of American vocational education in tune with the needs of the last third of the 20th century.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful to Mr. Robert Moyer, staff assistant of the House Appropriations Committee, and all of the members of the staff, who have been so very helpful in understanding the needs of American vocational education.

I do hope the House will overwhelmingly approve the conference report and express our gratitude to both our colleague Congressman DAN FLOOD and our colleague Congressman ROBERT MICHEL of Illinois, ranking minority member of the House conferees, as well as all the other House conferees who have today made such an enormous contribution toward improving vocational education in America.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The question is on the conference report.

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. 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 359, nays 30, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEAS—359

Abbott	Brasco	Cohelan
Abernethy	Brinkley	Collier
Adair	Brooks	Collins
Adams	Broomfield	Colmer
Addabbo	Brotzman	Conable
Albert	Brown, Calif.	Conte
Alexander	Brown, Mich.	Conyers
Anderson,	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
Calif.	Broyhill, N.C.	Corman
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, Va.	Coughlin
Andrews,	Buchanan	Cowger
N. Dak.	Burke, Fla.	Culver
Annunzio	Burke, Mass.	Cunningham
Arends	Burleson, Tex.	Daddario
Ashley	Burlison, Mo.	Daniel, Va.
Aspinall	Burton, Calif.	Daniels, N.J.
Baring	Bush	Davis, Ga.
Barrett	Button	de la Garza
Beall, Md.	Byrne, Pa.	Delaney
Belcher	Byrnes, Wis.	Dellenback
Bell, Calif.	Cabell	Denney
Bennett	Camp	Dent
Bevill	Carter	Dickinson
Biaggi	Casey	Dingell
Biester	Cederberg	Donohue
Bingham	Celler	Dorn
Blanton	Chamberlain	Dowdy
Blatnik	Chappell	Downing
Boggs	Clark	Dulski
Boland	Clausen,	Duncan
Bolling	Don H.	Dwyer
Bow	Clay	Eckhardt
Brademas	Cleveland	Edmondson

Edwards, Ala. Kyros
 Edwards, Calif. Landrum
 Eilberg Langen
 Esch Latta
 Eshleman Leggett
 Evans, Colo. Lennon
 Evans, Tenn. Lloyd
 Fallon Long, Md.
 Fascell Lowenstein
 Feighan Lukens
 Fish McCarthy
 Flood McClory
 Flowers McCloskey
 Foley McClure
 Ford, Gerald R. McCulloch
 Ford, McDade
 William D. McDonald,
 Foreman Mich.
 Fountain McEwen
 Fraser McFall
 Frelinghuysen McKneally
 Frey McMillan
 Friedel Macdonald,
 Fulton, Pa. Mass.
 Fulton, Tenn. Madden
 Fuqua Mahon
 Galifianakis Mailliard
 Gaydos Mann
 Gettys Marsh
 Glaimo Martin
 Gibbons Mathias
 Gilbert May
 Goldwater Mayne
 Gonzalez Meeds
 Green, Oreg. Michel
 Green, Pa. Mikva
 Griffin Miller, Calif.
 Griffiths Miller, Ohio
 Grover Mills
 Gubser Minish
 Gude Mink
 Hagan Minshall
 Haley Mize
 Halpern Mizell
 Hamilton Mollohan
 Hammer Monagan
 Schmidt Montgomery
 Hanley Moorhead
 Hanna Morgan
 Hansen, Idaho Morse
 Hansen, Wash. Morton
 Harrington Mosher
 Harsha Moss
 Harvey Murphy, Ill.
 Hastings Murphy, N.Y.
 Hathaway Myers
 Hays Natcher
 Hébert Nedzi
 Hechler, W. Va. Neilsen
 Heckler, Mass. Nichols
 Helstoski Obey
 Henderson O'Hara
 Hicks O'Konski
 Hogan Olsen
 Hollifield O'Neill, Mass.
 Horton Passman
 Hosmer Patman
 Howard Patten
 Hull Pelly
 Hungate Perkins
 Hunt Pettit
 Hutchinson Philbin
 Jacobs Pickle
 Jarman Pike
 Johnson, Calif. Pirmie
 Johnson, Pa. Poage
 Jones, Ala. Podell
 Jones, N.C. Poff
 Jones, Tenn. Preyer, N.C.
 Karth Price, Ill.
 Kastenmeier Price, Tex.
 Kazen Pryor, Ark.
 Kee Pucinski
 Keith Purcell
 King Quile
 Kloppe Railsback
 Kluczynski Randall
 Koch Rees
 Kyl Reid, Ill.

NAYS—30

Andrews, Ala. Devine
 Ashbrook Diggs
 Betts Erlenborn
 Blackburn Findley
 Chisholm Flynt
 Clancy Goodling
 Clawson, Del. Gross
 Davis, Wis. Hall
 Dennis Jonas
 Derwinski Kuykendall

NOT VOTING 42

Anderson, Tenn. Berry
 Ayres Bray
 Brock Brock

Reid, N.Y. Reifel
 Reuss Reuss
 Rhodes Rhodes
 Riegle Riegle
 Rivers Rivers
 Roberts Roberts
 Robinson Rodino
 Rodino Rodino
 Roe Rogers, Colo.
 Rogers, Colo. Rogers, Fla.
 Rooney, N.Y. Rooney, Pa.
 Rosenthal Rosenthal
 Rostenkowski Rostenkowski
 Roth Roth
 Roybal Roybal
 Ruppe Ruppe
 McFall St Germain
 Sandman Sandman
 Satterfield Satterfield
 Schadeberg Schadeberg
 Scherle Scherle
 Scheuer Scheuer
 Schwengel Schwengel
 Scott Scott
 Sebellius Sebellius
 Shipley Shipley
 Shriver Shriver
 Sikes Sikes
 Sisk Sisk
 Skubitz Skubitz
 Slack Slack
 Smith, Iowa Smith, N.Y.
 Snyder Snyder
 Springer Springer
 Stafford Stafford
 Staggers Staggers
 Stanton Stanton
 Steed Steed
 Steiger, Wis. Steiger, Wis.
 Stephens Stephens
 Stokes Stokes
 Stratton Stratton
 Stubblefield Stubblefield
 Stuckey Stuckey
 Sullivan Sullivan
 Symington Symington
 Taft Taft
 Talcott Talcott
 Taylor Taylor
 Teague, Calif. Teague, Calif.
 Teague, Tex. Teague, Tex.
 Thompson, N.J. Thompson, N.J.
 Thomson, Wis. Thomson, Wis.
 Tunney Tunney
 Udall Udall
 Van Deerlin Van Deerlin
 Vander Jagt Vander Jagt
 Vanik Vanik
 Vigorito Vigorito
 Waggonner Waggonner
 Waldie Waldie
 Watkins Watkins
 Weicker Weicker
 Whalen Whalen
 Whalley Whalley
 White White
 Whitehurst Whitehurst
 Whitten Whitten
 Widnall Widnall
 Wiggins Wiggins
 Wilson, Bob Wilson, Bob
 Winn Winn
 Wold Wold
 Wolff Wolff
 Wright Wright
 Wyatt Wyatt
 Wylder Wylder
 Wyllie Wyllie
 Wyman Wyman
 Yatron Yatron
 Young Young
 Zablocki Zablocki
 Zion Zion
 Zwach Zwach

Cramer
 Crane
 Dawson
 Edwards, La.
 Farbstein
 Fisher
 Gallagher
 Garmatz
 Gray
 Hawkins
 Ichord
 Kirwan

Long, La.
 Lujan
 MacGregor
 Matsunaga
 Melcher
 Meskill
 Nix
 Ottinger
 Pepper
 Pollock
 Powell
 Quillen

Rarick
 Rourkebush
 Ryan
 Tiernan
 Ullman
 Wampler
 Watson
 Watts
 Wilson,
 Charles H.
 Yates

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. Wampler.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. Pollock.
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Crane.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Fisher.
 Mr. Yates with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Meskill.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Lujan.
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Melcher with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Bray.
 Mr. Ullman with Mr. Quillen.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Rourkebush.
 Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Nix.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Ryan.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 7, strike out "That this appropriation shall not be available to pay local educational agencies pursuant to the provisions of any other section of said title I until payment has been made of 90 per centum of the amounts to which such agencies are entitled pursuant to section 3(a) of said title and 100 per centum of the amounts payable under section 6 of said title." and insert "That \$8,800,000 of this appropriation shall be available to pay full entitlement under section 3(a) of said title to a local educational agency where the number of children eligible under said section 3(a) represent 25 per centum or more of the total number of children attending school at such local educational agency during the preceding year."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"That this appropriation shall not be available to pay local educational agencies pursuant to the provisions of any other section of said title I until payment has been made of 90 per centum of the amounts to which such agencies are entitled pursuant to section 3(a) of said title and 100 per centum of the amounts payable under section 6 of said title: *Provided further*, That \$8,800,000 of

this appropriation shall be available to pay full entitlement under section 3(a) of said title to a local educational agency where the number of children eligible under said section 3(a) represent 25 per centum or more of the total number of children attending school at such local educational agency during the preceding year."

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 3, line 4, strike the words "State and" and insert in lieu thereof "States on behalf of".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Flood moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 9, line 3, insert the following:

"EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE"

"For assistance to desegregating local educational agencies as provided under part D of the Educational Professions Development Act (title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965), the Cooperative Research Act, title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 807 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, and title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, including necessary administrative expenses therefor, \$150,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of any funds appropriated herein to carry out programs under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be used to calculate the allocations and proration of allocations under section 102(b) of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds contained herein shall be used (a) to assist a local educational agency which engages, or has unlawfully engaged, in the gift, lease or sale of real or personal property or services to a nonpublic elementary or secondary school or school system practicing discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin; (b) to supplant funding from non-Federal sources which has been reduced as the result of desegregation or the availability of funding under this head; or (c) to carry out any program or activity under any policy, procedure, or practice that denies funds to any local educational agency desegregating its schools under legal requirement, on the basis of geography or the source of the legal requirement."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike the sum of "\$150,000,000" named in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof, "\$75,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

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

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION
ACT OF 1970

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 17654) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Boggs). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 17654, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 110, ending on page 24, line 12, of the bill, and there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF
NEW JERSEY

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: on page 23, line 15, strike out the words "and shall receive fair consideration in", and insert in lieu thereof the following: "if they so request not less than one-third of the funds provided for".

And make the appropriate and necessary technical changes in the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL TO THE
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF
NEW JERSEY

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DINGELL to the amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Add a new paragraph as follows:

"(d) The majority party on any such standing committee shall receive not less than one-third of the funds provided for the appointment of committee staff personnel pursuant to each such primary or additional expense resolution."

Renumber succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in

support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) because I believe the amendment brings very clearly into focus basic problems which attach to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey to provide that one-third of the investigative staff would be controlled by the minority.

I have for 16 years chaired investigative subcommittees of committees of this House, and on all of those subcommittees—and there have been quite a number of them—the investigative staff has done the work of the committee. It has not done my work. It has not done the work of the majority. It has done the work for the committee, and has been as available to the minority as to the majority.

As a matter of fact, I had inquiry made of the staff of my Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, and find that they respond to more requests from the minority than they do requests from the majority.

Now, I think we would have to look at the structuring of these investigative staffs. The responsibility of legislating and investigating and conducting the affairs of this Congress rests with the majority of the Congress, the majority party of the Congress, and that has long been a tradition. If we are now to change that pattern as it relates to staff and if it is going to be segmented, then let us do it fairly, let us give one-third of the staff to the majority and say "you use this for whatever partisan purposes you want," give one-third of the staff to the minority and say "you use this for whatever partisan purposes you might have in mind," and then have one-third to do the work of the Congress and carry on the responsibilities of the committee.

I believe that is fair, it is evenhanded, but I do not believe it will represent good Government, good investigation, or good legislative procedures to do it. But if it is going to be segmented by partisan designations, then do it that way.

At this moment I could not tell you the party affiliation of a number of the members who serve on the staff of my subcommittee, either on Government Operations, or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Then, of course, there is the very interesting question, How do you finally divide one-third of one? In some of these subcommittees, you end up with one investigator. How do we give one-third of one investigator to anybody? The problem becomes mighty complicated—or you could require that we cut him up into three—or maybe we can divide it on the basis of time rather than in dollars. I think it is a ridiculous proposal.

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

Mr. MOSS. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. It is not ridiculous at all because the language is very clear and precise and addresses itself to one-third of the funds. It says nothing about one-third of the people. It says one-third of the funds.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

It says one-third of the funds—and the funds employ people. Now you are going to have to have a staff director normally for a committee or a subcommittee. Who is going to pay for the funds that go to the staff director? Are you going to have two staff directors? If you are going to have two, then why not have three?

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

Mr. MOSS. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) has expired.

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Another interesting question is brought up by the Thompson amendment—Will the minority members have access to the two-thirds that are left that they have at the present time? In other words, are we really guaranteed two-thirds of the staff to the majority and one-third to the minority. Is that the purpose both in the professional and the clerical, because there is another section in the bill where they get to the clerical and the professional staff and the Thompson amendment, I understand, applies to the investigative staff.

So the intent apparently is to have one-third exclusive to the minority staff and then have full access to the balance of the staff, which they now have.

Mr. MOSS. That is the way I would read it. That is why I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, because that clarifies it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan says that there shall be one-third for the minority and one-third for the majority and then the other one-third, we will fight over who gets to appoint them.

Mr. MOSS. It is probably available to both.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. MOSS. It is probably available to both, and I would hope so, as the present professional staff is available to both sides.

I will concede it would create greater confusion than to attempt to intermix the staff in the manner that is proposed here.

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

Mr. MOSS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I do not know how it would work on all committees, but if it works the way it does on one committee I am on, it will not create any confusion because the professional staff that we had before are doing all the work and the one-third that has been added on are political employees and are out playing politics. They really do not interfere with anybody on the staff and they are never there and do not know what is going on.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and in opposition to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. Chairman, these amendments give me considerable concern. In fact, it frightens me. I am unable to ascertain from the debate, which I listened to very attentively, just what the real purpose of offering this amendment is.

Later on in the bill, as I said when I made my first remarks in presentation, I submit that the majority party was very fair to the minority in writing into the rules that we would have two of the six professional staff members and we would have one of the six clerical members.

I well realize, Mr. Chairman, that there are more than six staff members on a committee, and that more than one would not be 30 percent of the clerical staff on many committees, but that would at least give the minority some assurance that they will have two staff and one clerk. To go ahead now and start dividing up money on investigative staffs, in my opinion, would simply cause confusion.

There may be one or two committees in the House—if so, I have never served on them—where there is some dissension among the investigative staff of the committee. But I have served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and I never had any problems with the staff of that committee. I have never had any problems with the committee staffs. They are just as courteous, kind, and efficient to me as if I had a third of the money and attempted to pick up my own staff. I think we are going to start a backward step and end up with two competing investigative staffs.

As mentioned by the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS)—and I am not quite clear how he meant it—but assume the Committee on Internal Security or the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct wanted to hire a former investigator to go out and investigate a specific complaint. Are we then going to have three staff members so that the minority can have one as its staff member, one investigative member, so that he can go one way and the other two go the other way? I do not think we should have two investigative staffs competing with one another.

I do not have any such problem on the Rules Committee. In fact, if I were ever fortunate enough to be chairman of the Committee on Rules I would hope that the three clerical staff girls would stay with the committee and the two able professional staff members would, also.

I have never had a problem with the gentleman from New York on the Judiciary Committee. He was eminently fair in selecting able people to conduct appropriate investigations.

If you want to start killing this bill, if you want it killed with kindness, start with amendments like these that have been offered.

There are many points of value to the minority in the committee bill. I will not take the time to read them all. At least

we will have 1 day for witnesses and 3 days, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, to file our minority reports, which will have to be printed. We will have half the time on conference reports. I think the majority is being very fair to the minority, and the majority party has the responsibility of running the House of Representatives. If we ever get to be the majority party, it will then be our responsibility, and I hope that we will do a good job and we will be the ones who will be responsible for doing these things.

In my opinion, this is a bad amendment. I think it is wrong to proceed in this manner and clutter up this bill with this investigative staff proportion of the committees. I oppose the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. COLMER. This is a classical example of what happens when we try to rewrite the rules of the House on the floor of the House without ample and sufficient background. No. 1. No. 2, Mr. Chairman, it also exemplifies the high character, the objectiveness, and the statesmanship of the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) in approaching these matters without partisanship, and I just want to pay my compliments to him.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I will mention for the benefit of the Members various measures in which consideration for the minority has previously been considered:

It was recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress in its final report of July 28, 1966, page 21. It was in S. 355 as introduced by Senator Monroney on January 16, 1967.

It was in H.R. 2594, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) on January 17, 1967.

It was in H.R. 2595, introduced by former Member, Mr. Curtis from Missouri, on January 17, 1967.

It was in S. 355, and it was passed by the Senate.

It appeared in the same form in every legislative organization bill in this Congress by Republicans and Democrats, including 11 bills that have been introduced and given fair consideration. It seems to me that if all those people agreed with it, about 110 Members, the language in the bill is the best approach.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment and the amendment thereto be defeated.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CELLER was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. When threshed out, we will find it is full of mischief. Its paramount deficiency lies in its rigidity. It leaves no room for flexible personal policy.

When the committee's budget is submitted to the Committee on House Administration, the proposed expenditures

on salaries is at best only an estimate. The number of persons employed on the investigatory staff expands and contracts as the needs of the committee demand. One month the staff may number 15, and the following month 12. Thus, if the amendment prevails, the committee will find itself involved in constant bookkeeping operations. As the size of the staff changes, does the allocation in dollars and cents change? Remember, too, the salaries vary, so a rigid percentage would in no way guarantee adequate staff for the minority, depending upon which staff members were necessary to discharge and what was the rate of pay.

I remind the Members I am not talking in self-interest as the chairman of a committee, the Committee on the Judiciary. The staff of the minority on the investigatory payroll of my committee now receives more than 40 percent of the payroll expenditures. We go way beyond what the amendment even suggests.

I believe that the application of a rigid formula will do much mischief. By applying the formula which says "so much is yours," and "so much is mine," we risk a sharper polarization of staff. We encourage a greater emphasis on political affiliation rather than on technical competence.

I have long hoped that the committee staff would serve the Members, not only along ideological bipartisan lines, but along the lines of skilled professionals and craftsmen.

For example, in employing personnel for our investigation into conglomerate corporation mergers, as well as in all the other investigations we have conducted—and we have conducted many of them—in those we have undertaken I did not once ask the political affiliation of any applicant to the staff. This approach is reflected in the total staff. Many of the employees who now are considered majority employees came to my committee when the House was organized by the minority party. Consequently, there is a continuity of staff expertise. We kept them on, because they were competent, because they were dedicated, and not because they were Republicans or because they were Democrats, and not because they belonged to the minority or to the majority, but because they were worthwhile.

This rigid formula on salary allocations based on political affiliation and choice was always prohibited so far as I was concerned, and so far as my counterpart on the Republican side of my committee was concerned, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCULLOUGH).

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

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

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

The Chairman has spoken several times about the rigidity that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) might impose. I want to be sure the chairman realizes that the amendment specifically says that they will have not less than one-third if they request it.

Mr. CELLER. I am aware of it, but there is the other word "one-third," and that is the word that is going to count most, not the least. The demand is always going to be with more emphasis on one-third, and that is what I object to.

This should not be a matter of arithmetic. This appointment of staff members ought to be a point of competence.

The use of a fixed formula in no way guarantees an equitable solution. Much depends upon the nature, the duration, and the objective of the committee. The situation should dictate staffing needs.

I believe that the proposal as is presently in the bill will work in the best interests of both the majority and minority parties.

Members should keep this in mind: That the majority staff of my Judiciary Committee and all other committee staffs serve all the members of the committee. Certainly the clerical staff who man the telephones, who keep the committee calendars, who mail the agenda, who distribute the mail, and so forth, are all charged to the so-called majority payroll but they serve all the members. Are they to be subtracted, added to, divided, and subdivided according to this formula? We see how absurd and inane this proposal becomes.

Now, as to the amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) to create two separate staffs, one for the majority and one for the minority, that will completely polarize the two factions. It would create greater and unnecessary dissension. Both sides would be weakened.

The greater responsibility lies with the majority. It has more members. It has to file the reports. It floor manages the bill. It leads in conference. It assumes the greater responsibility. Thus there was never meant to be any equality between the majority and the minority in that regard, and the Dingell amendment flies in the face of that theory.

I wonder, how otherwise could the majority, the majority of the people, properly discharge their responsibility?

Finally, the development should be toward a professional corps rather than a partisan or ideological division. The ideology should be controlled, by whom? The ideology should be controlled by the members, but the technique of the committee should be controlled by the staff. That should be the lodestar that governs and guides all committees.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I will not bicker with the dean of the House with respect to his views relating to my amendment, but I should like to comment on the amendment to my amendment by the gentleman from Michigan.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish more time.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to reiterate what has been said before, that there is a great deal of flexibility involved. The amendment is not inflexible as others believe.

The gentleman from New York has indicated it is inflexible. The amendment does not say it must be one-third, but it says it should be at least one-third. If there is an arrangement in the Judiciary Committee where the minority needs 40 percent, there is nothing to prevent it. However, it does insure for the minority, if they request it, that there would be at least one-third of the funds—not one-third of the staff, but one-third of the funds.

If the committee operates so that there is no ideological difference at all, undoubtedly the majority and the minority will work together on the staff and all the staff will serve all the members.

However, in many of the committees there is a philosophical difference which seems to fall along party lines. Some seem to worry that this would cause greater partisanship. I have had experience since 1959 on the Committee on Education and Labor. If any committee has had partisanship, this one has certainly had it. But back some years ago, when we had very little funds for the minority, I recall one year when the majority had 50 staff members and we had four. The chairman then fired two of our minority staff members, which really put us in an embarrassing position. If you wanted to say there was partisanship, we certainly had it that year.

We had it until we were able to secure about a third of the money for the minority. We worked much better since that time. The reason is this: Instead of resorting to partisanship, we have been able to develop the facts and come up with the kind of dialog in debate that has meaning to it.

We can use the example of the coal mine safety bill which passed this Congress. I recall in previous Congresses the coal mine safety bill legislation was fraught with complete partisanship and there was little logic to the debate. At least in this Congress, though, the House Members on both sides of the political aisle had done a very thorough study on their amendments. I think they came up with better educated arguments than had ever been pursued before.

For that reason I think this amendment makes good sense. While those of you who are now on the majority side have been on that side for most of your own careers here in the Congress, you may be on the minority side someday.

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) for the kind of forthright stand he has taken, being in the majority and sticking up for the rights of the minority, because without that kind of support we would be lost over here.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I really honestly believe that the minority should have some help, but I do not want

any construction put on my amendment that in any way I anticipate or desire to be in the minority.

Mr. QUIE. I recognize the gentleman neither anticipates nor desires that. I am also enough of a realist to know that it would be just about a miracle, I guess, next fall if we had the election turn out where we would be in the majority afterward. Most of the reason for that is the fact that you do have a pretty sizable majority now and we have developed a means whereby an incumbent can reach his constituents better than ever before, so it is easier for him to stay in office than ever before, as the last few elections have indicated.

I should also point out, while it is a help to the minority, this Member of Congress does not anticipate staying in the minority forever. I hope you will be able to benefit from this amendment some day in the future.

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

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

Mr. FRASER. I want to say to the gentleman that we both served in the State Senate of Minnesota. One of the reasons why I support this amendment is I found in all the years that I served in that legislature I was a member of the minority group in the State senate. I fought hard to get minority rights. I find it impossible now that I am in the majority suddenly to decide that I was wrong all those 8 years. It seems to me minimum protections for the minority strengthen the legislative process. That is why I think the amendment is a good one and I intend to support it.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman from Minnesota learned what it was like to be in the minority while he was in the minority in the State senate, and I learned how important it is to have minority rights while serving in the Congress, but both of us recognize what some of the minorities go through, and when the majority say, "Well, we will give you what you need," it is not always sensitive to the needs of the minority.

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

Mr. Chairman, when the Dingell amendment is disposed of, I want to serve notice that I am going to offer an amendment to the Thompson amendment which will strike out the period and insert a comma and the following words:

Provided further, That this amendment shall become effective upon notification from the President that the Executive Branch of the Government will assign to the opposition party the appointment of one-third of the nonclassified personnel appointments in the Executive Departments and agencies of the Government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if this is such a good thing, we ought to spread it around. If that amendment should fail—and I do not think it will because I am going to make the point of order and get the reformers over here; you know there are a lot of reformers around here and there are a good many of them on our side but I do not see many of them here; they want to reform but they do not want to be here when we reform. I made a speech

last night in Columbus on behalf of the Democratic candidate for Attorney General in Ohio—if he lives until November he will be elected in view of what is going on out there with the Republicans trying to cut each other up—and I told them that there are certain areas in Washington where words and slogans become popular. We had the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the Square Deal, the Bull Moose, and right now it is reform. I told them last night, publicly, I said if you wanted to pass a bill to legalize prostitution, you call it a reform bill and you can get it through the House in 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there is not any reform about this. I know something about professional staffs and have dealt with them over the years. We have a staff on the Foreign Affairs Committee that I can honestly tell you does a job for both sides and I have no idea as to the politics of any one of them insofar as that is concerned.

And, Mr. Chairman, another thing. Why 35 percent? If I can read the political signs right and if the Nixon depression continues, we may only have 25 percent Republicans in Congress but over there, if this passes they are going to have 35 percent of the jobs. What kind of arithmetic is that?

We have made provision in the House Administration Committee to see to it that the minority—and I supported it and voted for it and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Accounts I have said that if they get money—and we have asked every chairman and every ranking minority member who came before the Subcommittee on Accounts, "Are you satisfied with the staff arrangements? Are you getting your share? Are you agreed that you have professional people on the minority? Is the committee in agreement on how much money you want?" And not until they said they were have we given the committee chairmen any money. That is a rather recent development, but that is the fact of the matter.

Now, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that this amendment would, if it passes, as the distinguished dean of the House said, further polarize the staffs of the committees until you get them so busy working against each other that they cannot work for the Members. I think that is what is going to happen if this amendment passes.

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

Mr. HAYS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I join with the gentleman in his regret that those who so badly desire reform do not happen to be here this afternoon. I feel we possibly ought to send letters out to all of them, advising that if this reform bill passes and there is adopted the public teller amendment, each and every Member is going to have to be on the floor of the House for every amendment on every bill or be listed as absent in the RECORD.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman from Illinois makes a fair statement and I do not think that amendment is going to pass, because I have a substitute for that which will make the vote public but

which will do it in an orderly and definite way so that you will not have some clerk back there and be wondering whether he is writing down the right name or the wrong name.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I would not think the distinguished minority whip would want to send that letter until he got the postal reform bill through.

Mr. HAYS. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that if we have this bill around for another week or so—and I do not know what my distinguished friend from California is going to do—but if this thing keeps on the way it is going, I can tell you what I would do in his place. I would move that the Committee rise some evening and then I would forget to ever move that they go back into the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was not able to be present on Monday, and therefore I could not extend my congratulations to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) and the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) for the fine work that they have done in bringing to the floor this particular bill.

However, I find myself with the same feeling as my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) that as good and effective a piece of legislation as I think this is, I believe it can be improved and, where it should be, we owe an obligation to offer those amendments that would improve it.

I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) who has offered this amendment in good faith on minority staffing.

I have the feeling that there has been an effort on the part of some to ridicule this as an unworkable and completely impossible idea and yet, if I had the time, and I do not in the brief 5 minutes that are allotted to me, I could point out that, for example, as long ago as in March 1963, we had a very distinguished group of political scientists testify before a subcommittee of our House Republican conference, and they made a statement at that time that I think is worth quoting now:

Some have argued that an increase in minority staffing of congressional committees would jeopardize the recent "professionalization" of these staffs. We do not believe that is true. There is no reason why such "professionalization" cannot take place in a bipartisan framework. What is needed are professional staff members separately responsible to the majority and the minority. The demand that a substantially larger portion of the professional staff be responsible to the minority members is wholly reasonable and within the best democratic traditions.

And I listened with great interest to the distinguished dean of the House when he said a few moments ago that the matter of staffing is not a matter of arithmetic; it is a matter of competence—and I agree. There is nothing in

the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) that is in the least inconsistent with that idea. I wonder why it is that the suggestion has been made this afternoon that when the majority controls all of these funds, and has the responsibility for the hiring, that they are in every instance going to hire competent, professional, nonpartisan people, but that if the minority is granted control over one-third of the committee funds, that somehow or other they are then going to resort to partisan chicanery, and they are going to hire political hacks, they are going to hire incompetents who are there only for the purpose of stirring up partisan controversy.

I think, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) said yesterday, that the whole intent is, within the best traditions of the democratic process, to bring out those differing responses, those differing ideas that can be used on the anvil of debate so that we hammer out the very best possible legislation that we can within the committee room, and then here on the floor of the House.

So to suggest that we are going to resort to partisanship if we are given responsibilities for one-third of the funds allotted on the investigative staff of the committees, completely distorts what the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) is trying to do.

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

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, in view of this interesting debate on this amendment, I hurriedly did a little checking, and I note that the Committee on Government Operations has 75—I repeat—75 employees, out of which three are minority and one a clerk. That is something to chew on.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, because it illustrates the very next point that I want to make. It is not that we in the minority feel that these people on the majority staff are going to be unwilling to help, but it is that we do not feel that they are responsive to us—you do not feel the same freedom and the same ease that I think the Members on the majority side feel when they go to a member of the staff and say, "I would like to have you research this particular point." It is very interesting to sit here, as I have done for the last day or two now, and hear people who have served in the House, as has the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS), for 16 years, and say, "I have never known an instance where a member of the committee staff has refused any member of the minority every cooperation."

Well, for one thing I do not suppose he has gone around, like Hawkshaw, with a spy-glass, looking for any of those instances where maybe the minority has not always been able to get all the information that it felt it needed to research a particular point.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I men-

tioned the gentleman's name, and of course, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. I only observed that the distinguished minority whip did a thorough job in checking, and who they are assigned to and their political affiliations. If he continued that, he might have learned that there are a great many more of his party working within the committee than three.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Let me close by saying that in the final report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which was issued back in July of 1966, they said this:

It is fundamental to our legislative system that the opposition have adequate resources to prepare informed dissent or alternative courses of action. All sides of an issue need to be forcefully presented.

That is all, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment on minority staffing is designed to do.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I address myself to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to my amendment, and in the course of doing so I would like to make this comment—there are a great many distinguished committees of this body and each and every one of them has a jurisdiction differing from the other, although there is some overlapping.

But every one of them is composed of different Members with different experiences, with relation to staff.

I did not intend in the slightest, as the dean of the House implied, for this to be mischievous. I simply remember, and perhaps too well, my days in my State legislature as the minority leader when we had absolutely nothing. When my party came into the majority I persuaded them that the minority should have some staffing. Since then they share, as about this amendment would do, and everything works well.

I might point out, on the Committee on Education and Labor, I am chairman of the Special Committee on Labor. The distinguished member, my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK), is the ranking member. I defy anyone to find two more divergent political philosophies or political voting records than the philosophy and voting record of my friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) and myself.

We have had nothing but complete and total cooperation, notwithstanding our partisan differences.

Perhaps I am not so confident, as a great many of my friends on this side of the aisle; that we can always remain in the majority? Then, if we are in the minority, that we should have nothing—that we should trust no one appointed by the other side of the aisle? I do not believe this. Certainly, I expect partisanship. Certainly, I would like, however, to see more sophisticated minority views and more thoroughly discussed issues in the committees and a better rapport in the national interest between the majority and the minority, without taking in the slightest away from the responsi-

bility, in which I do believe in the right of the majority to rule. Because, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. CELLER) said, that is the way the people want it.

I am willing to take my chances, and the Lord only knows that I cannot stand in this well and claim to be nonpartisan—because I am not.

The gentleman from Michigan has what I characterize as a cute idea—one-third for the minority, one-third for the majority, and the last third to fall to the Chair.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOSS. If it is so cute perhaps the gentleman could tell us how the remaining two-thirds is to be directed?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not obvious to my friend from California that if one-third goes to the minority, if you are in control, the other two-thirds goes to the majority? Are you afraid of that?

Mr. MOSS. It is not obvious to me, no more than it would be—

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will not yield any further.

Mr. Chairman, I am not really much of a mathematician, but I think I can understand this. I do not say the gentleman from California, the gentleman from New York, the gentleman, my friend, from Ohio, who has done precisely on the Committee on Accounts what he says he has done, I do not say that their ideas are invalid, nor do I put them down. I simply say that we have a difference of opinion on this subject. I certainly respect their point of view. They disagree with mine thoroughly and articulately, and are so entitled. But that does not mean that they are impugning my motives.

I think the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is in fact and in effect frivolous and should be defeated. That will reduce the question to my amendment. Those who agree with it, please vote for it. Those who disagree with it, please vote against it and let the House work its will.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) and against any amendment to the amendment. The gentleman from New Jersey has made crystal clear the objective of his amendment. I am totally in sympathy with his approach to a solution of a legislative problem.

I have said many times that I respect this Congress because there is in it more capability and capacity in the sense of dedication on both sides of the aisle than in any Congress before in history. But it has not had a chance to come through, and one of the reasons it has not had a chance to come through and function at its best is because the minority has not had a chance. What the gentleman's

amendment proposes will give us a fighting chance.

I salute the gentleman from New Jersey for his statesmanship here in this House. As I have spoken in the well of statesmanship, and many Members of the House have done so, also, I have praised the leadership on our side for having continued to study the minority staffing problem. Under the leadership of the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. CLEVELAND) with whom I served as a member of the Public Works Committee, we had a real and genuine staffing problem, and also on the House Administration Committee. I recognize his capability and his fairness. He has done a study of this matter. He has written an article and has a chapter in a book entitled "We Propose" on the need for increased minority staffing.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD at this point so it can be read by all Members of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the statement that the gentleman is requesting to be printed in the RECORD his own statement?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HAYS. I thought the gentleman said that it was the statement of somebody else.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair inquired of the gentleman if it was his own statement. Is it the statement of the gentleman in the well?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman from Iowa will have to request permission for that statement to be printed in the RECORD when we go back in the House.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. At the proper time I will make that request.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman made a very interesting statement. He said that he thought the amendment which would give the minority one-third of the employees would give them a fighting chance. What percentage does the gentleman think he would have to have to give them a chance?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, my proposal is—and it is in bill form before the Congress and it is the result of rather thorough study—it would be at least 40 percent, but I am willing to buy this. I think it is a significant step forward.

If we want to make this the kind of effective Congress that it can be and should be, I think we ought to take the amendment without amendment. It sets a wonderful precedent for the House.

It aids and abets also and is central also to what I call the adversary system that we are used to in America. Better opposition—and I think this is true and political scientists agree on it—produces

better legislation in the finality. If the opposition has adequate staff to propose good legislation, this forces the majority to produce a superior product, and then we will have to choose the better of two ideas or propositions which are presented.

So I think if we want to improve the Congress and its opportunity to function at its best, we have got to give the minority a chance. This amendment is sound, because it does not interfere in situations such as the gentleman from New York referred to in his committee, where they have recognized the minority rights and given the minority an opportunity to function properly, and out of his committee has come some pretty significant and meaningful legislation through the years, and I think it is an example that it works.

So, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope we will give sincere consideration to the amendment, and that we will vote against the amendment to the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan for precisely the same reason that I have opposed the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. It strikes me we are embarking upon a day or a week or perhaps weeks of legislative reorganization and we hope legislative reform, and it is truly a great day for our House. But to bog down the debate on true legislative reform with an argument over the patronage system to me seems to be completely inconsistent.

The notion that by adding more Republican Members to the committees, we will have a more representative type of government representing the people of our country is inconsistent both in fact and in ideology. I think we should look forward to having a type of legislative in which the staff of our committees will be hired on merit and ability of men to serve rather than on their political party. Certainly we will be departing from what I consider to be legislative reform to go back to a system in which party affiliation is more important than merit.

I had served 14 years in the State legislature, 12 of them under Republican control. We were lucky to be given a seat in the house at that time. I think that was unfair. What we should do is strike from our rules any question of political party insofar as employees or staff are concerned.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows, being a member of the House Committee on Administration, that we have in effect for all intents and purposes a rule that requires the majority and the minority to get together and negotiate out the status of the staff. It does not tie it to any hard and fast percentage. The gentleman is also aware that we do not give them any money until they both come in and say they are satisfied and that the negotiations have been successfully concluded.

So I am agreed in principle with what the gentleman is saying. I merely made a speech about this proposed amendment, because I wanted to show how consistent the minority would be when it came to truly dividing up the jobs. They want a third of them here, but they do not want us to have any of them downtown. I do not say all of them, because the distinguished gentleman from California, I think, made a very brilliant presentation.

I agree with him. He is one exception, but I would say those who vote for this amendment on the minority side ought to, if they really believe it, then vote for my amendment, and I simply offer it in the spirit of finding out who is consistent and who is being political.

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

Finally we must give additional credence to the possibility of having the Republican Party, should this amendment prevail, having filled its one-third complement, and then a man appearing before the committee with all the expertise the committee absolutely requires, and being denied the opportunity to serve merely because the Republican complement has now been completed.

For these reasons we should go back to the business of reforming our legislature without reference to the patronage system.

Therefore, I oppose both amendments.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

We have the Armed Services Committee. We do not even have a minority committee room in our committee. I do not have any idea of the political feelings of the staff. I do not know which party they belong to. I understand the chief counsel is a Republican.

What we are interested in is security. How in the name of goodness could we segregate our staff and find out what their beliefs are and then go out and get security clearance on a lot of people? What we want are people who are dedicated to America.

We never discuss that. If anybody raises the question of politics in our committee he gets shouted down. It has seldom happened—perhaps once since the committee was formed.

We could not do a thing like this. This is ridiculous. It is absurd to go out here with 30 percent this and 30 percent that. It just could not happen.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Of course I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I appreciate the complete sincerity of the gentleman now in the well, and I am sure he is stating the absolute fact when he says he is not aware of the political affiliation of those employed on the staff of the Armed Services Committee. That is the way it should be.

I wonder why it is that the gentleman, as so many others on this side of the aisle this afternoon, has jumped to the conclusion that if the minority have the responsibility of one-third of the funds

for the investigative staff they would be more inclined to regard partisanship as the main consideration in hiring somebody? I believe the gentlemen ought to give us credit for having the same desire as they have to maintain a nonpartisan staff on a committee concerned with national security.

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted the gentleman asked that. We have an investigative committee, and we are interested in getting the job done. We do not ask the employees what their political persuasions are.

To get out here and say, "I will take one-third of you, and I will take one-third of you, and I will take one-third of you" is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of.

Never having been exposed to it, I do not know what you are talking about.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Of course I yield further.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. It is not a question, as I tried to point out earlier, of partisanship. It is a question of having the minority secure in the feeling that they have a portion of the staff who are responsible to them.

Mr. RIVERS. We do not have a minority on our committee. I do not know what this talk is all about. We have a group of dedicated Americans who are trying to keep this country free. We could not live under this amendment.

Ask the distinguished minority whip. I do not know what this talk is all about.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. What the gentleman from South Carolina says about our committee staff is absolutely true. I myself, the same as the gentleman, do not know whether they are Republicans or Democrats. I have never bothered to ask, because we have one concern on that committee, and that is what is best for the United States from the standpoint of our military posture.

Mr. RIVERS. I have observed one thing. We adopt our rules and we live by them. Whenever anything comes up, I follow the rules of the House. I go and talk with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS) who represents the minority, and then we decide what we are going to do in the committee. We have never heard any more about the minority. We could not live under a silly thing like this. It just could not be done.

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

Mr. RIVERS. Of course I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I must say I admire the way in which the gentleman's committee operates. Unfortunately, all the committees of the House do not have that same commonality of purpose and method as the gentleman's committee.

Mr. RIVERS. Let me answer by saying:

And while the lamp holds out to burn,
The vilest sinner may return.

We may be prophets without honor.

Mr. BLACKBURN. If the gentleman

will yield further, I would say that on our committee we have some very fine staff people on both sides, the minority as well as the majority. I can assure the gentleman that on the Committee on Banking and Currency everything in the committee becomes a partisan issue to a very distressing degree. If every committee operated like that of the gentleman in the well, this amendment would not be necessary, but unfortunately I find that they do not, and therefore I support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIVERS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, I do not question the gentleman, but I just never sat on a committee like that, and if it is as you say, then go ahead and pass it. We will have trouble living under it, but if it will change some of the things that you say exist, go ahead and pass it. I cannot live under it, but go ahead and pass it. We do not need it. I thought this bill here was for the purpose of expediting the business of the House. If there ever came a bill before this House that will foul it up in more ways than a country boy can go to town, I have not found it. I do not know when we have had one like this.

Let me tell you something else. Take the \$20 billion authorization bill that we reported out of our committee. It would take us so long to get that bill out of committee that I think I could retire on that one bill in our committee if you followed out some of the things that are being adopted here. The thing to do as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) said, is to give this thing a respectful burial and forget it.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I will not take the 5 minutes. I rise to see just where we stand. I have had a number of compliments from Members that we have not attempted to cut off time, and I am not here attempting to cut off time, but we have been on this amendment now for quite some time yesterday afternoon and today. All I am seeking to do here is to determine how many speakers we have left and see if we can get unanimous consent for a time certain for a vote this afternoon, because there are Members, I am sure, who would like to attend to other business over the weekend. How many Members desire to speak, so we can have an idea of what is possible?

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. All I want is 2 minutes. I will not ask for 5.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we vote at 4:20 with a reservation of 5 minutes for the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the time again.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, the unanimous consent request was that we vote at 20 minutes after 4, with 5 minutes reserved for the gentleman from Missouri who would like to speak on it.

The CHAIRMAN. On the pending amendment before the Committee of the Whole and all amendments thereto?

Mr. SISK. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to address myself to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois because he seemed somewhat puzzled by the response from the previous speaker in the well.

The system that is advanced here by the previous speaker in the well is known as the "angel system of government." Those who are above politics do not need rules. Laws are not needed in a society of angels. But maybe, just maybe, Congress does not consist of angels. Therefore, I urge rule by law here, rather than "rule by man"—even "the Man." That is why I support the amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey. Good will is a fine thing. But just in case we are dealing with men and women here, and not angels, let us put fair play in writing. That way we will be sure not to forget. I think committee chairmen would find they could live with it, perhaps not live it up so much. But do not shed a tear. Life can go on—maybe even be beautiful—for more people.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this discussion appears to be getting cast in terms of partisanship. I do not think it is partisan at all. Our goal here is to have a workable set of rules under which this body may operate. The fragmenting of any staff is extremely bad. I think every member of every committee should be able to call to the fullest extent upon members of the committee staff. I recognize the need for minority staffing.

Mr. Chairman, I would call the members of the Committee's attention to the committee language which appears on page 75 of the bill and which sets out what we should have in the way of committee staff. It says:

(3) The professional staff members of each standing committee—

(A) Shall be appointed on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions;

That is what the committee staff should be, whether it be professional or investigative, and any language which would change that fundamental concept would usurp and would inject a partisan viewpoint and any partisan viewpoint in the hands of the staff would be bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, before we go further, let me read. The Thompson amendment is on page 23, line 14, and reads as follows:

The minority party of any such standing committee is entitled to, upon request, not less than one-third of the funds provided for the operation of that committee.

That means in a case where you operate largely on a bipartisan basis, where you operate with a chairman who is able to perform in that manner, you do not have to divide the funds and the minority, perhaps, would not ask for them.

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Subcommittee on Accounts of the House Administration Committee and there are committees where there is no problem like this. But, there is definitely a problem here and in my opinion the long debate which we have had on this subject has pointed it out.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge and remind my fellow colleagues on the majority side that the tables can always turn but I hope they will not turn. However, I think it would be a good idea to set a constructive precedent now. I urge the adoption of the Thompson amendment.

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

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, all of a sudden "nonpartisanship" is the cry on every venerable Democratic lip, and the glories of the two-party system are all but forgotten. Well, I am not a very partisan Democrat, but neither am I clear about why defeating this amendment is the way to show a nonpartisan spirit. Some Republicans might even suspect that the purpose of all this sudden enthusiasm for nonpartisanship is to deny Republicans reasonable representation on committee staffs while jobs are saved for Democrats. That, by coincidence or not, is the effect of defeating this amendment in the noble pursuit of "ignoring party labels."

But the question arises, if committee staffs should be nonpartisan, why should not committees? Should we not elect chairmen—and maybe the Speaker—in the same nonpartisan spirit? I do not remember much enthusiasm among some of today's most vociferous nonpartisans when some of us mentioned such a possibility a while ago. And how about choosing the membership of this body? Maybe we too should seek our jobs without party labels. That might not be a bad idea, at least for those of us who must run in districts where the other party is the majority party.

As long as we get here by party, and sit on committees by party, I can see no excuse for denying representation in staff personnel to both parties. Somehow, this view seems to me consistent with genuine nonpartisanship. In fact, those who have espoused nonpartisanship here today ought to listen to their own eloquence and join me in voting for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment without amendment. The minority staffing provisions of the bill be stricter in order

that the spirit of the new rule cannot be violated. I assure the members of the Rules Committee which reported this bill that I appreciate their work on this aspect, but I and several of my colleagues of both parties have discovered a loophole in the proposed rules which we believe must be plugged.

The minority party has been severely hampered in past years, particularly with the increase in the workload and the complexity of our problems, because of inadequate staff on the committees. As a group of distinguished political scientists has said:

To deny the Minority in Congress access to adequate representation on Committee staff eliminates the opportunity for a minority to act responsibly after a careful examination of the problems under consideration.

The minority party has been forced to act with a lack of adequate data and evaluation in several subject areas, and has, as a result, often been unable to offer complete and complex alternatives to legislation.

The members of the Rules Committee have evidently seen the need for an active and competent loyal opposition in order to improve our alternatives, and they have seen fit to take a step in the direction of solving the problem in the current bill. As the chairman of a Republican conference subcommittee which studied the problem of minority staffing, I have become quite well acquainted with the subject, and I and several of my colleagues, particularly my fellow Republican Mr. CLEVELAND and two of our Democrat counterparts, Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. WAGGONER have discovered some cracks in the wall, and we are working to fill them with this amendment.

Though it is true that there are no minority staffing problems on many committees, there are some which have proved unacceptable. Specifically, the problem is that the staff hired by the minority is subject to the veto of the entire committee, which gives the majority party the power to deny competent personnel to the minority. This flaw is unacceptable, as, I am sure, the majority party would agree if the minority were to have a veto over its staff. I would hasten to add that the present majority party may not always enjoy such status.

Our amendment provides for the separate hiring by either party of the allotted number of staff personnel. Neither party will have a say in whom the other shall appoint to its professional or clerical positions. This provision would be extremely helpful in the minority's attempt at fulfilling the role of a loyal opposition, thereby contributing to the upgrading of the legislation which would result from an improved and more dynamic adversary system.

This change is relatively minor, particularly in view of the enormous benefits which would accrue. The current situation, in which the majority has a veto power, distresses me, and I ask your support in changing the bill to permit the minority sole hiring and firing power over the minority staff. This amendment stems from a bipartisan effort and is supported by a broad spectrum of the

Members. I ask you to join us in this effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN).

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I rise in opposition to both the Thompson and Dingell amendments. I think this idea of allocating at least one-third of the staff of each committee to the minority is a dangerous precedent, regardless of which party might now or hereafter be in control of the Congress or either of its branches.

If there are committees where the minority is inadequately staffed to assist it in carrying out its responsibilities to the people, then we should do something about the situation on those particular committees. But let us not saddle all of the legislative committees in the Congress with two separate and distinct staffs. Where any minority, whether they be representatives of a political party or within a political party, needs staff help to enable them to get their job done, they should have it, and on the vast majority of the committees in the Congress, I am told that they do have it.

I happen to have the privilege and responsibility of chairing an investigative subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations. Fortunately, under present circumstances, with the splendid minority membership we have on that subcommittee, I would have no fears of their unwise use of any additional staff they may need. We have wonderful cooperation on that committee, and a nonpartisan experienced professional staff. The gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER) is the ranking minority member of our subcommittee and of the full Committee on Government Operations. We also have among the minority the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. VANDER JAGT). They are not only among our most able and competent members, but they have been nonpartisan in their labors. Ours has been a nonpartisan committee.

It has not mattered which administration has been in power. We have endeavored to exercise our surveillance responsibilities over the agencies under our jurisdiction without regard to the political affiliation of their heads, or of the party in power. I think this has been substantially true with every other subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

Let me emphasize—ours is an investigative committee which requires experienced nonpartisan professional people whose concern is objectivity and whose dedication is to honest and efficient government service. Our investigations are the responsibility of the majority of the members of that committee, and especially the members of the majority political party. For one subcommittee or a committee to have two separate investigative staffs which may feel obligated to oppose or check on each other and make separate investigations could result in an extremely costly and unwieldy situation.

Whether the professional staff members be Republicans or Democrats, no committee can do an adequate job unless the members of a staff work to-

gether. This has been the case on our subcommittee and the staff have been accessible to all members of the subcommittee—Democrats and Republicans alike. In addition, there is the minority staff which has limited responsibilities—primarily to assist the minority members. And if a particular committee has not provided adequate staff for the minority for that purpose then we should do something about that particular situation.

On the Government Operations Committee, for example, I feel sure that the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), who will be permanent chairman of that committee during the next Congress, if our party is still in power—and other members of the majority party, will cooperate with the minority members to the end that they have adequate staffs. The distinguished minority leader of our committee, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. DWYER) will have no problem in this respect. I am sure she would treat us the same way. The House Administration Committee has helped this situation and will, I am sure, continue to do so where there are justified complaints. If inequities exist and are not corrected by the committee themselves, then the House can act.

I am satisfied that no member of the minority of the subcommittee which I happen to chair, will contend that he or she has not had full access to the professional staff of our subcommittee in addition to their own minority staff, and all of the records and facts uncovered by the full committee staff. While we have had wonderful relations with the splendid members of the minority party now serving on the Government Operations Committee, I am fearful that an increase in personnel in excess of the actual needs of a minority of whichever party, regardless of which political party may be in control of the Congress, could well lead to a lot of unnecessary trouble, confusion, and even embarrassment to the minority members, as well as to the Full Committee. You see the majority members have no special staff. The staff are actually supervised by committee chairmen on behalf of the full committees. So in a way, the minority already have an advantage over the other members.

I think all of us who have had chairmanship responsibilities on investigative committees, can well appreciate the inherent dangers of opening the door of opportunity to partisanship among staff members. It took us on the Government Operative Committee years to get this kind of staff. They are hard to keep. They are dedicated to the Congress and to the members of the committees on which they serve. I can not speak as strongly about legislative committees as I can about the Investigative Committee on Government Operations; but on that committee, I am satisfied there should be—in fact effective action requires—cooperative understanding not just among all committee members, but between the staff seeing the full committee and the limited staff selected to serve just the minority. It is an erroneous impression to conclude that because one political

party is in power, the staff selected by the majority party serves only the majority. They serve all of the members, while those selected primarily to assist the minority serve the minority. That is as it should be.

Let me emphasize again that I strongly support an adequate staff primarily for the minority members on a committee to assist them in research, in the preparation of their own views, and so forth, but not the right to "at least a third" of the entire staff on a committee or such a large staff that it could well become a stumbling block to the efficient and effective assumption by the full committee or subcommittee of their responsibilities to both the Congress and the American people.

Again, if there are inequities or injustices, let us eliminate them. If the full committees do not do it, let us do it here in the House, but let us not saddle all the committees of the Congress, and this Congress with a new staff quota system which we may live to regret. The rules we are about to adopt may well be the rules of this House for many years to come. Let us be careful not to adopt an expensive and unworkable patronage staffing system. We have already had enough unhappy experiences with some of the antiquated rules we now have.

Although all of us are elected to the Congress as members of a particular political party, once we get here and are assigned to committees, as members of those committees, we have a responsibility to the entire Congress and to all of the American people.

I therefore urge my colleagues to vote against these amendments and wherever there are inequities, let us deal with them individually, without imposing upon every committee an expensive and rigid staffing system which is neither wise nor necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, during yesterday afternoon, and also today, we have heard a great deal of debate and discussion about a particular amendment. It seems that we have gone down the road quite a distance, and we are only on page 23.

If we are interested in really reforming and improving the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government we should get on with the business, because if we become bogged down with every amendment like we are today we undoubtedly will take the rest of the year just trying to unravel what we are entangling so quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of California yielded his time to Mr. BOLLING.)

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

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee that dealt with this matter for 15 months anticipated this debate, and it has heard nothing new, and there have been no surprises. We heard all of

the same things said, almost, either in the open hearings or in statements presented to us in public and private and other fashion.

It is very clear that there is a very considerable division in the House, and an honest division, as to the way in which we should staff our committees.

Now, it is important to clarify a few things. I am sure more by accident than otherwise, a Member or two misrepresented the final report of the Joint Committee on Organization. The Joint Committee on Organization consistently held to the view which is expressed in its final report on page 22:

In seeking to provide protection for the minority, it would be an error to divide the entire staff of each committee along partisan lines, or to require a staff allocation for the minority proportionate to its representation on the committee . . .

The evidence, the testimony of those who have studied this the longest, and who are completely objective in their approach in that they are outside the institution, is that it is a mistake to go to a partisan staff.

It is a mistake in two ways.

First, it tends to exacerbate the natural divisions that exist in a basically two-party legislative body.

Curiously enough, to all of us who are partisan, the fact of the matter is that the public interest is not necessarily the sum of the reconciliation of the differences between the two parties. It may be something less—it may be something more.

But those of us on the subcommittee and the full committee recognize the validity of the point made, that the minority should be "protected."

It is ridiculous to talk of a committee staff as the only resources available to the majority or the minority. We all know that we have all kinds of resources other than those that reside here on the Hill. I, for example, can call on any economist in the United States, because I have been for 20 years a member of the Joint Economic Committee, and he will be delighted even to come to Washington to discuss a serious problem.

I have had that experience recently as chairman of the subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee. I took a trip last fall to look at regional planning and housing. The best qualified staff member of the joint committee available to me was a Republican. We had a fine trip and we made a useful report.

I think we have lost our approach. As soon as you provide one-third for the minority, then you inevitably respond with two-thirds to the majority. This particular amendment goes to a particular kind of staffing. It is the kind of staffing that is taken care of not by law but by resolution, which is then implemented through a resolution of the Committee on House Administration. It is the special staff over and above the standard staff, and it is clear that the Committee on House Administration in a flexible fashion is taking care of the problem.

On the permanent staff the committee has a proposition which has the virtues of protecting the minority and yet leaves in the hands of the majority, which is

responsible for the organization of the Congress and the organization of the committee, the final say.

In that language it is absolutely clear to any fairminded person that the standing regular professional staff of six shall include the minority chosen members. The only reservation is that they perform on good behavior—not on a policy question—but that they be people of good character and of proven qualifications.

This was the conclusion that was arrived at unanimously by the only group of people who heard any Member of the Congress who desired to be heard. We had open hearings and not as many showed up there as we had hoped—any more than there are as many people on this floor as we had hoped.

It was a unanimous decision on a bipartisan basis. We are completely convinced that we came to a solution, as proposed by the Joint Committee on Organization, which will best serve the Congress and the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON).

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SISK) there were—ayes 78, noes 53.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey and Mr. SISK.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC NOTICE OF COMMITTEE HEARING

Sec. 111. (a) (1) Part 3 of title I of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 831) is amended by inserting immediately after section 133 thereof the following new section:

"SENATE COMMITTEE HEARING PROCEDURE

"Sec. 133A (a) Each standing, select, or special committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the committee on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date."

(2) Title I of the table of contents of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 813) is amended by inserting, immediately below the item relating to section 133 contained in that title, the following:

"Sec. 133A. Senate committee hearing procedures."

Mr. SISK (during the reading). I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the portion of this section dealing with the other body and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the remainder of the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) Clause 27(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) Each committee of the House (except the Committee on Rules) shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted by the committee on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing, unless the committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. If the committee makes that determination, the committee shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. Such public announcement also shall be published in the Daily Digest portion of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made by the committee."

OPEN COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 112. (a) Section 133A of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as enacted by section 111(a) of this Act, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Each hearing conducted by each standing, select, or special committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) shall be open to the public except when the committee determines that the testimony to be taken at that hearing may relate to a matter of national security, may tend to reflect adversely on the character or reputation of the witness or any other individual, or may divulge matters deemed confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulation."

(b) Clause 27(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, as amended by section 111(b) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(2) Each hearing conducted by each committee shall be open to the public except when the committee, by majority vote, determines otherwise."

STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES AT COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 113. (a) Section 133A of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as enacted and amended by section 111(a) and 112(a) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) Each standing, select, or special committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) shall require each witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing to file with the clerk of the committee, at least one day before the date of the appearance of that witness, a written statement of his proposed testimony unless the committee chairman and the ranking minority member determine that there is good cause for the failure of the witness to file such a statement in compliance with this subsection. If so requested by any such committee, the staff of the committee shall prepare for the use of the members of the committee before each day of hearing before the committee a digest of the statements which have been so filed by witnesses who are to appear before the committee on that day.

"(d) After the conclusion of each day of hearing, if so requested by any such committee, the staff shall prepare for the use of the members of the committee a summary of the testimony given before the committee on that day. After approval by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee, each such summary may be printed as a part of the committee hearings

if such hearings are ordered by the committee to be printed."

Mr. SISK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of that portion of this section which deals with the other body and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the remainder of the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) Clause 27(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, as amended by section 111(b) and 112(b) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(3) Each committee shall require, so far as practicable, each witness who is to appear before it to file with the committee, in advance of his appearance, a written statement of his proposed testimony and to limit his oral presentation at his appearance to a brief summary of his argument."

CALLING OF WITNESSES SELECTED BY THE MINORITY AT COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 114. (a) Section 133A of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as enacted and amended by section 111(a), 112(a), and 113(a) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) Whenever any hearing is conducted by any such committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) upon any measure or matter, the minority on the committee shall be entitled, upon request made by a majority of the minority members to the chairman before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon."

Mr. SISK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of that portion of section 114 which deals with the other body and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the remainder of the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) Clause 27(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, as amended by section 111(b), 112(b), and 113(b) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(4) Whenever any hearing is conducted by any committee upon any measure or matter, the minority party members on the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the chairman by a majority of those minority party members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon."

POINTS OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO COMMITTEE HEARING PROCEDURE

SEC. 115 (a) Section 133A of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as enacted and amended by section 111(a), 112(a), 113(a), and 114(a) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Whenever any such committee of the Senate (except the Committee on Appropriations) has reported any measure, by action

taken in conformity with the requirements of section 133(d) of this Act, no point of order shall lie with respect to that measure on the ground that hearings upon that measure by the committee were not conducted in accordance with the provisions of this section."

(b) Clause 27(f) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, as amended by sections 111(b), 112(b), 113(b), and 114 (b) of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(5) No point of order shall lie with respect to any measure reported by any committee on the ground that hearings upon such measure were not conducted in accordance with the provisions of this clause; except that a point of order on that ground may be made by any member of the committee which has reported the measure if, in the committee, such point of order was (A) timely made and (B) improperly overruled or not properly considered."

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I herewith call to the attention of my colleagues and others a dissertation on minority staffing authored by a distinguished Member of Congress Mr. JAMES CLEVELAND of New Hampshire, with discussion on congressional reform. They are pertinent and valuable for all who are interested in a more effective Congress.

[From "We Propose: A Modern Congress"]

THE NEED FOR INCREASED MINORITY STAFFING

(By JAMES C. CLEVELAND, M.C.) *

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The adequacy of congressional staffing in a broader sense involves the continuing efficacy of Congress *vis-à-vis* the President. The survival of representative government is directly at stake.

In many areas of the world during recent years, we have witnessed a decline in the power of established parliaments and a shift of that power to the executive. The subordination of the power of newly established parliaments to the executive in the emerging nations of Africa and Asia underscores that trend. One of the most notorious instances of a decline in the power of an established parliament occurred recently in France, where the French people, with apparent willingness, accepted the transfer of important powers from the legislature to the executive.

It should be pointed out to those who can watch a drift away from representative government with equanimity, that it was such a trend which paved the way for the ascendancy of Hitler. Lack of representative government is also a characteristic of the Communist-dominated countries of today.

The need for establishing new rules in Congress to insure the minority party an adequate supply of professional staff on committees is of overriding importance. It must be met promptly if Congress is to fulfill its constitutionally assigned functions as a co-equal branch of government.

* Mr. Cleveland represents the 2nd Congressional District of New Hampshire. Before his election to Congress in 1962, he served 12 years in the New Hampshire State Senate where he was Majority Floor Leader for four years, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and, at various times, a member of eight additional committees. In Congress he is a member of the House Public Works Committee and was recently named to the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress succeeding former Rep. Griffin, now a U.S. Senator. Mr. Cleveland's wife, Hilary, teaches Government and History at Colby Junior College for Women in New London, N.H., the Clevelands' home.

This is a problem that has engaged and troubled many minds, inside Congress and out, in partisan and nonpartisan context, for many years. The work of this chapter is founded on much preceding labor by many hands as well as on my own experience and observations.

While it would be impossible for me to acknowledge everyone who has contributed to the development of this issue, I do wish particularly to acknowledge the work of the Honorable Fred Schwengel of Iowa, who was Chairman of the old House Republican Conference Subcommittee on Increased Minority Staffing, the predecessor to the present Task Force. I also wish to acknowledge the invaluable work of Miss Mary McInnis, staff assistant to the present Task Force. * * *

The serious threat to an effective Congress, and therefore to representative government itself, which is posed by the lack of adequate staff for the minority has not been fully understood, even by some members of the minority. Interest and concern is growing, however, and the time is not far off when, I believe, the majority of both parties in Congress will realize what adequate minority staffing would really mean for them in terms of increasing their effectiveness—and that of representative government.

One of the best statements of the issue was published on March 15, 1963, by the Schwengel Subcommittee and signed by the following political scientists: Dr. Robert J. Hushorn, Bethesda, Maryland; Dr. Howard Penniman, Chairman, Department of Government, Georgetown University; Dr. Franklin Burdette, Bethesda, Maryland; Dr. Brownlee S. Corrin, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland; Dr. George Carey, Georgetown University; and Dr. Russell Ross, University of Iowa. I quote it here in full:

"POLITICAL SCIENTISTS' STATEMENT ON MINORITY STAFFING"

"The committee staff function at the congressional level is not being fulfilled. And a failure to do so is not only unfair, but it is a threat to the tradition of representative government. Responsibility for this condition falls upon the Democratic Party leadership in Congress.

"To deny the Minority in Congress access to adequate representation on Committee staffs eliminates the opportunity for a minority to act responsibly after a careful examination of the problems under consideration. Congressmen, in this difficult and complex period of our history, require access to data and evaluation in those subject areas to which they are given responsibility as Committee members. It is obvious that this work cannot be placed regularly with their own office staffs, which have functions very different from those of a Committee. It is obvious, in light of policy formulation patterns at all levels of government, that the adversarial technique of law and politics in this country requires a personal relationship in which a congressman can develop confidence with the professional staff members. This is why, of course, the President has a high degree of control over his White House staff, as well as at many policy-making levels in the Executive Departments.

"Some have argued that an increase in minority staffing of congressional committees would jeopardize the recent 'professionalization' of these staffs. We do not believe that this is true. There is no reason why such 'professionalization' cannot take place in a bipartisan framework. What is needed are professional staff members separately responsible to the majority and the minority. The demand that a substantially larger portion of the professional staff be responsible to the minority members is wholly reasonable and within the best democratic traditions.

"Congressional committee staff members are not intended to serve the same function as staff members in the Legislative Reference

Service. Nor should they. The Committee staff must possess high levels of competence. It is equally important, however, that there exists mutual confidence between the congressmen and the staff members. This confidence is not possible when a minority party, be it Democrat or Republican (and there is always the possibility of reversal of role), does not have access to adequate and qualified professional staff members of its own selection.

"The existing position is more than unfortunate; it is a subtle denial of freedom of effective speech, of which Congress as a body purports to be justly proud. It hinders reasoned debate that alone can lead to just solution of legislative problems. It prevents the minority from carrying out its major democratic function of knowledgeable criticism.

"The country cannot afford gamesmanship or petty, cheap politics at the congressional level. Yet, we are witnessing an outstanding example of partisan pettiness in the denial to the minority in Congress the right to exercise its legislative function by refusing to grant it necessary staff support."

The issue has also engaged the earnest attention of thoughtful members of the present majority party. In his testimony before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, Rep. John S. Monagan (D., Conn.), stated:

"The capacity of the minority to examine and criticize should not be abridged, but should be preserved as a basic strength of our system."

In the course of these same hearings, Rep. David S. King (D., Utah), expanded this line of thought: "... a formula must be found for balancing the personnel of the committee staffs more equitably between the majority and minority parties. ... In my opinion, the balance of personnel between the two parties on the committee staffs should more nearly approximate the division of party strength in the House itself. ..."

One more quotation will help set forth the urgency of the issue. Dr. James A. Robinson, professor of political science at the University of Ohio, writes:

"It is not fairness, however, that constitutes the most compelling argument for providing minorities with a staff almost equal in number with that of the majority. The best argument is that the improved performance of the minority members helps to strengthen the legislative way of life. If the majority party becomes increasingly aligned with the executive branch ... then we must look to the minority to check the majority and in so doing to provide the necessary counterbalance to executive power. Hence, generous allocations of minority staffing are essential to the normative theory of Congress."

The present situation is deplorable. Although precise figures on majority-minority divisions among committee staffs in the House have proven impossible to obtain, research into committee payrolls, conducted both by the old Schwengel Subcommittee and my own Task Force, establish a general ratio of about 10 to 1 in favor of the majority.

Some committees—e.g., Armed Services, House Administration, and the Un-American Activities Committee—list no personnel as responsible to the minority.

One rough measure of the discrepancy in staffing is that counsel assigned to the minority often do not receive as much pay as majority counsel. Naturally, this creates difficult recruitment problems for the minority. There has never been any suggestion that minority members of Congress should be paid less than Congressmen belonging to the majority party, and the principle is pre-

cisely the same in the case of staff. It makes no more sense to pay minority staff personnel less for equal work than majority staffers than it would to pay less to minority Congressmen themselves.

In fairness, however, it must be conceded that minority leaders on committees do not always press as hard as they should to obtain salary equity for minority counsel. This condition, however, merely reinforces the need to establish the equal pay principle by legislation.

Even in the cases of committees which do list staff members as assigned specifically to assist the minority, those employees are ultimately responsible to the committee chairman, who is always a member of the majority party. By that I mean that they cannot be hired without the chairman's approval; their salaries are subject to the approval of the majority, and often their physical location is determined by the majority. Thus, nowhere in the House does the minority party have guaranteed to it an unobstructed conduit to information vital to the success of its adversary role under our two-party system.

We Republicans, currently in the minority, are often accused of mere obstructionism and are charged with failure to come up with constructive alternatives. Under the extremely hampering conditions in which we must operate, it is remarkable that we have done as well as we have. When the majority party not only controls all committee personnel but, as is the case at present, has exclusive access to the vast resources of advice, information, and power in all the federal agencies, the minority party is at a terrible disadvantage. This is very bad for representative government, because it chokes off responsible criticism and seriously cramps the capacity of the public to find out what is going on so it can form independent judgments. The ability to reach sound policy decisions for the nation, both in foreign and domestic affairs, is critically hobbled in these circumstances.

In spite of its handicaps, the Republican Party is doing a creditable job in its present minority status in the House. This is reflected in the increase in the number of Minority Views and Supplemental Views by Republicans appearing in committee reports on various bills. These minority views perform a vital function under the adversary system and represent a valuable distillation of opposition views. Often they form the basis of future legislation or corrections to existing programs.

In my own Committee on Public Works, I use this vehicle quite frequently even when I am in accord with the general purposes of the particular legislation. They are the best means of establishing for the permanent record an assessment of flaws in generally acceptable legislation and, of course, they serve to expound detailed arguments in opposition to legislation deemed unacceptable.

They can be used quite dramatically to capture attention for minority positions that otherwise tend to be overlooked by the news media, which tend to concentrate on the activities of the majority party. I put into verse my supplemental views opposing the legislation authorizing an official mansion for the Vice-President.⁴ This poetic device had never been used before in an official congressional report on a bill and that fact was what got the most attention. At the same time, however, my reasons for opposing the bill also received wide publicity that we couldn't afford it at this time and that it was singularly inappropriate to build a luxurious mansion for the Vice-President while the country was at war and our servicemen are badly housed in many parts of the country. After the bill was approved, the President ordered an indefinite halt to the project, using much the same reasoning.

Minority views have frequently influenced the course of legislation. Notable examples

Footnotes at end of article.

include the Manpower Development and Training Act, which was almost completely rewritten on the basis of Republican proposals before it was passed; the Civil Rights Act of 1964; and Medicare, among many others. Minority views on the anti-poverty program and the Participation Sales Act have had great impact in the country and will almost certainly lead to future reforms, if not in this Congress, then hopefully in the next.

The Legislative Reorganization Act

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 streamlined committee jurisdictions and reduced the number of standing committees of the House from 48 to 19. As a result of the Act, provisions for more uniform procedure were written into the standing Rules of the House, including the provision that each committee, other than the Committee on Appropriations "is authorized to appoint by majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office."

Rule XI further provides that:

"Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them."

In actual practice, both the spirit and letter of the law have been violated. (One of the most flagrant examples of such a violation occurred in my own Committee on Public Works when it was under control of the previous chairman, former Representative Charles Buckley of New York. We discovered that the committee payroll contained the names of nine persons who were never known to have done any work for the committee or had never even been seen in Washington. They were assigned to work for the chairman in his own Congressional District in the Bronx. I condemned the situation publicly and this exposé perhaps was a contribution to the chairman's defeat in a party primary.⁵ With this defeat, the problem ended. Under its new administration the Public Works Committee is operating fairly once again and is one of the committees which gives reasonable, though not adequate, consideration to the minority membership in the matter of staff. Eight employees are assigned to the minority out of a staff of around 40. However the chairman insists upon paying minority staff members substantially less than majority personnel performing similar duties.)

I question the wisdom of ever incorporating into the standing rules governing any legislative body such specific language as that contained in Rule XI, which, to repeat, provides that each committee may appoint "not more than four professional staff members." Twenty years ago the authors of the Reorganization Act could not even foresee the need for a standing committee on Science and Astronautics (which was added in 1958). Today this committee, which must oversee one of the largest Government agencies, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, with an annual budget totaling over \$5 billion, operates with one of the smallest staffs in the House. Other committees have augmented their staffs through extra authorizations by the House Administration Committee for "investigative" or additional professional personnel. The Science and Astronautics Committee, however, continues to function with only four professional staff employees. In the words of one of the Committee's members:

"Anyone who has served on this committee and participated in the markup of the NASA authorization bill knows that, while the desire is there and the intentions good, there are instances when many members must in-

evitably conclude on a given item that they just don't know with assurance whether or not it is reasonable."

But this is not the whole story. The Committee on Appropriations was carefully exempted from any ceiling on the hiring of employees; yet some of its members suffer from a shortage of expert assistance! The entire federal budget, program by program and agency by agency, goes through this committee—which assigns only one professional staff person to each of its subcommittees with the exception of the Subcommittee on Defense and Independent Offices.

"How does a member know that the post office needs so many trucks, or so many mailbags? How does a member know that a Coast Guard station is obsolete and should be discontinued? We have in the past had to use our common sense and rely on the people who have made a request. But if someone were to come to them and say: 'Do you know, or does the committee know, this or that for a fact?' the only honest answer we can give is, 'Well, this is how the executive branch justified their request.'"

Without competent and adequate committee staffing, Congress is at a distinct disadvantage *vis-a-vis* the executive branch. Without such staff assistance, the overwhelming task of checking on the operation of government becomes impossible. And without checking the myriad details, Congress can only pay lip service to its constitutional duty of control over government expenditures.

By law, each of the standing committees is required to report the names, positions and salaries of all of its employees every six months. These lists are duly printed in the *Congressional Record*. Simple enough? Try ferreting out the physical location of all of these people!

"The student of committees," wrote former British M.P. Kenneth Wheare, "has to make a choice. Either he can try to hack his way through the jungle on foot, or he can try to get a bird's eye view of the terrain from the air. If he chooses the first alternative, the most he can hope for is to clear a portion of his territory; if he chooses the second, the most he can hope for is to produce a rough sketch-map of the whole area." How true this is. Our Task Force has tried both approaches.

The push for reform of the minority staffing question is, and has been, hampered by two major underlying fundamental conditions, which must be reported.

First, there is an absence of any consensus among the members of either party as to the proper role of Congress in the 1960's. Should Congress concede its loss of initiative in policy-making and bill-drafting to the executive and become more of an agency for oversight of the administration? Or should Congress attempt to regain some of its initiative in the legislative process and be content with a general overseeing function? The question does not have to be answered to bolster the case for increased committee staffing, because either direction calls for expert assistance and independent sources of information to serve Congress. (Clearly, a national debate over the role of Congress in the twentieth century is in order. The Administration, the academic community, the press, and interested citizens throughout the country should join. This book is an attempt by House Republicans to get the dialogue moving in a meaningful and constructive manner.)

The second condition we found in the committee staffing situation is the prevalent abuse of committee staff people by individual members of both parties. To reiterate the injunction of Standing Rule XI:

"Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them."

Candor compels me to admit this rule is sometimes violated. Professional staff employees are sometimes commandeered to write speeches or do other chores for individual Members that are not directly connected with the business of the committee, to handle constituent mail on matters of no relevance to the committee, and even to engage in activities directly concerned with the re-election of a Member. We turned up a distressing number of instances in which committee employees were physically quartered, not in the committee staff room, but in the personal offices of committee members. (Part of this situation is undoubtedly due to space limitations, however. A staffer may be assigned to a Member's personal office in some instances because there is simply not room for him in the limited committee quarters. Another reason may be that, because of his committee responsibilities, the individual Member may wish to have his staff adviser readily accessible. This would be particularly true where the Congressman's office was located inconveniently far from the committee offices.)

There is also the fact that Members of the minority party have failed to prosecute actively the case for increased staffing. In an extensive survey of Republican Members' attitudes with respect to the work and staffing of their committees, we found roughly two-thirds dissatisfied with the performance of their committee in the exercise of oversight of the Administration. Yet, we are able to document a grand total of only eleven instances in which minority Members were denied requests for additional committee staff help! (One reason, undoubtedly, is that minority Members know from painful experience that it is pointless to make such requests because they have invariably been turned down.) This does not, of course, negate the case for better staffing for the minority; it does point up the educational job we have to do on our own side of the aisle as well as generally.

It is hoped that this chapter will form part of this educational process.

THE ADVERSARY SYSTEM

This writer, in common with most responsible political observers, believes firmly in the two-party system. The system has evolved naturally from the early days of our Republic as the best means for organizing disagreement in a diverse society.

The importance of the two-party system goes, indeed, far deeper than simply the "firm belief" of this author or of any other observer. The two-party system is the vital ingredient that has made possible the success of our government. Throughout our history, the interplay between two broadly based, widely inclusive national political parties has enabled the country to overcome, in large measure, those regional differences and conflicts between social and economic interests that, in many other democracies, result in the formation of numerous, specialized parties, none able to speak for the whole nation, or worse, to dictatorship.

The capacity of our two-party system to resist the divisive formation of effective third parties has been the salvation of America. Freed from the worst excesses of enervating factionalism, our country has been able to develop in freedom her enormous natural resources and to achieve fulfillment, in great measure, of the individual rights guaranteed by our Constitution. That document alone could not have provided this result without the proper instruments to carry it into effect. The impotence of mere documents is nowhere better to be seen, for example, than in the Soviet Union, where maximum tyranny reigns under the aegis of one of the world's most liberal written constitutions. In our case, the most effective political instrument for the fulfillment of our Constitution's promise is the two-party system.

Footnotes at end of article.

The evolution of the system followed logically from our Anglo-Saxon tradition of jurisprudence, which is the root of all American legal institutions.

It is based on the adversary system. The right to counsel and the right to be judged on the facts pertaining to the issue are rights that are stamped indelibly on the minds and hearts of the American people. Through the adversary system, we get more information on which to base our judgments. Under ideal conditions, each side has complete freedom to develop relevant information and present its arguments. The end result is the production of the greatest possible amount of information, and therefore, the greatest possible understanding for those who must render decisions.

Much the same adversary technique is seen in business competition as well. Competition in business leads to better products at lower cost and to improved public understanding of the products themselves as well as the nature of business. Competition is the economic strength of the nation, and in the marketplace of ideas the principle is of equal importance.

This tradition is as applicable to a legislative body as it is to a court of law. Under free government, each party is permitted to present its views fully. Most important, the system protects the rights of minorities while allowing the will of the majority to prevail.

The success of the adversary system depends on the quality of the debate. To assure the highest possible quality, each side must have equal opportunity to marshal evidence in support of its positions. In a legislative body, it is just as essential that the minority party have sufficient staff assistance as it is for either party in a court of law to have proper counsel.

The present situation in Congress, as the staffing ratio proves, is deplorable with respect to counsel for the minority. When both Senate and House and the Presidency are controlled by the same party, the situation is at the point of maximum danger to representative government. When the minority in Congress is reduced to capitalizing on such mistakes as are made by the Administration (if it can find out about them), effective opposition (if there is any) must come from the ranks of the majority party itself. This is the present trend and it is a very unreliable state of affairs. The business of the Republic demands that the effective expression of minority views not be allowed to rest on the capricious, internal strains within the party that is charged with the responsibility of governing.

In this connection, I wish to mention a Republican-sponsored proposal to give to the minority party control of an investigative committee of the House whenever the majority party controls both houses of Congress and the executive branch. Sponsors of the bill are headed by Minority Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan, and include Congressman Robert H. Michel of Illinois, whose chapter in this book is devoted solely to a detailed explanation of the proposal.

Here I merely want to point out that the adoption of the Republican proposal would ease considerably some of the problems of a minority party seeking to fulfill its functions under the present state of affairs. It would help insure against whitewashes of wrongdoing and gross errors on the part of government officials.

While outsiders and members of the majority party may be forgiven a feeling of suspicion at Republican motives in making the proposal, in refutation of these I point out that there is good Republican precedent for the idea.

In 1923, when both the executive branch and both houses of Congress were controlled by the Republican Party, rumors of improprieties surrounding the leasing of the Teapot Dome oil reserve whirled through the

Capital. As they grew to a point requiring formal investigation, Republicans prevailed upon Democratic Senator Thomas J. Walsh of Montana to take charge of the investigation. This is a dramatic example of a case in which Republicans gave to the Democrats control of an investigation into a major scandal involving high-ranking members of a Republican Administration. The results were salutary and of great benefit to the whole country. There should be formal provisions enacted so that this would always be the case.

(It should also be noted that the British House of Commons has a Committee of Public Accounts whose chairman is by tradition a leading member of the Opposition, usually a person who has been Financial Secretary of the Treasury. The committee is charged with responsibility for insuring that all public money is spent in the manner intended by Parliament. It promotes economy and efficiency and helps to maintain high standards of morality in all public financial matters.)

In this day and age, more is expected of a minority party than mere criticism, a political platform, and legislative debate. A responsible party must be one in which people have confidence and one to which they will entrust their destiny. It must be prepared to present, in reasonable detail, at least some practical alternatives to the hundreds of complicated and technical issues confronting the country. Offering meaningful alternatives is no simple task. The development of such alternatives requires the services of specialists and technicians, men and women who have devoted their lives to concentrated study of a particular problem.

By the very nature of a Congressman's job, it is very difficult for most Members to become as expert as the problems require. They must be concerned with too wide a range of subjects to permit specialization. Many Members of Congress face still another problem. Most Congressmen feel that they simply do not have the time to study all legislative matters and administrative policies. Just to keep up with individual problems of constituents is a huge task. Consider the following examples: A shortage of heating coal, fraud by mail, eligibility for a pension, the impact of a new law, a missing person, a family tragedy, a suspected crime, a missing pension check, harsh treatment at the hands of a government agency, the need for a job, a visa, citizenship for a relative or friend, the impact of a drought, a rate increase, a public transportation problem, a tariff ruling, information concerning the workings of an obscure government agency, a man's draft status, taxes, naming a mountain, a hardship discharge, a promotion, a pay increase—the list is endless.

Besides answering a large volume of mail, greeting constituents visiting the Capitol, attending to the needs of their districts and their party obligations, Congressmen are called upon to exercise leadership and concern in almost every matter involving the federal government. Although some of these areas are beyond the immediate control of Congress, a Congressman frequently must act to rally public opinion or file strong protests on behalf of his constituency. He has an important role in reminding the often smugly insulated federal agencies that they are meant to be the servants and not the masters of the people.

Congressmen have personal staffs to help with some of their tasks, but some responsibilities cannot be delegated. Some commentators have suggested that it would be helpful to the legislative process to remove certain of these tasks from the Congressman's workload by establishing an Ombudsman-type office. This writer is strongly opposed to any such proposal. Dealing with constituent and district problems is the raw material of the legislative process. The Congressman, through the power conferred by his constituents' vote

and acting, in a sense, as a trustee, can cut through red tape and keep our government responsive. Even more important is the fact that as he performs this function the Congressman becomes aware of problems which need legislative action.

Above all, however, a Congressman is a legislator. This most important function begins with his committee work. Although Congressmen are responsible for final judgments in the legislative product of their committee work, their acts are influenced in many ways by the work of the committee staffs. No significant legislation is produced without the aid of experts. The staff supplies the expertise necessary to reduce the extensive time which few Members of Congress can afford to devote to legislative duties. Under the direction and supervision of committee members, the staff suggests investigations, prepares their preliminary groundwork, and often influences their scope and direction. The staff selects witnesses and prepares lines of questioning. The staff collects mountains of data, checks facts, organizes and digests them into manageable proportions. The staff may generate or prepare special studies. Staff people often draft reports upon which the most pivotal committee decisions are based. In short, the staff does that essential spade and leg work few Congressmen have the time to perform.

The demands on a Congressman's time highlight the importance of good staff work. Implicit in this situation is the recognition that many Congressmen cannot devote as much time as they would like to supervising the work of their committee staffs. If this is so, it suggests yet another reason for adequate minority staffing: mindful of human nature, it is conceivable that improperly supervised staffs could exercise undue influence over the work of their committees. A good check on this, obviously, would be an alert minority staff.

Infrequently, the minority is blessed with offers of outside assistance. One memorable example occurred when a task force under the chairmanship of Representative Frank Bow (R., Ohio) and composed of Republican members of the House Appropriations Committee undertook a thorough analysis of the proposed budget for fiscal 1964. Maurice Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget under President Eisenhower, and some half dozen former members of that agency, provided valuable assistance to the project. The economy drive which this effort spearheaded resulted in savings of \$6.3 billion to the taxpayers of this country. It also permitted economy-minded Congressmen to vote for the tax cut.

It is interesting to note that when Congressman Bow first announced that he thought his task force could recommend substantial cuts in the budget, without damage to necessary programs, he was challenged immediately to itemize the proposed cuts. Congressman Bow refused because he feared that by thus forewarning agencies their public relations sections could man the ramparts and stave off a threatened economy drive by whipping up public opinion as only battle-tested bureaucrats can. I mention this here because it shows how important secrecy is in connection with legislative strategy. Obviously, a minority which relies entirely on a staff responsible to the majority, with lines of communication to the executive departments and agencies, is either naive or lazy or worse.

It should be noted here that where the minority is deprived of its own staff and where members are not as fortunate as Congressman Bow in receiving aid, there is always a temptation to turn to private interests for help. Without discussing the advantages and disadvantages of consulting special interests in regard to legislation which affects them, I shall simply contend that any situation which forces minority Congressmen to

turn to special interests for staff work is not in the best interest of sound representative government.

All Members do, of course, have access to the assistance of the Senate and House Legislative Counsel for bill-drafting, and to the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for research. The primary functions of the Senate and House Legislative Counsel involve the highly technical and specialized task of drafting legislation. The staffs of both offices are composed of qualified and dedicated personnel. The Legislative Reference Service operates exclusively as a non-partisan research and reference service for Members of Congress. Its staff has grown steadily and in all probability will continue to grow with the increasing need of Congress for specialized research assistance with which to deal with the technologically induced changes in our society and economy. Assuming that Congress maintains a reasonable balance between the legitimate demands for staff assistance from these auxiliary sources and the actual capacity of the staffs to provide such help, it is the committee staff system itself on which Congress must principally rely. While organizations like the Legislative Reference Service greatly assist individual Members in their particular areas, they cannot substitute for committee staffs.

But the needs of congressional committees go beyond the question of sheer size of a staff and reach to the problem of making possible an effective distinction between majority and minority positions in order to facilitate meaningful floor debate and responsible problem-solving. As long as Congress is organized on the basis of a differentiation between majority and minority roles, even at the committee level, it is not realistic to expect adequate legislation to evolve from a "nonpartisan" staff arrangement.

The nonpartisanship of the 1946 Reorganization Act has not, as I have suggested, been a success. Some committee staffs in the House of Representatives are truly nonpartisan, not only in terms of party affiliation but in terms of serving members of both parties equally. On other committees, the principle of appointment and control of tenure by a majority of the committee has led to control of the staff by the Chairman and almost exclusive use of its time by the majority party. Even on the few committees which try to give equal service to members of both parties, it is evident that whoever appoints the staff also controls it. Today, the overwhelming majority of committee staff members are hired, supervised, promoted, and assigned duties by the chairmen of the committees. When the workload of these committees is heavy, the staff naturally feels obliged to give preference to the needs of the majority members on whom they rely for their jobs. Consequently, one can understand why members of the minority party cannot always confide in or depend upon staff members responsible to the opposing party.

CONCLUSION

The case for increasing the staff available to the minority is overwhelming, in my opinion. It has been brought to the attention of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, which is preparing its report and recommendations as this book goes to press. Very likely the Committee's report will have been issued before this paper is published. However, because many Members addressed themselves to this problem in the course of the Committee's extensive hearings and because our Task Force has worked closely with the Committee's staff, it is expected that the report will contain strong recommendations for immediate action to correct the partisan imbalance in committee staffing.

In discussing what should be done, I do not believe it is necessary to get into a numbers game and try to set up any specific ratios that will meet the problem. The work of

every committee is different; accordingly, its personnel requirements are different. Moreover, staffing needs must change in response to new developments.

I strongly believe, however, that the minority on every committee should have the right to hire and fire its own staff personnel, set their salary scales, and locate them without prior approval of the majority.

Last year, minority members of the Public Works Committee asked permission to hire an economist to assist them in consideration of the extremely involved implications of the Appalachian Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act then pending before the Committee. These programs involved many social and economic factors not normally within the purview of the Public Works Committee. We needed to have competent outside advice and counsel. The majority turned us down, and we had no recourse but to swallow this decision and get along as best we could. This is wrong. We should have been able to make our own decision on this point and hire the expert we wanted. While I have no illusion that the final passage of some bills would have been changed, greater public knowledge would have resulted from clearer delineations of portions of them, and it is likely that improvements in the legislation could have been made during the drafting of the bills in committee.

(Another example drawn from the Committee on Public Works is the fact that as of this writing more than eight months have elapsed since a new subcommittee was authorized for the purpose of supervising, overseeing, and investigating the new Appalachian Redevelopment Program and the Public Works and Economic Development Act. Committee members of both parties unanimously adopted the Resolution creating the new subcommittee. This failure to activate the subcommittee, while not directly applicable to the minority staffing question, is further illustration of the need for the minority to have an investigative arm of its own. In this particular situation, even the majority seems powerless to enforce its own formally approved decision. The minority has no chance at all.) (The subcommittee finally was activated July 13, 1966.—Ed.)

Frankly, I wish to state that this concern on my part does not stem entirely from the fact that I am a member of the current minority party. Although it is true we feel the brunt of this staff deprivation at the moment, I expect to feel no differently when my party is in the majority. Effective criticism from the loyal opposition is essential to good government, regardless of which party is in control. As far as I am concerned, the Republican Party has a commitment when it becomes a majority to see that the minority is provided adequate staffing.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Hearings, Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 89th Cong., 1st Sess., Part 1, p. 74.

² *Ibid.*, Part 4, p. 527.

³ Robinson, James A., *Congress, The First Branch of Government*, American Enterprise Institute, 1965, Library of Congress Catalog No. 66-14193, p. 273.

⁴ From Supplemental Views of Rep. James C. Cleveland on S. 2394, 89th Congress, 2nd Session:

"But over the hill and horizon
A light is beginning to burn;
Dissent is getting respectful again,
Thinking is taking a turn. . . .

"So courage my lonely colleagues,
Be of good heart and of cheer;
Minority views are sometimes read
And the public's beginning to hear."

⁵ I had prepared an article for the *George Washington University Law Review*, which was not published due to the insistence of

the faculty adviser that I omit a footnote naming the nine persons and monies received.

⁶ Rumsfeld, Rep. Donald, (R., Ill.), JCOC Hearings, Part 4, p. 538 (1965).

⁷ Conte, Rep. Silvio (R., Mass.), JCOC Hearings, Part 2, p. 278.

⁸ Wheare, K. C., *Government by Committee: An Essay on the British Constitution*, Oxford University Press, 1955.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, as we continue to clear a path through the legislative jungle of amendments being offered to the Legislative Reorganization Act I feel most optimistic and confident that at long last we are beginning construction of a great new legislative freeway that will give our citizens increased efficiency without the obstructions of needless legislative secrecy.

Many members on both sides of the political aisle have contributed and are contributing to streamlining and upgrading the structure and procedures of the House. All of us who were in the 89th Congress voted for creation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, which reported numerous recommendations incorporated in the bill before us now. I think the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform is entitled to equal congratulations on its magnificent contributions.

As our Nation's population continues to grow past the 200 million mark, the tendency of individual citizens to feel that they are out of touch with the formation of national policy increases proportionately. To reinforce the fact that no citizen is a cipher in our form of representative government, that the Congress is indeed cognizant of and responsive to his views, it is essential that we dispel any notion, however erroneous, that the Congress operates under a cloud of subterfuge and needless secrecy, or that any of us is afraid to stand up and be counted by name when the roll is called on any issue. Congress must reestablish contact with the people and restore good faith and confidence in representative government by being receptive to new ideas, new faces and the challenge of new goals. I feel we are on the way to achieving that to a great degree with the Legislative Act of 1970, which I strongly support.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the proposals embodied in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. We must have constructive change in our legislative process and I believe deeply that the provisions contained in this bill will go a long way in improving the operation of the House of Representatives.

The Members have long needed a means by which to better record their actions and thus keep the public at large more informed and up to date on the issues which we consider. We have always considered ourselves as Members of the greatest lawmaking body in the world, the Congress of the United States. It is that privilege and obligation which we enjoy which should be foremost in our minds when we consider the constructive improvements that are contained in the measure before us.

The proposed changes would do the following: Give us, in the Congress, a new source of information in keeping abreast of this fast-changing world. We

are going to have the marvel of automatic data processing without our system because of action taken by my Committee on House Administration. The expansion of the legislative Reference Service into a truly Congressional Research Service is also a progressive step forward.

The opening of our congressional deliberations is of major importance. In a free society like ours, the more people know what is at stake, the more constructive will be the actions of their Representative. Greater public awareness and understanding of the congressional process will, I am sure, produce better legislation for the entire Nation.

On the subject of recording the all important teller votes, I am in complete agreement with this proposal. First, it would meet the public's right to know what is going on and, as I have said, this is all important in a free society. Second, it would strengthen the House as an institution by making more Members participate in the important stages of the legislative process. In addition, it would go a long way in removing any secrecy in voting.

The need for a public record on teller votes is most important because it is right. The people back home have the right to know what their elected Representative in Congress is doing. For too many years, this right has not been honored. The practice of determining the fate of key amendments in the Committee of the Whole, without a public record, as I have indicated, helps spread the wrongful notion that the House has something to hide. By supporting these changes we can change this idea.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this is a good and proper thing we are doing today. By enacting these constructive changes, we do honor to the great country and all the people who have placed us here to serve them. By enacting these reforms, we will certainly make the House function more responsibly and in doing so we will also take a major step forward in our effort to reorient our priorities of the Government in the direction of putting the people first.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Rules Committee for providing us with the framework for putting our House in order. The need for more efficient and effective procedures for performing our important work is all too apparent. This act, which I support, when coupled with several needed amendments for providing the public with more open access to our proceedings, will, I believe, restore the confidence and relevancy of this body.

In my view, the Rules Committee has provided us with a good foundation upon which we must add some further supports for our democratic system. The expansion of the Legislative Reference Service, the telecasting of some committee hearings, more democratic controls over committee procedures and several other important measures are included in this legislation. However, several necessary reforms, regrettably, were not adopted by the committee.

The major reforms that are omitted are mostly those that deal with the inordinate amount of secrecy and lack of democratic procedures that have become part of our daily processes. The essence

of the democratic process relies heavily on public knowledge. This knowledge is made up in no small measure by the proceedings of this body and its committees, and the statements and actions of its members. Therefore we must provide in this legislation better access for the public and the Members to the information and questions with which we deal.

Unfortunately one of the most important amendments that would have helped correct this was defeated by a teller vote on Tuesday. That amendment called for a positive approach to opening and closing of committee hearings. It is now the rule to have certain committee sessions closed and a vote must be taken in order to open the meetings. It rather should be the rule to keep the meetings open and the exception to close them. The public has the right to know and must, if we are to have a truly informed public, be allowed access to our committee sessions, except of course where classified information is being discussed. Furthermore, it is ludicrous that not only are the members of the public excluded from these closed sessions, but the Members of this very body are not permitted to attend these sessions without invitation.

We are here as Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States because we were duly elected by the people of our districts to represent their interests in the making and regulating of the laws of this Nation. The constituencies which we represent have the right to know how we are performing our duty. In order for the people of this Nation to make an intelligent choice at the polls, and in order to insure the responsiveness of this body we must commit ourselves to making known our votes on important issues. The recording of teller votes is a necessary step in that direction. Far too many important issues are won or lost on unrecorded teller votes. How can we pretend to be accountable to our constituencies if we hide behind the secrecy of teller votes? This undemocratic process must be changed in our reorganization of the Congress.

Along these same lines our votes on issues in committees must also be recorded publicly. The heart of our legislative process is the work done in committee and therefore our actions in this part of the process must be open to the scrutiny of the public eye.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this body should be aware of the intricacies and principles involved in the various legislation and amendments that we are called to vote upon. Due to the vast number of bills and the extensive work required of the members of any given committee no man can be fully informed on all pieces of legislation. However, we certainly should make an effort to provide each member the opportunity to inform himself about the legislation which he must act on. Therefore, I believe it is imperative that we institute the practice of laying over for 3 legislative days all conference reports. In the same vein we should reconsider the inequitable practice of limiting debate time on amendments.

A vital part of the legislative procedure is the improvement, by amendment, of measures included in legislation which

is considered for some reason unacceptable to a number of Members. Yet the amendment procedure is stifled and made a farce when a man with a valid amendment, attempting to improve a piece of legislation is allowed only minutes, in some cases seconds, or in some cases no time at all to present his arguments and to inform his colleagues of the intent of his measure. In order to have rational actions in our legislature we must be willing to debate matters, particularly with such great import attached to them.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we must address ourselves to the question of selection of committee chairmen. To select a member of a committee to be chairman of that committee simply because he has tenure is not only undemocratic, but it is also an unwise and unfair procedure. I believe that a man certainly needs experience in a given area before he can qualify as chairman of a committee. However, simply a man's political longevity does not provide the necessary competence. To make this process both more democratic and more effective I believe that the chairman of the committee should be elected by the majority members of the committee from among the three most senior majority members, and that the ranking member should be selected from among the three most senior members of the minority by election by secret ballot also. The time has come for the choice of chairmen rather than the echo of the past.

The rejection of these vital reforms will leave this Nation with a feeling of mistrust and hopelessness. If we can not function, and function within the framework of true democracy, then we do not, and can not demand the respect and faith of the people of this Nation.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the objectives of the legislation before the House of Representatives today, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. I believe this bill is a step in the right direction toward a more modern Congress—responsive to the needs and desires of the American people and their elected representatives.

The thrust of this bill will assist in bringing our multibillion-dollar Government organization out of the bygone days and into the space age. Reform and modernization are long overdue, and I hope the House will approve the bill.

The House Rules Committee is to be congratulated on bringing the legislation to the floor. This bill, H.R. 17654, is an excellent companion to the legislation offered by the Rules Committee last week, amending the rules of the House to allow the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate lobbying practices and campaign financing and make recommendations for changes in the laws. These two areas need reform, and I have introduced H.R. 953, to strengthen the lobbying laws, and H.R. 958, providing for public disclosure of campaign finances, which I hope will be recommendations of the ethics committee.

I will support certain amendments to the bill before us today, including one to permit recording teller votes on major amendments. There are other house-keeping items not in the bill, including

the establishment of an electronic voting system in the House Chamber, which I would have liked to have seen in the bill. There are several provisions in the bill which I have worked for over the last several Congresses, and I am happy they are included in the bill.

One of my bills, H.R. 951, introduced first in the 89th Congress, and also in the 90th and 91st Congresses, would provide for a Congressional Budgetary Information Service to promote fiscal responsibility in the Federal Government.

The legislation was introduced by me after an evaluation and study of how the Congress functions with the executive branch of Government, particularly in the fiscal and budgetary areas. At the time of introduction, March 9, 1966, the country was taxing and spending the citizens of America a total of over \$100 billion annually, but our accounting was geared more to a Continental Congress with horse and buggy tools rather than with the instruments of a missile and jet era. The bill called for the Congress to have a "computerized analytical ability."

The Arthur D. Little Co., of Cambridge, Mass., in cooperation with the National Broadcasting Co., suggested such a budget office in the Congress in its extensive study of the House and the Senate, and the Florida Times-Union, of Jacksonville, Fla., said in an editorial of March 12, 1966:

The annual budgets will grow more complex and the probability that the Congress will be able to analyze them will be reduced unless some steps are taken soon to provide senators and representatives with an agency that is staffed and equipped with professionally trained personnel and analytical machinery.

For fiscal year 1971, the President's budget requests totaled \$203 billion, doubled in 4 years. My legislative idea to make sure every taxpayer gets "his dollar's worth for every dollar he pays in taxes" is included in title II, part I, section 201, "Budgetary and Fiscal Information and Data," and title IV, part I, section 401, "Joint Committee on Data Processing" in the bill before us today. My bill has been endorsed by the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Council of Economic Advisers.

Said the House report on H.R. 17654:

Potentially, the spending power is the most powerful prerogative Congress possesses for affecting and affecting public policy decisions. In recent decades, however, Congress has wielded this precious constitutional birthright in an increasingly haphazard and essentially ineffective manner.

The budget, fiscal, and data processing sections of the bill will make for a sounder and more economical government.

Another bill I have sponsored and supported, House Resolution 22, first introduced in the 89th Congress, follows and strengthens Public Law 801, enacted in 1956, which required the executive branch to report on cost estimates for Government programs. My bill would amend the rules of the House to provide for a detailed accounting in committee reports on spending bills and creation or expansion of Federal programs by the Government. This legislation is included

in the legislative reorganization bill in title II, part 2, section 221, "Supplemental Budget Information," and title II, part 5, section 252 "Cost Estimates in Reports."

The committee report on H.R. 17654 states:

In order to give the Congress a better picture of the expected expenditures in future years, the committee bill will require estimates for those years to be included by the executive when it recommends a new program or a change in an existing one. These estimates must cover the ensuing fiscal year and the next four fiscal years.

Further, committee reports will include estimates and 5-year projections on all programs.

The Wall Street Journal of July 14, 1966, commenting on my bill, House Resolution 22, included in the new reorganization bill, said:

Congress continues blithely to authorize programs, which eventually have to be paid for, without keeping tabs on over-all spending figures or even putting any price tag on some programs at all.

Sporadic efforts to persuade Congress to adopt at least some elementary bookkeeping so far have been unsuccessful, although a few hardy souls keep trying. Among them is Rep. Charles E. Bennett, who has offered a bill to require committees approving creation of new federal programs to present statements estimating those programs' costs for each of the next five fiscal years.

A third bill I have sponsored in the 91st Congress, H.R. 17622, to provide for annual reports concerning price increases in Government contracts and failures to meet contract completion dates, is covered in the expansion of the General Accounting Office, included in title II, part 1, section 204 of legislative reorganization bill. This section calls for the Comptroller General to review and analyze the results of Government programs and activities carried on under existing law, including the making of cost benefit studies. In the important area of contract overruns, the section allows the General Accounting Office additional authority to insure fiscal responsibility in our Government. My bill, H.R. 17622, has had favorable reports from the Comptroller General who wrote:

We are in agreement with the basic objectives of the bill.

And the Bureau of the Budget:

We believe the general purpose of this bill, to assure disclosure and closer scrutiny of selected government contract costs and performances, represents a desirable objective.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, is a good bill. It will help the Congress do a better job, especially in the oversight field of watching our tax dollars.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, Dr. George Galloway, one of the most respected observers of the Congress of the United States, has noted:

Representative government is the keystone of the democratic arch. The eyes of the world are upon it and the way it works. If Congress is to save itself from the antidemocratic forces which are challenging it at home and abroad, then it must act promptly to improve its efficiency and democratize its methods.

Except at those times when scandal rocks the Halls of Congress, congress-

sional reform and reorganization are not headline-making subjects. And yet, as the volume of information, problems, programs, solutions, and responsibility explodes on Congress, the maintenance of the legislative branch as an effective coequal depends on our mastery of our operations.

It is apparent today that Congress has not achieved a sufficient degree of such mastery. Outdated procedures and rules, an ornate but cumbersome committee arrangement, and an antiquated legislative calendar virtually prohibit the Congress from responding to new needs, new viewpoints, and new political forces within the Nation.

The need for congressional reform—and the urgency of that need—is highlighted if we look beyond the Congress to the changes that have taken place in other institutions in our society. Modern management techniques have been adopted with astonishing speed by the industrial sector where failure to keep pace with a competitor can mean extinction.

The executive branch has undergone numerous reorganizations—creating new agencies, such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, in order to deal more effectively with new problems. It also subjects itself to scrutiny and recommendations for change by a never-ending host of outside specialists.

Once considered the bastions of conservatism, our churches have undertaken changes in their ritual and organizational structure to an extent that would have been unimaginable a few short years ago.

We also see our universities and other educational institutions undergoing basic overhauls—as they struggle to stay relevant and up-to-date with changing conditions.

The individual State governments are also attempting to keep pace. Since 1960, eight States have adopted new constitutions and numerous improvements in procedures, and rules have been instituted by the legislatures of other States.

But the reluctance of Congress to make needed changes continues and, in my judgment, contributes greatly to a general loss of public esteem. We no longer enjoy the confidence of the public the way we did years ago. Without maximum public confidence, we cannot be as effective as we must be. As the executive branch has grown in power and influence, Congress has surrendered important initiatives and its influence has declined. One sad result of this is seen in the growing number of people who are going outside the system to seek redress of their grievances.

Perhaps the most apparent deterioration of the functions and authority of the Congress may be seen in the field of foreign affairs. A power which has been expressly reserved to the Congress—the authority to declare war—has disappeared in a haze born with the Gulf of Tonkin resolution in 1964 and thickened further with the recent invasion of Cambodia. Our partnership role in formulating this Nation's foreign policy has been reduced

to a minimum and we have become followers where we were intended to be leaders.

I. WHAT OF THE ESSENTIAL PRODUCTIVITY OF CONGRESS?

At the time I testified before the House Rules Committee during its hearings on legislative reorganization — November 1969—the House of Representatives had been in session for 164 days, recorded 11,072 pages of Members' debates and worldly observations, borne the filing of 20,239 bills by its 535 Members, and of this number, there had been enacted only 117 public bills and 55 private laws. We had recorded in the House 277 quorum rollcalls which required 185 hours, while being in session 625 hours and 11 minutes.

This incredible waste of time, money, and intellectual resources was graphically illustrated during the 1965 hearings on legislative reorganization in testimony by Congressman David King, of Utah. He pointed out at that time:

During the six-year period from 1958 to 1963 there were 632 roll call votes in the House. The average legislative day during this period lasted about four hours. Figuring an average roll call at 40 minutes, 111 full legislative days were consumed on roll call votes alone.

During this same period, the House had 725 quorum calls. Figuring an average call at 22 minutes, the House used 69 legislative days on this activity.

Thus, a total of 180 legislative days was spent on roll calls and quorum calls over a six-year period. In terms of a 5-day week, House Members spent more than 8 months just responding when their names were called.

And what of costs?

During the 88th Congress, the House was in session for 334 days. More than 2 months—68 legislative days, to be exact—was consumed with roll calls and quorum calls. Computed from fiscal 1965 legislative appropriations, the cost of each daily session was slightly more than \$64,000.

Thus, \$4.4 million was spent on roll calls and quorum calls during the 88th Congress alone. It cost each of our constituencies \$10,000 for us to respond to our names.

How much will it cost our constituencies today for us to answer to our names? How many legislative days in the 91st Congress and subsequent Congresses will be lost because of rollcalls and quorum calls? This is a problem which has been alleviated in many State legislatures, but it is 54 years now since the first bill was introduced to employ a form of electronic voting in the Congress.

Coupled with a time-saving electronic voting system, the House should either devise a quorum system of notifying Members when a requisite number have already reached the floor or adopt the Senate procedure of abandoning the call when a quorum is achieved in order to save fruitless, time-consuming floor trips.

However, antiquated voting procedures and the needless consumption of the Members' time is only part of a great malady: a seeming lack of legislative restraint and legislative responsibility among House members.

In the first session of the 91st Congress, more than 17,000 bills were introduced. Of course, most of these will be pigeonholed in committee, but is it possible to legislate under such a burden?

It would be possible for congressional committees to consider—at least receive reports and hold hearings—on far more of the legislation introduced each year if Congress would fully exploit the benefits of computerization and automatic data processing. It is conceivable that every bill introduced could be cataloged and imputed into an ADP system that would provide a daily digest report.

II. CONGRESS AND THE COMPUTER AGE

It is past time that we brought Congress out of the horse and buggy age and into the computer age. With the exception of a few units to handle payrolls, the Congress makes no use whatever of the most significant invention of our time—the electronic computer. It is essential that Congress establish a Legislative Data Processing Center to coordinate the development of ADP facilities and services for both Houses. This center would provide each Member of Congress with instantaneous, up-to-the-minute data on such things as the status of all bills and resolutions, budget receipts, and expenditures for each fiscal year, statutes currently in force, schedules of committee meetings and legislative sessions, significant developments, and bibliographical references in each Member's field of interest, statistics compiled by Federal departments and agencies to justify program expenditures, and analyses of the merits of competing demands for Federal resources.

I envision a central read-out facility on Capitol Hill that could tap the memory banks of the more than 3,000 computers now in use by Federal executive departments and agencies. The information could be channeled into each congressional office via desk-sized read-out devices or closed circuit television screens.

Such an ADP center would not only relieve Senators and Representatives of a number of time-consuming chores, but enable them to make better informed decisions on legislative matters. More significantly, it would enable Congress to keep up with the pace of change and progress in the Nation, perhaps even to anticipate it.

III. A JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

Even with the advantages an ADP center would provide, congressional operations would remain diverse, complex, and often intricate. A permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations would provide a continuing study of these operations and functions and would be able to recommend improvements. It could also be charged with new functions which significantly involve Congress as an institution, improve its relationships with other branches of the Government, and enable it better to meet its constitutional responsibilities. It could also be authorized to make recommendations on the rules, procedures, practices and precedents of either house. My concern with this aspect of reform rests not so much on what areas are specified as appropriate to be studied, but rather that there be a permanent, ongoing committee whose responsibility it is to maintain a continuing interest in the Congress as an institution. Failure to establish such a committee could lead to a situation in which some type of re-

form bill is passed and then no further action is taken for another 20 years.

IV. A LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR CONGRESS

At present, when it becomes necessary in any legal proceeding for the courts to look into the question of legislative intent, the opinions, generally speaking, have been obtained from the Department of Justice and the Attorney General. It appears in some cases that this causes a problem, since the administrative and executive parts of the Government are attempting to interpret what the legislative branch intended. This is not to imply that the opinions of the Attorney General are anything but honest, but the procedure does represent a tendency to favor the division of powers between the legislative and the executive, heavily on the executive side.

Congress should enact legislation providing for a legislative attorney general, and necessary staff, to serve as the authoritative source for interpretation of legislative intent. The legislative attorney general should be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, subject to ratification by Congress.

On the floor of the Senate and in the House, there have been great debates as to whether an item of legislation, as it was written, was actually constitutional. This is being raised now with regard to legislation authorizing 18-year-olds to vote. But there is no one in authority in such instances. There are such groups as the Legislative Reference Service, counsel on committees, individual lawyers, but there is no one in an authoritative position to really represent the position of Congress before the courts to say that for these or those reasons Congress thought legislation which it passed is constitutional.

The same thing is involved with regard to legislative intent. We frequently find a wide variety of thought. Several years ago, for instance, there was a difference of opinion between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the State of Alabama on a point of legal interpretation of a law that Congress passed. The State of Alabama contended HEW's action was arbitrary, but there was no authoritative voice to speak for the intent of Congress.

For another example, take legislation which is considered by the Senate Finance Committee or the House Ways and Means Committee. These bills are subject to many interpretations of tax law. Situations arise which just were not considered at the time the legislation was before the committees. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee made a speech at one time in which he indicated seven different interpretations had been given to one paragraph of a revenue law, none of which was the one he thought was really meant when the House was giving original consideration to the bill.

V. COMMITTEES AND THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

Woodrow Wilson said that "Congress in committee is Congress at work." The work of committees must, however, be made more productive and less agonizing and the committee process must become more reflective of the democratic traditions in which we believe.

One essential reform must be to truly open committee sessions to the public. Rather than permit the chairman to determine whether hearings should be open, I feel that we should require that all hearings be open except when national security or the privacy of individuals would be unduly violated. Certainly, the presumption ought always to be in favor of open sessions. This must apply to the appropriations committees, for there is no logic in the idea that money matters are less the public's business than other matters.

Additionally, we should arrange it so that committee schedules conflict as little as possible with the general and daily schedules of the House and Senate. Each year, great difficulty is encountered in carrying on legislative business when the authorizing and appropriations hearings are out of sequence. It is not unusual, for example, for the markup of an appropriation bill dealing with foreign aid to proceed while the authorizing legislation is still under discussion.

Voting in committees is now cloaked from public view and this is wrong. In many instances, votes in committee have far more significance than votes cast on final passage of a bill. All committee votes should be matters of public record and readily available to the press and the people.

Committee reports and the bills as reported by the respective committees should be made automatically available to Representatives and Senators no less than 5 legislative days before debate commences, and they should be accompanied by the printed text of the committee hearings. It is unconscionable that a defense appropriation bill of more than \$60 billion, for instance, could be brought to the House floor a mere 2 hours after the text of the bill and the committee report were made available.

Most Representatives and Senators are eager for all the radio and television they can get when they are campaigning. Unfortunately, this eagerness has not been matched in the legislative arena. Some of us, at least, seem to be a bit jittery about the possibility of a camera catching us in an unguarded moment in committee. Wide broadcast coverage would be valuable, in my view, in informing the American people not only as to the decisions their Congress is making, but equally important, how those decisions are arrived at. All open committee sessions should be subject to radio and television coverage, as should regular House and Senate sessions. Committee witnesses should not be permitted to bar coverage of their testimony, and adequate physical facilities should be made available so that at least five television cameras can be accommodated.

At the heart of any program for congressional reform and reorganization is the seniority system. While many proponents of reform advocate total abolition of the seniority system, and while this has a good deal of surface appeal, I believe it would present situations in which the cure would be worse than the disease. In the present Congress, for example, abolition of the seniority system and substitution of a procedure in which committee chairmen were chosen by majority vote would result in the loss of a

good number of progressive chairmen and the rise to power of men representing a conservative coalition of southern Democrats and less-than-progressive Republicans. The following procedure, advocated by Congressman BINGHAM, is far preferable, in my judgment:

A. RECORD VOTE APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

First. At the beginning of each Congress, the caucus of the majority party should have submitted to it for approval the names of all proposed committee chairmen. On demand of a certain number of members—perhaps one-fifth—a record vote should be taken, the results of which would be made public.

Second. If the seniority rule or a variation of it is to be continued, the most senior eligible member of the committee would automatically be nominated. If that member failed to obtain approval by the majority, the next senior member of the committee would be voted on, and so on until a chairman was elected.

Third. The same procedure should be followed for the chairmanship of subcommittees of the appropriations committee and of such other subcommittees as the caucus might decide.

Fourth. By this means the caucus could assure that members who were out of sympathy with major elements of the Democratic Party platform or who had not been performing their duties as chairmen in accordance with the wishes of the caucus would not serve as chairmen of important committees or subcommittees.

B. ROTATION OF CHAIRMANSHIP

First. There should be rotation of all committee and subcommittee chairmanships except where an overwhelming—perhaps two-thirds—majority of a caucus decides otherwise.

Second. Such rotation would give more members an opportunity to hold positions of responsibility, tend to prevent the accumulation over time of excessive power in the hands of a few individual members, encourage greater professionalization of committee staffs, and assure that committee and subcommittee chairmen not in the mainstream of national Democratic Party thinking could be replaced without embarrassment.

Third. The principle of rotation could—and should—be applied whether choice of chairmanships is based on seniority or not. If there is no widespread agreement on what system should be substituted for seniority, seniority could be continued as the basic criterion for choosing chairmanships in the first instance.

Fourth. The following is one illustration of how the seniority rule and the principle of rotation in office could be combined:

For each committee chairmanship, eligible members would be voted on in the caucus in order for seniority—as suggested under A above.

No member of a committee would be eligible to serve as chairman after serving two terms in that office, unless the caucus should decide by a two-thirds record vote to suspend the rules.

The same procedure would be followed in the case of chairmen of subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee and of

such other committees as the caucus might designate. The selection of the remaining subcommittee chairmanships would be left to the respective committees, with the proviso that no subcommittee chairman could be elected for more than two terms without the approval of the caucus by a two-thirds vote.

A member who had served as a subcommittee chairman would be eligible to serve as chairman of another subcommittee or of the full committee. A member who had completed two terms as chairman of a committee would retain his seniority and would be eligible to serve as chairman of a subcommittee of which he had not previously been chairman for two terms.

VI. FISCAL YEAR CALENDAR YEAR

I strongly recommend that the fiscal year for all departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government coincide with the calendar year. In September, 1969, when I introduced legislation to authorize such a change, a conference committee was about to meet to reconcile differences between the appropriations bills passed by the House and Senate for the Department of the Treasury and the Post Office Department. It was the first of 13 regular appropriation bills to reach that stage, and that was two and a half months after the new fiscal year began. By late November, a full five months after the start of the fiscal year, final action still had not been taken on appropriations bills for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, public works and the Atomic Energy Commission programs, military construction, the Department of Transportation, and foreign aid.

Even in a normal year—if there ever is such a thing—the appropriations process is a complex difficult one. In this area, even more so than in other aspects of congressional business, times have changed and the rules of Congress simply have not kept pace. It was not so long ago that the job of a Congressman was equally divided between service in Washington and service in his district. It was possible to convene in Washington in January, transact the Nation's business and then return home in June or July. Money was authorized and appropriated for a fiscal year that began soon after final passage of the bills.

But today we are dealing with a Federal budget that is approaching \$200 billion, and a myriad of Government programs and policies that touch virtually every aspect of daily life. Consideration of these programs and policies requires fuller investigation and greater understanding. The work of the committees is longer and more complex. Our work in Washington occupies us regularly 12 months of the year.

Changing the fiscal year to coincide with the calendar year will permit a full year to consider authorizations and appropriations and permit a greater opportunity for thorough yet timely work on the appropriations bills. It will permit programs to be authorized and funded in advance of the the start of the year. It will end the waste and diversion that

cost us so much under the present system.

VII. FLOOR PROCEDURES

In the area of business conducted in what the public believes is the major legislative arena—the House and Senate floors—reform is particularly urgent in the House, and in two main areas. First, it is long past time to do away with a procedure that does violence to the democratic process—the closed rule. There simply is no sound reason to preclude germane amendments to legislation. The American people expect, and rightfully so, that national legislation is the product of full and fair deliberation by 435 Representatives and 100 Senators. But with a closed rule in effect, much of that legislation is really the product of a single committee—perhaps 35 Members.

A second major reform, also applicable to the House, must be to put all votes on the public record. Under present rules, the really key votes—those coming on amendments to pending bills—are voice or teller votes, and there is no way for the press or the public to determine how a Member is voting. If there is to be heightened confidence in our political system and our legislative process, our emphasis must be on opening up the process by which national policies are made and carried out.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, in addition to supporting amendments on the above recommendations, I intend to back all the liberalizing amendments that will be offered on this important measure. By approving a strong bill we will take a giant stride toward bringing Congress out of the dark ages and into an era of new respect for the institutions which shape our national policies and priorities.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, this week on the House floor we are considering a most important legislative matter—the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. Twenty-four years have elapsed since Congress last made a comprehensive attempt to reform and modernize its internal machinery. This fact alone emphasizes the failure of the Congress of the United States to improve its own operations in a time when its ability to operate effectively is increasingly questioned by the American people.

In the time I have been a Member of Congress, I have experienced and observed many inadequacies and deficiencies which cripple the effective internal operation of Congress; the same faults which so many other Members have seen, described and attempted to reform. I have observed the secrecy of committee hearings, the failure to have committee votes made known to the public, and teller votes which permit Members of Congress to remain anonymous to the public and their constituents in terms of their support or rejection of legislation. I have seen the stifling influence of strict adherence to the seniority system in all activities of Congress—from the choosing of committee chairmen to the control of the motion to recommit and the allotment of amendments under the 5-minute rule on the House floor to the selection of House-Senate conferees. I have seen the senseless inefficiency occasioned by such archaic rules and pro-

cedures as time-consuming quorum calls and rollcall votes which could be handled quickly by an electronic voting system. I could go on and on. The examples above are only some of the anachronisms which impede the effective working of Congress. This institution has been operating with horse and buggy rules which are not effective in this age.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 is only the beginning of a comprehensive effort to free Congress of archaic, outmoded practices. The act itself is a small beginning in the mammoth task of overhauling our legislative machinery. It will be a worthy beginning only if it is strengthened by the worthwhile amendments which are to be proposed.

Among the more important amendments to be proposed are those which would: First, record and make public the votes of individual Members in teller votes; second, release to the public all rollcall votes taken within committees and subcommittees; third, open all committee hearings to the public except those closed by a two-thirds vote of the committee members, and, fourth, provide that appropriations bills, other bills, and House-Senate conference reports all be made available to House Members a number of days before they are voted upon so that Members might become familiar enough with them to amend and vote upon them intelligently. I must stress again—only with these amendments will the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 be a worthy reform measure. These amendments are absolutely necessary if the Congress is to become a progressive and positive force in America.

Even with the adoption of the amendments noted above, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 must be construed only as a beginning of congressional reform.

Many other impediments of the effective operation of Congress will not be dealt with in this legislation. If we must again wait 24 years for the next congressional reorganization effort to follow this one, we will have failed. We will have failed to make Congress an effective institution for dealing with the problems which confront America today. Those who consider this package of legislation a once-for-all effort at reform are deceiving themselves. They will be disillusioned later. Cumbersome rules and procedures, and seniority preferences will continue to pervade and impede the operations of Congress. Only with continued effort beyond this legislation will we make substantial progress toward a 20th century Congress.

As we approach the challenge of modernizing Congress, we must consider our image in the eyes of the American people whom we serve. We can serve the American people effectively only if we command their respect and confidence in us as a legislative body. We must recognize that many people representing different political persuasions and philosophies look with jaundiced eye at the House of Representatives being able to find solutions to fundamental national problems. Black Americans, other minorities and whites are especially doubtful that substantial progress in the face of America's

mounting problems will emanate from the U.S. Congress.

Perhaps most disturbing of all is the conception many of our young people have of the U.S. Congress. The young people who dream of an improved and more responsible America feel almost no hope that our national legislature can play a positive role in achieving this future. We call them "alienated." The lack of faith in the U.S. Congress is pervasive among many young people—the people who will be the future leaders of America. Working youths, minority youths, State college students, and ivy league students alike feel that the U.S. Congress is an anachronistic and archaic institution obsessed with procedures and maneuvers irrelevant to the greater problems of today which threaten the very future of America.

Thus we must reform and modernize Congress not only for ourselves, but also for the American people whom we serve. We must not let considerations of what makes things easiest for liberals or for conservatives or for our own reelections dominate our actions. We have the greater burden of regaining the confidence of the American people, especially the young people upon whom the very future of this Nation rests. To regain the confidence of the people we must dedicate ourselves to what is truly best for the people. That is to update the U.S. Congress into an effective institution which will lead in discovering solutions to fundamental problems in our Nation today.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say this: I think we have moved along rather well for a little while here. We are coming up now to a subject on which there is a great deal of concern having to do with the televising and radio broadcasting of committee hearings. It seems to me this might be a good breaking point.

With that in mind, at this time, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, 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. 17654) to improve the operation of the legislative branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on official business and missed rollcall No. 213. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 20

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the

distinguished majority leader as to the legislative program for the following week.

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

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Monday is Consent Calendar Day. There will be six suspensions, as follows:

H.R. 18253, to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans.

H.R. 14114, to improve the administration of the national park system.

S. 3279, to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest, Nev.

H.R. 12475, Federal Aid in Fish and Wildlife Restoration Acts.

H.R. 14124, to extend the term for fisheries loans.

H.R. 15351, to authorize additional funds for the operation of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

Then we will resume consideration of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week:

Tuesday is Private Calendar Day. There is also scheduled for the consideration of the House the Department of Labor, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

Following that, we will return to H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. If we finish that bill in time—and there may be at least one or more conference reports—we will go on with the program which we previously announced for this week, that is:

H.R. 13100, to extend programs for training in the allied health professions under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate;

H.R. 14237, to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate; and

H.R. 16542, to regulate the mailing of unsolicited credit cards, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority whip will yield further, may I state also that we do intend to have a Friday session next week. We must do this. We have a backlog of rules and it is necessary to do this if we hope to dispose of all available business by the middle of August.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Public Works; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 14, 1970.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 201 of Public Law 89-298, the Omnibus River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1965, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on July 14, 1970, approved by resolution the following flood control projects:

Fourmile Run, City of Alexandria and Arlington County, Virginia

Channel Improvements on Souris River through and below Minot, North Dakota

Attached are copies of the resolutions referred to above.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman.

THE SUCCESSFUL 747

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

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, today, July 16, 1970, bears special significance for the aviation industry of the United States and for the traveling public throughout the world. Today a 747 superjet is carrying the millionth passenger since the airplane started commercial service this past January 21.

Seldom has a single technological innovation caused such international interest as the 747 jetliner. Four years ago, this airplane existed only in the minds of men. In 2 years' time one of the largest buildings in the world was constructed at Everett, Wash. Today, the airplane is flying in 12 countries and serves 2 dozen of the great cities of the world. It carries up to 30,000 people daily to their destinations.

This is only a start, for this program is young. The 50 superjets delivered to date will increase to 100 by the end of this year, and 747's will be touching down in nearly every corner of the world. The numbers will continue to grow, and the economic impact will be felt wherever the airplane is seen. This is a large airplane, Mr. Speaker. It is 232 feet in length—112 feet longer than the first flight of the Wright brothers. It can carry up to 490 people per flight, although the airlines are flying at a maximum capacity

of 364 at this time. The 747 will reduce congestion in the airways, since one superjet can do the work of about 2½ 707-type jetliners. On some transcontinental routes, many flights have already been consolidated into single 747 flights. And this, too, is only a start.

The 747 is typical of American genius. A firm in the northwest corner of the United States, the Boeing Co. of Seattle, Wash., had enough faith in its own capability to invest nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars of its own resources to make the 747 a reality. But the story does not end there. Boeing subcontractors and suppliers for the 747 are located in every State of the Union and in six foreign countries. Those outside firms receive 50 cents of each dollar spent with Boeing for these airplanes. The multiplier effect of 747 money spreads throughout this Nation. And further, nearly half of the 747 orders are placed by foreign carriers. This has a favorable impact upon the United States' balance of trade.

The 747 is a credit to our country, to the airlines flying it and to the company that is building it. Somewhere today, passenger number 1 million is flying in the greatest comfort he ever has known in the largest and probably the safest airliner ever built. Once again the Boeing Co. has combined research and engineering into a success that benefits us all.

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

Mr. MEEDS. I yield to my colleague from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to commend my colleague from the State of Washington for his remarks regarding a great airplane and a great aerospace company.

Mr. Speaker, I share his pride in the contribution that the Boeing Co. and the 747 jetliner are making to modern air travel.

Meanwhile, south of the 747 plant, and in Seattle, the Boeing Co. is applying its wealth and talent and technological ability to the next generation of commercial jetliners—the U.S. supersonic transport.

When it enters commercial service in 1975, this marvel of American genius and technology will provide a major advance in service to the traveling public. For example, with a cruising speed of 1,800 miles an hour, it will transport up to 300 passengers in complete comfort and safety from Washington, D.C., or New York to London in 2 hours and 45 minutes; or from San Francisco to Tokyo in slightly more than 5 hours. In retrospect, each advancement in commercial aviation during its relatively brief history has benefited our society. By making the world smaller, the air travel has significantly enhanced the communication and interrelationships between the peoples of the earth.

Looking to the future, it does not require a vivid imagination to recognize the benefits that our Nation will derive from the SST. Intercontinental travel time will be reduced by two-thirds. Think of what this will mean in the fields of commerce, finance and international relations.

Mr. Speaker, the positive impact on our national economy will also be far-reaching. Studies by the Boeing Co. and the Federal Aviation Administration indicate a market potential for more than 500 U.S. SST's by 1990, based on selected international routes with no boom-producing flights over populated areas. This is over \$20 billion worth of business. And by 1985, the SST share of the long-range air traffic will equal the total free-world traffic of 1970. Here is what this much business would mean to the U.S. economy. At the peak of production, the SST program will provide about one out of every 50 new civilian jobs. The long-term direct work force on the SST may number 50,000 and the supportive work force, 100,000.

Although the Boeing Co. has the prime contract, the engines will be assembled in the General Electric plant in Farmingdale, Ohio, the cockpit and hinged nose sections will come from Hawthorne, Calif., and the tail assembly from Farmingdale, N.Y.

Depending upon final source selection by Boeing and General Electric, there is a potential opportunity for suppliers and subcontractors in most of the 50 States to benefit from the program.

Last, but certainly not the least of the economic benefits, will be the impact of SST sales on the U.S. balance of payments. The potential balance of trade effect of a successful American SST program in international competition during the next two decades becomes a consideration of major national significance with the serious deterioration of our balance of payments outlook as viewed after the first quarter of 1970. It is now estimated that this balance of trade impact could reach as much as \$22 billion over the life of the SST program.

Mr. Speaker, a program of this size and scope is certainly not without risks and high cost. The development costs of the SST prototype program is estimated at \$1.3 billion—more money than has been required to build any other airplane now flying commercially, and certainly more money than private industry is in a position to invest. Therefore, the only feasible way in which the United States could meet the competition from the British-French and Russian Government-financed SST's was to form an industry-government financial partnership on a 90-10 cost sharing basis. Contrary to the claims of some of the program's critics, this is not a Government subsidy—it is a loan which will be repaid totally upon the sale of the 300th SST.

As much as I desire to do so, I will not take the time here to attempt to answer the other criticisms being voiced by the critics of the U.S. SST program. I will, however, offer the observation that a considerable amount of the controversy is either nonfactual or is based upon misinformation. With this thought in mind, I ask unanimous consent to submit at the conclusion of my remarks the June 19, 1970, issue of the Boeing Management Information bulletin containing a transcript of an interview with H. W. "Bob" Withington, vice president-general manager of the SST Division of the Boeing Co. Mr. Withington very ably separates fact from fantasy regarding the major

criticisms of the SST program. I commend it for your reading.

And Mr. Speaker I close my remarks by quoting a statement about the SST program made by President Nixon on September 23, 1969, in which he said:

For fifty years the United States has led the world in air transport . . . It is essential to build this plane if we are to maintain that leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the money spent now on the SST program is truly an investment in the future.

FACTS ON SST: AN INTERVIEW WITH WITHINGTON

Controversy, accompanied by a great amount of misinformation, has surrounded the congressional battle over the supersonic transport. So that Boeing managers will be able to sort fact from fantasy, here is a special interview with H. W. "Bob" Withington, vice president-general manager of the SST Division.

Q. At this point, as you're getting ready to start building the prototypes, are you really satisfied with the SST design?

A. Absolutely. I think one of the most significant things is the technical stability our design has maintained over the past year and a half. We have been working more than a dozen years on the SST, and during most of that time almost every configuration we had gradually seemed to get worse the more we worked on it. This one has stayed good all the way and in some places has even improved. We know where we are technically and we really are ready to go with the prototypes.

Q. What are you looking for in the way of competition from the Concorde and the Russians?

A. We think our airplane will be greatly superior in performance and passenger appeal to both the British/French Concorde and the Russian airplane. Remember, though, that they have a long lead on us. The potential threat this poses is that, with their experience from flight tests, they may be able to come up with a second-generation airplane that would be much more competitive and would be available in the same time period as ours.

Q. You don't expect, do you, that their second-generation airplane would be better than our first production models?

A. No. But anyone who has tried to sell airplanes outside the U.S. knows that his product has to be quite a bit superior to a foreign product if he's going to make the sale. We're anticipating a 500-airplane market, but we expect about half of it to be overseas.

Q. Foreign sales of the Boeing SST, then, are pretty vital to the program's success?

A. Yes, for a couple of reasons. We need them to make the program an economic success, for Boeing and for the government. One of the reasons that three administrations have considered it important that the U.S. go ahead with an SST is that it is expected to give America a favorable effect in the balance of trade. If no American SST were available, it is estimated that U.S. airlines would have to purchase some 380 foreign-built SSTs to maintain a competitive position. Approximately 250 of these could be expected to be advanced-model Concorde's approaching the performance, size and economy of the present American design and therefore selling at a higher price than the original Concorde's. The unfavorable balance of trade during this period caused by these increased imports and loss of exports, would amount to some \$22 billion—enough to seriously tip the scale against the United States in its international monetary position. Right now, commercial transports are one of the very few kinds of manufactured products in which the U.S. still has a marked edge in the world market.

Q. But haven't a lot of critics been saying

the government shouldn't have to put up the money for a privately produced product?

A. They have, but they're ignoring some pretty basic facts. The government is loaning us about one and a quarter billion dollars—and I think we ought to make real sure we understand this is a loan, a long-term loan. The government isn't giving anyone that money; it's investing it. It will get its principal back by the sale of the 300th airplane, and its full interest in another 200. Beyond that, it will draw royalties that will amount to clear profit. And the government is not putting up all the money, as the governments of Britain, France and Russia are doing for their supersonic airplanes. Twenty-six airlines, including fourteen foreign carriers, have reserved delivery positions for 122 U.S. SST's. More than \$80 million has been invested by the carriers, some \$60 million of it at risk by nine domestic airlines and one foreign airline. General Electric (producer of the engines) has a total commitment of \$94 million. And Boeing's commitment is about \$214 million—half in cash and half in the cost of facilities.

Q. Mr. Withington, some critics have been saying the SST will create sonic booms that will break windows, stampede cattle, and knock housewives off their kitchen stools. Care to comment?

A. I shouldn't have to comment, simply because that charge should have been laid to rest long ago. It's ridiculous, on two counts. First, the government has stated quite clearly that the SST will not be permitted to fly at boom-producing speeds over populated areas. In fact, all of our studies at Boeing—including economic studies—have been based on the assumption that the SST will not be flying over land at supersonic speeds.

Second, there is a tremendous misconception about the effects of sonic boom. Critics tend to think of some of the things that have happened when fighters have broken the so-called sonic barrier over a community. The over-pressures involved in those incidents were 60 to 80 pounds per square foot. The SST's over-pressure is four pounds in climb, two in cruise. That magnitude of noise is about equal to the thunder clap from a lightning bolt that hits a half mile away, and I don't think that amount of noise has ever broken anything. We recognize, however, that it can be an annoyance, and we don't intend to perpetrate that annoyance on anyone.

Q. What about the effect of sonic boom on ships at sea?

A. It will be negligible. A special report to the Secretary of the Interior, prepared by a committee appointed by him, indicates that it seems unlikely that the pressure from sonic booms would have any effect on ships, especially since "the overpressure from sonic booms are much less than the difference in pressure between the top and the bottom of a small ocean wave."

Q. Apart from sonic boom, aren't you anticipating noise problems around airports?

A. We're anticipating just one tough problem here, but we expect to solve it. The SST's engines will generate about as much thrust as four 707's. This means there will be quite a bit of what we call "sideline" noise—principally noise on the airport itself—unless we suppress it. The prototype engines will not have sound suppression, but Boeing and the engine manufacturer, General Electric, have a major program aimed at reducing engine noise for the production engines.

Q. With sound suppressors?

A. Yes. We think we know, from the acoustical standpoint, what we need to do. Fundamentally, there are two approaches which will be explored: One to reduce specific thrust (reduce jet exhaust velocity), and the other to change low frequencies to high (high frequency attenuates rapidly

with distance). We feel that, by the time we get to the production airplane, we can make a significant reduction in sideline noise. This is something most of the critics don't seem to appreciate: The fact that we have some years ahead of us in which to advance our technology.

Q. What about noise on takeoff and approach?

A. Because we have so much power on this airplane, we climb fast and will get pretty high over the community at a very early point. Our calculations indicate the SST may be even better than today's airplanes at meeting the government's requirements with respect to noise in the community under a takeoff.

As far as approach is concerned, we also should be better than today's aircraft. Part of the reason is the unique engine inlet required for supersonic flight. We can choke it and no noise will come out the front. Besides this, the instrumentation, the capability of the airplane, the auto-throttles and the automatic flight control on approach will permit us to use techniques that will hold down the noise.

Q. We read a lot about air pollution these days. Do you expect the SST to be a factor in pollution?

A. A fully loaded SST, traveling at 1780 miles per hour, won't emit any more air pollutants per mile than three automobiles traveling at 60 mph. That may sound surprising, but the fact is that reciprocating engines used in land transportation vehicles convert 30 to 50 per cent of the fuel consumed into air pollutants. Turbine engines convert less than 1 per cent.

You might remember also that smokeless burners now are being installed on today's aircraft engines. In ground operation, they have reduced smoke particles by about 65 per cent and smog ingredients by 50 per cent.

Q. Didn't one critic predict some kind of permanent high-altitude overcast resulting from crystallized SST contrails—an overcast he said might blot out the sun and change the earth's climate?

A. I'm afraid he did, and he even got some congressmen excited about it. But the fact is that condensation trails are seldom, if ever, formed at the 60,000 to 70,000-foot altitude at which the SST will cruise. We know this, because military pilots have flown supersonically for hundreds of thousands of hours at high altitude.

Q. Well, what did this man base his theory on?

A. Apparently on some early studies that indicated it might take 10 years or so to circulate air and water out of the stratosphere, thus permitting the SST's water vapor to accumulate as a sort of global cirrus cloud layer. But later studies show that the circulation time is more like one year.

As a matter of fact, the National Academy of Sciences and the Office of Meteorological Research both have studied this prospect and reported that a fleet of SST's will have no appreciable effect on the earth's normal atmospheric balance. The NAS study showed that 1,600 SST flights per day would produce about 150,000 tons of water. That's about the same amount that would be injected into the stratosphere by a single large cumulonimbus cloud in the tropics.

Q. Haven't some other critics suggested that SST passengers might be exposed to too much radiation in the thin atmosphere at high altitudes?

A. That's really a far-out suggestion. Military airmen and astronauts have spent a great deal of time at such altitudes and there has been no evidence of radiation hazard.

Federal standards recommend that the general public not be exposed to more than 500 millirems of radiation per year. Atomic workers are permitted 5,000. In some areas of the world, natural radiation runs as high as 12,000 millirems per year.

A person would have to make 250 trips from Seattle to New York at the altitudes we fly today to receive an additional 500 millirems of exposure. Flights at 65,000 feet would increase the radiation dose by a factor of three, but at SST speed you would be exposed only one-third as long. Thus the SST passenger isn't going to have any more radiation exposure over any given number of miles than today's subsonic-jet passenger.

Q. Altogether, what you're saying, then, is that the SST will not in any way pose additional hazards to man and his environment?

A. That's what I'm saying, yes. It's popular these days to attack a great many things on environmental grounds, and a lot of these things should be attacked because we've got to stop the deterioration of our environment. In the case of the SST, though, the critics simply have the wrong whipping boy.

Q. Isn't congestion on the airways and airports an environmental problem?

A. I guess you could call it that. But if you're suggesting that the SST will compound the congestion, I think we're still talking about the wrong whipping boy. Remember, this airplane will fly at 60,000 feet and above. This is a complete new chunk of airspace—so we actually will be helping to alleviate the airways congestion problem.

So far as the airports are concerned, obviously we'll have to go into the same traffic pattern as other aircraft. But the SST's short time of flight will give us an opportunity for wholly different schedules in terms of departure and arrival times.

Q. You mean the SST will be taking off and landing at different times than most other aircraft?

A. I expect it will be scheduled that way. Right now the peak departures from Kennedy International to Europe are in the evening—6, 7, 8 o'clock—and that, coupled with the domestic traffic, makes Kennedy pretty congested that time of night. Well, the SST can leave as early in the morning as you want to get up, or as late as 1 o'clock in the afternoon, and still reach its destination the same day. For this reason, I think the SST is going to help lighten the airports' burden.

Q. One persistent critic in the Senate has been calling the SST a "plaything for the jet set." How do you answer that charge?

A. By pointing out that the SST is the farthest thing from a "plaything"—it's in fact a "workhorse." Because of its speed alone, it will do three times the work of a subsonic jet of equal capacity.

You know, there were equally unrealistic criticisms from some congressmen on other Boeing products. For example, when we were introducing the B-17 Flying Fortress, congressmen debated appropriations for anything bigger than two-engine planes because "there would be too many eggs in one basket." And then when we were going from piston engines to jets for commercial travel, there were scare stories about what would happen if we tried to break the so-called sonic barrier. All those criticisms faded away promptly as soon as the airplanes had a chance to prove themselves. I expect the same thing will happen to the criticisms of the SST once we've got it in the air and demonstrated what it can do.

DESPICABLE LAW IN EFFECT IN NORTHERN IRELAND

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I pointed out the need for a thorough investigation of the Northern Ireland situation by the United Nations. I hope that the relative calm in Northern Ireland recently does not cause the U.N. officials to ignore the problem.

I would like to bring to the attention

of my colleagues a despicable law in effect in Northern Ireland. The Special Powers Act, which was passed by the Northern Ireland Parliament in 1922, would permit near dictatorial rule by those in power. I offer for the record the provisions of this act.

If such a law were proposed in this country, there would be a great hue and cry about civil liberties and destruction of the Constitution. Yet, how can we condone such a law—and particularly its implementation—in Northern Ireland?

Mr. Speaker, we are currently marking Captive Nations Week in this country. Today, in this Chamber, my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) will sponsor a special order so that the Members can express their concern over the conditions in countries dominated by communism.

Many who take to the floor this afternoon will have much to say about the right of self-determination and how every person should be allowed to exercise that right. Yet unfortunately in the so-called free world, those Irish Catholics in Northern Ireland do not have that right. Let us never forget that the cause of freedom and justice can best be served through the strengthening of these values in the democratic nations. I think it is time that this country became concerned about the cause of freedom and justice in Northern Ireland as well as those countries in Europe and Southeast Asia under the domination of foreign powers.

Summary of the Special Powers Act follows:

THE SPECIAL POWERS ACT, NORTHERN IRELAND

1. Arrest without warrant;
2. Imprison without charge or trial and deny recourse to habeas corpus or a court of law;
3. Enter and search homes without warrant, and with force, at any hour of day or night;
4. Declare a curfew and prohibit meetings, assemblies (including fairs and markets) and processions;
5. Permit punishment by flogging;
6. Deny claim to a trial by jury;
7. Arrest persons it is desired to examine as witnesses, forcibly detain them and compel them to answer questions, under penalties, even if answers may incriminate them. Such a person is guilty of an offense if he refuses to be sworn or answer a question;
8. Do any act involving interference with the rights of private property;
9. Prevent access of relatives or legal advisers to a person imprisoned without trial;
10. Prohibit the holding of an inquest after a prisoner's death;
11. Arrest a person who "by word of mouth" spreads false reports or makes false statements;
12. Prohibit the circulation of any newspaper;
13. Prohibit the possession of any film or gramophone record; and
14. Arrest a person who does anything calculated to be prejudicial to the preservation of peace or maintenance of order in Northern Ireland and not specifically provided for in the regulations.

THE NATION'S NEWSPAPERS ARE DEMANDING REDUCTION OF FABULOUS FARM SUBSIDIES

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

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last week

the Senate courageously limited annual subsidy payments to any farm operation to the amount of \$20,000. A year ago the House pioneered the \$20,000 limitation, but unfortunately when this legislation was before the other body the \$20,000 limitation was rejected.

The other body no doubt is reacting to the avalanche of American public opinion and the demand of taxpayers that this unfortunate raid on the public treasury be terminated. All Members of Congress in both bodies want legislation that will make agriculture prosperous and by limiting payments to \$20,000 annually thousands and thousands of smaller farm operations will be given protection on a sensible farm legislation program.

Many newspapers over the Nation have commended the Senate for its action on this subsidy limitation to \$20,000 annually, on July 8, 1970. I do hope when the House Conferees meet with the Senate Conferees they will go along with the action of the Senate and uphold the limitation the House enacted last year on the farm subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing the following editorial from the Hammond, Ind. Times and Gary, Ind., Post Tribune commenting on the limitation enacted by the Senate:

FARM SUBSIDIES

Crippling of one of the nation's worst boondoggles, the farm subsidy program, was narrowly voted by the Senate. It decided 40-35 to limit handouts to \$20,000 a year per farmer.

Heretofore, attempts to limit the amount were rejected by the Senate. It was always in the House that they flourished where last year the limit won 224 to 140 approval.

Now that the Senate has come to its senses, the House is in retreat. It has already rejected the \$20,000 ceiling, and hopes appear shaky that it will accept the Senate's decision.

Should the House fall in line, it could mean annual savings of from \$200 to \$300 million for the taxpayers, according to Illinois' Senator Smith, a sponsor of the Senate restriction. He estimates that more than \$3 billion is paid every year in farm subsidies.

If all that money went to stave off economic disaster for the small farmer, it would be well invested. That was the original intent of the program through its mechanism of paying him to idle land thereby depressing crop production so prices would remain reasonably high and his income adequate.

But most of the money over the years has found its way into the hands of the huge corporate farms, the principal reasons being the drastic shrinkage in the number of small farmers. Sen. John Williams, (R., Del.) long an advocate of a subsidy ceiling, notes that such farms are owned by industrial monoliths like Standard Oil of California and Reynolds Aluminum Co.; numerous banks also receive the subsidy payments.

"Those collecting the money aren't cultivating the farms. They're cultivating the Treasury of the United States," Williams correctly observes.

Subsidy proponents argue that if the payments are curtailed, the large landowners will return idle acreage to production, flood the market with products and drive down prices. The implication is that to keep the little farmer solvent, the big ones must be allowed at the trough, too.

The rebuttal to this illogic is for the government to protect the floundering little guy; reject obvious manipulators. The \$20,000 limit is a good idea.

[From the Gary Post-Tribune, July 11, 1970]

LIMIT THE SUBSIDIES

Gary's Rep. Ray J. Madden faces a new opportunity and a new challenge involving one of his pet projects—in which we are heartily in accord.

What is involved in the possibility of limiting farm subsidy payments to \$20,000 for any one farmer.

Previously Madden has been instrumental in getting legislation for such a limitation through the House. Previously it has died in the Senate. Now this week the Senate has surprised its farm bloc by approving such a limitation by a 40-to-35 roll call vote. Now, however, the proposal reportedly faces rough going in the House.

We feel sure Madden will be trying hard to get it through. Admittedly such an effort takes no great courage for a representative of a district as little farm-oriented as his is. Nevertheless, we wish him success.

The farm subsidy program was wisely conceived in the depression years as a means of cutting down overproduction of certain crops without leaving farmers destitute because of what they failed to plant. That kind of control probably still is needed. However, too often in more recent years of bigger corporate farms such subsidies have resulted in huge windfalls for very big landowners. That wasn't the original idea. It should be stopped.

CON SON—AND WHY NOT HUE?

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the National Observer asks a very good question, one that the proponents of appeasement need to answer. That question is: "Con Son—and Why Not Hue?"

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, why not Hue? Or why not the American prisoners of war? Why not, indeed, that land of prisoners—Czechoslovakia?

Why not, indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the July 13, 1970, editorial from the National Observer, "Con Son—and Why Not Hue?" at this point:

CON SON—AND WHY NOT HUE?

Con Son—that's the big name this week and probably next week and the one after that for those who are determined to get the government of Thieu and Ky, at whatever cost, and to increasingly and compulsively prove the "immorality" of United States involvement in Vietnam.

The spectacle of prisoners being mistreated is not a pleasant one. Not a very new one, either. But that the outrage was mostly political was quickly evident. There was the remark, for example, of Rep. Augustus F. Hawkins, Democrat of California, that Con Son is "a symbol of how some American officials will cooperate in corruption and torture because they want to see the war continued and the government they put in power protected." Getting Thieu and Ky is a long-standing game—in which there has been far more weeping and gnashing of teeth over what they have allegedly done than hard evidence of ill doing—of which Con Son, though not really dramatic, is rather heaven-sent.

As we say, the spectacle of prisoners being mistreated is not a pleasant one. Atrocities never are. But how much outcry have we had over some other atrocities—Hue, for example, where thousands of South Vietnamese were murdered by Viet Cong.

Hue is not publicized, of course, because it would harm the image of a benign Viet Cong, more sinned against than sinning. Smith Hempstone, writing in the Evening

Star of Washington, D.C., recalled some other atrocities—the South Korean "spy" mangled in a North Korean prison, the Belgian nun beaten to the bone by bicycle chains in the Congo. Somehow these incidents never caused the outcry that Con Son, for example, does.

Do the young people going from here to cut sugar cane for Castro recall how he abolished elections and sent his foes before kangaroo courts and on to the firing squads? Or do they condone it? And how about their parents who continually push for closer relations with Cuba? How about the mass murders perpetrated on the China mainland by the Chinese Communists? Are they likewise condoned by those who so ardently seek to embrace that land? Why all the outcry over Con Son and so little over the treatment of U.S. prisoners in the hands of the Viet Cong?

Well, the difference isn't hard to find. If the atrocity is perpetrated by a right-wing government, it is built into a major event. If it comes from a left-wing government, it is ignored, or swept under the rug.

We would be more impressed by all the concern over atrocity if it were applied more to atrocities themselves and less to political targets.

SUPPORT FOR VETERANS BY THE HONORABLE FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

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

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was very much disturbed quite recently to read in the Easton Express, a leading newspaper in my district, an article which alleged that the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) had not taken an interest in veterans affairs. I do not know the person who made the allegation, but I do know our distinguished friend and colleague (Mr. THOMPSON), and I do know, as a former member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, of his unswerving and dedicated support to assist our veterans. Little more than a month ago, our distinguished colleague (Mr. THOMPSON) issued a public statement pointing to the plight of the veterans hospital program. That statement set forth in specific detail the staffing needs for veterans hospitals in New Jersey. With your permission, I would like to make that statement part of the RECORD.

Under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, the House has passed several major bills relating to veterans affairs in this session of the Congress. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) supported and voted for each and every one of these bills, a list of which, with the House's permission, I attach herewith. While the gentleman from New Jersey needs no defense from me for his support of legislation on veterans affairs, I felt that I could not let the published statement go unanswered or un rebutted. I commend the gentleman, and I am sure that those of our colleagues who know of his record on veterans affairs will wish to join me.

LIST OF HOUSE-PASSED BILLS RELATING TO VETERANS' AFFAIRS

H.R. 370—Increases from \$1,600 to \$2,500 the amount allowed for the purchase of spe-

cially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans.

H.R. 372—Provides for changes in the reporting requirement and establishes additional income exclusions relating to pensions for veterans and their widows.

H.R. 692—Extends the length of time community nursing home care may be provided for veterans at U.S. expense from 6 to 9 months.

H.R. 693—Provides that veterans 70 or older shall be deemed unable to defray expenses of necessary hospital care and provides an extra \$50 a month for a widow who is helpless or blind.

H.R. 2768—Eliminates the 6-month limitation on the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans with service-connected disabilities.

H.R. 3130—Provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may furnish medical services for nonservice-connected disability to any war veteran who is totally disabled from a service-connected disability.

H.R. 4622—Insures the preservation of all disability compensation evaluation in effect for 20 or more years under veterans benefits.

H.R. 6808—A bill which permits a veteran to receive GI educational benefits whether or not he is receiving assistance under another Federal program.

H.R. 9334—Increases generally the Federal payments to the states for the care of veterans in state homes.

H.R. 9634—Improves the V.A. program of sharing specialized medical resources.

H.R. 10912—Provides for the liberalization of the conditions under which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is required to effect recouping from disability compensation otherwise payable to disabled veterans.

H.R. 11959—Increases rates of vocational rehabilitation, educational assistance, and special training allowance paid to eligible veterans.

H.R. 13576—Increases the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation payable to widows of veterans.

H.R. 16661—Authorizes a maximum of \$15,000 coverage under Servicemen's Group Life Insurance.

H.R. 17958—Provides increases in the rates of disability compensation and liberalizes criteria for eligibility of widows for such benefits.

STATEMENT

While Memorial Day is still fresh in our minds, it would be appropriate for all Americans to join in a national commitment to provide a higher standard of care for those veterans who are hospitalized. Their number is truly staggering. Each year more than 800,000 patients are treated in Veterans Administration Hospitals, and the number is growing by 16,000 a year as a result of the Vietnam war. In spite of this growing roster of patients, we actually have 1,100 fewer staff personnel in our 166 VA Hospitals today than we had in 1966.

A recent article in Life Magazine publicized a situation that has developed for several years. The fact is that the present Administration and the preceding Administration has consistently underestimated staffing needs for VA Hospitals. Therefore, the executive branch has failed to request sufficient funds from the Congress to operate the VA Hospitals in a manner that will assure adequate care for the patients.

In New Jersey for example, Reuben Cohen, Director of the East Orange VA Hospital, advised the Committee on Veterans Affairs that he has 34 authorized staff positions now vacant, but no funds to hire personnel to fill them. Moreover, Mr. Cohen has said he needs authorization for 695 new positions to adequately staff the hospital.

Dr. S. T. Ginsberg, Director of the Lyons VA Hospital, advised the committee that he has 19 authorized staff positions which he cannot fill because of the lack of funds.

He estimates that he needs authorization for 200 additional employees to provide an adequate standard of care.

President Nixon recognized the crisis on April 2 in a special message to the Congress. He recommended appropriation of an additional \$15 million for the VA medical budget for the current fiscal year which ends June 30; and an additional \$50 million for the 1971 fiscal year. The House of Representatives acted promptly and, upon the advice of Rep. Olin E. Teague, Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, we went beyond the President's recommendations. The House appropriated an additional \$22 million for the VA medical budget for the current fiscal year and an additional \$75 million for the coming fiscal year. The House Committee did not act in a vacuum. The Committee staff conducted a four-month survey of all veterans hospitals last year. The findings fully support the conditions reported by Life Magazine.

Advanced medical techniques have wrought miracles in providing treatment for seriously wounded men. A soldier may now find himself on the operating table within minutes of being wounded. As a result, men are being saved who in prior years would never have reached a hospital bed. How ironic it is for wounded servicemen to receive superb medical care under battle conditions only to fall victim to neglect in a VA Hospital at home. Surely, this Nation can do better. It must do better.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CHANGES POLICY FOLLOWING MARINE'S DEATH

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

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on May 7, 1970, I told my colleagues of the unfortunate death of Pvt. George J. Girot, a U.S. Marine recruit who died of a heart attack during training exercises at Parris Island, S.C.

Young Girot had managed to enlist in the U.S. Marine Corps even though he was classified 4-F by his local draft board because of a heart condition. He also managed to pass the physical examination at the Armed Forces Entrance Examination Station at Coral Gables, Fla., primarily because the physicians at the examining station did not know he was 4-F and did not bother to check his draft status with his local draft board or with the recruiter who referred Girot for a physical examination.

I expressed dismay at the fact that the U.S. Army or the U.S. Marine Corps, both of which use the AFEES facilities, would not have sufficient liaison with these examining stations to provide information on a prospective recruit's draft status or medical history. I was further concerned that the AFEES station in Coral Gables, Fla., did not attempt to ascertain young Girot's draft status from his local board or from the recruiter.

On May 7 I sent a letter to Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor urging that such lax procedures be reviewed and recommending that better liaison be established between the AFEES facilities and the Selective Service System in order that such tragedies could be avoided in the future.

I have received a reply from Col. Raymond T. Reid, Chief of the Legislative Liaison Office, Department of the Army,

in behalf of Secretary Resor, stating that the Department of the Army, acting as executive agency of the Department of Defense for the operation of AFEES, has adopted a change in policy along the lines which I recommended.

I would like to insert at this point in the Record that letter from Colonel Reid for the benefit of my colleagues:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., July 2, 1970.

Hon. PAUL G. ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR Mr. ROGERS: The Secretary of the Army has asked me to reply to your inquiry concerning the death of George J. Girot.

As a result of the unfortunate death of Private Girot, the administrative directives relating to evaluation of medical documentation for applicants with a previous IV-F classification were subjected to intensive review. The review revealed that in certain circumstances, such as those under which Private Girot applied and was accepted for enlistment, prior medical documentation was not in fact made available for evaluation at the Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Station (AFEES).

Following the review, the U.S. Army Recruiting Command recommended to the Department of the Army (Department of Defense executive agency for operation of AFEES) that any prospective applicant for enlistment previously registered with his local draft board as IV-F be referred back to that board to request re-examination by AFEES. This will insure that the documented medical history of the individual is furnished to AFEES along with the request for reexamination and will negate total reliance on the applicant's Personal History Form. This recommendation is now being coordinated with the other services and National Headquarters, Selective Service System. Informal coordination with the other recruiting services indicated their acceptance of this proposal, and it should be implemented in the near future.

I trust this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND T. REID,
Colonel, GS, Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

I am very pleased that the Department of the Army has acted favorably in this matter, and I believe the new procedures will greatly improve the liaison between our armed services, the Selective Service System, and the physical examination facilities throughout the country, and that such tragedies as befell young George Girot can be avoided in the future.

INDUSTRIAL OUTPUT DECLINE

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently we have witnessed a steady barrage of statements emanating from the executive branch of the Government to the effect that our current economic recession has bottomed out and that we are on the road to recovery. Bottoming out appears to be an expression developed by this generation of Republican policymakers to replace that somewhat tarnished expression used by their political forbears; namely, "prosperity is just around the corner." Like its ill-fated predecessor, the phrase "bottoming out" has as its objective the creation of a rosy warm glow

of confidence as to this Nation's economic status. Unfortunately, when subjected to the acid test of the factual situation in the real world, it fails to engender the desired results. Quite the contrary; as the history of 40 years ago so effectively demonstrated, repeated Presidential expressions of unwarranted optimism as to the state of the economy when sharply contradicted by economic statistics, tend to aggravate lack of confidence on the part of both business and the public.

Yesterday, the Federal Reserve Board revealed that industrial production during May had dropped once again. This decline means that the country has now experienced a downward thrust in the economy for a year. The press reports that shortly after the report was issued, President Nixon met with his top economic advisers for a general discussion on the economy. White House Press Secretary Ron Ziegler, however, stated that Mr. Nixon was not necessarily planning any new move on the economy.

Mr. Speaker, the million people who are now unemployed and who had jobs when Mr. Nixon took office, and the workers who are experiencing sharply reduced workweeks, will find little comfort in the fact that the President held a general discussion on the economy yesterday with the selfsame officials, Messrs. Mayo, McCracken, Kennedy, and Burns, who have been the architects of our current unprecedented economic disaster. As I have stated on previous occasions, these gentlemen have somehow concocted an economic policy which has at one and the same time produced galloping inflation and deepening recession.

Mr. Speaker, the country has had enough of Pollyanna statements from the administration on the economy, it has had enough general discussions on the economy, it has had more than enough of a Republican economic elixir guaranteed to produce both inflation and recession. It is time for the President to take those economic measures necessary to curb inflation and put people back to work.

ANGKOR WAT AND THE HAGUE CONVENTION

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, as a result of the combat in Cambodia many people throughout the world became acquainted with the ancient cities of Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom. Those monuments of a great and early civilization appeared to be threatened with destruction and are still in peril. I received requests from a number of constituents concerned with protecting those and other art treasures that I ascertain what measures could be taken by the United Nations and the United States to protect them.

I discussed the matter with our distinguished colleague, PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey, whose deep involvement in cultural matters is well known to the public. We decided to urge upon Secretary General U Thant a course of action which would seek the establishment of a United Nations pres-

ence to safeguard these extraordinary structures and on June 16, 1970, we sent him a telegram requesting his intercession.

We then enlisted the aid of Thomas P. F. Hoving, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Richard F. Brown, president of the American Association of Art Museum Directors, and Kyran McGrath, director of the American Association of Museums, and wrote to more than a hundred museum directors and others throughout the country who would be interested in preserving architectural and cultural treasures throughout the world requesting that they endorse and sign a petition which would be delivered to Secretary General U Thant. One hundred petitions have been signed and returned to us. Last night Representative FRELINGHUYSEN and I forwarded these petitions to the Secretary General.

In the course of the correspondence which we had with Secretary General U Thant we were advised that the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, which was drawn for the express purpose of protecting such threatened cities as Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom has not been ratified by the United States, North Vietnam, or South Vietnam.

Because of our great anxiety relating to these two cities and other cultural and architectural objects which might be endangered in the future on July 15 we wrote to President Nixon urging that he immediately submit the Convention to the Senate for ratification.

With the thought that the correspondence and petition would be of interest to our colleagues I am setting forth the texts.

The material follows:

JUNE 16, 1970.

U THANT,
Secretary General,
United Nations,
New York, N.Y.:

Possible destruction of Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom makes your immediate intercession desirable. We urge you to call on all combatants to bar any military action in or around the ruins; further, that, that you seek to establish a U.N. presence to safeguard these extraordinary structures which are the patrimony of all mankind.

Let not happen to Angkor Wat that which happened to the Parthenon in 1687, when it was used by the Turks to store explosives and shelled by the Venetians and destroyed after surviving for 2000 years.

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
EDWARD I. KOCH,
Members of Congress.

UNITED NATIONS,
June 23, 1970.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of the Secretary-General, I acknowledge your telegram of 16 June requesting United Nations intercession to protect the temples of Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom.

For your information, I enclose the Secretary-General's appeal made on 8 June and an account of very recent steps taken by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization toward the same end.

With regard to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, it is extremely

pertinent to note that, of the parties involved in the conflict in Cambodia, only Cambodia is a party to the Convention. The United States, North Viet-Nam and South Viet-Nam have not acceded to it.

Please be assured that the Secretary-General shares your concern for the protection of these great monuments and that he is doing everything within his power to help assure their safety.

Yours sincerely,
NANETTE B. RODNEY,
First Officer.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY GENERAL,
U THANT

The extension of the Viet-Nam war to Cambodia has resulted in more death, more destruction and more devastation. The Viet-Nam war has already become an Indo-China war.

The latest news dispatches indicate that one of the most sacred and renowned religious and cultural monuments of man—Angkor Wat in Cambodia—is in danger of following the fate of Hué, another cultural and religious centre revered by all Viet-Nam people. Angkor Wat must be saved.

I earnestly appeal to all concerned to respect, and to take every possible precaution to preserve, the many historic religious and cultural edifices in the fighting zone and elsewhere in Indo-China.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 15, 1970

Hon. U THANT,
Secretary General, United Nations,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY GENERAL: Pursuant to the correspondence we have had on the subject of Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom, we would like to present you with 100 petitions signed by museum directors throughout the country and others interested in preserving cultural and architectural treasures throughout the world. The petitions are intended to support your efforts and those of UNESCO in protecting the temples of Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom and give you additional support for placing similar antiquities and other cultural objects under United Nations protection.

A list of those who have subscribed to the petitions and their affiliations is enclosed.

Sincerely,
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
EDWARD I. KOCH,
Members of Congress.

STATEMENT ADDRESSED TO SECRETARY GENERAL U THANT AND SIGNED BY 100 MEMBERS OF THE ART COMMUNITY

We believe that there is urgent need to protect the architectural and art treasures of the world, wherever they may be, from the threat of damage and destruction. The imminent peril to Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom because of the conflict in Cambodia shows dramatically that affirmative action is needed.

We propose that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization immediately take steps to take under its protection architectural and art treasures of the world which are the patrimony of all mankind. In addition to whatever the United Nations may do to enable UNESCO to carry out such a mission, UNESCO now carries immense influence and could marshal world opinion to protect important artistic treasures.

At this moment, Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom, a spectacular complex of buildings covered by some of the finest sculptural decorations in the world, are in danger. Built from the 8th to the 13th Centuries, they are comparable in grandeur to the medieval cathedrals of Europe. Insuring their safety is of urgent concern. The danger to the temples through air bombardment or ground action is apparent. Further, because of re-

cent conditions in Cambodia, some senseless act of destruction could take place.

Therefore, we urge that U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations, immediately call upon all parties to the conflict to withdraw from those two sites and to respect them as they would open cities.

We also urge the cultural leaders of every country having armed forces in Cambodia to act now in pressing their governments to safeguard these monuments of antiquity which are some of the finest art treasures of the world.

SIGNATORIES

Phillip R. Adams, Director, Cincinnati Art Museum.

Mrs. Howard Ahmanson, Trustee, Los Angeles County Museum of Art; Trustee, California Museum of Science and Industry.

Karl Bach, Director, Denver Art Museum. Fred S. Bartlett, Director, Colorado Springs Fine Arts Center.

John I. Baur, Director, Whitney Museum of American Art.

David Bourdon, Art Editor, LIFE Magazine.

Adalyn Breeshin, Director Emeritus, Baltimore Museum of Art.

James M. Brown, Director, Virginia Museum of Fine Arts.

Richard F. Brown, President, Assoc. of Art Museum Directors.

David S. Brooke, Director, Currier Gallery of Art.

Charles E. Buckley, City Art Museum, St. Louis, Missouri.

Thomas S. Buechner, Director, The Brooklyn Museum.

Clyde H. Burroughs, Gevener Cheseb.

James Chillan, Jr., Director Emeritus, Museum of Fine Arts, Houston.

Anthony M. Clark, Director, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts.

Thomas C. Colt, Director, Dayton Arts Institute.

Christopher C. Cook, Director, Addison Gallery of American Art, Phillips Academy.

Mrs. Glenn C. Cooper.

Mrs. George M. Crandell.

C. C. Cunningham, Director, The Art Institute of Chicago.

Larry Curry, Curator of American Art, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Frederick J. Dockstader, Director, Museum of the American Indian.

Kenneth Donahue, Director, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Edward H. Dwight, Director, Museum of Art, Utica, New York.

Ebria Einblatt, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Dr. Lorenz Eitner, Director, Stanford University Museum, Chairman, Dept. of Art, Stanford University.

James Elliott, Director, Wadsworth Atheneum.

S. Lane Faison, Director, Williams College Museum of Art.

James W. Foster, Director, Honolulu Academy of Arts.

Charlie Francis.

Martin Friedman, Walker Art Center.

Richard Fuller, President and Director, Seattle Art Museum.

Barbara B. Grant.

Richard N. Gregg, Director, Joslyn Art Museum.

Harry D. M. Grier, Director, The Frick Collection.

George Heard Hamilton, Director, Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute.

Katherine Hanna, Director, The Taft Museum.

Eleanor C. Hartman, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

John B. Hightower, Director, The Museum of Modern Art.

Thomas Carr Howe, Director Emeritus, California Palace of the Legion of Honor.

Thomas P. F. Hoving, Director, Metropolitan Museum of Art.

H. W. Janson, President, College Art Association of America.

Jack Jungmeyer, Jr.

Edith Skouras Jungmeyer.

Mary Kahlenberg, Curator, Textiles and Costumes, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Dr. Patrick J. Kelleher, Director, The Art Museum, Princeton University.

Sherman E. Lee, Director, The Cleveland Museum of Art.

John Palmer Leeper, Director, Marlon Koogler McNay Art Institute.

Samella Lewis, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Caroline Liebig, Trustee, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

Mrs. Phoebe S. Liebig.

Lynne Marlass.

Kyran McGrath, Director, American Association of Museums.

Mrs. Hyman Miller.

Agnes Mongan, Director, Fogg Art Museum, Harvard University.

Philippe de Montebello, The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, Texas.

Francis J. Newton, Director, Portland Art Museum.

Gerald Nordland, Director, San Francisco Museum of Art.

Mrs. Charles O'Gara.

Malle Scott Olsen.

Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Park.

Charles Parkhurst, Director, The Baltimore Museum of Art.

James B. Prethard, Associate Director, University Museum.

Harris K. Prior, Director, Memorial Art Gallery, University of Rochester.

Perry T. Rathbone, Director, Museum of Fine Arts of Boston.

Richard H. Randall, Jr., The Walters Art Gallery.

Charles van Ravenswaay, Director, The Henry Francis du Pont Winterthur Museum.

Andrew Ritchie, Director, Yale University Art Gallery.

Frederick B. Robinson, Museum of Fine Arts, Springfield, Mass.

Merrill C. Rueppel, Director, Dallas Museum of Fine Arts.

Charles Ryskamp, Director, The Pierpont Morgan Library.

Marvin Sadik, Director, National Portrait Gallery.

Charles H. Sawyer, Director, The University of Michigan Museum of Art.

Taft B. Schreiber, Member of the Board of Trustees, Los Angeles County Museum of Art.

William Seitz, Director, Rose Art Museum, Brandeis University.

Maria P. Shearer.

Joseph C. Sloane, Director, Ackland Art Center, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Gordon M. Smith, Director, Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, N.Y.

Dr. A. J. Smith.

Mrs. Kellogg Spear.

John R. Spencer, Director, Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin, Ohio.

Charles N. Stanford, Director, North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh, N.C.

Harold P. Stern, Acting Director, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

William B. Stevens, Jr., Director, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts.

George L. Stout, Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, 2 Palace Road, Boston, Massachusetts.

Barbara Sweeny, Curator, John G. Johnson Collection, Philadelphia, Pa.

Ross E. Taggart, Senior Curator, Wm. R. Nelson Gallery of Art, Kansas City, Missouri.

Joshua C. Taylor, Director, National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution.

Lorenzo C. Tedesco.

Thomas S. Tibbs, Director, La Jolla Museum of Art, La Jolla, Calif.

Constance R. Treusch.

Evan H. Turner, Director, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Phila., Pa.

Diana Turner, Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, California.

William R. Tyler, Director, Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Washington, D.C.

Hal Wallis, Universal Studios, Universal City, California.

John Walker, Director Emeritus, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. Virginia Slocum Weaver.

Carl J. Weinhardt Jr., Director, The Indianapolis Museum of Art, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Ian M. White, Director of Museums, M.H. deYoung Memorial Museum and California Palace of the Legion of Honor, San Francisco, Calif.

Caroline K. Wilson, Art Museum Council, Los Angeles County Museum, Los Angeles, California.

Willis F. Woods, Director, The Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit, Michigan.

Mahonri S. Young, The Columbus Gallery of Fine Arts, Ohio.

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 15, 1970.

HON. RICHARD NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because of our great anxiety with respect to the possibility of destruction to the two ancient cities of Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom in Cambodia, we wrote to the Secretary General of the UN requesting UN intercession to protect them. We were advised that the Secretary General shares our concern for the protection of these great monuments and that he will do everything within his power to insure their safety. We were also advised by the Office of the Secretary General of the following:

"With regard to the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, it is extremely pertinent to note that, of the parties involved in the conflict in Cambodia, only Cambodia is a party to the Convention. The United States, North Vietnam and South Vietnam have not acceded to it."

May we urge you in the interest of protecting not only these two Cambodian cities, but also other cultural treasures throughout the world that you submit to the Senate for ratification this Hague Convention. We urge you to do this immediately so that our country may further assist in marshaling world opinion in protecting the cultural heritage of all mankind.

Sincerely,

PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN,
EDWARD I. KOCH,
Members of Congress.

GET YOUR FACTS FIRST

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there was a very famous American gentleman who lived in Hannibal, Mo., slightly upriver from my hometown of East St. Louis, Ill., who was quoted by Rudyard Kipling as having said:

Gets your facts first, and then you can distort them as much as you please.

I was reminded of this quotation after having read a truly simplistic article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 25, 1970, which attempts to point out, gleefully I might add, that the dirty old AEC has had it. As Mark Twain said in cable to the Associated Press in 1897:

The reports of my death are greatly exaggerated.

I would like to state that the uninformed author of the article I cited is confused when it comes to reporting on the health of the nuclear power industry.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this point an announcement on an International Atomic Energy Agency conference to be held in New York City on August 10 through 14, 1970, on Environmental Aspects of Nuclear Power Stations. It is interesting to note that 55 papers will be presented by authors from 10 countries. This sounds pretty healthy to me.

The article follows:

MORE THAN 50 PAPERS TO BE PRESENTED IN IAEA SYMPOSIUM ON ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS OF NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS AT U.N.

More than fifty technical papers have been selected for presentation at the Symposium on Environmental Aspects of Nuclear Power Stations at United Nations Headquarters in New York City on August 10-14. The International Atomic Energy Agency is sponsoring the conference in cooperation with the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

The 55 papers which have been selected by the IAEA to date will be presented by individuals from the following 10 countries and three international organizations: Canada, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Switzerland, United Kingdom, the United States, the IAEA, the United Nations, and the Commission of European Communities.

The symposium will consist of a series of technical sessions in the five major subject areas—nuclear power as an energy resource, standards for the control of effluents, effluent control and monitoring, considerations affecting steam power station site selection, and benefit-risk assessments. There is also to be a panel discussion on "Prospects for the Future" to be held at the end of the closing session.

It is expected that nearly 400 representatives from countries and international organizations throughout the world will be on hand for the symposium. The countries and organizations presenting papers have a high degree of experience or interest in the nuclear power field. Interest in the symposium is expected to be high because of the current worldwide emphasis on environmental matters.

In accordance with normal procedures of the International Atomic Energy Agency, those persons wishing to participate in or observe proceedings of an IAEA symposium must be designated by their respective governments. As was indicated in AEC news release N-45 dated March 24, 1970, the deadline for receipt by the AEC of abstracts of U.S. technical papers for the environmental symposium was April 15, 1970. Other persons in the United States who would like to participate or attend the symposium should communicate with John H. Kane, Special Assistant for Conferences, Division of Technical Information, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C. 20545.

The provisional program, including those who will present the papers, their affiliations, the titles of the papers and the co-authors, is attached.

SYMPOSIUM ON ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECTS OF NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS

MONDAY, AUGUST 10, 1970

Opening of symposium—10:00 a.m.

Nuclear Power as an Energy Source: Session I—10:30 a.m.

M. K. Hubbert, U.S. Geological Survey, Washington, D.C.—"Energy Resources for Power Production."

United Nations Speaker—"Future World Electrical Needs."

B. Spinrad, IAEA, Vienna—"Role of Nuclear Power in Meeting World Energy Needs."

T. Ipponmatsu, Japan Atomic Power Company, Tokyo, Japan—"Role of Nuclear Power in Japan."

T. J. Thompson, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C.—"Role of Nuclear Power in the United States."

Standards for Control of Effluents: Session II—2:30 p.m.

E. E. Pochin, University College Hospital, Medical College, London, U.K.—"The Development of the Quantitative Basis for Radiation Protection."

L. Rogers, USAEC, Washington, D.C.—"U.S. Regulations for the Control of Releases of Radioactivity to the Environment in Effluents from Nuclear Facilities."

A. Preston, Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries Radiobiology Laboratory, Hamilton Dock, Lowestoft, Suffolk, England—"The U.K. Approach to the Application of ICRP Standards to the Controlled Disposal of Radioactive Waste Resulting from Nuclear Power Programmes."

P. Candes, Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique, Centre d'Etudes Nucleaires de Saclay F-91 Gif sur Yvette, France—"Arrangements for the Control of Radioactive Wastes Associated with the Fast Reactors Developed in France."

P. L. Courvoisier, Section on Safety of Nuclear Installations of the Federal Office of Energy, 5303 Wuerenlingen, Switzerland—"Standards for Effluents in Switzerland," co-author: B. Muller.

D. S. Barth, Department of Health, Education & Welfare, National Air Pollution Control Administration, Durham, North Carolina—"U.S. Approach to Development of Air Pollution Emission Standards for Stationary Sources," co-author: J. C. Romanovsky.

D. I. Mount, National Water Quality Laboratory, 6201 Congdon Boulevard, Duluth, Minn.—"Thermal Standards in the United States."

TUESDAY, AUGUST 11, 1970

Session II Continued—9:15 a.m.

K. Z. Morgan, Health Physics Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.—"Criteria for the Control of Radioactive Effluents," co-author: E. G. Strunness.

M. M. Hendrickson, Battelle Memorial Institute, Room 230, Federal Building, Box 999, Richland, Wash.—"The Eventual Total Body Exposure Rate from ⁸⁵Kr Released to the Atmosphere"

Y. Tsunetoshi, c/o Y. Tsunetoshi, Field Survey Div., Center for Adult Disease, Minami-1, Higashinari-ku, Osaka, Japan—"Atmospheric Contamination of Industrial Areas Including Fossil-Fuel Power Stations & a Method of Evaluating Possible Effect on Inhabitants," co-authors: S. Kajihara, T. Shimizu, A. Ohshino, K. Sakaki, M. Ogino and Y. Nishiwaki.

I. L. Ophel, Atomic Energy of Canada, LTD, Chalk River Nuclear Lab., Chalk River, Ontario, Canada—"Waste Control Problems in an Expanded Nuclear Power Industry," co-author: P. J. Barry

V. P. Bond, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York—"Evaluation of Potential Hazards from Tritium Water"

(Panel Discussion on Standards for the Control of Effluents.)

Effluent Control and Monitoring: Session III—2:30 p.m.

P. N. Krishnamoorthy, Atomic Energy Establishment, Trombay, Bombay 74 (AS) India—"Methods of Effluent Control to Meet the Standards Set for Nuclear Plants"

J. E. Martin, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Rockville, Md.—"Radioactivity from Fossil Fuel and Nuclear Power Plants," co-authors: E. D. Harward, J. M. Smith and P. H. Bedrosian.

J. M. Smith, General Electric Company, San Jose, Calif.—"Effluent Control from Boiling Water Reactors," co-authors: S. Levy and C. E. Kent.

S. Meyers, National Air Pollution Control Administration, Cincinnati, Ohio—"Methods of Effluent Control of Fossil Fuel Burning Power Plants," co-author: E. D. Margolin.

K. J. Schneider, c/o K. J. Schneider, P. O. Box 999, 324 Building, Richland, Wash.—"Status of Solidification & Disposal of Highly Radioactive Liquid Wastes from Nuclear Power in the United States of America," co-authors: A. G. Blasewitz, R. L. Bradshaw, J. O. Blomeke and W. E. McClain.

P. Pellerin, Ministere de la Sante SCPRI, B. P. No. 35, 78—Le Vesinet, France—"Environmental Monitoring of Power Stations."

C. Beck, USAEC, Washington, D.C.—"Elements in the Environmental Monitoring System of the U.S. for Licensed Power Reactors."

W. Schikarski, Kernforschungszentrum, Karlsruhe, Postfach 3640, 75 Karlsruhe, F. R. Germany—"An Approach to Compare Air Pollution of Fossils and Nuclear Power Plants," co-authors: P. Jansen and S. Jordan

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1970

Session III Continued—9:15 a.m.

H. J. Dunsted, UKAEA Health & Safety Branch, Harwell, Didcot, Berks., England—"Environmental Monitoring British Policy & Procedures"

T. Itakura, c/o T. Itakura, Otemachi Building, Otemachi, Chiyodaku, Tokyo, Japan—"Management of Effluent from JAPC's Nuclear Power Stations," co-author: T. Yoshioka

F. E. Gartrell, 720 Edney Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.—"Environmental Quality Protection—Large Steam-Electric Power Stations—Tennessee Valley Authority," co-authors: G. F. Stone and T. A. Wojtalik

W. R. Gould, Southern California Edison Company, Los Angeles, Calif.—"Regional Environmental Considerations in the Evolution of and Operating Experience with the Southern California Edison Company Generating System," co-author: J. B. Moore

W. Feldt, Isotopenlaboratorium der Bundesforschungsanstalt fur Fischerel, 2 Hamburg 55, Wustland, F. R. Germany—"Research on the Maximum Radioactive Burden of Some German Rivers"

D. Merriman, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.—"Does Industrial Calfecation Jeopardize the Ecosystem of a Long Tidal River?"

B. Kahn, Radiological Eng. Laboratory, U.S. Public Health Service, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio—"Radiological Surveillance Studies at a Boiling Water Nuclear Power Reactor," co-authors: R. L. Blanchard, H. L. Krieger, H. E. Kolde, D. B. Smith, A. Martin, S. Gold, W. J. Averett, W. L. Brinck and G. J. Karches

J. H. Wright, Westinghouse Electric Corp., P.O. Box 355, Monroeville Mall, Pittsburgh, Pa.—"The Impact of Environmental Radiation and Discharge Heat from Nuclear Power Plants," co-authors: J. B. F. Champlin and O. H. Davis

(Wednesday Afternoon Free.)

THURSDAY, AUGUST 13, 1970

Session III continued—9:15 a.m.

R. E. Nakatani, Battelle Memorial Institute, Pacific Northwest Laboratories, P.O. Box 999, Richland, Wash.—"Thermal Effects and Nuclear Power Stations in U.S.A.," co-authors: I. C. Roberts, G. L. Sherwood, D. Miller and J. V. Tokar

T. Philbin, Empire State Atomic Development Associates, 1250 Broadway, New York, N.Y.—"Thermal Effects Studies in New York State," co-author: H. Philipp

W. L. Templeton, Battelle Memorial Institute, Pacific Northwest Laboratories, Richland, Wash.—"Studies on the Biological Effects of Thermal Discharges from Nuclear Reactors to the Columbia River at Hanford," co-author: Ch. C. Coutant

P. Bogn, Motor-Columbus Engineering Co., Baden, Switzerland—"The Control of River Heating by Accurate Digital Simulation," co-author: H. Zund

Considerations Affecting Steam Power Stations Site Selection: Session IV.

J. T. Ramey, U.S. Atomic Energy Commissioner, Washington, D.C.—"Environmental Considerations in the Regulatory Process for Nuclear Power Plants in the U.S.—The Role of the Public and Public Understanding"

F. R. Hunt, Central Electricity Generating Board, London, E. C. 1., United Kingdom—"Power Station Site Selection in England and Wales"

H. Mauer, Commission of European Communities, Brussels, Belgium—"Engineering Safety Factors and Their Influence on Siting Practices for Nuclear Power Plants in the European Community," co-authors: W. Vinck and L. Leonardini

S. Nishiyori, The Federation of Electric Power Companies (Japan), Otemachi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan—"Status on Site Selection Problem for Nuclear Power Station in Japan"

P. Courvoisier, The Federal Office of Energy, 5303 Wurenlingen, Switzerland—"Siting of Nuclear Power Stations in Switzerland"

R. A. McCormick, National Air Pollution Control Administration, Washington, D.C.—"Environmental Aspects of Power Plant Siting," co-authors: L. E. Niemeyer and J. H. Ludwig

L. H. Roddis, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., New York, N.Y.—"Metropolitan Siting of Nuclear Power Plants," co-authors: W. J. Cahill, A. Hauspurg and W. E. Wall

R. T. Jaske, Battelle Memorial Institute, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Wash.—"Improved Methods for Planning of Thermal Discharges Before Site Acquisition with a Specific Case Example on the Columbia River," co-authors: W. L. Templeton, J. R. Ellason and J. C. Sonnichsen

S. D. Freeman, Office of Science & Technology, Washington, D.C.—"Policy Alternatives for Resolving the Power Plant Siting Problem"

C. Velez, Comision Federal de Electricidad, Rodano 14, Mexico 5 D. F. Mexico—"Selection of a Site for the First Nuclear Power Station in Mexico"

M. Nasim, Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission, P. O. Box 3112, Karachi, Pakistan—"Environmental Aspects of Karachi Nuclear Power Plant"

"Environmental Aspects of Karachi Nuclear Power Plant"

FRIDAY, AUGUST 14, 1970

Session IV Continued—9:15 a.m.

F. K. Wachsmann, Institut für Strahlenschutz, 8042 Neuherberg, F. R. Germany—"Considerations for Siting Nuclear Power Plants in Areas with High Population Density in Germany," co-author: J. Schwibach

S. I. Auerbach, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn.—"Ecological Considerations in Reactor Power Plant Siting," co-authors: D. J. Nelson, S. V. Kaye, D. E. Reichle and C. C. Coutant

M. Saiki, National Institute of Radiological Sciences, Chiba, Chiba Prefecture, Japan—"Public Acceptance Aspects of Nuclear Plants Site Selection on Coastal Areas of Japan"

H. G. Slater, Atomic Industrial Forum, New York City, N.Y., Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, 300 Erie Boulevard, West Syracuse, N.Y.—"Public Opposition to Nuclear Power—An Industry Overview"

M. Eisenbud, New York University Medical Center, Sterling Lake, Tuxedo, N.Y.—"Review of U.S. Power Reactor Operating Experience"

Benefit-Risk Assessments: Session V. C. Starr, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.—"Benefit-Risk Assessment of Modern Technology"

F. D. Sowby, ICRP, Clifton Ave., Sutton Surrey, England—"Some Risks of Modern Life"

Panel Discussion: Prospects for the Future—2:30 p.m.

Another document of interest, titled "Status of Central Station Nuclear Power Plants—Significant Milestones," which is reproduced below, shows that from January 1, 1970 to May 31, 1970, nine new nuclear powerplants were ordered versus the total of seven ordered in calendar 1969.

I would like to tell these purveyors of doom and gloom to stop their wishful thinking about the death of the nuclear industry and to do something realistic about the sad state in which they find this country. Constructive action, not

false destructive criticism, will help improve things in this country. As my good friend and chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, CHET HOLIFIELD, said on June 30, 1970—page 22161 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Today it is fashionable to write bad science fiction and sell the articles as true stories about the uses and abuses of the entire spectrum of nuclear energy.

When Mark Twain wrote science fiction like "A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court," he wrote to entertain the public, not to try to scare them to death by deliberate distortions of the truth. There are some who may recall how adroitly the episode of the eclipse was used in the King Arthur tale.

False statements about reactors, which liken them to bombs, are deliberate misrepresentations, although some recent authors may not even know this. As a matter of fact, as I read some of this article, I knew I had seen the identical material in print before, and I wondered if there is such a shortage that the fraternity is now reduced to plagiarism. Joseph Paul Goebbels, the Nazi propaganda minister, may not have been the originator of the theory of continually telling the big lie until all the people believe it, but he certainly made it work in Nazi Germany.

We can drive these junior league Goebbels' out of business in this country by keeping an open mind and by examining the facts presented by all the sides involved in a controversy.

I would like to make two additional quotes from Mark Twain:

One of the most striking differences between a cat and a lie is that a cat has only nine lives.

When in doubt, tell the truth.

The material referred to follows:

STATUS OF CENTRAL STATION NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS—SIGNIFICANT MILESTONES

Project/Location	Owner	Capacity* Net (MWa)	Type	NSSS/AE Contr.	Publ. Ann'd	NSSS Contr. Awarded	Constr. Permit Applied	CP/POL Issued	Initial Crit.*	First Elec.	Initial Design Power*	Com- mercial Opera- tion*
Shippingport Atomic Power Station, Unit 1 (Pa.)	Duquesne Light Company and AEC	90.0	PWR	West. S&W	10/53	7/53	NA	NA	12/2/57	12/18/57	12/57	NA
Indian Point Station, Unit 1 (N.Y.)	Consolidated Edison Co.	265.0	PWR	B&W O/Vit.	2/55	2/55	3/55	5/56 3/62	8/2/62	9/16/62	1/63	10/62
Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (Ill.)	Commonwealth Edison Co.	200.0	BWR	GE Bech.	4/55	7/55	3/55	5/56 9/59	10/15/59	4/15/60	6/60	8/60
Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Mass.)	Yankee Atomic Elec. Co.	175.0	PWR	West. S&W	4/55	6/56	7/56	11/57 7/60	8/19/60	11/10/60	1/61	2/61
Hallam Nuclear Power Facility (Neb.)	Consumers Public Power District and AEC	75.0	SGR	AI Bech.	4/55	9/57	2/59	7/60 8/62	8/25/62	5/29/63	7/63	11/63
Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant (Mich.)	Power Reactor Development Company	60.9	FBR	PRDC CA	4/55	3/57	1/56	8/56 7/63	8/23/63	8/5/66		
Elk River Nuclear Plant (Minn.)	Rural Cooperative Power Association and AEC	22.0	BRW	AC S&L	2/56	6/58	3/59	12/59 11/62	11/19/62	8/24/63	2/64	7/64
Piqua Nuclear Power Facility (Ohio)	City of Piqua, Ohio and AEC	11.4	OMR	AI H&N	2/56	6/59	9/58	1/60 8/62	6/10/63	11/4/63	1/64	2/64
Pathfinder Atomic Power Plant (S.D.)	Northern States Power Company	58.5	BWR	AC PSE	2/57	5/57	3/59	5/60 3/64	3/24/64	7/25/66	9/67	(d)
Carolinas-Virginia Tube Reactor (S.C.)	Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc.	17.0	HWR	West. S&W	8/57	1/59	7/59	5/60 11/62	3/30/63	12/18/63	9/65	3/64
Humboldt Bay Power Plant, Unit 2 (Calif.)	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	68.5	BWR	GE Bech.	2/58	2/58	4/59	11/60 8/62	2/16/63	4/18/63	5/63	8/63
Boiling Nuclear Superheater Power Station (P.R.)	Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority and AEC	16.5	BWR	Comb. J&M	6/58	1/60	12/59	7/60 4/64	4/13/64	8/14/64	9/65	(f)

Footnotes at end of table.

STATUS OF CENTRAL STATION NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS—SIGNIFICANT MILESTONES—Continued

Key to AE's (Architect-Engineer)

Key to NSSS's (nuclear steam system supplier)

Project/Location	Owner	Capacity* Net (MWs)	Type	NSSS/AE Contr.	Publ. Ann'd	NSSS Contr. Awarded	Constr. Permit Applied	CP/POL Issued	Initial Crit.*	First Elec.	Initial Design Power*	Com- mercial Operation*
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 1 (Pa.)	Philadelphia Electric Company	40.0	HTGR	GAA Bech.	11/58	11/58	7/60	2/62	3/3/66	1/27/67	5/67	6/67
Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant (Mich.)	Consumers Power Company of Michigan	70.3	BWR	GE Bech.	12/59	12/59	1/60	1/66	9/27/62	12/8/62	3/63	3/63
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 (Calif.)	Southern California Edison & San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.	430.0	PWR	West. Bech.	4/60	1/63	2/63	8/62	6/14/67	7/16/67	10/67	1/68
LaCrosse Boiling Water Reactor (Wisc.)	Dairyland Power Cooperative and AEC.	50.0	BWR	AC S&L	4/61	6/62	11/62	3/67	7/11/67	4/26/68	8/69	-----
N-Reactor/WPPSS (Wash.)	Washington Public Power Supply System	790.0	PWR	Burns & Roe	4/62	4/63	NA	7/67	12/31/63	4/8/66	7/66	-----
Malibu Nuclear Plant Unit 1 (Calif.)	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power	462.0	PWR	West. S&W	11/62	1/63	11/63	-----	8/75	-----	11/75	3/76
Haddam Neck Plant (Conn.)	Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company	575.0	PWR	West. S & W	12/62	12/62	9/63	5/64 6/67	7/24/67	8/7/67	12/67	1/68
Oyster Creek Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (N.J.)	Jersey Central Power & Light Company	530.0	BWR	GE B & R	5/63	12/63	3/64	12/64 4/69	5/3/69	9/23/69	12/69	12/69
Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station (N.Y.)	Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation	500.0	BWR	GE O	7/63	10/63	3/64	4/65 8/69	9/5/69	11/9/69	1/70	12/69
Dresden Nuclear Power Station Unit 2 (Ill.)	Commonwealth Edison Company	809.0	BWR	GE S & L	2/65	2/65	4/65	1/66 12/69	1/7/70	4/13/70	5/70	5/70
Fort St. Vrain Nuclear Generating Sta. (Colo.)	Public Service Company of Colorado	330.0	HTGR	GGA S&L	3/65	3/65	10/66	9/68	10/71	-----	2/72	3/72
Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (Conn.)	The Millstone Point Company	652.1	BWR	GE Ebas.	4/65	9/65	11/65	5/66	7/70	-----	9/70	10/70
Shoreham Nuclear Power Station (N.Y.)	Long Island Lighting	819.0	BWR	GE S&W	4/65	2/67	5/68	-----	1/75	-----	1975	5/75
Pilgrim Station (Mass.)	Boston Edison Company	654.0	BWR	GE Bech.	8/65	8/65	6/67	8/68	4/71	-----	8/71	10/71
Robert Emmett Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (N.Y.)	Rochester Gas & Electric	420.0	PWR	West. Gil.	8/65	8/65	11/65	4/66	11/9/69	12/2/69	3/70	1970
Turkey Point Station, Unit 3 (Fla.)	Florida Power and Light Company	651.5	PWR	West. Bech.	11/65	11/65	3/66	4/67	4/71	-----	6/71	-----
Turkey Point Station, Unit 4 (Fla.)	Florida Power and Light Company	651.5	PWR	West. Bech.	11/65	4/67	3/66	4/67	-----	-----	1972	-----
Indian Point Station, Unit 2 (N.Y.)	Consolidated Edison Company	873.0	PWR	West. UEC	11/65	11/65	12/65	10/66	2/71	-----	4/71	5/71
Vermont Yankee Generating Station (Vt.)	Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation	513.9	BWR	GE Ebas.	12/65	8/66	11/66	12/67	2/71	-----	6/71	7/71
Maine Yankee Atomic Power Plant (Maine)	Maine Yankee Atomic Power Corporation	790.0	PWR	Comb. S&W	1/66	2/67	9/67	10/68	2/72	-----	-----	5/72
H. B. Robinson S. E. Plant, Unit 2 (S.C.)	Carolina Power and Light Company	700.0	PWR	West. Ebas.	1/66	1/66	7/66	4/67	6/70	-----	8/70	11/70
Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit 3 (Ill.)	Commonwealth Edison Company	809.0	BWR	GE S&L	1/66	1/66	2/66	10/66	10/70	-----	2/71	6/71
Palisades Nuclear Power Station (Mich.)	Consumers Power Company of Michigan	700.0	PWR	Comb. Bech.	1/66	1/66	6/66	3/67	5/70	-----	7/70	8/70
Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit 1 (Wisc.)	Wisconsin Elec. Pwr. Co. and Wisc. Mich. Pwr. Co.	497.0	PWR	West. Bech.	2/66	2/66	8/66	7/67	8/70	-----	10/70	12/70
Quad-Cities Station Unit 1 (Ill.)	Commonwealth Edison-Iowa Illinois Gas & Electric	809.0	BWR	GE S&L	4/66	4/66	5/66	2/67	3/71	-----	6/71	7/71
Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant (Minn.)	Northern States Power Company	545.0	BWR	GE Bech.	4/66	4/66	8/66	6/67	5/70	-----	7/70	7/70
Rancho Seco Nuclear Gen. Station (Calif.)	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	800.0	PWR	B&W Bech.	4/66	8/67	11/67	10/68	12/72	-----	4/73	5/73
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 2 (Pa.)	Philadelphia Electric Co., PSE & GC, ACEC, DP & LC	1,065.0	BWR	GE Bech.	5/66	8/66	2/67	1/68	12/71	-----	2/72	5/72
Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 3 (Pa.)	Philadelphia Electric Co., PSE & GC, ACEC, & DP & LC	1,065.0	BWR	GE Bech.	5/66	8/66	2/67	1/68	11/72	-----	1/73	3/73
Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 (N.J.)	Public Serv. Elec. & Gas Co., PEC, ACEC, & DP&LC	1,050.0	PWR	West. O	5/66	8/66	12/66	9/68	7/72	-----	11/72	12/72
Salem Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2 (N.J.)	Public Serv. Elec. & Gas Co., PEC, ACEC, & DP&LC	1,050.0	PWR	West. O	5/66	5/67	10/67	9/68	2/73	-----	6/73	7/73
Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (Ala.)	Tennessee Valley Authority	1,064.5	BWR	GE O	6/66	6/66	7/66	5/67	7/71	-----	30/71	10/71
Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2 (Ala.)	Tennessee Valley Authority	1,064.5	BWR	GE O	6/66	6/66	7/66	5/67	1/72	-----	20/72	4/72
Surry Power Station Unit 1 (Va.)	Virginia Electric & Power Company	780.0	PWR	West. S&W	6/66	10/66	3/67	6/68	3/71	-----	6/71	6/71
Cooper Nuclear Station (Nebr.)	Nebraska Public Power District	778.0	BWR	GE B&R	6/66	4/67	7/67	6/68	12/71	-----	3/72	4/72
Fort Calhoun Station Unit 1 (Nebr.)	Omaha Public Power District	457.4	PWR	Comb. GHDR	6/66	10/66	4/67	6/68	4/72	-----	6/72	6/72
Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 1 (S.C.)	Duke Power Company	841.0	PWR	B&W O	7/66	7/66	11/66	11/67	12/70	-----	4/71	6/71
Oconee Nuclear Station Unit 2 (S.C.)	Duke Power Company	886.0	PWR	B&W O	7/66	7/66	11/66	11/67	12/71	-----	4/72	6/72
Quad-Cities Station Unit 2 (Ill.)	Commonwealth Edison-Iowa Illinois Gas & Electric	809.0	BWR	GE S&L	7/66	7/66	8/66	2/67	10/71	-----	2/72	5/72
Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (Calif.)	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	1,060.0	PWR	West. O	9/66	11/66	1/67	4/68	6/72	-----	9/72	1/73
Surry Power Station Unit 2 (Va.)	Virginia Electric & Power Company	780.0	PWR	West. S&W	10/66	10/66	3/67	6/68	2/72	-----	4/72	4/72
Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (Pa.)	Metropolitan Edison Company	810.0	PWR	B&W Gil.	11/66	11/66	5/67	5/68	12/71	-----	3/72	5/72
Donald C. Cook Plant, Unit 1 (Mich.)	Indiana & Michigan Elec. Co.	1,054.0	PWR	West. AEP	12/66	7/67	12/67	3/69	6/72	-----	7/72	9/72
Salisbury (Mass.)	New England Electric System	800.0	-----	-----	12/66	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Bailly Generating Station (Ind.)	Northern Indiana Public Service Company	660.0	BWR	GE S&L	1/67	1/67	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	2/76
Prairie Island Nuclear Gen. Plant, Unit 1 (Minn.)	Northern States Power Company	530.0	PWR	West. PSE	2/67	2/67	4/67	6/68	2/72	-----	5/72	5/72
Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (Pa.)	Jersey Central Power and Light Company	810.0	PWR	B&W B&R	2/67	2/67	4/68	11/69	8/73	-----	10/73	12/73
Trojan Nuclear Plant (Oregon)	Portland General Electric EW&EB and PP&LC	1,106.0	PWR	West. Bech.	2/67	11/68	6/69	-----	2/74	-----	7/74	9/74
Zion Station, Unit 1 (Ill.)	Commonwealth Edison Company	1,050.0	PWR	West. S&L	2/67	2/67	7/67	12/68	12/71	-----	3/72	4/72

Footnotes at end of table.

Project/Location	Owner	Capacity* Net (MWa)	Type	NSSS/AE Contr.	Publ. Ann'd	NSSS Contr. Awarded	Constr. Permit Applied	CP/POL Issued	Initial Crit.*	First Elec.	Initial Design Power*	Com- mercial Opera- tion*
Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (Wisc.)	Wisconsin Group (WPSC, WP&LC, MG&EC)	527.0	PWR	West. PSE	2/67	2/67	8/67	8/68	2/72		4/72	6/72
Crystal River Plant Unit 3 (Fla.)	Florida Power Corp.	858.0	PWR	B&W Gil.	2/67	2/67	8/67	9/68	1/72		3/72	4/72
Point Beach Nuclear Plant Unit 2 (Wisc.)	Wisconsin Elec. Pwr. Co. and Wisc.-Mich. Pwr. Co.	497.0	PWR	West. Bech.	2/67	2/67	8/67	7/68	5/71		7/71	8/71
Grays Harbor Plant (Wash.)	Washington Public Power Supply System	1,100.0		B&R	2/67							1977
Bell Station 1 (N.Y.)	New York State Electric and Gas Corp.	838.0	BWR	GE UEC	3/67	6/67	3/68					
Seabrook Nuclear Station 1 (N.H.)	Publ. Serv. Co. of N.H. & United Illuminating Co.	860.0	PWR	West. Ebas.	3/67	8/68	4/69					
Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 (Ark.)	Arkansas Power and Light Company	850.0	PWR	B&W Bech.	4/67	4/67	11/67	12/68	5/73		9/73	9/73
Indian Point Station, Unit 3 (N.Y.)	Consolidated Edison Company	965.0	PWR	West. UEC	4/67	4/67	8/67	8/69	2/73		4/73	5/73
Oconee Nuclear Station, Unit 3 (S.C.)	Duke Power Company	886.0	PWR	B&W O GE	5/67	5/67	4/67	11/67	12/72		4/73	6/73
	Pennsylvania Power and Light Company	1,052.0	BWR	GE	5/67	5/68						1975
Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (Md.)	Baltimore Gas and Electric Company	800.0	PWR	Comb. Bech.	5/67	5/67	1/68	7/69	8/72		1/73	1/73
Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2 (Md.)	Baltimore Gas and Electric Company	800.0	PWR	Comb. Bech.	5/67	5/67	1/68	7/69	7/73		1/74	1/74
Bayside Generating Station (N.J.)	Atlantic City Electric Company	1,000.0			6/67							75-76
Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2 (Conn.)	The Millstone Point Company	828.0	PWR	Comb. O/Bech.	6/67	12/67	2/69		12/73		3/74	4/74
Hollister Ranch (Calif.)	Southern California Edison Company	1,000.0			6/67							1980
Browns Ferry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 3 (Ala.)	Tennessee Valley Authority	1,064.5	BWR	GE O	6/67	6/67	7/67	7/68	7/72		30/72	10/72
Prairie Island Nuclear Gen. Plant, Unit 2 (Minn.)	Northern States Power Com- pany	530.0	PWR	West. PSE	6/67	6/67	8/67	6/68	2/74		5/74	5/74
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 1 (Ga.)	Georgia Power Company	786.0	BWR	GE SSC/Bech.	6/67	12/67	5/68	9/69	11/72		6/73	6/73
Zion Station, Unit 2 (Ill.)	Commonwealth Edison Com- pany	1,050.0	PWR	West. S&L	7/67	7/67	8/67	12/68	1/73		4/73	5/73
Donald C. Cook Plant, Unit 2 (Mich.)	Indiana & Michigan Elec. Co.	1,060.0	PWR	West. AEP	7/67	7/67	12/67	3/69	3/73		5/73	6/73
Beaver Valley Power Station Unit 1 (Pa.)	Duquesne Light Co., Ohio Edison Co. and Pennsylvania Power Co.	847.0	PWR	West. S&W	9/67	9/67	1/69		12/72		5/73	6/73
Limerick Generating Station Unit 1 (Pa.)	Philadelphia Electric Company	1,065.0	BWR	GE Bech	10/67	10/67	3/70		12/74		1/75	3/75
Limerick Generating Station Unit 2 (Pa.)	Philadelphia Electric Company	1,065.0	BWR	GE Bech	10/67	10/67	3/70		12/76		1/77	3/77
North Anna Power Station, Unit 1 (Va.)	Virginia Electric & Power Company	845.0	PWR	West S&W	10/67	10/67	3/69		9/73		1/74	3/74
North Anna Power Station, Unit 2 (Va.)	Virginia Electric & Power Company	845.0	PWR	West. S&W	10/67	1/70	3/69		9/74		1/75	3/75
Midland Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1 (Mich.)	Consumers Power Company of Michigan	492.0	PWR	B&W Bech.	12/67	5/68	1/69		10/73		12/73	2/74
Midland Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2 (Mich.)	Consumers Power Company of Michigan	818.0	PWR	B&W Bech.	12/67	5/68	1/69		10/74		12/74	2/75
Verplanck Unit 1 (N.Y.)	Consolidated Edison Company	1,115.0	BWR	GE O	1/68	1/68	6/69		6/77		10/77	5/78
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Unit 2 (N.C.)	Carolina Power and Light Company	821.0	BWR	GE UEC	1/68	1/68	7/68	2/70	11/73		2/74	3/74
Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Unit 1 (N.C.)	Carolina Power and Light Company	821.0	BWR	GE UEC	1/68	1/68	7/68	2/70	11/75		2/76	3/76
North Carolina	Carolina Power and Light Company											
Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station (Ohio)	Toledo Edison and Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	872.0	PWR	B&W Bech.	2/68	10/68	8/69		7/74		11/74	12/74
Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2 (Calif.)	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	1,060.0	PWR	West. O	2/68	7/69	6/68		12/73		3/74	7/74
Duane Arnold Energy Center Unit 1 (Iowa)	Iowa Elec. L&P, Cent. IPC, and Corn Belt PC.	545.0	BWR	GE Bech.	2/68	2/68	11/69		7/73		9/73	12/73
Hutchinson Island Unit 1 (Fla.)	Florida Power and Light Co.	800.0	PWR	Comb. Ebas	2/68	12/67	1/69		2/73		4/73	5/73
Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 (Ohio)	Cincinnati Gas and Elec. Co., C&SOEC and DP&LC	810.0	BWR	GE S&L	3/68	9/69	4/70		9/74		12/74	1/75
Oregon	Pacific Power and Light Co.	1,000.0			3/68							1977
Sequoyah Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (Tenn.)	Tennessee Valley Authority	1,124.0	PWR	West. O	4/68	4/68	10/68	5/70	4/73		30/73	10/73
Sequoyah Nuclear Power Plant Unit 2 (Tenn.)	Tennessee Valley Authority	1,124.0	PWR	West. O	4/68	4/68	4/68	10/70	1/74		20/74	7/74
	Pennsylvania Power and Light Co.	1,052.0	BWR	GE	5/68	5/68						1977
Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant Unit 2 (Mich.)	Detroit Edison Company	1,123.0	BWR	GE O/S&L	7/68	8/68	4/69		9/73		12/73	2/74
James A. FitzPatrick Nuclear Power Plant (N.Y.)	Power Authority of the State of New York	821.0	BWR	GE S&W	8/68	12/68	12/68	5/70	1/73		4/73	5/73
Forked River Nuclear Generat- ing Station, Unit 1 (N.J.)	Jersey Central Power and Light Co.	1,129.0	PWR	Comb. B&R	12/68	12/69	6/70		6/75		9/75	1/76
	Seattle City Light and Snohomish County PUD.	1,000.0			4/69							1979
Joseph M. Farley Nuclear Plant (Ala.)	Alabama Power Company	829.0	PWR	West. SSC/Bech.	5/69	5/69	10/69		10/74		2/75	4/75
Newbold Island. Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1 (N.J.)	Public Service Electric and Gas Co.	1,088.0	BWR	GE O	8/69	8/69	3/70		9/74		2/75	3/75
Newbold Island, Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2, (N.J.)	Public Service Electric and Gas Co.	1,088.0	BWR	GE O	8/69	8/69	3/70		9/76		2/77	3/77
McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (N.C.)	Duke Power Company	1,150.0	PWR	West. O	11/69	11/69			7/75		9/75	11/75
McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (N.C.)	Duke Power Company	1,150.0	PWR	West. O	11/69	11/69			1/77		3/77	5/77
Wm. H. Zimmer Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2 (Ohio)	Cincinnati Gas & Elec. Co., C&SOEC and DP&LC	810.0	BWR	GE S&L	1/70	1/70	4/70		9/75		12/75	1/76
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2 (Calif.)	Southern Calif. Edison and San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.	1,140.0	PWR	Comb.	1/70	1/70	5/70		2/75		5/75	6/76
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 3 (Calif.)	Southern Calif. Edison and San Diego Gas & Elec. Co.	1,140.0	PWR	Comb.	1/70	1/70	5/70					1977
Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2 (Ga.)	Georgia Power Company	786.0	BWR	GE SSC/Bech	2/70	2/70						1976
LaSalle County Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (Ill.)	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1,100.0	BWR	GE S&L	3/70	5/70						1976

Footnotes on following page.

STATUS OF CENTRAL STATION NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS—SIGNIFICANT MILESTONES—Continued

Key to AE's (Architect-Engineer)

AEP	American Electric Power Service Corporation	J&M	Jackson and Moreland
Bech.	Bechtel	O	Owner
B&R	Burns and Rowe	PSE	Pioneer Service and Engineering
CA	Commonwealth Associates	S&L	Sargent and Lundy
Ebas.	Ebasco	SSC	Southern Services Company
Gil	Gilbert Associates	S&W	Stone and Webster
GHDR	Gibbs, Hill, Durham & Richardson	UEC	United Engineers and Constructors
H&N	Holmes and Narver	Vit.	Vitro

Key to NSSS's (nuclear steam system supplier)

AC	Allis-Chalmers
AI	Atomics International
B&W	Babcock & Wilcox
Comb.	Combustion Engineering
GGA	Gulf General Atomic
GE	General Electric
PRDC	Power Reactor Development Company
West.	Westinghouse

Project/Location	Owner	Capacity* Net (MWe)	Type	NSSS/AE Contr.	Publ. Ann'd	NSSS Contr. Awarded	Constr. Permit Applied	CP/POL Issued	Initial Crit.*	First Elec.	Initial Design Power*	Com- mercial Operation*
LaSalle County Nuclear Station, Unit 2 (Ill.)	Commonwealth Edison Co.	1,100.0	BWR	GES&L	3/70	5/70						1977
Aguirre Nuclear Power Plant (P.R.)	Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority	583.0	PWR	West.	5/70	5/70						1976
Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2 (Ark.) ^a	Arkansas Power and Light Company	950.0	PWR	Comb.	5/70	5/70						1976

*Initial or current capacity; may be lower than that authorized by license. Information on achievement of future milestones based on data furnished by utility.

CP=Construction Permit.

NA=Not Applicable.

POL=Provisional Operating License.

^a Shut down 9/64.

^b Plant shut down 2/68. On 3/20/70 RCPA rejected an option to purchase ERR.

^c Shut down for repairs January 1967; operating contract terminated 12/67.

^d Plant was shut down October 1967; on 9/68 NSP announced plans to install gas fired boilers for operation summer 1969; license to possess but not operate issued May 14, 1969.

^e Shut down January 1967.

^f Decision to decommission announced 6/88. Order to dismantle issued 8/11/69.

^g AEC owns reactor, WPPSS the generating facilities with Burns & Roe the contractor for WPPSS.

^h This unit originally planned as Oyster Creek 2; transfer to Three Mile Island Site announced by GPU 12/31/68.

ⁱ Indefinite postponement announced by utility on 4/11/69.

^j Indefinite postponement announced by utility on 11/13/69; August 1968 contract with Westinghouse terminated in May 1970.

^k Consumers Midland Unit 1 will also produce 3.6 million pounds per hour of process steam; Unit 2 will provide 0.4 million pounds per hour.

^l Consolidated Edison has an option for an identical unit at the same site (Nuclear 5), CP applied 6/69.

^m PANSY took over Niagara Mohawk contract for Easton Plant announced and contracted in 1966.

ⁿ Jersey Central has an option for another unit of same size.

^o Arkansas Power and Light has an option for another identical unit.

NUCLEAR STEAM SUPPLY SYSTEM CONTRACT AWARDS¹—U.S. CENTRAL STATION PLANTS, NUMBER OF UNITS/NET MWE

Year	GE		Westinghouse		B. & W.		Comb.		Other		Total	
	Number	MWE	Number	MWE	Number	MWE	Number	MWE	Number	MWE	Number	MWE
Through 1964	5	1,368.8	6	1,749.0	1	265.0	1	16.5	8	1,107.8	21	4,507.1
1965	3	2,115.1	3	1,944.5	0		0		1	330.0	7	4,389.6
1966	9	7,744.9	6	4,867.0	3	2,537.0	2	1,157.4	0		20	16,306.3
1967	8	7,075.5	13	10,656.5	5	4,204.0	5	4,018.0	0		31	25,954.0
1968	9	8,171.0	4	4,414.0	3	2,182.0	0		0		16	14,767.0
1969	3	2,986.0	3	3,129.0	0		1	1,129.0	0		7	7,244.0
1970	4	3,796.0	2	1,428.0	0		3	3,230.0	0		9	8,454.0
Total	41	33,257.3	37	28,188.0	12	9,188.0	12	9,550.9	9	1,437.8	111	81,622.0

¹ Through June 1, 1970.

Status	Number of plants	Capacity, MWE (net)
Decommissioned	6	200.4
Operable ¹	16	5,073.7
Building	52	42,364.9
Contracted	37	33,983.0
Announced	7	6,760.0
Total	118	88,382.0

¹ Achieved initial criticality; not permanently shutdown.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF INITIAL DESIGN POWER¹—NUCLEAR POWERPLANTS CONTRACTED FOR AS OF JUNE 1, 1970

Year	MWE net		Number of plants	
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative
Through 1968				
1969 ²		3,484.2		18
1970	4,884.0	8,368.2	9	27
1971	7,492.9	15,861.1	10	37
1972	15,614.9	31,476.0	19	56
1973	15,874.0	47,350.0	18	74
1974	9,614.0	56,964.0	11	85
1975	10,389.0	67,353.0	11	96
1976	4,900.0	72,253.0	6	102
1977	7,710.0	79,963.0	7	109
Indefinite	1,659.0	81,622.0	2	111

¹ Based on Mar. 31, 1970, schedule information reported by utility.

² Includes 6 plants which achieved design power in prior years but have since been permanently shut down: Hallam (75 MWE); Plaquemine (11.4 MWE); CVTR (17 MWE); Bonus (16.5 MWE); Pathfinder (58.5 MWE) and Elk River (22 MWE).

TENSIONS IN NEW BEDFORD

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, New Bedford, Mass., was once known as the greatest whaling city in the world. It was once also one of the greatest textile manufacturing centers of the Nation. In recent days, however, it has become a city divided.

New Bedford has, over the past 10 years, received more Federal aid than any city its size. Yet it has the highest unemployment rate in the State and one of the highest in the country. It suffers from serious housing problems, poor police-community relations, considerable poverty, and a serious alienation of its minority groups from the community. Out of this has grown an increasing bitterness, which climaxed last week in an outbreak of violence and the tragic, meaningless death of an innocent youth.

It is easy to assign blame for this turmoil, and it can be liberally spread around; but it is less easy to find the answers to the problems—made even more difficult by the outbreak of violence—for they are not unique to New Bedford. Almost every city in this Nation holds, to a

greater or lesser degree, the potential for similar hostilities.

There are, therefore, valuable lessons to be learned from the efforts that have been made in the last few days to ease tensions in New Bedford and restructure community priorities. It is to the great credit of men such as Senator EDWARD BROOKE, Congressman HASTINGS KERTH, and the various city officials and minority group representatives who met last Monday, that a series of agreements were reached which have calmed the situation. More important, these agreements point the way to further progress in tackling the basic problems that have plagued the community.

As a recent Boston Globe editorial comments:

These agreements are a beginning . . . and a testament to what can be accomplished by the concerned—provided they swing enough weight to make their presence felt.

It is indeed a tribute to the immense creative energy of our colleague in the House, HASTINGS KERTH, and to the responsible leadership which Senator EDWARD BROOKE has appropriately and conscientiously provided, that a dialog—and the initial steps toward reconciliation and repair—has begun. I am pleased to be able to present here, for the consideration

of my colleagues, the full text of the editorial statement which appeared in the Boston Globe of July 15:

BROOKE IN NEW BEDFORD

The concessions to poverty stricken blacks and Puerto Ricans which Sen. Edward W. Brooke has obtained from the city government in New Bedford are not the complete answer to the racism and frustration that took one life and injured more than a score of persons on five consecutive nights of disturbances in that city. One man cannot in a day settle problems which had been aggravated by neglect for years and to which some members of the City Council have shown continuing indifference.

But the concessions are a beginning, anyway, and a testament, also, to what can be accomplished by the concerned—provided they swing enough weight to make their presence felt. Two hundred new housing units will not suffice as accommodations for the families who have lost 1200 homes to indifferently conceived highway and urban renewal programs—even if, indeed, the City Council approves the land sale on which the program is contingent. Nor will an approximate 400 jobs in the new industry which the new mayor, George Rogers, is bringing to the city make much of a dent in the ranks of more than 6000 jobless in a workforce of 62,000.

What Sen. Brooke did is vital for all that, and a lesson, too, for other communities that are heading into trouble because they treat their minorities as though they weren't there. By handpicking an 11-member community council of blacks and Puerto Ricans to take the place of Mayor Rogers' Human Relations Commission, which obstructionists on the City Council had starved out of existence by cutting its budget in half, he and the mayor together have given the minorities assurance that their social, housing and job problems will not be pigeon-holed from now on as they have been in the past. A voice in the control of its own affairs is what any minority is entitled to. It is this that now is assured.

What happened to the more than \$100 million in Federal money which Mayor Rogers says was poured into New Bedford "over five or 10 years" prior to his inauguration last January is a question to which both Sen. Brooke and Mayor Rogers will ask either a congressional committee or the U.S. Attorney's office to find the answer. How that much money could be spent in a city of 100,000 with such negligible results is a puzzle. The minorities now will have, as they should, some say in how such funds are to be spent in the future.

One area in which it could and should be useful is in food for New Bedford's share of the 5000 persons in Massachusetts who go to bed hungry every night, and for its share of the 90,000 children under 12 who are suffering medical symptoms of protein deficiency.

"END-WAR" ADVERTISING RAISES SERIOUS QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, with no little fanfare in the media, a reportedly half-million dollar advertising campaign has been launched to "gain," as United Press International puts it, "wide public support for legislation calling for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam by next summer."

More specifically, this unusual and flagrant lobbying effort is in behalf of

the end-the-war amendment of Senators GEORGE S. MCGOVERN and MARK O. HATFIELD and cosponsored by 23 other Senators—the so-called McGovern-Hatfield amendment.

According to the UPI report which appeared Monday, July 6, 1970, in the Washington Post, the advertising stresses the following themes:

The war could go on "forever" if it is not stopped by congressional action; it is not unpatriotic to be against the war; inflation is hurting everyone and the war is causing inflation.

A similar Washington-dated UPI report which appeared Monday, July 6, 1970, in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer contained this additional information which, certainly, is not without significance:

Probably for the first time in history members of Congress are buying advertising to appeal above the heads of their colleagues for citizen support of a legislative proposal. To ward off anticipated complaints that the campaign is actually intended to promote McGovern's unannounced candidacy for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1972, the commercials will show no politician or widely known personality.

Even so, the version of the UPI report which appeared in the Washington Post spoke of "Gordon Weil, McGovern's press secretary, who is helping coordinate the campaign." Of course, this is only supposed to be a coincidence.

Both versions of this report carried the information that:

The advertising, prepared with volunteer New York professional talent (was) said to be worth \$200,000 if it had been purchased * * *

However, it was not indicated if this "professional volunteer talent" was contributed by corporations or individuals.

At this time, I shall leave it to those who may wish to do so to argue the sensitive questions of how close this unprecedented technique may come, perhaps, to violating at least the spirit of laws regarding campaign and/or lobby practices. Certainly this matter raises some rather obvious questions. For example:

Is it ethical? Is it legal? Are these gentlemen arranging for a full accounting of the funds which, by public solicitation, they are raising? If they are, to whom, and how, will they make such an accounting? Are contributions tax deductible items for the contributor? Are these contributions taxable items for the recipient? Exactly who, or what, is the actual recipient of these funds? Have these gentlemen formed a nonprofit, non-taxable organization to effect and protect this action? What is the view of the Internal Revenue Service? Has it been checked—has it been cleared—with IRS?

To these several questions, there may well be added four others:

First, might political history one day write that this effort in behalf of the McGovern-Hatfield concept of peace in Vietnam proved to be the beginning of a McGovern-Hatfield—or a Hatfield-McGovern—third party "peace ticket" in 1972?

Second, are these two gentlemen, their cosponsors, supporters, and contributors,

so genuinely interested in peace in the world—so devout in their belief that their "United States Get Out" policy is so sound, right, and just that, even as they would apply it to Vietnam, they would also apply it to Israel?

Third, what prevents Senators McGovern and HATFIELD and their supporters from seeing the threatening menace of communism? What prevents them from recalling that it was a nonaggression treaty signed by Stalin for Communist Russia that gave Adolph Hitler's Nazi Germany a safe eastern front and permitted Hitler to start World War II? Are not they aware of the fact that Communist North Vietnam has 50,000 men in Cambodia and, probably, as many men in Laos and that the Communists have been violating the territorial integrity of these countries for at least 5 years?

Fourth, do they not know that Communist Russia is supplying the Arabs in the Middle East and even has pilots in Egypt? Has not anyone told them that every time we have attempted to achieve a detente with Russia, the Communists turn their backs on us and that right now Russia's missile building program is proceeding at an accelerated pace? Can't they understand that the Soviet worldwide military deployment continues, even in Castro's Cuba, with the confidence that arises from nuclear equality or superiority?

Whatever may be the answer to these questions, and I totally fail to understand how they can fail to see the very real threat of communism while being constantly critical of U.S. policies, I am confident that I have good reason to suspect that these two distinguished gentlemen, their cosponsors and their supporters, might well be expected to complain of violation of at least the spirit of law regarding campaign and/or lobbying practices if conservative opposite numbers were involved in such an effort in behalf of total military victory, or in support of President Nixon's policy of wind-down and withdraw.

So much for rhetorical question and speculation. Permit me, now, to move to respond to what, according to UPI reports, are the three claims stressed in this landmark political-lobbying maneuver in which Senators McGovern and HATFIELD and their associates solicit money with which to persuade Americans to pressure Congress in behalf of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment to compel the President and Commander in Chief to alter his diplomatic and military policy regarding the Vietnam conflict.

First, under President Nixon's policy and procedure, the war is not being permitted to go on forever, and no congressional action has forced it; quite the contrary, all of the months of sometimes politically-opportune criticism and debate over such converse policies as those of Senators McGovern and HATFIELD have given the other side in Vietnam cause to believe that our Nation and Government is so deeply divided that, one day, the Communists will be handed Vietnam on a platter.

Meanwhile, Mr. Nixon and his military commanders have gone routinely

about their business of hastening the Vietnamization of the war and the planned, orderly, systematic withdrawal of our forces, first from combat, and second from Vietnam itself.

As a result, we see, again and again, in public opinion poll and survey after poll and survey, that the majority of Americans continues to prefer the Nixon plan and system which, among other things vital, will permit the people of Vietnam the means of defending themselves against continued Communist efforts to dominate or destroy them after the last American soldier has been withdrawn. This is the policy and program which, from the outset, I have supported, and which I will continue to support.

Second, no, it is not unpatriotic to be against the war; it is quite intelligent, Godly and human to be opposed to all war, and certainly, to one of this most terrifying character; but it is a grave disservice, and it is grossly unfair for those of the McGovern-Hatfield persuasion to portray that majority of Americans who support the Nixon plan for peace as superpatriots who fashion themselves as having an exclusive claim to patriotism.

Third, it is, by no means, Vietnam and Vietnam alone that is causing inflation; quite the contrary: Over the past nearly four decades of deficit spending, of borrowing from Peter to pay Paul in order to support more and more self-proliferating, self-perpetuating social welfare plans and programs, our national debt has grown to more than \$374 billion, with the long-overburdened American taxpayers confronted with an interest cost of nearly \$20 billion in this new fiscal year, 1971, which began only the first of this month. This interest cost to the American taxpayer will increase to \$30 billion annually by 1973.

This incredibly massive squandering must be brought to a quick end. Certainly, I see little in the record, from persons of the McGovern-Hatfield persuasion, which would suggest that, given their way in Vietnam, they would not immediately argue for mere transfer of the moneys currently appropriated for Vietnam to more, and enlarged and expanded social welfare schemes and programs here at home which, in turn, would convince more and more Americans that, by doing less and less, they can get more and more from the Federal Government.

It is against this background that I note with no little interest a significant quotation attributed, in the UPI account, to Gordon Weil, McGovern's press secretary; the quotation, "This is emotional stuff," referring to the use of "sweet kids" who, according to one of these TV spot advertisements, could "die in Vietnam 12 years from now" if the war is not stopped.

This is, indeed, "emotional stuff," the propriety of which I seriously question because something more candid and practical and honest is needed to bring peace than the emotions upon which ultra-liberals and the anti-war, peace-at-any-price cult have too long been permitted to play.

I can only conclude that the sponsors and supporters of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, and their supporters, are

more interested in something other than the security and future of the United States and the free world.

BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the following bill which I believe is a forward-looking proposal for the establishment of a Big Thicket National Park in east Texas.

I think my plan is sound. It will connect the major pearls suggested for the park via the waterways. It provides for the development of a low-speed scenic roadway, constructed so as not to disturb in any way the ecological balance of the area. Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel says my bill "appears to have tremendous potential."

The Big Thicket area in east Texas is one of the rare sites left in America remaining essentially as it was hundreds of years ago. This is a crucial time for this biological crossroads. The Big Thicket is a vanishing wilderness. Once covering three and a half million acres in eastern Texas, today only about 10 percent of those acres in the Big Thicket remain untouched. Each week this acreage diminishes.

It is fortunate that the importance of conserving our natural resources and natural environment has become an important challenge. No one I have spoken with disputes the fact the Big Thicket has a unique quality that must be preserved. But, there has not been much agreement on how to accomplish this. One proposal has been made to create several independent units known as "pearls." Other proposals call for conserving the pearls and a separate large tract which affords a home for wildlife of the area.

To develop a plan which will readily accomplish the preservation of the forest areas of the Big Thicket, I have called upon the expertise of those who know the area best, and the Department of the Interior. The key to preserving the ecological balance of the Big Thicket is proper drainage. As Secretary Hickel said in a letter to me:

You certainly are correct in your statement "that drainage is the key for preserving the ecological balance of the Big Thicket." Your proposal appears to afford the necessary protection for this important drainage.

My bill does provide for that. In detail it asks the Federal Government to acquire land along the Neches River, the Village and Big Sandy Creeks. Acquisition of land along these waterways will tie together some of the virgin forest areas previously identified by the Department of the Interior as being of unique ecological value. The bill provides for a contiguous national park area.

I believe the low-speed roadway proposed in this measure to be feasible and desirable. Constructed so as to maintain the ecological balance of the Big Thicket community without disturbing its natural beauty, such a roadway will provide means for our citizens to experience much of this wilderness.

Hopefully, the introduction of this bill will hasten the day when the Big Thicket National Park will be a reality rather than a dream.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like Secretary Hickel's letter and the bill printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1970.

HON. GEORGE BUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUSH: I read with interest your letter of July 7 suggesting the establishment of a national park in the Big Thicket area of between 100,000-150,000 acres. Your suggestion that we connect the "string of pearls" concept to an acquisition program of land along the Neches River and the Village Creek, extending up to Sandy Creek, together with the development of a low-speed scenic roadway system certainly appears to have tremendous potential. As you know, I join your concern in preserving the Big Thicket area and feel that your suggested proposal would afford outstanding recreational activity for residents of Houston, Beaumont, Port Arthur, Dallas, Fort Worth and other parts of eastern Texas.

You certainly are correct in your statement "that drainage is the key for preserving the ecological balance of the Big Thicket." Your proposal appears to afford the necessary protection for this important drainage.

This Department is currently considering various proposals for the protection of the Big Thicket area and your suggestion will certainly be reviewed as a possible solution.

As requested, I am enclosing a drafting service prepared by this Department implementing your suggested program. As I am sure you realize, we can take no official position on this legislation until we have clearance from the Office of Management and Budget.

Sincerely yours,
WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior.

H.R. 18498

A bill to authorize the establishment of the Big Thicket National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve for the education and inspiration of present and future generations certain unique natural areas in Tyler, Hardin, Jasper, Polk, Liberty, Jefferson, and Orange Counties, Texas, and to interpret therein the outstanding scientific values and ecological associations within the Neches River, Village Creek, and Sandy Creek watersheds, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to establish the Big Thicket National Park (hereinafter referred to as the "park"). The boundary of the park shall be as generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Big Thicket National Park, Texas," dated July 1970, and numbered NP-BT-91,001. Copies of the drawing shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary may make minor revisions in the boundary of the park from time to time but in no event shall the boundary encompass more than 150,000 acres.

Sec. 2. Within the boundary of the park the Secretary is authorized to acquire lands, waters, and interests therein by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. Property owned by the State of Texas or any political subdivision thereof may be acquired only by donation. Federal property within the boundary may be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary without consideration for purposes of

the park, with the concurrence of the head of the agency having administrative jurisdiction thereover.

Sec. 3. In order to provide access to the unique natural areas within the park and to fully provide for the interpretation of its ecology, the Secretary is authorized to construct and maintain scenic roads within and between the units of the park, including roads outside of the boundary of the park where necessary. For the purposes of this section the Secretary may acquire lands and interests therein outside the boundary by any of the methods authorized in section 2 of this Act. The scenic roads and related facilities herein authorized shall be designed, constructed, and operated so as to avoid permanent adverse effects on the ecology of the park and adjacent areas, and they shall include rights-of-way of sufficient area to assure protection of the scenic quality of the road and, where appropriate, to provide facilities for interpretation and administration of the park. The scenic roads and related facilities authorized herein shall be administered as a part of the park, subject to such special regulations as the Secretary may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

Sec. 4. The Secretary shall administer the park in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4).

Sec. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

URBAN COALITION: POWER PLAY FOR DISASTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest lobbies for massive Federal spending is the so-called urban coalition headed by John W. Gardner. This group has been effectively mounting a crusade for heaping more and more taxes on the back of the already overburdened American taxpayer. Through its spokesman, Mr. Gardner, it has come out against giving any tax break to the average American and has called for massive doses of socialism and spending to cure every conceivable ill.

It is of vital concern because the urban coalition has the backing of most big city U.S. mayors and all too many big businessmen in the country. A good example of their efforts was seen in the disastrous welfare bill which recently passed the House of Representatives. The U.S. Senate did the work that the House chose not to do under a blinding magic spell cast by the White House on many otherwise conservative Republican Congressmen. There is yet hope that the Senate will save us from this folly but it will not be with the help of the urban coalition which was one of the bill's chief sponsors.

Even the National Association of Manufacturers was taken in by the rhetoric of the bill. In fact, they supported it even though it is full of inconsistencies which have been fully documented before. I take this opportunity today not to condemn the so-called family assistance plan—I have done this in detail before—but rather to point out some of the liberal forces which spearheaded this drive. In the future, they will undoubtedly

be in the forefront of the more socialistic proposals and it would be well to understand a little more about this power bloc.

To read Mr. Gardner's speeches, he presents the picture of an overage hippie who sees no good in the American system and like the radical kids, simply would substitute about everything we have for massive doses of the Federal programs which have failed in the past. Vice President AGNEW would be pilloried for the same rhetoric but the left is in tune with Mr. Gardner's attacks and demands. In his speech to the National Press Club last December, Mr. Gardner suggested that the public throw the weight of public opinion against those industries who contribute to the problems he cited. In that spirit, it would be wise to look at just who is sponsoring the urban coalition and backing its radical, socialistic, and budget-busting proposals. Maybe the public can throw its weight against them although in a different way than Mr. Gardner advocated.

On March 30, 1970, the following letter was written to Members of Congress from the Urban Coalition Action Council:

THE URBAN COALITION ACTION COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1970.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Within a few days the Family Assistance Act of 1970 (H.R. 16311) will be brought to a vote in the House of Representatives. Many prominent corporate executives support this legislation and have signed a statement urging members of the House to vote for it.

I am enclosing the statement and a list of the signers. The Urban Coalition Action Council joins these business leaders in urging you to support the Family Assistance Act.

Sincerely,

LOWELL R. BECK,
Executive Director.

Enclosed was a statement by business leaders which also listed four pages of those who supported the welfare bill. The statement and the list of signers follows:

STATEMENT OF BUSINESS LEADERS WELFARE REFORM

The failure of present welfare programs has been of growing concern to the business community. Leading businessmen have participated in the work of public and private commissions that have studied the problems of poverty in the United States. Their studies have concluded overwhelmingly that the time has come to discard the existing patchwork of ineffective public assistance programs.

President Nixon last year put forward an extremely important set of proposals for a family assistance program. The House Ways and Means Committee, after extensive hearings on the President's proposal, has approved H.R. 16311, the "Family Assistance Act of 1970". The Act contains important, new and innovative sections. It could be strengthened further. However, it is an important breakthrough and deserves strong support.

The Federal Government will for the first time accept responsibility for financing a minimum level of payment throughout the Nation. The Act provides help for the working poor, those fathers and mothers who may work full-time and still not earn enough to bring their families above the poverty line. It offers stronger incentives for those now on welfare rolls to seek training and

job opportunities. National standards of eligibility will correct some of the present disparities between one state and another. House passage of this legislation would be an important step toward a sound and more equitable welfare system.

As a group of interested businessmen, we feel the time has come to speak out for welfare reform. We urge members of the House of Representatives to vote for the Family Assistance Act of 1970.

LIST OF SIGNERS OF WELFARE REFORM STATEMENT

Vernon R. Alden, Chairman, the Boston Company, Inc.

Joseph Allen, President, McGraw-Hill Publications, Inc.

Ernest C. Arbuckle, Chairman, Wells Fargo Bank.

Charles Bluhdorn, Chairman of the Board, Gulf and Western Industries, Inc.

Donald Burnham, President, Westinghouse Electric Corp.

F. L. Byrom, Chairman, Koppers Company, Inc.

Howard Clark, Chairman, American Express Company.

A. W. Clausen, President, Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association.

Frederick J. Close, Chairman of the Board, Aluminum Company of America.

C. W. Cook, Chairman, General Foods Corp.

Alonzo G. Decker, Chairman and President, Black & Decker Manufacturing Co.

Harry K. DeWitt, Chairman of the Board, American Hospital Supply Corp.

George S. Dillon, President, Air Reduction Company.

Harrison F. Dunning, Chairman, Scott Paper Company.

W. D. Eberle, President, American Standard.

William Ericsson, President, American National Bank & Trust Company of Chicago.

Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr., Chairman of the Board, First National Bank of Chicago.

John W. Gardner, Chairman, Urban Coalition Action Council.

Gen. James Gavin, Chairman of the Board, Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Ell Goldston, President, Eastern Gas & Fuel Associates.

Rodney C. Gott, Chairman, American Machine & Foundry Co.

J. Peter Grace, President, W. R. Grace & Company.

Donald M. Graham, Chairman, Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Company of Chicago.

Stanley Grossman, President, Lebanon Knitting Mills, Inc.

W. P. Gwinn, Chairman, United Air Craft Corp.

John C. Haas, Chairman, Rohm & Haas Company.

R. V. Hansberger, President, Boise Cascade Corporation.

Howard C. Harder, Chairman of the Board, CPC International.

Ellison L. Hazard, Chairman & President, Continental Can Company, Inc.

Ben W. Heineman, President, Northwest Industries, Inc.

Andrew Heiskell, Chairman of the Board, Time, Inc.

William A. Hewitt, Chairman, Deere & Company.

William R. Hewlett, President, Hewlett-Packard Company.

Philip B. Hoffman, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Johnson & Johnson.

Amory Houghton, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Corning Glass Works.

William Hudjins, President, Freedom National Bank of New York.

Robert S. Ingersoll, Chairman, Borg-Warner Corp.

Herman E. Johnson, Chairman, Western Publishing Company.

Samuel C. Johnson, Chairman and President, S. C. Johnson & Sons, Inc.

Stephen Keating, President, Honeywell, Inc.

D. B. Kamball-Cook, President, Shell Oil Company.

Donald M. Kendall, President, Pepsico, Inc. Francis Keppel, Chairman, General Learning Corporation.

Ralph Lazarus, Chairman of the Board, Federated Department Stores, Inc.

Gustave Levy, Partner, Goldman, Sachs & Company.

Roger Lewis, Chairman and President, General Dynamics Corporation.

Franklin A. Lindsay, President, Itek Corporation.

John L. Loeb, Senior Partner, Loeb, Rhoades & Company.

Charles F. Luce, Chairman of the Board, Consolidated Edison Company of New York.

William F. May, Chairman, American Can Company.

J. Irwin Miller, Chairman of the Board, Cummins Engine Company.

Alfred S. Mills, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, The New York Bank for Savings.

Guy M. Minard, President, Kimberly-Clark Corp.

Milton E. Mohr, President and Chief Executive Officer, Bunker-Ramo Corporation.

Henry T. Mudd, Chairman, Cyprus Mines Corporation.

Milton C. Mumford, Chairman of the Board, Lever Brothers Company.

William C. Norris, Chairman & President, Control Data Corporation.

Daniel Parker, Chairman, Parker Pen Company.

Donald Perkins, President, Jewel Companies, Inc.

Howard C. Reeder, Chairman and President, CNA Financial Corporation.

H.R. Roberts, President, Connecticut General.

William E. Roberts, President & Chief Executive Officer, Ampex Corporation.

David Rockefeller, Chairman of the Board, Chase Manhattan Bank.

Charles G. Rodman, President, Grand Union Company.

James Rouse, President, The Rouse Company.

Lelan F. Sillin, Jr., President, Northeast Utilities Service Co.

John Simmen, Chairman of the Board, Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island.

J. Henry Smith, President, Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States.

Edwin H. Snyder, Chairman, Public Service Electric & Gas Co.

Emmett G. Solomon, Chairman of the Board, Crocker-Citizens National Bank.

Martin Stone, Chairman & President, Monogram Industries, Inc.

Robert Stuart, President, National Can Corporation.

Robert D. Stuart, Jr., President, Quaker Oats Company.

Henry G. Van der Eb, President & Chief Executive Officer, Container Corporation of America.

L. H. Warner, President, General Telephone & Electronics Corporation.

Rawleigh Warner, Jr., Chairman, Mobil Oil Corporation.

Richard Wasserman, President, Levitt & Sons, Inc.

John Wheeler, President, Mechanics and Farmers Bank.

Nelson C. White, Chairman, International Minerals and Chemical Corp.

William M. White, Jr., Chairman & President, Great Western United Corp.

Joseph C. Wilson, Chairman of the Board, Xerox Corporation.

C. A. Winding, Chairman, Marine Midland Banks, Inc.

F. C. Wiser, President, Trans World Airlines.

Walter B. Wriston, President, First National City Bank.

C. J. Zimmerman, Chairman, Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Company.

Whether these businessmen had been mesmerized or whether they had really studied the bill and thought its guaranteed annual income innovation was needed in America cannot be known. What is known is that a substantial number of American business executives threw their weight behind one of the worst bills ever to pass the House of Representatives and one of the most radical, socialistic proposals ever to be recommended to this body.

No amount of spending will ever be enough for these urban coalition types. The Nixon budget had no sooner been offered than it was assailed by Mr. Gardner. He said:

We must act to increase Federal revenues. As a start, I would suggest that the remaining 5 per cent of the surtax should not, under any circumstances, be allowed to lapse in June.

The urban coalition not only presses for more spending, more programs, more deficits but also called for the defeat of Judge G. Harrold Carswell. They have currently jumped on the antimilitary bandwagon of the left.

WHO IS JOHN GARDNER?

Who is John Gardner? He is the perfect example of the sophisticated east coaster who is virtually hatched by the foundations and the liberal establishment. These types have come in and out of government for the past 25 years. The 1967 Congressional Directory contains the following biography of Mr. Gardner when he was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare:

John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; president of Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, from 1955 to July 27, 1965, date of his appointment to the Cabinet by President Johnson; born in Los Angeles, Calif., 1912; married Aida Marroquin; children: Stephanie (Mrs. Philip Trimble), Francesca (Mrs. John Reese); honorary fellow of Stanford University where he received his A.B. and M.A. degrees; received Ph. D. from the University of California; before World War II, taught psychology at Connecticut College for Women and Mount Holyoke College; served in 1942 as chief of the Latin American Section of Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission; in 1943 joined the U.S. Marine Corps and was assigned to the Office of Strategic Services; served with the OSS in Washington, Italy, and Austria; joined the Carnegie Corp. in 1946 as executive associate; served as consultant to various government agencies; served on President Kennedy's Special Task Force on Education; chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs (1962-64), President Johnson's Task Force on Education (1964), and of the White House Conference on Education (1965); awarded the U.S. Air Force Exceptional Service Award, and in 1964 the Presidential Medal of Freedom; served as member of the board of the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the American Association for the Advancement of Science; is a fellow of the American Psychological Association and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; member of the Council on Foreign Relations and the Society of Sigma Xi; author of numerous articles and studies on American education; editor of President John F. Kennedy's book "To

Turn the Tide"; author of the books "Excellence; Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?" and "Self-Renewal; The Individual and the Innovative Society"; took oath of office as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on August 18, 1965.

Foundation background, Council on Foreign Relations and special assignments in Government provided the background for this man who, after being created to specification, now tells us how to reform the Congress, our cities, the Federal Government and our way of life.

Unfortunately, many businessmen follow this pied piper of Eastern liberalism, as witnessed by the welfare bill fiasco. Some of these same businessmen were active in the committee set up in 1964 to oppose BARRY GOLDWATER after the Republican Party nominated him. For the record, I here include the list of the business leaders who formed a committee to back L.B.J.:

CHAIRMEN

John T. Connor, Summit, N.J.
John L. Loeb, Sr. Partner, Carl M. Loeb, Rhoades & Co.

VICE CHAIRMEN

Carter Burgess, Ch., American Machine & Foundry Co.
William A. Hewitt, Pres., Deere & Co.
Edgar F. Kaiser, Pres., Kaiser Industries Corporation.
Mills B. Lane, Jr., Pres., Citizens & Southern National Bank.

SPONSORS

Kenneth S. Adams, Ch., Phillips Petroleum Co.
John M. Akers, Pres., Akers Motor Lines.
Frank Altschul, New York, N.Y.
Robert B. Anderson, Greenwich, Conn.
James W. Aston, Pres., Republic National Bank of Dallas.
Perry Richardson Bass, Fort Worth, Tex.
Ford Bell, Ch., Red Owl Stores, Inc.
Arthur E. Benning, Pres. & Gen. Mgr., The Amalgated Sugar Co.
T. Roland Berner, Ch., Curtiss-Wright Corporation.
William R. Biggs, Washington, D.C.
Gordon Bilderback, Champaign, Ill.
Eugene R. Black, New York, N.Y.
Jacob Blaustein, Co-founder & Former Pres., American Oil Co.
Joseph L. Block, Ch., Inland Steel Co.
Samuel J. Blomington, New York, N.Y.
James H. Brady, Knoxville, Tenn.
Edgar M. Bronfman, Pres., Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.
D. W. Brosnan, Pres., Southern Railway.
Paul C. Cabot, Ch., State Street Investment Corp.
Thomas D. Cabot, Ch., Cabot Corporation.
Cass Canfield, Ch., Exec. Com., Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.
Charles A. Cannon, Ch., Cannon Mills Co.
Edward E. Carlson, Pres., Western Hotels, Inc.
James V. Carmichael, Pres., Scripto, Inc.
Henry Z. Carter, Pres., Avondale Shipyards, Inc.
Sam H. Casey, Pres. Commonwealth Oil Refining Co.
Nobel C. Caudill, Dir., Genesco, Inc.
J. M. Cheatham, Pres., Dundee Mills.
Peter Colefax, Ch., American Potash & Chemical Corp.
Donald C. Cook, Pres., American Electric Power Co.
James M. Cox, Pub., The Miami News.
Edgard M. Cullman, Pres., General Cigar Co., Inc.
Nathan Cummings, Ch., Consolidated Foods Corp.
Colgate Darden, Norfolk, Va.
Ralph K. Davies, Ch., Natomas Co.
A. D. Davis, Pres., Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc.

Lewis W. Douglas, Sonoita, Ariz.
 Marriner S. Eccles, Ch., Utah Construction & Mining Co.
 Buford Ellington, Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.
 German H. H. Emory, Ch., Riegel Textile Corp.
 Ray R. Eppert, Pres., Burroughs Corporation.
 Amon C. Evans, Pub., The Nashville Tennessean.
 Samuel M. Fleming, Pres., Third National Bank in Nashville.
 Marion B. Folsom, Dir., Eastman Kodak Co.
 Henry Ford II, Ch., Ford Motor Co.
 James M. Gavin, Pres., Arthur D. Little Co.
 Eli Goldston, Pres., Eastern Gas & Fuel Assoc.
 William T. Gossett, Bloomfield Hills, Mich.
 Herschell Greer, Pres., Guaranty Mortgage Company.
 Walter A. Hass, Jr., Pres., Levi Strauss & Company.
 Robert V. Hansberger, Pres., Boise Cascade Corp.
 Robert M. Hart, Ch., Boulder National Bank.
 Ben W. Heineman, Ch., Chicago and Northwestern Ry.
 Harry B. Henshell, Pres., Bulova Watch Co., Inc.
 George Watts Hill, Ch., Home Security Life Insurance Co.
 Walter Hochschild, Ch., American Metal Climax, Inc.
 Bailey K. Howard, Ch., Field Enterprises Educational Corp.
 Edwin Janss, Jr., Pres., Janss Corp.
 R. Huston Jewell, Pres., Crystal Springs, Bleachery.
 D. Wellsman Johnson, Pres., Abney Mills.
 Earl D. Johnson, Past Pres., General Dynamics Corp.
 Halbert M. Jones, Pres., Waverly Mills, Inc.
 Sidney Kellman, Ch., Bank of Virginia Beach.
 Charles Keller, Jr., Pres., Keller Construction Company.
 James R. Kerr, Pres., AVCO Corp.
 George L. Killion, Pres., American President Lines, Ltd.
 E. William King, Pres., Mason & Dixon Lines, Inc.
 Thomas S. Lamont, New York, N.Y.
 Harley Langdale, Jr., Pres., The Langdale Company.
 John Lawrence, Ch., Dresser Industries.
 Ralph Lazarus, Pres., Federated Department Stores, Inc.
 Robert Lehman, Sr. Partner, Lehman Bros.
 Salim L. Lewis, Bear Stearns & Company.
 Sol M. Linowitz, Ch., Xerox Corp.
 August C. Long, Ch., Texaco, Inc.
 J. Howard Marshall II, Pres., Union Texas Petroleum Corp.
 J. Elroy McCaw, Communications & Real Estate.
 David M. McConnell, Belk Stores.
 Joseph H. McConnell, Pres., Reynolds Metals Co.
 John Mecum, Houston, Tex.
 Andre Meyer, Sr. Partner, Lazard Freres & Co.
 Al C. Mifflin, Jr., Pres., Murfreesboro Bank & Trust Co.
 Arjay R. Miller, Pres., Ford Motor Company.
 Bernard A. Monaghan, Pres., Vulcan Materials Co.
 Walter S. Montgomery, Pres., Spartan Mills.
 Charles H. Murphy, Pres., Murphy Corp.
 Charles F. Meyers, Jr., Pres., Burlington Industries, Inc.
 John Nuveen, Dir., John Nuveen & Co.
 Monford A. Orloff, Pres., Evans Products Co.
 General Frederick Osborn, New York, N.Y.
 Herman H. Pevler, Pres., Norfolk & Western Railway.

Alexander M. Poniatoff, Ch., Ampex Corp.
 Troy V. Post, Ch., Greatamerica Corp.
 Jerome Preston, Preston, Moss & Co.
 Hickman Price, Jr., Ch., International Products Corporation.
 Will Turner Ray, Ch., Bank of Monterey.
 Richard S. Reynolds, Jr., Ch., Reynolds Metals Co.
 L. W. Robert, Ch., Robert & Company.
 Corbin J. Robertson, Quintana Petroleum Corporation.
 James E. Robison, Pres., Indian Head Mills, Inc.
 Lessing J. Rosenwald, Former Ch., Sears Roebuck.
 Raymond Rubicam, Scottsdale, Ariz.
 W. H. Ruffin, Ch., Irwin Mills.
 Robert M. Schwarzenbach, Pres., Schwarzenbach Huber Co.
 Norton Simon, Pres., Hunt Foods & Industries, Inc.
 Ross D. Siragusa, Sr., Ch., Admiral Corporation.
 Robert S. Small, Pres., Woodside Mills.
 Roger Sonnabend, Pres., Hotel Corporation of America.
 William E. Spaulding, Ch., Houghton Mifflin Co.
 Modie J. Spiegel, Ch., Spiegel, Inc.
 Mansfield D. Sprague, American Machine & Foundry Co.
 Sydney Stein, Jr., Stein, Roe & Farnham
 William C. Stolk, Ch., American Can Co.
 Ralph I. Straus, Dir., R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.
 Alfred A. Streisin, Ch., Cenco Instruments Corp.
 H. Gardner Symonds, Ch., Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.
 S. Mark Taper, Ch., First Charter Financial Corp.
 Charles B. Thornton, Ch., Litton Industries, Inc.
 Walter J. Tuohy, Pres., Chesapeake & Ohio Railway.
 Frederick M. Warburg, New York, N.Y.
 Sidney J. Weinberg, Sr. Partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.
 Charles A. Wellman, Pres., First Charter Financial Corp.
 Howard Werthan, Dir., Werthan Bag Corporation.
 Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., Ch., Pitney-Bowes, Inc.
 Alfred Mayowilson, Exec. V. Pres., Honeywell, Inc.
 John U. Wilson, Pres., E. P. Wilson & Son.
 Joseph C. Wilson, Pres., Xerox Corp.
 Frederic B. Whitman, Pres., Western Pacific RR. Co.
 Joseph S. Wright, Pres., Zenith Radio Corp.

COUNSEL

Henry H. Fowler, Washington, D.C.
 Lloyd M. Cutler, Washington, D.C.
 Maxwell M. Rabb, New York, N.Y.
 The persons listed as officers or sponsors serve in their personal and individual capacity; the corporate and business affiliations listed are purely descriptive, carrying no implication of authorization or participation by the organization noted.
 Incorporated in 1964.

Their influence was clear on the usually conservative National Association of Manufacturers which supported the welfare bill. The following telegram was sent to Members by the NAM:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
 April 15, 1970.

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
 Washington, D.C.:

We urge your support for H.R. 16311, the Family Assistance Act of 1970. The failure of the present system is clear. The incentive features of this bill point to a practical way of strengthening family life and reducing poverty and welfare dependency.

W. P. GULLANDER,
 President, NAM.

I immediately wrote Mr. Gullander and received the following reply:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
 MANUFACTURERS,
 April 29, 1970.

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASHBROOK: Thank you for your letter on H.R. 16311.

Our reasoning on the work requirement and work incentive is detailed on pp. 5-6 and 8-11 of the attached analysis of Title I. We are very aware of the risks attendant on these proposals. However, we feel that something must be done before the present AFDC "mess" becomes worse and, of all the proposals we have heard, H.R. 16311 makes the most sense.

We are mindful of the dangers of another "Medicaid." Therefore, in our statement to the Senate Finance Committee we intend to stress the importance of a careful start at limited benefit levels. We also expect to suggest several ways to strengthen the "workfare" aspects.

This was not a hasty decision on our part. For the better part of a year, a group of our members studied the various welfare reform proposals. Their conclusion was that a work- and incentive-oriented program was necessary. The NAM Board of Directors reviewed their proposal in December and endorsed it. That policy is appended to the analysis of H.R. 16311 and is the basis for our support of the bill.

Sincerely,

W. P. GULLANDER.

It is interesting to note that the NAM has evidently had a relapse of conscience or good judgment and now speaks more cautiously about the welfare bill. However, they played their part in getting this dangerous bill passed in the House of Representatives and their reluctance comes a little late.

Does the urban council have an ally in the National Association of Manufacturers? Only time will tell. At any rate, it will be most interesting to watch this new high-powered pressure group for the left. I will introduce more material on the urban coalition as the months progress. Prudent Americans who are worried about the direction of the Federal Government, our Federal tax burdens, huge and mounting Federal deficits, and grasping Federal bureaucracy should keep an alert eye on the urban coalition and John Gardner. They are the powerful foe of all who believe in limited government and checking the runaway nature of the Federal Government. In fact, these same Americans should watch these business leaders who aline themselves with Mr. Gardner and his crowd. As consumers, they should make their weight felt.

REINTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO LIMIT THE IMPORTATION OF ELECTRONIC PRODUCTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Congressman SILVIO O. CONTE and I are introducing again today—this time with 20 cosponsors—our legislation to place limits on the importation of electronic products.

The cosponsors, a bipartisan group of eight Democrats and 12 Republicans,

share our alarm at the staggering new increases in electronic imports—increases that are threatening the jobs of hundreds of thousands of workers from coast to coast. Enjoying an ample supply of cheap labor and other economic advantages that American industry lacks, foreign manufacturers soon may dominate this country's marketplace in electronic products. Electronic workers are already losing their jobs. Major layoffs in this industry—as in the shoe and textile industries—are becoming almost commonplace.

Plainly, Mr. Speaker, the Congress must honor its responsibility to safeguard the jobs of American working men and women.

I want to emphasize again today—as Mr. CONTE and I did in fuller discussions of this problem March 25 and May 14—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 9369 through 9373, March 25, and pages 15627 through 15628, May 14—that our bill is not just another piece of shortsighted protectionist legislation.

It simply allows domestic and foreign manufacturers to compete fairly for the consumer's dollar.

The bill's cosponsors, besides Mr. CONTE and I, are:

JAMES T. BROYHILL, Republican, of North Carolina.

JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

LAURENCE J. BURTON, Republican, of Utah.

HUGH L. CARY, Democrat, of New York.

TIM LEE CARTER, Republican, of Kentucky.

DEL CLAWSON, Republican, of California.

JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire.

HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

THADDEUS J. DULSKI, Democrat, of New York.

JOHN J. DUNCAN, Republican, of Tennessee.

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Democrat, of Maryland.

JAMES G. FULTON, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of New York.

HASTINGS KEITH, Republican, of Massachusetts.

DAN KUYKENDALL, Republican, of Tennessee.

PHILIP J. PHILBIN, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

KEITH G. SEBELIUS, Republican, of Kansas.

ROBERT O. TIERNAN, Democrat, of Rhode Island.

LOUIS C. WYMAN, Republican, of New Hampshire.

A BILL TO AMEND PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT OF 1962

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. McFALL), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and much has been written about the economic decline during the past year and the attendant intolerable

unemployment rates experienced in many of our communities.

Unemployment has increased from 3.3 percent at the beginning of 1969 to approximately 5 percent nationally, with the unwelcome prospect of further increases in sight. This means 1½ million more Americans out of work than was the case 18 months ago. Many millions more have seen their purchasing power and paychecks eroded by shorter workweeks and higher costs.

Implementation of certain Federal executive policies has contributed both to the increase in unemployment and inflationary conditions now plaguing the country. In some vital parts of the economy, such as housing, the term "depression" is not too strong.

The result has been that in certain geographic areas, pockets of unemployment have been created which have alarming portent.

Legislation I am introducing today could be the basis for one task force to help turn the tide of unemployment rates downward in impacted areas where great economic peril exists. This bill offers no panacea, but from previous experience with similar programs, it could be extremely beneficial in reversing current trends.

Mr. Speaker, the repeated reports that things will get better and prosperity is around the next bend, no longer hold out the hope or fulfill the promises needed to satisfy the workingman without a job. The need is now. The time for action is now. The opportunity for the Congress to join forces with the administration in offering solutions is now. The burden of responsibility is ours to authorize actions and appropriate funds now.

The measure I am offering is not complicated. It uses as its basis a law still on the books that was highly successful as an antirecession measure in the early days of the 1960 decade, the Public Works Acceleration Act.

It would give the administration a major tool to assist communities that are particularly hard hit by the current recession.

I propose to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 to provide immediate direct Federal assistance of 80 percent for construction of needed public facilities in areas where unemployment has soared to 150 percent above the national average.

The basic ground rules for the program require that the applicant have a firm plan for a badly needed permanent public facility, be able to finance the local share of construction, be ready to begin almost immediate construction, and guarantee that a high percentage of the construction cost will be labor.

I was particularly distressed by the news report only last week that the city of Stockton, Calif., in my congressional district, led all major labor market areas in the Nation in unemployment. The figure of 10.6 percent for March was more than three times last year's national average.

Stockton, one of the oldest cities in California, has not attracted the type of individuals who look to the Federal Government for cradle-to-grave existence. Its people are proud and would prefer not

to rely on welfare and unemployment checks. The area is inhabited with willing hands, but the work they want in most instances simply has not been available.

Even worse conditions prevail in smaller communities across the country classified as "redevelopment areas." During the entire first 6 months of this year, Modesto—also in my congressional district—had an unemployment rate more than three times last year's national average.

Under this bill there would be 197 similar areas which would be eligible for special assistance, using the "trigger" mechanism of an unemployment rate of 150 percent above the national average.

I ask the Congress and the administration to turn their attention inward to developing domestic lifelines for the hard-core areas suffering from inordinately high rates of unemployment. To do nothing may be construed as benign neglect.

EXPERTS ALL, SCHOLARS FEW

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 months we in the Congress of the United States have been deluged by mail and visitors concerning the issues of Cambodia, Southeast Asia, and student unrest. My office alone has received, as of our latest count, 1,629 letters on the Cambodian action—1,217 against the Cambodian action, and 412 supporting our policies in Cambodia. I think it is significant and necessary to footnote this tally further by saying that from May 20 until our most recent count, the letter count has been 206 against to 205 in support of the President. I have met personally with over 400 visitors. These meetings have been frank, informal, and interesting dialogs in which I have tried extraordinarily hard to be attentive to the ideas brought to my attention.

I think this recent trend of concern over our national policies and priorities is healthy and has the potential to be extremely useful to the leaders and decisionmakers of our country. This is the lifeblood of representative democracy which, for all of its faults, is still the best system of government mankind has ever devised. I have always prided myself on listening to and welcoming at all times rational forms of criticism, and I continue to do so.

Although I feel that peaceful dissent is healthy, I have become very disturbed with the inaccuracy, emotion, and most often the vacuum of knowledge people have used to justify arguments concerning Southeast Asia. I realize this has occurred on both sides of the issue, but the most vociferous and the most disturbing group, the academic community, has most flagrantly violated logical debate by making statements of the most grave nature without any research or background material to base them on. I have found most academicians unaware of the recent sweeping land reform bill enacted by the legislative body of South Vietnam or of the Supreme Court of South Vietnam overruling its President recently, yet al-

most every one of them has suggested that the present Government in South Vietnam is totally corrupt and dictatorial.

I find the academic community unreasonable when it does not put its ability to the most desirable use by instituting independent research to get hard facts that at present, from all quarters, are admittedly obscure, to substantiate its sweeping, blanket statements or to open its eyes to new revelations. I realize that students and professors, like everyone else are disheartened with the whole subject of Vietnam, but I do not believe that this justifies their inability to face up to the subject academically, with solid research and applied reason. I do not claim to be an expert on Indochina, because I am not. But in order to be swayed in my beliefs I must have hard facts rather than emotional pleas. There is a huge area for study in Southeast Asia and I am disappointed that the academic community in this country has not taken the initiative to instigate study.

I am also disappointed in the academic community for its inability to accept outside criticism. A large portion of the academic community has been trying to tell Mr. Nixon how to operate in Vietnam, and Mr. Nixon has responded and listened to this constructive criticism. But when anybody even proposes to criticize the academic community, much of the group becomes deeply resentful, insulted, or even hostile.

I commend this Boston Herald Traveler editorial of June 12 for my colleagues' earnest attention. I also plead with the academic community to do itself justice by living up to the high ideals of education by teaching and practicing the truly democratic and intellectually honest method of sound decision-making and openmindedness:

EXPERTS ALL, SCHOLARS FEW

The nation's colleges and universities, which boast countless "experts" on the legality, logistics and life of Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia, have in truth fostered precious little study of the region.

Consider these dismal facts unearthed in a recent survey: Fewer than 30 students in the entire country are studying Vietnamese; there is not a single scholar with a tenured professorship at an American university who specializes in Vietnamese studies; nor is there an American scholar who devotes a major portion of his time to the study of current affairs in North Vietnam.

Cornell University's program in Vietnamese language, history and politics, reputed to be the best in the nation, has awarded only three doctoral degrees in 10 years. Yale University, the only school in the nation that offers a course in Cambodian, last semester enrolled the grand total of two students in the language.

The nation's great centers of learning, some of which have shut down because of events in Vietnam and Cambodia, have, in effect, shut their minds to the region. That the focus of the nation's academic agitation should be the subject of such scant academic inquiry is an outrageous paradox.

What is even more disturbing is the major reason cited for the dearth of Vietnamese studies. Professor John K. Fairbanks, director of Harvard University's East Asian Research Center, opines: "Academics are fed up with the whole subject of Vietnam. They would like to abolish Vietnam if they could. So students are not interested in going and studying about it."

A paradox confounded by illogic and academic asceticism is redoubtable. But it is incumbent on the academic community to undo the contradiction and perhaps do a little recording of its own esoteric priorities.

THE CRISIS IN MEDICAL EDUCATION AND MANPOWER TRAINING

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

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, I have spoken out repeatedly about the major crisis that the Nation faces in the field of medical education and manpower training.

Just today, I have arranged an important meeting between my colleagues in the Maryland delegation and representatives of affected institutions in the State of Maryland. At that meeting we discussed in depth the Nation's, and particularly Maryland's interest in this crisis and the Federal role encouraging and fostering the needed educational opportunities and training for the doctors, nurses, and other health personnel that are so badly needed.

Next week, as we all know, the vital appropriations measure to meet this need will be up for a vote here in the House. To perhaps better acquaint any Member who is not fully briefed on this important problem I would like to share with my colleagues a recent letter and enclosures which I received from Dr. John C. Hume, M.D., of the Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health and include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF HYGIENE AND PUBLIC
HEALTH,

Baltimore, Md., June 20, 1970.

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRIEDEL: I am writing you on behalf of The Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health, of which I am the Dean, as well as in my capacity of President of the Association of Schools of Public Health, about a matter of deep concern to me and to my colleagues. This has to do with the FY '71 appropriations upon which the schools of public health are heavily dependent. It is my personal opinion that the financial plight of many of the educational institutions preparing individuals for the health professions is quite well known. Much has been written, for example, about the difficulties of schools of medicine. The public as a whole, and I suspect some members of Congress, are less aware of the role of the schools of public health, their multidisciplinary approach to the education of their students and research on health problems. I am therefore sending to you two documents. The first of these is a brief statement I recently prepared for Internal University use which I believe will give you some feel for the interest and activities of schools such as ours, as well as some of the needs and goals of our particular institution in Baltimore. The second document is a statement presented by Dr. Myron E. Wegman, Dean of the School of Public Health at the University of Michigan, on behalf of the Association of Schools of Public Health to the Subcommittee on Labor-HEW Appropriations of the House of Representatives on June 5, 1970. I subsequently submitted the same statement be-

fore the Senate Subcommittee on Labor-HEW Appropriations.

It is obvious that all educational institutions are having financial difficulties but it is also true that schools of public health are peculiarly dependent upon and a responsibility of the federal government. There is some documentation of this in the statement and I shall not repeat this here except to state that this has been repeatedly borne out at Congressional hearings each time the authorization bill has been considered.

In response to the urging of the federal government during the early and mid-sixties and demands of the public over the past five or six years, the schools have expanded very dramatically, tripling their annual enrollment over a ten-year period and doubling the number of degrees awarded annually over a six-year period. This has come about through an increase in the output of existing schools and the creation of new schools. In 1959, there were 12 accredited United States schools; there are now 16 and there are 5 waiting in the wings. The one at the University of Washington presumably is to be approved within the next few months.

If the momentum of the past decade is not to be lost in the immediate future, it is imperative that federal support be increased through Sections 306 and 309(a) and (c) of the Public Health Service Act. Section 306 provides support to students in the form of stipends, dependency allowances and payment of tuition. Section 309(a) provides funding to institutions for project grants designed to assist in the development of new programs or the improvement and enrichment of existing curricula. Section 309(c) provides institutional support to schools of public health through formula grants, traditionally known as Hill-Rhodes funds.

Despite President Nixon's health message emphasizing prevention of disease and disability and the preparation of health personnel, the President's budget for FY '71 shows an actual decrease in requested appropriations for this area. While appropriations for the two sections of the Public Health Service Act have never equalled the amounts authorized, Section 306 for several years has had appropriations at the level of 80% of the authorization and Section 309(a) and (c) combined, approximately 63%; 309(a)—55% and 309(c)—roughly 75%. If the President's budget figures are accepted for FY '71, the equivalent figures would be Section 306—53%; 309(a)—32%; 309(c)—51% and 309(a) and (c) combined—39%.

The authorization figures of Section 306—14 million dollars, Sections 309(a) and (c) combined—23 million dollars; Section 309(a)—14 million dollars and Section 309(c)—9 million dollars are, in fact, reasonable estimates of requirements. A reduction to the levels proposed in the President's budget would literally be disastrous. Maintenance of the same proportion of appropriations to authorizations as has obtained in the recent past would be uncomfortable but tolerable. This would result in appropriations as follows: Section 306—11.2 million; Section 309(a)—7.75 million and Section 309(c)—6.75 million.

I earnestly solicit your concern and dare to hope that you will find it possible to discuss this with your colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, particularly on its Subcommittee on Labor-HEW, and to support our cause on the floor.

Since you have been a constant supporter of our School and the schools of public health since the inception of the program of formula grants to schools of public health, I feel confident that you will continue your interest in us and give your backing to our request.

With best personal regards and all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,
JOHN C. HUME, M.D., Dr.P.H.
Dean.

STATEMENT OF DR. MYRON E. WEGMAN, DEAN, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR-HEW COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE, JUNE 17, 1970

I am Dr. Myron E. Wegman, Dean of the School of Public Health of the University of Michigan, representing the Association of Schools of Public Health. There are, at present 16 accredited schools of public health in the United States, nine in state universities and seven in private universities.* I wish to comment particularly on the portions of the Appropriations Act having to do with preparation of health manpower for preventive services and public health, under Section 306 and Section 309 of the Public Health Service Act.

My testimony this year has a special sense of urgency. Over the past several administrations there has been uniform recognition that prevention of disease results in economy in both public and private funds. This thesis was supported by President Nixon in his health message to this Congress when he emphasized prevention and the preparation of health manpower. It is, thus, particularly bewildering and disillusioning to find that the two key appropriations requested for preparation of manpower in public health and preventive medicine have not been increased, as one might have expected from increased authorizations and the health message, but have actually been decreased.

It seems to me incredibly shortsighted, at a time when there is such grave concern over soaring hospital and health care costs to reduce efforts at prevention—yet prevention offers the best chance for curbing illness and consequent costs for hospitalization and medical care. Business men know that proper investment in maintenance and protection will cut repair costs but somehow government seems to have difficulty in learning the lesson.

The legislative provisions of Sections 306 and 309 are an outgrowth of the attitude of the Congress, both in authorization and appropriation, over more than a decade. Three National Conferences on Public Health Training, 1958, 1963 and 1967, all held at the direction of the Congress to provide recommendations on legislation, uniformly emphasized the need to prepare manpower for comprehensive services for health protection, health maintenance, and prevention of disease. Since the Conferences made special note of the large number of unfilled positions in public service in the country, the then 11 schools of public health made great effort to expand and five new schools were accredited. The results are shown in Table I and II, showing the increased enrollment and the increased graduates at schools of public health. We are proud of the increase and we have enough momentum for still greater expansion.

The special reasons for federal aid in preparation of public health and preventive medicine manpower were examined in great detail by this very Congress, which, after considering two bills in the Senate after five in the House, unanimously passed S. 2809, which was signed by President Nixon on March 12, 1970, as P.L. 91-208. This legislation achieved the uniformly supported step of bringing Federal support for students and for the institutions into coordinated planning. Although I am particularly concerned about schools of public health, to which Section 309(c) applies, I must emphasize that Section 306 and Section 309(a) of the Public Health Service Act provide the basic support for preparation of public health person-

nel in every variety of school, including nursing schools, engineering schools, medical schools, osteopathic schools and others, as well as the 16 accredited schools of public health.

With regard to student support the Congress noted that those who undertake careers in public health, in the very nature of the services they will be providing, cannot look forward to large remuneration. They look forward primarily to careers with federal, state and local civil service, or with voluntary agencies, none of which are known for high income levels. To be sure, a good number of our students come to schools of public health with previous doctoral degrees in medicine, dentistry or similar professions. It is a wry joke among our schools that few can equal us in being able, in one year's training, to convert a successful pediatrician from someone who can make \$40,000 a year in private practice into a public servant who can command \$20,000 a year as salary. One expects higher education to fit a person for being more productive, and this is usually evidenced by higher income. It is our claim that we fit a person to be more productive in public service but that his recompense is in personal satisfaction rather than greater salary. The point of the argument simply is that one cannot expect students to invest the necessary sums from personal savings for tuition in what is admittedly an expensive program where there is so little likelihood of long time compensatory gain.

The Congress noted and accepted that increased personnel needs justified the rise in the authorization for traineeships in public health from \$10,000,000 in FY 1970 to \$14,000,000 in FY 1971.

I should like to summarize briefly the points noted in the testimony and the report on P.L. 91-208 with regard to institutional support:

(1) The 16 accredited schools must provide the trained public health personnel for all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and overseas territories.

State legislatures cannot be expected to meet a high proportion of teaching costs, when two-thirds to three-quarters of the enrollment at schools of public health are from out-of-state.

(2) The complexity of professional preparation in public health, requiring instruction in both natural sciences and social sciences, make a large multidisciplinary faculty necessary.

(3) The Federal Government sends about two-thirds of the students to these schools yet tuition covers only a small proportion of teaching costs.

(4) Professional training at schools of public health is brief and intensive. In contrast to some other health professional schools, the majority of students receive the Master of Public Health degree in one calendar year and are then ready to work in preventive health service programs.

(5) Section 309(c) provides a fixed sum of dollars to be divided, according to a formula, among all accredited schools of public health. There are at present 16 such schools in the United States but several other institutions, stimulated by the demand for graduates, are in various stages of preparing for establishment of schools of public health. Among these, in particular, are the University of Washington, University of Illinois, the University of Cincinnati, the University of Alabama and the University of Missouri.

The University of Washington, which has a widely-known and excellent Department of Preventive Medicine, has formally applied for accreditation as a school of public health. It is expected that accreditation will be accomplished in the next few months.

The University of Illinois is actively seeking a Dean for its School and hopes to accept students within the year. These additional schools are sorely needed to meet the nation's demands for health personnel. Yet, in fact, in

the absence of any increase of appropriation, an allotment to a new school means that all the other schools will receive a relative decrease in funds allocated. It hardly seems rational to increase capacity for trained personnel by establishing new schools while decreasing the capacity of existing schools for the same purpose.

The actual situation in respect to authorization and appropriation may be summarized as follows:

TABLE III
[In millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971
Sec. 306:			
Authorization.....	10.0	10.0	14.0
Appropriation.....	8.0	8.0	7.4
Sec. 309:			
(a) Authorization.....	9.0	9.0	14.0
(c) Authorization.....	6.0	7.0	9.0
Total.....	15.0	16.0	23.0
Sec. 309:			
(a) Appropriation.....	4.917		
(c) Appropriation.....	4.554		
Total.....	9.471	10.071	9.071

¹ Spending to be reduced to 9.471 in order to achieve 2 percent reduction. One new school accredited: University of Texas.

² President's budget proposal. Appropriation will need to provide also for new school at University of Washington.

Furthermore, the budget document states that decrease in numbers of students trained will be only 4.5% while the appropriation is decreased 7.5%. In view of increased tuition and other costs this estimate is inexplicable.

Astronomical increases in health care costs fall as burdens on the entire general public as well as on the Federal Government. A most significant way to lower these costs is by preventing the disease and disability which necessitate the high costs of care. The expanded program for preparing public health personnel is absolutely essential if intensification of preventive services is to be accomplished and the resultant savings obtained. The substantial decrease in appropriation, at the very time the Congress has sharply increased the authorization is clearly contradictory.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there has been no evidence suggested in any way that the health problems of our country have decreased. I submit further that an actual decrease in numbers of personnel trained in preventive services can only result in increased cost and increased burden to the economy. I urge that the amounts authorized be appropriated.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, THE SCHOOL OF HYGIENE AND PUBLIC HEALTH: ITS ROLE AND PROGRAMS IN THE SEVENTIES

When the School of Hygiene and Public Health was established at this University in 1916, it was a truly pioneering effort. There were no models to follow, but its architects, Dr. William H. Welch and Mr. Wickliffe Rose, were men of remarkable vision. They stressed the inseparability of research and education, already a cardinal principle of all graduate programs at Hopkins. They also defined in the broadest terms the immense scope of the fields of knowledge embraced by hygiene and public health. In their concept, "hygiene" included "... the whole body of knowledge and its application relating to the prevention and improvement of health of individuals and of the community and to the prevention of disease." They also regarded public health as being virtually synonymous with the health of the public and not limited to the control of specific diseases or health hazards. In sum, they planned for a university school of public health based upon an

*At the following universities: California (Berkeley), California (Los Angeles), Columbia, Harvard, Hawaii, Johns Hopkins, Loma Linda, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pittsburgh, Puerto Rico, Texas, Tulane, Yale.

institute of hygiene, with a multidisciplinary faculty and student body representing the biological, physical, social and behavioral sciences in which "unity is to be found rather in the end to be accomplished—the preservation and improvement of health—than in the means essential to this end." The objectives of the School were to be, and remain, the advancement of knowledge and the provision of educational opportunities for students who wish to prepare themselves for careers in the field of public health or in the sciences which are basic to it.

It is unlikely, however, that the founders of the School could have foreseen the dramatic rush of events which has overtaken our society and brought the traditional concerns and resources of the School into congruence with a large proportion of the major issues currently confronting our society. In fact, a retrospective glance at the past decade makes it clear that it is rash, in view of the revolutionary nature of today's world, to predict with any real sense of security the future demands upon and needs of a school of public health during the next ten-year period. The changing face of our society, the burgeoning population, the almost incredible rate of increase of scientific knowledge, the gross inadequacies of our medical care systems and the excursions into the unknown to seek for solutions, the recognition of the need for entirely new categories of health professionals and the impending restructuring of the so-called power structure of the health professions, the entirely new environmental problems being posed in a technological society which has literally been backed into a corner by the debris which it has been creating and ignoring for so many years, the new ethical problems which are forcing a complete reevaluation of the nature of the decision-making processes at the interface between the provider and the consumer of the product of the health professions, the social and moral issues confronting the guardians and protectors of the accumulating hordes of aging and aged populations—all these factors and many others combine to force us to recognize the futility of putting too much weight on long-term projections.

The dimensions of the health sector have changed almost as rapidly as its nature. In this country during the sixties the annual national expenditures for health have more than doubled from approximately 25 to over 60 billion dollars, and the share of the gross national product devoted to health has increased by more than 30%. Such expansion has obvious implications for the demand for trained health professionals and, even more importantly, for managerial and administrative skills to cope with this unplanned, at times chaotic, expansion. The acute shortages of health manpower are generally recognized.

EFFECTS ON SCHOOL

These political and societal changes have been reflected by dramatic alterations in the School. The student body has increased by more than 160%, the faculty has almost doubled in size, and additions to the physical plant have more than doubled the space available.

Shifts in emphases have occurred in areas of instruction and investigation partly in response to demand and partly because the availability of support made it possible to move in previously charted directions. Outstanding examples of these areas are population dynamics, chronic diseases, international health, social and behavioral sciences, medical care and hospital administration. The School has had activities in each of these areas for years but had been unable to develop them on a large scale as a result of relative public apathy.

While, from its inception, the School had been a multidisciplinary faculty, there has been a reclustering of individuals from the various disciplines as departments or other units were developed which were oriented to

problem areas rather than disciplines. It is clear that this is a transitional period in which increasing pressures will build up, forcing greater collaboration among the disciplines and among the departments and divisions of the University to work towards the solution of society's health and health-related problems. The trick will be to achieve this goal without losing the potential for developing the highly-qualified and specialized scientists essential to the realization of these solutions.

ACADEMIC CHANGES IN THE COMING DECADE

It is probable that the nature of the teaching program of the School will be drastically altered during the next ten years. Whereas the vast bulk of graduates have in previous years received the degree of Master of Public Health, the increasing trend towards departmentalization and specialization has led to the situation where the "generalist" degree is losing its appeal for many students, particularly those from the United States. Already, in response to pressures for increasing opportunities for specialized training, a new program leading to the degree of Master of Health Sciences has been instituted. It is believed that this new approach will lead to greater flexibility in the provision of graduate programs of a concentrated nature by the several departments of the School while preserving the integrity of the concept of broadening the horizons of professionally-prepared students to allow them to work effectively in the field of public health through the more generalized program provided in the Master of Public Health curriculum. While the view is somewhat murky, it seems likely that the size of the M.P.H. student body will remain at the same or a slightly higher level while there will be a considerable, possibly dramatic, number of students entering the new Master of Health Sciences program. Certainly, the increasing desire of the new generation of medical students to become involved with the community will make the School of Hygiene and Public Health an increasingly popular base for postgraduate and residency training. The same forces are at work in virtually all of the traditional health-related professions. In addition, there is an increasing demand on the part of college graduates for educational opportunities which will prepare them to play an appropriate role in the public health field. It is clear that these forces will result in a relative increase in the emphasis placed on departmental graduate training efforts at the master's and doctoral levels as well as specialized training for postdoctoral fellows, including residents in general preventive medicine.

PROGRAM EMPHASES DURING THE SEVENTIES

The very nature of the mission of this portion of the University has kept its faculty in close contact with the immediate problems of society and hence less isolated than is true of many parts of the academic world. Its greater peril lies in the ever-present possibility that the exigencies of societal problems and the demands of the public will divert the School from its equally vital role of preserving and increasing its strength in the sciences basic to public health. The maintenance of a balance among the various essential elements of the School becomes more and more difficult as public enthusiasms of the moment create excessive insistence upon the development of certain programs and lavish financial support upon them, while others of more permanent and fundamental value but of less immediate popularity are deprived of minimal sustenance. For these reasons, our first priority must be to assure the continued excellent quality and necessary quantitative growth of the nuclear elements of the School. These central areas include biostatistics, epidemiology, administration, and the environment in relation to man's health. Having emphasized this, let us look at the following nine

programs, all of which depend upon the fields of priority listed above, eight relating to areas of substance, and one to expanded responsibility in the provision of educational opportunity.

1. The organization and delivery of personal health services

This is a problem of world-wide concern and has reached crisis proportions in this country. While the School of Hygiene and Public Health is not a provider of such service, it has been concerned since its establishment with the study of systems of medical and health care. The past decade has seen the development of a Department of Medical Care and Hospitals which is totally involved in the study of such systems both internationally and within the United States. The Department has played a dominant role in the Health Services Research and Development Center of the Office of Health Care Programs of the Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions. This interdivisional and interinstitutional program is an outstanding example of the pooling of University and Hospital resources to meet current community problems while at the same time providing an excellent laboratory for the faculty. Other departments of the School also are involved in studies in this field independently and in collaboration with the Department of Medical Care and Hospitals. Among these are the Departments of Behavioral Sciences, Biostatistics, Epidemiology, International Health and Public Administration. The obvious great need for persons to work in the field as administrators and investigators assures the continuation of strong academic programs as a major emphasis for the foreseeable future.

2. Environment and health

It is hardly necessary to belabor the importance of this general field. While much of the current conversation and proposed solutions to our problems are overly simplistic, there can be no doubt that man, if he is to survive, must secure more knowledge about human ecology and how both man and his environment can be controlled. The School has great strength in those departments with special interest in the environment. The departments almost totally involved are Environmental Health, Environmental Medicine and Radiological Science. The Departments of Epidemiology, Pathology and Public Health Administration, including the Operations Research unit, also have responsibility for and interest in this matter. While the mobilization of resources within the School for the purposes of both research and training has already started, the next decade should see a much better integration of these activities at inter- and intra-divisional levels. There can be no doubt this will be an expanding activity in the years ahead.

3. Population dynamics

Recognized generally as possibly the greatest single problem facing mankind, this activity has become a major commitment of the School during the past decade, though research and teaching in some aspects of population dynamics has been carried out since the 1920's. The Department of Population Dynamics has three major units with responsibilities in demography, program administration and reproductive physiology. The Departments of Biostatistics, International Health, Maternal and Child Health and Public Health Administration also have concerns in the field, collaborating to various degrees with the Department of Population Dynamics in the teaching program and, either independently or in concert with that Department, prosecuting studies related to population problems. Efforts are under way to bring together the departments most involved into a Center which will more effectively coordinate their activities and define their respective roles. Many opportunities exist in this field for collaborative effort across divisional lines. Work in Population

Dynamics will inevitably be a top priority endeavor of the School for decades to come.

4. Administration

A Department of Public Health Administration has existed since the formation of the School. Historically, it has had periods of growth, particularly in specialty areas, followed by the splitting off of the following separate departments: Behavioral Sciences, Chronic Diseases, International Health, Maternal and Child Health, Medical Care and Hospitals, Mental Hygiene and Population Dynamics. All of these Departments are basically specialized units of Public Health Administration. While Public Health Administration retains its fundamental responsibility for being a resource for expertise in management skills and the principles of administration, it is also that one Department with program orientation that retains a broad, general interest in public health without specialized content area, methodologic or geographic limitations. The Department has faculty groups with skills in public health nursing, operations research and systems analysis, economics, education and general administration and should increasingly provide the instruction in administration for all of the departments with program content. Meanwhile, it is developing a program in comprehensive health planning in collaboration with the Departments of International Health and Medical Care and Hospitals. With the big demand for health manpower in the fields of Health Services Administration, Health Research Administration, Comprehensive Health Planning, Environmental Health Program Administration and General Public Health Administration, there is of necessity a very high priority assigned to the strengthening of this Department and the broadening of its programs of research and training.

5. Nutrition

Possibly the most illustrious and influential research work done in this School over the years was done in the field of nutrition under the direction of Dr. Elmer V. McCollum. The Department of Biochemistry, of which Dr. McCollum was Chairman for many years, has continued its endeavors in this field and today is involved in studies of animal and human nutrition of tremendous potential significance. More recently the Department of International Health, because of the overwhelming importance of nutrition as a world-wide program, has inevitably become involved in nutritional studies. The public awareness of nutritional problems has again focused attention on research and education in this field and, with the combined strength of faculty in these two Departments, there will be an increasing emphasis in this area over the coming years.

6. Social and behavioral sciences

In the Welch-Rose report it is stated, "When one considers the many points of contact between the modern social welfare movement and the public health movement, and to what an extent social and economic factors enter into questions of public health, it is clear that an Institute of Hygiene must take full cognizance of such factors and that students of social science should profit by certain opportunities in the Institute, as well as students of hygiene by training in social science. . . . Particularly over the past decade this School has been fortunate in attracting a distinguished faculty group with backgrounds in the social and behavioral sciences. The focus of work in the behavioral sciences has been reflected by the creation of a Department of this name. The faculty of roughly half of the Departments of the School include individuals from such social science backgrounds as sociology, anthropology, social demography, social psychology, political science, ecology and ethology. Obviously our well-known Department of Men-

tal Hygiene has had an important role in this field. The faculty of this School have been deeply involved in the development of the Center for Urban Affairs and the Chairman of the Department of Behavioral Sciences is also the Director of that Center. The imperative requirement for the involvement of individuals with these interests and backgrounds in the understanding and solution of human health problems is indisputable. In view of the increasing recognition of this need, it is essential that strength in this area be fostered in the years ahead.

7. Maternal and child health

The importance of work in the field of maternal and child health has long been recognized, and while the nature of the health problems has changed as many of the communicable diseases have been controlled if not conquered, it still remains a matter of utmost national concern. Virtually each President in recent times has referred to this field as a priority item of Federal Government responsibility in his messages to the Congress. The work in this Department must be expanded in the 70's, if the School is to meet its obligations nationally and internationally.

8. Genetics

This institution has had an interest in genetics *ab initio*. There has been ongoing research on a gradually increasing scale for the past several years. The interest is spread over several Departments with faculty competence in such areas as epidemiologic genetics, cytogenetics, population genetics, and the biochemistry and immunology of genetics. Members of the faculty of this School have collaborated with representatives of the other divisions of the University in providing training opportunities in the field of human genetics. With the rapid advances now occurring in this field and as knowledge with practical application begins to emerge, there will be increasing concern in this School for investigations in genetics and the applications of new findings to our population as this becomes feasible.

9. Extension of educational opportunities

Every effort is being made to develop degree program opportunities for individuals currently working in the various health agencies in this region. Such opportunities would involve the enrollment of professional workers in health departments and other health agencies in part-time degree programs which could be completed in a two to three-year period. The first effort will be made in all likelihood in the provision of a program for individuals in the Washington, D.C., area. Possibly half of the actual course work would be carried out in facilities of the District of Columbia Department of Health. The remainder of the work, primarily elective course work, would be given within the School of Hygiene and Public Health. If this proves as successful as seems probable, this would be a continuing effort and it is possible that similar arrangements might be made for work in other locations as well. Our faculty look upon this as one of the most exciting developments in recent years and it is probably the most appropriate and effective type of contribution which this School could make to this and the surrounding communities.

PHYSICAL PLANT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SEVENTIES

Despite major additions to the School of Hygiene and Public Health during the 60's, bringing the total available space to nearly 200,000 net square feet, the rapid growth in the size of the faculty and student body has already outstripped the capacity of the physical plant. There are currently over 20,000 net square feet of space being rented in buildings outside the main facility. Qualitatively there are major problems as well. Plumbing and heating systems in the orig-

inal building are outmoded and there is no architectural provision for air-conditioning. Over half of the space in the building is devoted to wet laboratory activities for which the building is no longer well suited and for which no alternative space is provided in the newer areas of the building. There is therefore need for additional space to accommodate the increasing student body and faculty. This would be in the form of classrooms, offices, student studies, teaching laboratories and service facilities. In addition, such new ongoing activities as research in genetics, human nutrition, reproductive physiology, environmental health and medicine, virology and immunology will demand expanded laboratory and animal facilities. The solution is the development of a new building devoted primarily to modern laboratory facilities and renovation of the original building with the provision therein of offices and teaching facilities.

FACULTY ADDITIONS DURING THE SEVENTIES

Recognizing the growing fiscal constraints, it is somewhat alarming to consider the increases in faculty which will be required to cope with the anticipated increase in student enrollment and to maintain a favorable faculty-student ratio, to develop research activities in certain essential areas and to maintain our current leadership position among schools of public health. The following table sets forth, by Department, rather modest estimates of these requirements:

Department	Current positions	Estimated number of new positions	Estimated total 1979-80
Behavioral sciences.....	5	22	27
Biochemistry.....	10	2	12
Biostatistics.....	13	8	21
Environmental health.....	2	5	7
Environmental medicine.....	25	6	31
Epidemiology.....	36	10	46
International health.....	22	2	24
Maternal and child health.....	16	6	22
Medical care and hospitals.....	15	10	25
Mental hygiene.....	9	3	12
Pathobiology.....	50	4	54
Population dynamics.....	12	8	20
Public health administration.....	16	10	26
Radiological science.....	33	4	37
Total.....	264	100	364

THE SIZE OF THE STUDENT BODY DURING THE SEVENTIES

The School has been in a rapid growth phase during the past decade. While this has inevitably brought certain stresses to bear on the institution, adjustments have been made. Assuming the availability of funds, faculty and space, the further enlargement of the student body envisioned below should be more readily accommodated than that of the recent past.

Degree program	Enrollment 1968-69	Projected enrollment 1979-80
Master of public health.....	96	125
Doctor of public health.....	23	60
Master of science.....	30	50
Doctor of science.....	57	100
Doctor of philosophy.....	57	125
Master of health sciences.....		125
Special students ¹	45	100
Total.....	308	685

¹ Includes postdoctoral fellows and general preventive medicine residents.

These estimates do not include degree candidates in such programs as may be developed at sites outside the School. Conceivably this could lead to the graduation of 25 to 50 additional students per year at the master's level.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

Much has been said about the past rapid expansion of the size and scope of the School's

activities during the past decade. It was emphasized that this was brought about in response to public demand. It also should be made clear that it was possible only because this demand was reflected in governmental financial support in the form of fellowships for students, general institutional support and research and training project grants. In effecting these responses, the School has been forced to take calculated risks in financing. In this decade, its annual expenditures have increased 460% as compared to an overall University increase of 330%; the historic value of its endowment funds has increased by only 20% in contrast to an increase of 58% for the University at large; and the School now receives approximately 86% of its revenue directly or indirectly from the Federal Government, in comparison to 53% for the University as a whole. It is obvious that such dependence on Federal funds, a large portion of which are derived from restricted grants, jeopardizes the ability of the School to maintain its independence in the establishment of its own academic priorities. If it is to remain an independent private institution, a more favorable ratio of unrestricted private support to public funding must be secured.

HIGHWAY SAFETY—A COMMENTARY

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year now I have inserted into the RECORD a number of articles to bring to the attention of the American people the appalling slaughter and the unending, mounting carnage which occurs, not on the battlefields of Vietnam, but on our Nation's highways. In 9 years of the Vietnam war, 39,979 Americans have been killed. This same period of time has been marked by 437,000 highway deaths. In this year of interest in preserving our Nation's resources, what resource is more valuable—and more necessary to be preserved—than that of human life?

Today's offering, written by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, appeared in the New York Times on July 5, 1970. Dr. Rusk states with strong evidence that—

The No. 1 culprit in automobile accidents is the drunken driver. The National Safety Council reports that, during 1969, drunk drivers killed 25,000 people and caused 800,000 accidents.

Dr. Rusk also questions, with good cause, the standard used in most States to determine whether or not a driver is legally drunk. This generally accepted standard, he says, is the "presence of an alcohol concentration in the blood of 0.15 percent or higher by weight in the bloodstream." Though this figure may sound acceptable for determining the point of being legally drunk, many medical experts would disagree. Facts have shown:

The odds of becoming involved in an accident increase astronomically when the alcohol-blood level goes above .05 percent.

Since the waste of lives and resources due to the menace of drunken driving was brought to my attention in hearings before the House Public Works Committee, on which I serve, I have been looking for ways to bring attention to this sense-

less and avoidable tragedy of more than 50,000 highway deaths yearly.

It is my hope that Dr. Rusk's informed commentary will be read and well heeded. These needless highway tragedies must be reduced in their rate of occurrence; and if more people present these facts to the media, and focus needed attention to this serious matter, I feel that the situation can indeed be ameliorated.

I highly commend this thought-provoking article to the attention of my colleagues:

DEATH ON THE HIGHWAY—DRUNKEN DRIVER STILL NO. 1 CULPRIT AS FOURTH OF JULY TOLL IS RECORDED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

This weekend on the highways is like Tet in Vietnam or the opening day of deer season in the Adirondacks. It is open season for death. The National Safety Council estimated that from 6 P.M. Thursday until midnight tonight there will have been 560 to 660 traffic deaths and 27,000 to 31,000 injuries. Over the Fourth of July weekend in 1969, 609 persons were killed on the highways and 28,000 had disabling injuries.

Last year's tally also showed that 183 drowned, 36 died in small-plane accidents and 10,000 suffered from fireworks injuries.

In Vietnam, a total of 39,979 American men died in nine years of the war. During the same period in the United States, the automobile accounted for 437,000 deaths. The injuries in Vietnam numbered 263,000, there were 138 million disabling highway injuries at home. During its 70-year history, the automobile has taken 1.75 million lives—far more than from all the wars in America's history.

The No. 1 culprit in automobile accidents is the drunken driver. The National Safety Council reports that, during 1969, drunk drivers killed 25,000 people and caused 800,000 accidents. Especially tragic is the fact that much of the annual loss of life, limb, and property damage on the highway involves completely innocent persons.

INNOCENT VICTIMS

One medical examiner has estimated that 44 per cent of the drivers killed were innocent victims of drunken driving. The social drinker in the past has been labeled as the culprit in the drinking-driver problem. However, people arrested for drunken driving typically are social drinkers who have had only a couple of drinks. But the majority of such drivers are hard-core alcoholics of which there are from five to six million in this country.

In 1968, a study made by Dr. William Haddon and his colleagues of the National Safety Bureau detailed the most relevant data ever gathered about the effects of alcohol on the drunken driver problem. The Haddon Report indicated that the major proportion of drinking drivers involved in accidents have a high blood alcohol level.

Workers in the field have been intrigued by the standard still used in most states in determining whether a driver is legally drunk—that is the presence of an alcohol concentration in the blood of .15 per cent or higher by weight in the blood stream. For instance, in order to reach a level of .15 per cent or higher in the blood of a man weighing 190 pounds, one would have to drink 10 ounces of 80-proof liquor in one hour on an empty stomach or 12 ounces on a full stomach.

Obviously, most social drinkers would be flat on their backs at that level. Thus, actual measurements of blood-alcohol concentrations in accident subjects refute the belief that people arrested for drunken driving tend to be "ordinary," or "social," drinkers. Ac-

tually, more than half of all drivers arrested for this offense have blood-alcohol concentrations of .20 per cent or even higher.

THE ODDS INCREASE

Conversely, it has been established that the odds of becoming involved in an accident increase astronomically when the alcohol-blood level goes above .05 per cent. Many European countries have adopted .05 per cent as the point at which a person is legally drunk. That is about four ounces of 80-proof an hour for a 190-pound man on an empty stomach, and about six on a full stomach. By comparison, one state in the United States—Utah—has .08 per cent. A few have .10 per cent and most others have .15 per cent.

The Advertising Council, in behalf of the National Safety Council, has mounted a campaign this year that goes far beyond the old premise of the past. "If you drink, don't drive." Obviously, this kind of a slogan is unrealistic and ineffective. This year the campaign theme is, "Scream Bloody Murder." The publicity copy sardonically thanks the drunk drivers "for all they've done for us." It goes on to say:

"They've helped eliminate overcrowding in our schools—by killing and injuring our children; they've brought families together—in hospital rooms and at funerals, and they've added an unforgettable red color to our highways. Drunk drivers have killed more Americans than World War II. Close your eyes and pretend you're driving a car. Now you can see how a drunk driver does it."

This is a sad weekend for at least 100,000 mourners of the dead and families of the injured. The tragedy is that it is all so useless and preventable. In our society, we need not put our shoulder to the wheel but put sanity, sobriety, common sense and just plain old-fashion courtesy behind the wheel.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND OCEANOGRAPHY

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last week the administration sent to the Congress reorganization plans Nos. 3 and 4, to create an Environmental Protection Agency and a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. I want to take this opportunity to commend the administration on both of these monumental reorganization proposals which would give greater control over and direction to our national land-sea-air environment programs. The administration has pledged that this will be both a decade of Government reform and a decade of the environment, and these two plans reflect the depth of our commitment to both of those goals.

I am particularly interested in reorganization plan No. 4 to create a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration because this is an idea which I have long favored and supported. You will recall that on January 11 of last year a report entitled "Our Nation and the Sea" was released by the President's Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources, under the able leadership of Julius A. Stratton. The report was the culmination of a 2-year study authorized by the 89th Congress in the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-454).

One of the most important and urgent recommendations of the Stratton Com-

mission was the creation of a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency—NOAA. In the words of the report:

We believe that it will mobilize the resources of our government in the most effective manner to lend strength and power to the Nation's marine commitment. The incremental cost in taking prompt action for consolidation will in itself be relatively small. The added effectiveness for the fulfillment of the national program should be enormous.

The Stratton Commission noted that marine programs are presently scattered throughout some 23 departments and agencies of our Government and this made impossible any kind of unified national thrust in this area. Again quoting from the Commission report:

Marine missions have proliferated throughout the Federal Government, but most programs are too small to achieve real effectiveness. There are voids and overlaps. . . . The Commission finds that the present Federal organization cannot meet the changing, broadening aspects of marine affairs. . . . A new, strong Federal focus for marine activity is essential to a national ocean effort.

Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to read that report shortly after its release and I was both impressed and excited by its tone and thrust. As early as February 5, 1969, in remarks delivered to this Chamber, I made the following statement:

At a time when Executive reorganization is receiving such widespread attention, it is incumbent upon us in the executive and legislative branches to give careful and immediate consideration to proposals such as those made by the Stratton Commission. . . . I think we should turn our immediate attention to the Commission's proposal to establish the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency to coordinate our efforts in this area.

On April 29, 1969, the Oceanography Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee began a comprehensive series of hearings on the Stratton Commission report and specific legislation to establish a national marine program and agency. On Wednesday, May 7, 1969, I was privileged to testify before that subcommittee and lend my full support for a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency to coordinate and direct our national marine policy. All told, the subcommittee heard from 92 witnesses in 27 public hearings which were concluded in October of last year.

In his reorganization message to the Congress, the President acknowledges his indebtedness to the Oceanography Subcommittee and its exhaustive hearings. I too want to commend the subcommittee on its diligent efforts, and I particularly want to single out its distinguished chairman, Mr. LENNON, and its distinguished ranking Republican, my good friend and colleague, Mr. MOSHER. They have worked closely together in a bipartisan spirit for the implementation of a national marine program and NOAA, and it is obvious from this reorganization plan that their efforts have been rewarded.

While the administration's proposed NOAA is not, in every respect, identical to the NOAA envisioned in the Stratton Commission report or the committee's bill, the similarities are striking and significant, both with regards to its mission and composition. The main differ-

ences include placing NOAA under the Department of Commerce rather than making it an independent agency, and excluding the Coast Guard as one of its components. Without the Coast Guard, the Environmental Science Services Administration—ESSA—with its 10,000 employees would form the backbone of NOAA—70 percent of NOAA's personnel strength. Since ESSA is already a part of the Department of Commerce, it is only logical that the new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration would be placed under that same roof.

The other components of NOAA are virtually the same as those proposed by the Stratton Commission including elements of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the marine sport fish program of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Marine Minerals Technology Center, the Office of Sea Grant Programs, elements of the U.S. Lake Survey, the National Oceanographic Data Center, the National Oceanographic Instrumentation Center, and the National Data Buoy project.

I think it is important to note that in his message, the President carefully avoided making the claim that this reorganization plan was either perfection or panacea. In his words:

The reorganizations which I am here proposing afford both the Congress and the Executive Branch an opportunity to re-evaluate the adequacy of existing program authorities involved in these consolidations. As these two new organizations come into being, we may well find that supplementary legislation to perfect their authorities will be necessary. I look forward to working with the Congress in this task.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak for most of my colleagues in saying that we too look forward to working with the Executive on any supplementary legislation which may be deemed necessary to perfect the authorities of both EPA and NOAA. At the same time, we are indebted to the President and his advisory council on executive organization—the Ash Council—for the leadership they have demonstrated in truly making this a decade of both Government reform and the environment. Reorganization plans Nos. 3 and 4 have been brilliantly conceived, and upon their approval by this Congress, I am confident that they will be masterfully executed. In the words of the President:

The Congress, the Administration and the public all share a profound commitment to the rescue of our natural environment, and the preservation of the Earth as a place both habitable by and hospitable to man. With its acceptance of these reorganization plans, the Congress will help us fulfill that commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in this body to join with me in lending their full support for these far-reaching and vital reorganization plans.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

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

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the third full week of July marks the 12th an-

nual observance of Captive Nations Week. I join my colleagues in Congress, the people of the Fourth District of Kansas, and the rest of the Nation in commemorating July 12-18 as the national observance of this week.

Since its establishment in 1959, Captive Nations Week has become a significant part of American national life. Each year at this time Americans everywhere hold appropriate ceremonies, television and radio programs, and public discussion forums in remembrance of their fellow human beings trapped behind the Iron Curtain.

We, the American people, who so justly value and treasure our freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of assembly mourn the loss of these human rights and dignities by the East and Central European people to Soviet dictatorship. Through overt and covert aggression we have seen the Russian Communist subjugation of the national independence of Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Rumania. The so-called Brezhnev doctrine and the Czechoslovakia tragedy manifest for the world only another grave reminder of Russian suppression. That doctrine is a symbol of tyranny by unpopular regimes and perpetuated solely by the military force of the Soviet Union.

Despite 20 years of repression, the captive peoples continue to look to the day when they will at last be able to exercise their fundamental rights free of Soviet interference.

Let us resolve anew to never forget the millions of people who are under the yoke of communism in East and Central Europe. One of our greatest, yet most inspiring and worthy challenges, is the pledging of our Nation and our people to the cause of freedom for all mankind. America must continue to be the beacon of faith and the personification of individual rights and human dignity for the suppressed European nations.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. America's great technological achievements are perhaps best exemplified in agriculture. One hundred years ago, a farmer could support seven people with his crop yield. Today, the American farmer can feed over 40 people.

NATIONAL ARBORETUM

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, a few acres dotted with trees are an open invitation to a developer's bulldozer these days. Out in Southeast Washington lie the verdant slopes of the National Arboretum, 415

acres on which more than 7,000 species of trees, shrubs, and flowers serve for both research and education.

In years past, the arboretum has been threatened by highway schemes and housing proposals.

But now those who love nature's glories are confronted—and confounded—by another proposal, this one from Mrs. Martha Mitchell, the influential wife of the Attorney General.

In an interview published this week by *Look* magazine, Mrs. Mitchell proposes that a sort of public housing project for Cabinet officials and their families be constructed on the arboretum grounds.

The article's author, paraphrasing Mrs. Mitchell, reports that she has suggested the construction—presumably by the Federal Government—of a high-class protected compound for Cabinet families.

I doubt that Cabinet members and their wives really require a protected compound to guard them from the people. I suspect they could use more contact with ordinary citizens and their problems rather than less.

And I am certain that Martha Mitchell could not have selected a worse site for her Cabinet compound. This proposal to turn the bulldozer loose on the beautiful and nearly irreplaceable trees and shrubs of the Nation's arboretum assures Mrs. Mitchell of a place in history alongside Marie Antoinette. Let them see asphalt seems to be her attitude.

She says in the *Look* article:

They have so many acres out there, they could spare some.

They could, I suppose, but only at a sacrifice of some of the crapemyrtles and cotoneaster, boxwoods, azaleas, and 7,000 other priceless species on the arboretum grounds.

Let us hope that Mrs. Mitchell's suggestion is entirely her own and will be dismissed out of hand by all responsible officials and that we will be reassured by the highest sources that her insensitive proposal has no support within the administration.

There is value in flowers, trees, and open space; and the Nation's Capital has too little of all three. They must not be sacrificed for Mrs. Mitchell's personal public housing project—or for anyone else's.

REMARKS OF FRANK L. RIZZO, POLICE COMMISSIONER, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

(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 insert at this point in the RECORD the remarks of Frank L. Rizzo, police commissioner, Philadelphia, Pa.:

REMARKS OF FRANK L. RIZZO

(Given on Thursday, July 16, 1970, before the Select Committee on Crime, House of Representatives, U.S. Courthouse, Ninth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.)

GENTLEMEN: Thanks for the opportunity to discuss Philadelphia's teen-gang problem with your distinguished panel.

The gang problem is of immense concern to city and State officials, and I am pleased the

Federal Government has shown a similar interest.

Philadelphia's gang situation is very critical, make no mistake about it. I say this, despite the fact that conditions have improved slightly this year.

So far in 1970, 17 persons—including a nine-year-old girl sitting innocently on her front step—have been slain in gang-related rampages. For the corresponding period last year, there were 24 gang-related slayings.

In all of 1969, 41 persons lost their lives in gang incidents.

Gentlemen, this is a needless, senseless, shameful loss of life; and it must be halted immediately. Any time one of our citizens is slain, it becomes the concern of all society, not law enforcement alone.

The recent killing of nine-year-old Antoinette Williams was particularly tragic. This innocent child was cut down in the crossfire between two rival gangs—the 8th and Diamond Streeters and 12th and Oxford Streeters.

It is important that police arrested the culprits—two members of the 8th and Diamond gang and one from the 12th and Oxford Streeters. But even more important, we must take an initial step here today, to see that other Antoinette Williamses are not killed in the future. It is for us to insure that her death was not in vain.

At this point, let us examine the scope of Philadelphia's teen-gang problem, and some of its causes.

First, I view teen-gang violence as part of the overall crime problem. There is no doubt in my mind that social ills such as inadequate housing, lack of jobs and inferior education are the root of much of our crime today.

I am equally convinced that these conditions must be remedied if we are to keep crime at a minimum.

But the solutions to many of these ills must come from the community. While awaiting these solutions, I, as police commissioner, cannot sit idly by and allow the lawless to take over our schools, our streets, our city.

We must have speedy trials for hardcore gang offenders, plus swift and severe penalties for those convicted. Surely, the snail's pace of our judicial system is no deterrent to crime.

Gentlemen, we must put gang members on public notice that if they break the law, they will be punished quickly and severely.

Now, some facts about gangs.

Philadelphia has 93 organized teen-gangs, enlisting 5,300 members.

Seventy-two of these gangs are negro. The largest gang in the city—valley gang, vicinity of 25th and Diamond Streets—has 250 active members. The white gangs are located in the northeast and south Philadelphia.

Practically none of the gang-fighting is racially inspired. In most cases, negro gangs battle negro gangs, and whites move against whites.

The 93 gangs are divided into two groups, aggressive and defensive.

An aggressive gang is one that moves into or through another's territory to create or invite trouble. Defensive groups stay within their own "turf" and defend it from "invasion". Typical of these are gangs formed at public housing projects.

Many gang members have girl friends who travel with the gangs; in some cases the girls serve as weapons carriers. Often, the girls are a source of contention between gangs, leading to armed warfare.

Investigation has shown that narcotics play no part in gang activities. In many cases, when a gang member becomes hooked on drugs, he ventures alone into a career of burglary and larceny to feed his habit.

In the past, many gang members were armed with home-made zip guns fashioned

from lengths of pipe and rubber bands. Recently, however, their weapons have become more sophisticated, and it is not uncommon to confiscate pistols, revolvers, rifles and shotguns during a rumble.

Many of these guns are obtained by gang members through burglaries, and it becomes the "corner gun," passed from member to member for personal use.

Last year, police confiscated 145 weapons from gang members. These included 59 hand guns, 5 rifles, 14 shotguns, 53 knives and 14 miscellaneous weapons. The latter included pipes, car aerials, brass knuckles, lengths of chain and razors.

So far this year, 72 assorted weapons, including 43 knives and 11 pistols and revolvers, have been confiscated.

By confiscating these weapons, police saved an untold number of lives, and prevented injury to scores of citizens, young and old. Gang members range from midgets, 12 to 14 years old, to the "old heads," over 18.

Each gang is headed by a leader known as the "runner." The "warlord" is in charge of the gang while in battle. Certain influential members are known as "check holders." The rank and file are called "corner boys."

Most gangs in the city lay claim to a special "turf" which is off limits to other gangs. Intrusion means warfare.

There is no sole, logical explanation of why boys join gangs.

There is evidence, however, that boys join for status, to satisfy a longing to own or belong to something. Others are attracted by the violence generated by gangs.

In some cases, gang members cite fear or the need for self-protection as reasons for joining gangs.

While there is some doubt as to why boys join gangs, there is no doubt of the death and destruction caused by gangs.

Lest people get the false impression that police have done nothing about the gang situation, I wish to point out that arrests have been made in each of the city's 100 gang killings since January, 1967.

This excellent record is a tribute to the dogged determination of our gang control and homicide units. Our uniform policemen also deserve credit for preventing even greater gang bloodshed.

Police are fully conscious of the many problems facing the youth of our city.

In our way, through the Police Athletic League and the Police Community Relations programs, we seek to turn youngsters from a life of self-destruction to one of fruitful endeavors.

Police are involved in these programs to provide a friendly contact with the city's underprivileged.

The police maintain 22 PAL centers, most of them in gang areas. Cost to the police department: \$270,000 a year.

The police department also expends \$217,000 a year on various specialty programs for youth, including town watch, designed to forestall criminal activity; free lunches for needy children and free movies in the streets.

By now gentlemen, you realize these programs cost staggering amounts of money.

Indeed, the expenses of law enforcement and the courts in Philadelphia are so great, that we cannot bear the burden alone.

The police department budget alone rose from \$30 million in 1960 to the current \$81 million.

Last summer, the State crime commission held hearings on the city's teen-gang problem. Very little came of these hearings.

I did make one change—I added 20 men to the 43 assigned to the gang control unit. Gentlemen, this was done without State aid, purely from police department funds.

I mention this to emphasize that Philadelphia needs large and immediate infusions of State and Federal aid.

The gang-control officers are among 263 men assigned to the Juvenile Aid Division.

The current budget for the Juvenile Aid Division is \$3.1 million. Salaries for the gang control unit alone amount to \$660,000.

Gentlemen, it is clearly obvious that outside funds are needed to help combat Philadelphia's gang problem.

If additional Federal funds were available for such needs as police community relations, equipment and training, this would free blocs of funds in our budget, enabling us to hire more policemen.

I would assign two police gang control experts to each of the city's 50 most active and violent gangs. Hopefully, these experts would develop close personal ties with gang leaders, diverting gang energy into constructive pursuits.

These experts would serve as consultants to gang members, helping them obtain employment, special tutoring and, if necessary, clothing and other needs of life.

I sincerely believe that only with this helping-hand treatment, can we make effective inroads against the gang problem.

As an extension of this program, the police department might if Federal funds were available, assist needy pre-gang age children.

I envision a program whereby the police department would supply deserving families with certificates to purchase clothing, shoes, and storm gear for their elementary school children.

Too often, our police see these unfortunate children trudging to school, underclothed and unprotected from the elements. It is both the parents and the children of underprivileged families that we seek to assist in such a program.

Gentlemen, it is a sad commentary on our times, that some children miss school today, simply because they have nothing to wear. To me, this is an intolerable condition.

Some may criticize these recommendations as beyond the scope of the police department. Maybe so.

But many city agencies that should be providing this assistance are caught in the squeeze of rising governmental costs. They simply don't have enough money to get the job done.

Furthermore, the police department wishes to become involved in these aid programs. We want the public to realize that the police department has a heart, that we're genuinely interested in the welfare of Philadelphians, and not simply intent on arresting people.

Recently, the police department launched a free lunch program for needy children. I'm extremely happy with the initial success of this project, and hopeful of expanding into other neighborhoods.

However, this requires additional funds.

In my opinion, the federal government should appropriate money for programs such as this, thus affording youngsters a better chance to become the productive citizens of tomorrow.

Already, our department performs many non-police services. Last year, we handled over 800,000 non-criminal services, including 137,000 hospital cases.

The policeman's job today is very diverse, and we must respond to the various needs of all citizens, particularly those in needy areas.

These added tasks place a heavy financial drain on our department; for this reason, we urgently need federal funds.

Without doubt, we also need additional people to work closely with gangs. These workers must come from within the community. They must be people who best understand the fears and frustrations of gang members, as well as their street culture.

Here again, money is the problem.

In conclusion, I respectfully offer these additional recommendations:

1. More recreational facilities to serve as an outlet for juvenile energies.
2. Additional vocational and job training programs for our youth.

3. Improved housing and job opportunities.

4. Special counseling within the school system to divert gang-inclined youths.

Gentlemen, Philadelphia is ready for a wholesale assault on its gang problem. Won't you give us the funds to mount a full offensive?

Thank you for your interest and kind attention. I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

CHART PRESENTATIONS OF COMMISSIONER FRANK L. RIZZO PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT JULY 16, 1970

JUVENILE GANG HOMICIDES BY YEAR

Year	Number of gang homicides	Cleared by arrest
1967	12	12
1968	30	30
1969	41	41
1970 (Jan. 1, 1970 to June 30, 1970)	17	17

JUVENILE GANG HOMICIDES BY MONTH

	1967	1968	1969	1970 (January 1, 1970 to June 30, 1970)
January	0	1	5	0
February	0	3	5	1
March	2	2	1	3
April	1	4	2	7
May	0	4	7	3
June	3	1	4	3
Subtotal	6	15	24	17
July	0	6	1	
August	2	2	5	
September	1	2	1	
October	0	1	6	
November	2	2	4	
December	1	2	0	
Total	12	30	41	17

¹ 6 month total.

JUVENILE GANG HOMICIDES BY GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISION

Division	1967	1968	1969	1970 January 1 to May 1970	Total
Central	2	4	4	0	10
East	0	3	3	4	10
North central	4	8	12	7	31
Northeast	0	1	1	0	2
Northwest	1	2	8	0	11
South	1	6	7	2	16
West	4	6	6	4	20
Total	12	30	41	17	100

HOMICIDE

City	1969 homicides	Clearance rate (percent)	1970 homicides	1969 gang killings	1970 gang killings
Philadelphia	271	91.5	1176	41	117
New York	1,043	68.0	2,434	(?)	(?)
Los Angeles	377	67.5	1,500	(?)	(?)
Chicago	716	85.7	1,419	74	230
Detroit	439	81.0	1,238	(?)	(?)
Baltimore	236	86.0	95	(?)	(?)
Houston	278	84.5	153	(?)	(?)
Dallas	232	84.8	102	(?)	(?)
Cleveland	266	66.5	140	(?)	(?)
St. Louis	254	88.6	108	(?)	(?)
Washington, D.C.	292	88.0	117	(?)	(?)

¹ January to June 30.

² January to May 31.

³ No statistics available—not categorized by type.

GANG CONTROL UNIT ACTIVITIES

	1968	1969	1970 to June 30
Pt. 1 crimes	370	350	201
Cleared	267	269	130
Percent	72.2	76.9	64.7
Pt. 2 crimes	216	206	109
Cleared	182	169	83
Percent	84.3	82	76.1
Runaways Youth Detention Center	595	291	165
Cleared	376	162	108
Percent	63.2	55.7	65.5
Curfew violations	1,085	931	130
Miscellaneous investigations	17,098	18,291	8,293
Total investment	19,364	20,069	8,898

NUMBER OF JUVENILE GANGS BY GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISION

	Number
Northeast division	13
Northwest division	12
Northcentral division	17
East division	7
Central division	7
West division	18
South division	19
Total gangs	93

JUVENILE GANG HOMICIDES BY AGE OF VICTIM

Age	1967	1968	1969	1970 to June 30	Total
7 to 13		2		1	3
14		3	2	1	6
15		2	4	4	10
16	2	5	10	5	22
17	4	5	6		15
18	2	1	5	2	10
19	3	2	4	1	10
20 to 24		5	4	3	12
25 to 35		2	1		3
36 to 50	1	1	4		6
Over 50		2	1		3
Total	12	30	41	17	100

JUVENILE GANG HOMICIDES BY AGE OF OFFENDER

Age	1967	1968	1969	1970 Jan. 1 to June 30	Total
13	0	2	2	2	6
14	1	3	6	3	13
15	1	4	17	7	29
16	5	16	25	11	57
17	7	18	35	8	68
18	6	7	19	8	40
19	2	5	3	6	16
20	2	4	2	0	8
21	1	0	0	0	1
22	0	0	0	1	1
23	0	0	1	0	1
Total	25	59	110	46	240

JUVENILE GANG HOMICIDES BY WEAPON

Method used	1967	1968	1969	1970 Jan. 1 to June 30	Total
Firearm	6	18	24	8	56
Knife	6	10	17	9	42
Beating	0	2	0	0	2
Total	12	30	41	17	100

¹ Grand total, 100.

GANG WEAPONS CONFISCATED

	1969	1970 to June 30
Handguns	59	11
Rifles	5	4
Shotguns	14	4
Knives	53	43
Miscellaneous	14	10
Total	145	72

CASE STATUS OF GANG HOMICIDE ARRESTS

	1967	1968	1969	1970 to June 30	Total
Trial pending.....	0	10	59	38	107
Trial completed....	25	149	51	8	133
Total de- fendants.....	25	159	110	46	1240

* 1 defendant in 1968 case died before trial.

DISPOSITION OF COMPLETED TRIALS

	1967	1968	1969	1970 to June 30	Total
Defendant convicted.....	21	32	39	6	98
Prison.....	10	11	5	0	26
Less than 2 years.....	5	1	0	0	6
2 years or more.....	5	10	5	0	20
Juvenile institutions.....	4	9	14	0	27
Probation.....	6	5	5	2	18
Sentence deferred.....	1	7	15	4	27
Defendant acquitted.....	4	16	12	2	34
Total, trials completed.	25	48	51	8	132

TOTAL JUVENILE ARRESTS

	1969		1970 (To May 30)
	Juvenile arrests	Percent of total arrests	Juvenile arrests
PT 1 OFFENSES			
Homicide.....	146	33	59
Rape.....	162	33	42
Robbery.....	1,194	51	601
Aggravated assault.....	872	34	434
Burglary.....	2,349	54	1,054
Larceny.....	1,973	41	666
Auto theft.....	1,665	54	714
Total.....	8,366	46	3,570

SELECTED PT 2 OFFENSES

Simple assault.....	1,083	31	500
Weapons.....	621	25	288
Narcotics.....	398	10	302

Note: Total juvenile arrests, 1969 10,468—1970 to May 30 4,660.

PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION REPORT—FOUNDATION FOR THE FUTURE

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Public Land Law Review Commission, I have urged all concerned to take the long view with regard to the Commission's report, "One Third of the Nation's Land," and its recommendations. The Commission was charged with the responsibility of making recommendations for the future and not for today alone.

The report that was submitted represents a consensus of 19 people with diverse backgrounds. While this does not mean unanimity, I, for one, support the basic principles on which the Commission's report is built and virtually all of its recommendations. But we do not expect these recommendations to be implemented overnight because, aside from anything else, it will take time for people to absorb both the policy framework

and the interrelationships of individual recommendations.

In receiving the report at the White House on June 23, President Nixon recognized the potential although he had not had an opportunity to see the report and its recommendations in advance. He referred to the development of the West and the historical role of the Homestead Act, and then added:

I trust that history will record one day that this program, about one-third of the Nation's remaining land, will have the same vision and make the same contribution to the greater America that we all want for our children.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), has emphasized that we do not seek universal endorsement of the Commission's report and recommendations, but we do seek understanding. This can then be the starting point for constructive, significant revision of the public land laws.

We have been heartened by numerous expressions of editorial opinion from coast to coast taking the same approach as that taken by President Nixon and Chairman ASPINALL. I would like to cite a few of these for my colleagues.

The Philadelphia, Pa. Inquirer, on June 28, discussed the importance of the public lands and emphasized that:

The Commission's findings and proposals need to be examined carefully by Congress, by officials at all levels of government, and by conservation groups.

The Huntsville, Ala., Times had earlier on June 24, similarly analyzed the public lands and concluded with the following:

We would not agree, in all probability, with all the recommendations of the study Commission. But it does appear that the United States should be exercising greater control over, and getting a greater financial return from, its vast land holdings than it now does. Implementing these recommendations will undoubtedly require years. The Nation can afford to wait for action on some of them—but not forever.

Likewise, the Providence, R.I., Journal, on June 28, recognized that it would take time but urged, in the following words that the initiative be taken by the administration in utilizing the Commission's report as a point of departure from which to build new public land policy:

If the Commission's work is not to be wasted, then the first task for President Nixon is to assemble a small, working staff to translate into legislation whatever must be done as a beginning to set a uniform land use policy. If the report simply gets filed away, then the Commission might better have saved its time and the government money by doing nothing.

Mr. Nixon has accepted the report with expressions of gratitude and with promises to begin work to realize whatever goals are realizable. But the Commission itself said that it thinks several years will be needed to get anything done; that time factor could be multiplied into the distant future unless Mr. Nixon can get machinery started right now.

The St. Louis, Mo., Post-Dispatch, on June 25, discussed various aspects of the Commission report and pointed out the need for national parks, wilderness

areas, forests, wild rivers, and a variety of preserves. The newspaper concluded its editorial with the following suggestion that requires thoughtful reflection:

The 750,000,000 acres of public land should be used for the public good, and the optimum use for some of it may be to absorb the additional 100,000,000 population that will be with us in only 30 years. The movement of population in a free country cannot be controlled, but it can be guided and encouraged. We will have to decide very soon what we want this country to look like by the time our school children reach middle age. Is the inevitable growth to be planned, or haphazard?

The Cleveland, Ohio Plain Dealer, on June 29, observes that:

The report represents the first really serious attempt to solve a long-standing national problem, the future determination of how a great national treasure shall be administered.

The editorial then discusses the background of the present situation and the Commission's recommendations and concludes that:

There is much for Congress to do in the matter of public lands and the Commission's report points the way to start action.

Another newspaper that has seen the need for intensive study is the Dallas, Tex., News which concluded its editorial of June 29 with the following:

Public lands are resources as well as landscapes, and somewhere, Congress willing, a balance ought to be struck between the two. The new report doesn't recommend dismemberment of national parks and forests, but it does recommend much broader use than recreation in other areas.

In the last 180 years, Congress has passed thousands of piecemeal land acts. It has an opportunity now to adopt a general policy for better management and use of a land area as big as Mexico.

The Denver, Colo., Post, on June 24, noted that:

The implications of making fundamental changes in something so vast as one-third of the Nation's land area are not encouraging to rapid change.

The Post then added the hope:

With anything so broad it is certain to generate worthwhile discussion and may, as a minimum, lead to legislative correction of the most glaring misuses of public lands.

The editorial then concluded:

But the subject is one of the most vital a citizen can address himself to as a guide to the kind of future this Nation's citizens are to have. We hope the report gets wide circulation and that its specific recommendations are taken as seriously as they deserve to be.

In the State of Oregon, where over 52 percent of its land area is owned by the Federal Government, the Coos Bay World, on June 26, urged considered evaluation of the recommendations and pointed out:

The completion of the Commission report and recommendations are but the beginning of the job which was assigned our federal law makers when the Commission was established early in the last decade. There is one certainty in the tangled mass of uncertainties which various competing interests have voiced since the Commission report was announced. As yet, nothing is changed. Recommendations are not laws.

Before the Commission findings and recom-

mentations have the power either to stimulate or restrict industrial or governmental actions, more laws must be passed rescinding the old ones and creating new authorities and restraints. History cannot be unmade and recreated in a day. Laws take time—this much we know.

Two particularly perceptive editorials appeared on successive days last week carrying forth the President's thought and the hopes that we of the Commission have. These editorials in the *Grand Junction, Colo., Daily Sentinel* recognize that the report contains only recommendations most of which must be implemented through legislation and concludes:

Now, all that remains is to hold these public hearings, work out the difficulties—and find out what, if any, other laws recommended we want and need for our journey into the 21st century.

Because of the objectivity of these editorials from the *Daily Sentinel* and their appeal to reasoned consideration, I commend them, Mr. Speaker, to all my colleagues and with permission of the House, include them at this point in the RECORD.

[From the *Grand Junction (Colo.) Daily Sentinel*, July 10, 1970]

NOT DICTATORIAL

The efforts of the Public Land Law Review Committee to be equitable, fair and realistic in its proposals for modern laws are obvious.

In moving from a frontier time to the 21st Century the committee has made it clear that environmental standards must be set by law and that all users must not only pay for use of the land but must be held responsible for damage done to it.

There are ample provisions for public hearings, and for protection of existing state and local boundaries. Reasons for rulings or exceptions to rulings must be made public and explained by government officials.

Mining, lumbering, grazing and recreation interests would be regulated. All public land would be classified—again, only after public discussion—and the dominant use determined. But neither the wilderness bug nor any industry would have a chance to close out any land to one use only. Determination of multiple-use in the best interests of the land, the environment, the economy and the people of the nation would be weighed. From that weighing would come limiting or non-limiting decisions.

Withdrawals of public land would be rigidly controlled. Environmental quality would be recognized by law as an important objective of public land management.

Restrictions would be in the interests of the preservation of the land, first of all. This would mean that mining, timbering, and grazing would have use of the land, but that maintenance and restoration would be a part of the right to that use.

This does not mean that the Public Land Law Review Committee saw the remaining public land as an open playground for the recreationist. Far from it.

The members saw it as a land being destroyed by jeeps, motorcycles, litter-bugs, over-crowding in parks, expanding highways, bad hunting and fishing practices and just plain negligence.

With a steady eye on the twin goals of environment and equity, they made provisions for recreational use, too. Rationing of visitors to crowded parks and an annual fee charge (\$1 to \$3 is suggested) for all users of public land are recommended.

Now all that remains is to hold these public hearings, work out the difficulties—and find out what, if any, of the laws recommended we want and need for our journey into the 21st Century.

[From the *Grand Junction (Colo.) Daily Sentinel*, July 9, 1970]
INTO 21ST CENTURY

To nostalgic Westerners and some vested interests the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission is the end of the world.

In a sense, it is. Public land laws, a conglomeration of regulations often contradictory and frequently unrealistic, were designed to expand and develop a frontier country.

The country was big; its resources were rich; the people were few; dreams of empire were rampant. The land was there for the taking.

Nobody seemed to notice that when the frontier was gone the laws stayed on. Few saw that a burgeoning, mobile population was on collision course with an over-used, fast disappearing expanse of land.

Special interests from cattlemen to conservationists, miners to motorcyclists, fought over everything from water to wilderness. Patchwork laws protected some interests, destroyed some rights, eroded the land and built administrative empires.

Men like the Fourth District's Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall saw that the patchwork wouldn't hold. America was bulging at the seams. If she were to survive with anything like a livable environment for human beings the inequitable, leaky old garment would have to be abandoned entirely. A new, carefully woven, water-and-air-tight model for the 21st Century was in order.

That did not mean dictatorship. It meant looking at cold, hard facts and cutting the cloth to cover them.

The No. 1 objective of the report, not just stated as its goal but repeatedly backed up in every proposed new regulation, is twofold. It would preserve the environment and provide equity for all land users.

More protection for the land with more protection for the users is the result. No one—and no special interest—can, if the recommendations are followed, make wanton, unproductive use of the land. Neither can he block proper use of it by any other segment of the American public.

That, of course, takes regulation. It takes a lot of money. It is going to take a lot of discussion, a lot of public hearings, and time. Unfortunately, we haven't much time.

The reasonableness of the equitable use and preservation of Uncle Sam's resources and the preservation of Uncle Sam's resources, as presented by the report, makes it possible to hope that what protests there may be can be overcome, ironed out or met before the time is all gone—and with it, the land.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that there is disagreement on some of the recommendations is actually proof that the Commission discharged its mission faithfully. The Commission did not avoid considering complicated issues. The Commission did face the issues squarely and in each instance suggested solutions which are at the very least, starting points for administrative and legislative accomplishment.

The Commission and its very excellent staff contributed in other ways. For instance, the Commission, for the first time, attempted to translate the abstract terms we use in discussing environment and ecology, into objectives and practices for concrete management.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, because this is the first time I have delineated my thoughts on the Commission report, I want to commend the Chairman of the Commission for the manner in which he headed the group. No member was ever denied an opportunity for full expression, or to offer any proposal or amend-

ment. I do not recall one instance in which the Chairman himself offered a motion on any recommendation. Even the day-to-day procedures were determined by Commission membership. The hearings and advisory council sessions were handled in the same fair fashion.

When the Commission's recommendations are translated into administrative procedures and statutes, I hope the deliberators will utilize the thousands of pages of hearing testimony, and the tens of thousands of pages of contract studies which gave objectivity to the Commission's findings. I have served on three commissions, and have studied many other commission reports. I am confident that no other such body ever studied more exhaustively from such a complete compendium of factual material.

HOUSE REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion about the residents of the District of Columbia being disenfranchised by the absence of congressional representation.

Many people have been indifferent to the controversy because they view the District as merely a complex of marble Government buildings and spacious lawns.

To a great extent, the public displays the same myopic attitude toward the efficacy of its own congressional representation.

Mr. Speaker, it is only now that constituencies around the country are beginning to realize that because of some rigid and archaic parliamentary rules, they can as easily be ignored in the halls of Congress as a citizen without any elected officials to look after his interests.

We must restructure the House to make it more accountable to the electorate. Our aim should be not only to stave off public wrath, but also to recapture the spirit of fair play and responsiveness to the people that are the cornerstones of democracy.

We have entered the nuclear age. America is in the midst of an enormous social upheaval that threatens to undermine her great strength. Under such circumstances, every major piece of legislation takes on added importance.

Members of Congress must have sufficient time to study the nuances of important bills. It is vital that the people have access to a lawmaker's full voting record so they can, in fact, determine the direction in which their Government will travel.

For 8 years, I have watched the House make major policy decisions through teller votes which do not divulge the identities of the participants.

To put it simply, the American people deserve better. Under a truly democratic form of government, they are entitled to know how their representatives voted on the issues, whether it be Vietnam or the dredging of a local pond. The present teller system not only relieves the Congressman of a sacred ac-

countability to his constituents, but also encourages vacillation, indifference, and unreliability.

I also urge passage of proposed reforms which give committee members a larger voice in guiding and reporting out legislation. We do not want to perpetuate a system where House committee chairmen head miniature fiefdoms within the framework of what is supposed to be the world's exemplary democracy.

The provision of the reform legislation allowing television and radio coverage of committee hearings is also consistent with the overdue democratization of House procedures. This public scrutiny of the House at work will do much to expedite constructive legislative reaction to urgent public concerns.

Reform which will compel congressional leadership to be more accountable, and therefore more responsive to the American people is sorely needed.

The legislation before us is a good start toward this objective, particularly if we adopt some amendments which will require record votes where at present a Congressman can conceal inconsistencies from the public.

CONCRETE OR HUMANITY?

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

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in West Virginia's State capital of Charleston, a classic struggle has ensued over the issue of whether justice prevails when an interstate highway ruthlessly bulldozes out people's homes before they are adequately relocated. The following account in the July 13 New York Times very clearly poses the issue involved:

CHARLESTON, W. VA.: HOMES OR A HIGHWAY?
(By Donald Janson)

CHARLESTON, W. VA., July 12.—This state capital, nestled in the narrow green Kanawha Valley of the Appalachian Mountains, has become a testing ground for the Nixon Administration's policy of financing highways only after adequate replacement housing is fully ready for people living in the highway's right-of-way.

On Wednesday and Thursday of last week, the jaws of a wrecking machine crunched 19 homes to rubble after Police Chief Dallas Bias and his men broke up a man wall of some 50 protestors seeking to preserve the predominantly black Triangle neighborhood between the Elk and Kanawha Rivers in the heart of Charleston.

The protest, against clearing the right-of-way for a six-lane, combined section of Interstate 64 and Interstate 77, prompted an order Friday by Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe to halt further demolition pending a review of the routing.

The small interstate segment is part of a total of 133 miles of the 42,000-mile system held up by route disputes in urban areas.

The common past practice of road builders was to route highways through parks and low-income areas as the path of least resistance. But, increasingly, community groups are objecting.

Whitney M. Young Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, has put it this way: "Transportation planning is going to have to get away from the habit of destroying black neighborhoods to make commuting faster and easier for white suburbanites."

To balance past condemnation practices, the 1968 Highway Act required state highway agencies to consider social and environmental factors in road-routing decisions.

"Now we have to change people's minds and sell them on a relocation plan," Federal Highway Administrator Francis C. Turner said in a recent interview. "Before, we just bought property and relocation was their responsibility."

CASE IS DISMISSED

But not all state highway departments put relocation needs ahead of road building, and the Triangle Improvement Council, a Charleston agency supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity, sued the West Virginia Highway Department last year, charging failure to supply adequate housing.

Federal District Judge John Field ruled that the highway department was not required to provide a comprehensive relocation plan and dismissed the case.

The Triangle Council has appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Overruling objections by the Highway Department, Chief Judge Clement F. Haynsworth Jr. of the appeals court has ordered that a Volpe order of last Feb. 16 be filed with the court for its consideration.

The Volpe order tightens the 1968 Highway Act requirement that state Highway Departments make replacement housing available "to the extent that can reasonably be accomplished."

The Volpe order said the Administration's policy would be to grant Federal funds for land acquisition and construction "only upon verification that replacement housing is in place and has been made available to all affected persons."

The Federal Government pays 90 per cent of the cost of interstate highways.

Charleston has a severe housing shortage. Benjamin Starks, publisher of the Negro Beacon-Digest here, said Triangle residents already displaced by the highway and by a West Virginia water company filtration plant planned for the area have in numerous cases had to double up or leave town for substandard housing on the outskirts.

Plans for an urban renewal project in the Triangle also are being opposed by residents as another threat to the long-established community.

Residents want the interstate looped around the city rather than through it, but would be content with a compromise that would shift its route one block east through the Triangle. This would save many homes by routing a segment of the road over Penn Central Railroad tracks.

James D. Brame, assistant secretary of transportation for environment and urban systems, came here in May and later indicated he favored a change. Last month the City Council passed a resolution favoring the one-block shift.

Mayor Elmer Dodson voted against a re-routing.

"Right or wrong" he said, "the work of demolition is legal and will continue."

State Highway Commissioner William S. Ritchie said, "It is too late to make changes."

DELAY CITED

The one-block route shift, he said, would delay the road at least three years.

He pointed out that the city council lacked jurisdiction over interstate highway routing.

Charleston blacks, 10 percent of the 70,000 population, welcomed the Volpe order to freeze demolition.

But bitterness remained high last week-end. The Save the Triangle Committee of residents demanded that incitement to riot and all other charges against 12 members of the protesters arrested Wednesday be dropped.

Mr. Starks said this week's protest with stones and firebombs and the rocking of the

car of police Chief Bias would be tame compared with violence in prospect if demolition is resumed.

Mrs. Ruth Robinson, president of the Save the Triangle Committee, said at the street-corner news conference Friday at the scene of the razing that residents would soon begin a boycott of downtown businesses.

They charge merchants and other downtown concerns with insisting on the present route for selfish reasons, despite the uprooting of families. They contend business is putting commuting ease and the hope for greater income foremost.

Charleston merchants have worked for the present route since planning began in the 1950's.

A recent full-page newspaper advertisement by the Charleston Downtown Association says:

"The big interstates . . . nearer and nearer they come . . . making it only minutes from your home to downtown Charleston, shopping capital of West Virginia . . . like riding on a magic carpet."

An editorial page columnist for the Charleston Daily Mail, which favors the present route, wrote:

"True, for those whose homes or businesses fall prey to the ribbons of concrete, there will be heartbreak, expense and inconvenience. But until there is a better way suggested, a few always will have to pay the price of progress."

He said one advantage of constructing the big highway through the narrow city would be to provide "a long-needed shift in the city's population."

Interpreted, Mr. Starks said, this is "Negro removal."

He said blacks under the plan of the city power structure, are to be sent to a nearly completed frame housing project on Hanna Drive on the city's outskirts. He described the buildings as "barracks" alongside a creek awash with raw sewage.

Mrs. Robinson has presented the city council petitions with more than 300 signatures thanking councilmen for backing the residents' plea for a shift in the interstate route to save their homes.

One of the signers was secretary of State John D. Rockefeller 4th, who is considering running for Governor in 1972.

"The Triangle community should not be split," he said in an interview, "I wrote the Department of Transportation earlier in the year to protest the route and asked that it be shifted a block. It should never have come into this narrow, mile-wide city in the first place."

"At what price progress? The sense of community is dying in America. People are not allowed to participate in decisions that affect them absolute ways. Moving the interstate one block would give Charleston and West Virginia some attention as governments that acted humanistically."

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TAKES GIANT STEP TOWARD GIVING THE PRESIDENT IMPORTANT NEW TOOLS TO STABILIZE THE ECONOMY

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee today took a giant step toward giving the President important new tools to stabilize the economy.

The committee, on an 18-to-15 vote, kept title II in the pending Defense Production Act. This title gives the President standby authority to stabilize wages,

prices, salaries, and rents until February 28, 1971.

This legislation is one of the most important economic measures of the 91st Congress and the Banking and Currency Committee is to be commended in the highest terms for taking this forthright and courageous action. The committee has recognized the seriousness of the Nation's economic ills and has let the American people know that Congress is willing to take concrete action.

This legislation will give the President the power to bring about a more stable economy and to put an end to the disastrous combination of inflation and recession which is plaguing the entire Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that the President has not spoken out in support of this vital measure. It is equally regrettable that the members of his party in the Congress are not putting their weight behind the legislation.

This morning, the effort to strike the standby wage-price authority from the bill was defeated on an 18-to-15 vote—with all 18 votes coming from the Democratic members of the committee. It is unfortunate that not a single member of the minority cast a vote in favor of giving the President standby authority to stabilize prices and wages.

Next Tuesday, I understand that the committee will complete markup of the Defense Production Act and I hope that the standby authority is retained in the final version of the bill. Today's 18-to-15 vote is a firm indication that the committee will so act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MATSUNAGA (at the request of Mr. Boggs) for today, on account of illness.

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. MILLER of Ohio), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 60 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. McFALL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BOLAND, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENNETT during consideration of H.R. 17654.

Mr. WOLFF during consideration of H.R. 17654.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. WYDLER in three instances.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. BUSH in two instances.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. BUTTON in three instances.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. HUNT.

Mr. QUILLEN in four instances.

Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. ROBISON.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in two instances.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. GUDE.

Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. DEVINE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) and to include extraneous material:)

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. BINGHAM in five instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. LEGGETT in two instances.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. OTTINGER in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. BRASCO.

Mr. UDALL.

Mr. MEEDS.

Mr. DENT in two instances.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. RODINO in three instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. McFALL in two instances.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 26. An act to revise the boundaries of the Canyonlands National Park in the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 27. An act to establish the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Arizona and Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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. 7517. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide cost-of-living adjustments in cash relief payments to certain former employees of the Canal Zone government, and for other purposes.

H.R. 11766. An act to amend title II of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1520. An act to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers.

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution to create a commission to study the bankruptcy laws of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 20, 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:

2218. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting copies of a Presidential determination authorizing an increase in military grant assistance to a country in Asia, pursuant to sections 610 and 614(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, and the third proviso of the Military Assistance paragraph of title I of the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Act, 1970; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2219. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for employment within the Environmental Protection Agency of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2220. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting requesting an extension of the filing date for a report required by law appraising the health profession educational assistance and nurse training programs under the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARMATZ: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 15770. A bill to provide for conserving surface waters; to preserve and improve habitat for migratory waterfowl and other wildlife resources; to reduce runoff, soil and wind erosion, and contribute to flood control; and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Problems confronting the Federal Aviation Administration in the development of an air traffic control system for the 1970's (Rept. 91-1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3978. An act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the na-

tional marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1971 (Rept. No. 91-1309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FLOOD: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 18515. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1310). 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. BOLAND (for himself, Mr. CONTE, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. CAREY, Mr. CARTER, Mr. DEL CLAWSON, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KEITH, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WYMAN):

H.R. 18497. A bill to provide for an equitable sharing of the U.S. market by electronic articles of domestic and foreign origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 18498. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Big Thicket National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 18499. A bill to amend section 700 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for violations of the flag code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. LENNON, Mr. RUTH, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. FOUNTAIN):

H.R. 18500. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to authorize the sale of tobacco acreage allotments under certain conditions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 18501. A bill to reduce the maximum alternative source interest rate for certain emergency loans under title III of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 18502. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to make its benefits available to certain areas of extra high unemployment, to authorize additional funds for such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. BARRING, Mr. FREY, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 18503. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 18504. A bill to authorize special appropriations for training teachers for bilingual education programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 18505. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide grants to States for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of low-cost meal programs, nutrition training and education programs, opportunity for social contacts,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 18506. A bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 18507. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 18508. A bill to provide that Federal assistance to a State or local government or agency for rehabilitation or renovation of housing and for enforcement of local or State housing codes under the urban renewal program, the public housing program, or the model cities program, or under any other program involving the provision by State or local governments of housing or related facilities, shall be made available only on condition that the recipient submit and carry out an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 18509. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States develop and carry out intensive local programs to detect and treat incidents of lead-based paint poisoning; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 18510. A bill to provide for amortization of railroad grading and tunnel bores, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 18511. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Metropolitan Drug Addiction Commission to coordinate and make more effective in the New York metropolitan area the various Federal, State, and local programs for the control, treatment, and prevention of drug addiction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 18515. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CAREY, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. HORTON):

H.J. Res. 1305. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New Jersey and New York for certain amendments to the Waterfront Commission compact and for entering into the Airport Commission compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. McKNEALLY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. WYDLER):

H.J. Res. 1306. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New Jersey and New York for certain amendments to the Waterfront Commission compact and for entering into the Airport Commission compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. FREELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MINISH, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. ROE, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.J. Res. 1307. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New Jersey and New York for certain amendments to the Waterfront Commission compact and for entering into the Airport Commission compact, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.J. Res. 1308. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period August 11 through 18, 1970, as "Law and Morality Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.J. Res. 1309. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.J. Res. 1310. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.J. Res. 1311. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriation of funds to assist school districts adjoining or in the proximity of Indian reservations, to construct elementary and secondary schools and to provide proper housing and educational opportunities for Indian children attending these public schools; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FALLON, Mr. FISH, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H. Con. Res. 633. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress relating to films and broadcasts which defame, stereotype, ridicule, demean, or degrade ethnic, racial, and religious groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HAYS, Mr. HICKS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WAGGONER, and Mr. WOLFF):

H. Con. Res. 684. Concurrent resolution relating to treatment and exchange of military and civilian prisoners in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GHAIMO, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. LOWENSTEIN):

H. Con. Res. 685. Concurrent resolution relating to treatment and exchange of military and civilian prisoners in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. CAREY, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. GRAY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PIKE, Mr.

ROGERS of Colorado, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. STEED, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. WYATT):

H. Con. Res. 686. Concurrent resolution relating to treatment and exchange of military and civilian prisoners in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (for himself, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. REES, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. VANNIK, and Mr. YATRON):

H. Con. Res. 687. Concurrent resolution relating to treatment and exchange of military and civilian prisoners in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. WOLD, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN):

H. Con. Res. 688. Concurrent resolution relating to a national Indian policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H. Res. 1145. Resolution providing funds

for the operation of the Select Committee on Small Business; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Res. 1146. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 1147. Resolution relating to certain allowances of Members, officers, and standing committees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 18512. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Severa Salonga Virag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 18513. A bill for the relief of Col.

Paul E. Greiner, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 18514. A bill for the relief of Luella M. Freeman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

544. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, Hometown, Ill., relative to captured American and allied fighting men and those missing in action in the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

545. Also, petition of Local No. 1271, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers Union, Lawrence, Mass., relative to the proposed merger of Northwest Orient Airlines and Northeast Airlines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

546. Also, petition of John C. Moran, et al., Greenville, N.C., relative to appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court and other Federal benches; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, July 16, 1970

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in whose name this Republic was born, and by whose spirit it has been guided, open our minds once more to Thy truth. Preserve us from contentment with things as they are and give us wisdom to strive for life as it ought to be. Create in us the qualities of manhood which fit us to be directors of the Nation's destiny. Qualified by Thy grace, bless this Nation and make it a blessing to the whole world. Hear and answer our prayers, uttered or unexpressed, and grant that our private lives and public actions may be consistent with our prayers.

Through Him whose name is above every name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. MIKE GRAVEL, a Senator from the State of Alaska, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GRAVEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of

the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 15, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) and the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION ON THE RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 3274.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. GRAVEL) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3274) to implement the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral

Awards which was on page 1, line 4, strike out "of" and insert "on the".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Chair now recognizes the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), for a period of not to exceed 1 hour.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, before I address myself to the subject matter I shall speak on this morning, I ask unanimous consent that Walter Planet, a congressional fellow, assigned to the Committee on Public Works, have the privilege of the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4092—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON FUELS AND ENERGY

FEDERAL FUELS AND ENERGY COMMISSION URGENTLY NEEDED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in these troubled times, we are a nation which seems to move from one crisis to another.

The crisis of which I shall speak today is a real and genuine one. It is not synthetic. It is not one that has been created. It has developed with the growth of our complex society. It is a crisis that faces approximately 205 million men, women, and children in the United States at this time of speaking.

What we do about facing up to the problem will, in some degree at least, cause the crisis to diminish or to continue. If we fail to affirmatively work on the problem we will have a crisis that