

are the preserves for the United States captive nations.

LEIGH STEINBERG

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have on a number of occasions over the past few weeks commented on the distressing events which threaten to destroy our universities as sanctuaries of free inquiry.

I am pleased to learn of the election of Mr. Leigh Steinberg to the office of student body president at the University of California, Berkeley. The newly elected president has clearly stated the need for reform and change, but reformation within the system, not destruction from without.

I am hopeful that Mr. Steinberg will be able to rally the student body at Berkeley to effect the much needed reforms while at the same time insuring the continued function of the university as a bastion of free intellectual inquiry and search for truth.

I enclose for the benefit of my colleagues a statement by Mr. Steinberg and a recent news article commenting on the election:

STATEMENT OF LEIGH STEINBERG, ASUC PRESIDENT

Two months ago, amidst the teargas and windowbreaking of the anti-ROTC demonstrations, a group of students got together and decided that there had to be a better way for the achievement of social justice. It became clear to us that the current round of skirmishes was not only morally reprehensible, but that they were counterproductive. We formed the nonviolent action party and pledged ourselves to find a creative alternative to the endless cycle of violent confrontation. These efforts culminated in the recent ASUC elections in which we were able to elect all five of our executive candidates and seven of our ten Senate candidates. On that ballot was a referendum which we sponsored by gathering 3,000 signatures, which reads: "It is the sense of the associated students of the University of California, Berkeley, that we do not support those violent

actions that have recently taken place on campus and in the community and that such violent acts are wholly unrepresentative of the will of this student body." This referendum passed by a three-to-one margin.

But it is not enough to simply condemn violence. There is a new resolve today at Berkeley, powered by a vision of a more ideal society, one without foreign wars, racism, or poverty, a world of harmony and equity. To achieve this dream we are calling for a partnership between the people of the State of California and their sons and daughters on its campuses, a partnership for progress.

We are still convinced that this dream can be achieved through the existing system. We are determined to make this system work. And we will try to the best of our abilities to see that rationality and persuasion prevail over rock and bottle throwing, that non-violent, creative, constructive talent is harnessed in productive ways. We see electoral politics, lobbying, and canvassing as the proper arena for these energies.

Being over thirty is a malady which will strike all of us some day, and we feel that it is not the calendar but the spirit which is the true gauge of youth. And so, we ask today for your help, your brains, your skills, your experience, and yes, your money, to help us live up to the ideals which you instilled in us.

[From the Washington Post, July 16, 1970]

BERKELEY STUDENT HEAD IS A MODERATE

BERKELEY, CALIF., July 15.—The University of California's new student body president is clean cut, deplores violence and says campus militants have been guilty of "incredible arrogance."

"The radicals cry 'Power to the people'—but the people would like to see them shot," says Leigh Steinberg, 21.

The Berkeley campus has been torn periodically by student-police clashes since 1964 and violent demonstrations against ROTC and the U.S. move into Cambodia were going on when Steinberg's Nonviolent Action Party swept the student elections last spring.

Steinberg, who says he prefers to work within "the system" for change, defeated a coalition of blacks and Mexican-Americans and a third party of white radicals by a 3-to-1 margin.

In a typical turnout 3,900 of the school's 27,500 students voted.

"If someone wanted to end the war in Vietnam, the right way to do it would be to go into middle America and convince them," he said in an interview.

"You don't do it by throwing excrement at their cars, or spitting on the flag, or burning down the university."

"You sit down and try to reason, find things in common."

Steinberg, son of a Los Angeles high school principal, will be attending law school in the fall. He succeeds Dan Seigel, 23, fiery orator who was formally prevented from taking office by the campus administration.

Although acquitted of an inciting-to-riot charge, Seigel was suspended last year for his role in the "People's Park" riot on May 15, 1969.

"There's not going to be a revolution in our country within our lifetime," Steinberg said. "The people don't want a revolution."

"The majority of the people in this country have never heard a real argument against the war. All they've seen is placards and demonstrations."

"I have more in common with them than with the people working for the revolution," Steinberg said, although he added he opposes the war.

His election victory, he said, indicates that Berkeley students believe "society is far from ideal, but they are sick of confrontation."

THE PLIGHT OF THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 16, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, our soldiers in uniform have always received the finest medical care possible. In the field and on our bases we have insured our men proper medical attention. But, the heroes of battlefields who take off their uniforms and become veterans return to a different story. They return to a situation in which their vast contributions to society are ignored. We have relegated them to a second class citizenship as evidenced by the medical treatment we offer them in VA hospitals.

In the first 4 months of the war this year we lost over \$166,500,000 worth of helicopters. But Congress will barely allot enough money to provide \$1.20 worth of food per day per patient.

Considering the nature of many VA hospitals, it may well take more courage to be a VA hospital patient than to have fought in the war.

VA patients and staff cannot keep battling such bad odds any longer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, July 20, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Let the peace of God rule in your hearts and be ye thankful.—Colossians, 3:15.

O God, our Father, we rejoice in the dawning of another week and pray that we may be so conscious of Thy presence and so receptive to the leading of Thy spirit that we may walk more worthily in Thy wholesome ways. We know that Thou art with us and we want to feel that we are with Thee.

Deepen our faith, increase our love, strengthen our hands that we may be faithful to Thee, devoted to our country, and true to the best within us. We do not ask Thee to remove our temptations but to give us power to meet them cou-

rageously, to manage them confidently, and to master them creatively. We do not pray for tasks equal to our strength but for strength equal to our tasks; not for responsibilities we can carry easily but for an inner spirit to carry our responsibilities, however heavy.

Grant unto us such greatness of soul, such gentleness of spirit, such goodness of heart that we may do our duties with due regard for the rights of others. So may we be just and kind in all our ways and honest and straightforward through all our days.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 16, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 14452. An act to provide for the designation of special policemen at the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14453. An act to authorize the Public Printer to grant time off as compensation for overtime worked by certain employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

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

S. 1046. An act to protect consumers by providing a civil remedy for misrepresentation of the quality of articles composed in whole or in part of gold or silver, and for other purposes; and

S. 3274. An act to implement the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3685) entitled "An act to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill (S. 885) entitled: "An act to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose lineal ancestors were members of the Confederated Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias merged under the Treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Dockets No. 314, amended, 314-E and 65, and for other purposes," with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

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

S. 209. An act to amend the act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), so as to authorize the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to plan and construct museum support and depository facilities.

S. 311. An act for the relief of James Glen Ramsey;

S. 878. An act for the relief of James E. Miller;

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Donal E. McGonegal;

S. 1804. An act for the relief of William H. Morning;

S. 1830. An act to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes;

S. 2755. An act for the relief of Donald N. O'Callaghan;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of John Borbridge, Jr.; and

S. 3138. An act for the relief of Ruth E. Calvert.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, which was read, and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 16, 1970.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered and unanimously approved the work plans transmitted to you by Executive Communication and referred to this Committee, the work plans involved are, by watershed, State, and Executive communication number:

Panther Creek, Mississippi, 1741, 91st Congress;

Grand Prairie, Oregon, 2171 91st Congress; Moorhead Bayou, Mississippi, 2171 91st Congress;

Mount Hope, Kansas, 2171, 91st Congress; Simon Run, Iowa, 2171, 91st Congress;

Spring Brook, Wisconsin, 2171, 91st Congress;

Starkweather, North Dakota, 2171, 91st Congress; and

Upper Bay River, North Carolina, 2171, 91st Congress.

Yours sincerely,

W. R. FOAGE,
Chairman.

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 referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
July 16, 1970.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives on July 9, 1970, approved the following public building project:

Potomac Annex, Building 6, Washington, D.C. (Alteration).

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON,
Chairman.

WHO WILL PROSECUTE?

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

MR. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, we now have a prohibition against disclosure of airline ticket taxes—but who is going to enforce it?

In theory, at least, violations are punishable by \$100 fines.

But my staff has been frustrated in trying to find an office in our sprawling Federal bureaucracy which is willing to stand up as the enforcer.

Maybe the agencies recognize the inherent injustice of this ban, the blatant contravention of the public's right to know how much tax it must pay for air travel.

Travel agents are understandably outraged by the restriction, which took effect 19 days ago. I have just received a letter from one agent, David Peters, president of Timely Travel, Inc., of Beverly Hills, Calif., who is determined to test the constitutionality of this secrecy requirement.

On July 1, the day this restriction took effect, Mr. Peters carefully noted both the tax and the fare on a ticket he wrote for one J. Gluecksman, a passenger flying from Los Angeles to San Francisco.

Mr. Peters, who would like to know which U.S. agency is now going to charge him with this heinous offense, has graciously sent me a copy of the technically illegal ticket form.

I will try to help him out by relaying the incriminating evidence to Randolph

Thrower, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. Peters would very much like to be taken to court—because he thinks this is a fight the Government could not win.

I am confident that Commissioner Thrower will know just who it is in his sprawling agency that can accommodate Mr. Peters by taking him to court for what is technically a violation of the law but is in actuality a commendable public service.

PERMISSION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY, TUESDAY, AND WEDNESDAY

MR. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Small Business may be permitted to sit this afternoon and also on Tuesday and Wednesday during general debate.

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

MR. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it contemplated that we will get back to the reorganization bill this afternoon?

MR. EVINS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

MR. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

MR. EVINS of Tennessee. We have a number of scheduled witnesses who are invited to appear coming from a number of different places. We felt, in order to expedite the business of the committee, that we would like to have permission to have these witnesses appear and testify.

In answer to the question of the gentleman with regard to the reorganization bill, I understand it is scheduled to come up today.

I hope the gentleman will permit us to meet.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the request is during general debate. Is that correct?

MR. EVINS of Tennessee. That is correct.

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

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

There was no objection.

JUANO HERNÁNDEZ

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

MR. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce the death of a distinguished Puerto Rican, Juan G. Hernández, better known under the stage name of Juano Hernández, last Friday. Juano Hernández first achieved national stature in the leading role of the movie based on William Faulkner's "Intruder in the Dust." A leading film critic of the time wrote this comment on his performance:

Mr. Hernández, who plays the condemned Negro in Mr. Faulkner's savage story . . . gives a staunch and magnificent integrity to his role. His carriage, manner and expression becomes the bulwark of all the

deep compassion and ironic comment in this film.

Juano followed this success with many others in Hollywood and on Broadway. He won the admiration of all of us in Puerto Rico for his work as an actor, even as he won our affection with his nobility and kindness. May his soul rest in peace.

TO AUTHORIZE PREPARATION OF ROLL OF LINEAL ANCESTORS OF CONFEDERATED TRIBES

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 885) to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose lineal ancestors were members of the Confederated Tribes of Weas, Piankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, merged under the treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 314, amended, 314-E and 65, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendments, as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be inserted by amendment numbered 3 of the House engrossed amendments and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 6. Any per capita share whether payable to a living enrollee or to the heirs or legatees of a deceased enrollee, which the Secretary of the Interior is unable to deliver within two years after the date the check is issued, and all unexpended tribal and judgment funds set aside for tribal roll preparation and distribution, shall revert to the Peoria Tribe, and all claims for such per capita shall thereafter be barred forever."

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I ask the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs whether or not the amendment adopted by the Senate is germane to the bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I say it was germane to the bill in my judgment and in the judgment of the members of the committee. It is not only germane, but it is in order to this particular legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. As far as I am personally concerned it improves the bill because it applies not just to the first judgment but to any other judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

AMENDING THE 1964 AMENDMENTS TO THE ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 778) to amend the 1964 amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 778, as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the expenditure of \$850,628 of appropriated funds which were not allocated or expended prior to the expiration of the obligational authority.

The bill, S. 778, authorizes this expenditure by amending the act of August 19, 1964, Public Law 88-451, more popularly known as the 1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act. That 1964 law, provided special measures to assist the State of Alaska in its efforts to reconstruct and rehabilitate areas devastated by the earthquake and subsequent seismic waves of March 27, 1964. One of the special measures under that law was a \$25 million Federal grant for urban renewal projects in communities damaged by the earthquake.

The need for this legislation arises as a result of a misunderstanding on the financial planning for these urban renewal projects. The Alaska State Housing Authority, in response to a request of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, submitted a plan for project financing showing a partial allocation of the \$25 million and requesting the balance to be held in "reserve" for close-out accounting and contingencies.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development regional office informed the Alaska State Housing Authority that it had some reservations concerning the financial planning, but agreed with the approach outlined and recommended approval by the central office. The Alaska State Housing authority, on the basis of that endorsement, proceeded to obligate and commit all but \$850,628 of the \$25 million authorized for urban renewal projects.

Early in 1968, the Alaska State Housing Authority submitted an application calling for a portion of the funds being held in reserve. The Department of

Housing and Urban Development denied the application on the basis that the authorization and authority under Public Law 88-451 expired on June 30, 1967. The Department of Housing and Urban Development takes the position that this legislation is necessary to authorize the sums already appropriated to remain available for obligation on urban renewal projects authorized under Public Law 88-451.

Only two of the eight urban renewal projects listed in the legislation require substantial work for completion. The funds involved in this legislation are urgently needed to complete these projects. Release of these funds will assist in the release of funds under the required 10 percent matching grant by the State of Alaska. In addition, the release of these funds will help to unburden a severe financial position which has resulted from the rising costs on uncompleted construction and the accruing interest on outstanding loans.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in reporting this legislation took the position that the funds made available by this bill may be expended only on the projects specifically referred to in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, S. 778 will provide the sums already appropriated and urgently needed to carry out the intent and purpose of Public Law 88-451, although not committed by contract prior to June 30, 1967, to remain available for obligation on eight specific urban renewal projects in Alaska until completed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge and support the passage of the legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask how much in the form of actual appropriations have been forwarded to the great State of Alaska following the expiration of the funds that this bill would resurrect.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will my distinguished friend from Missouri yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri asks his question rather in the reverse.

The House authorized Federal grants up to \$25 million for urban renewal projects. The House appropriated the whole amount but of that amount \$850,648 was not spent and it cannot be spent unless we have this new authorization, because of certain conditions surrounding the authorization and the appropriation namely, that this authority expired on June 30, 1967.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman states well the purpose of this bill. However, my question was not asked in reverse nor directed toward that question as of yet. I intended to ask that question later.

Let me rephrase my question.

If I recall correctly, the Congress has properly been very generous with the State of Alaska following this bad accident of nature that they had in 1964. I have since visited the State of Alaska. I am familiar with the geological make-up that allowed this disaster to occur

I am one of those who thinks that they should have been helped. To specifically rephrase my question, and it is based upon my memory and I am seeking confirmation, we did authorize an appropriation of additional funds beyond the \$25 million in 1964, some of which were made available after the expiration date—which was in 1967—of that particular appropriation which I understand we now seek to “resurrect” by reauthorization.

Now, my question is, how many or how much additional funds were appropriated for the relief of the State of Alaska since this unfunded portion of \$850,000 presumably reverted to the United States Treasury?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is absolutely correct. Other programs were authorized and they were activated under the 1964 act. On the other hand, this is the only authorization that came under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Of this amount we have the remaining \$850,628. Now, as far as the total amount of the other, I cannot answer my colleague, but the gentleman is correct, other programs authorizing appropriations were included in the 1964 act.

Mr. HALL. I simply thought that should be made a matter of legislative record, and I am glad the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs agrees with me, even though it did not happen by the committee he chairs, or under their jurisdiction.

My next question is: Did the \$850,000 that was unexpended for any reason, revert to the U.S. Treasury as required by the original law in 1967?

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will yield further, it is my understanding that they did revert to the Treasury, but being an integral part of the original authorization, and since it could not be used for other purposes, but only for those for which it was authorized, this calls for the new authorization to take care of the remaining program that specifically relates to Housing and Urban Development.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman, and I am glad that the funds did in fact revert back to the U.S. Treasury. I have read the bill carefully. I have read the report in detail, and I understand that this reauthorizes the “unexpended portion,” and indeed that it will make even more funds available because of the matching basis, Federal versus State, and other things under the Alaska Omnibus Act that might accrue to them in addition to the \$850,000; but, my concern and the reason for asking the questions in this order is dual. First, are we not establishing a dangerous precedent for retroactivity, or as I said in the beginning, resurrecting such an authorization and making in order appropriation therefor from funds that have actually in fact reverted to the Treasury? And second, if so, why not simply authorize and appropriate new funds for this purpose?

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will yield again, in fact, this is a new au-

thorization. I think my colleague will admit that.

As far as the funds in the original authorization, the original \$25 million have all been spent except for these, and had it been possible to spend this additional \$850,628, as the Alaska authorities had planned, these funds which are urgently needed to complete the projects would have been completed in time and before the authorization expired. It seems to me we are not establishing a precedent. We would be establishing a precedent if we tried to spend those moneys without a new authorization, but inasmuch as essentially all we are doing is we are going to use the funds for the original intent and purposes, but which could not be done at the present time under the existing statute, and it seems to me that we are only being honest with ourselves and the people of Alaska in handling it in this manner.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the distinguished gentleman, and I know we will always be honest with ourselves. And I full well realize that we cannot appropriate these funds which have reverted if we did not under the wise aegis and oversight of the legislative Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have the authorization for the expenditure of these funds.

But in some of the explanatory information such remarks are made, “In order to bring about the release of the remaining funds,” such and such a bill was introduced, was passed by the other body, and this will complete that action, and so forth and so on. I hasten to say that this is not the distinguished gentleman’s committee report from which I read. It is a letter of supplication and a statement of need from the Representative from Alaska to which I refer, and I wanted to establish the fact that this is not a release of funds which have in fact reverted to the Treasury, but is the addition of further authorization, albeit it may tie in to lack of ability to use the funds by the time limit wisely established by the previous Congress.

Is that a correct statement?

Mr. ASPINALL. If my colleague will yield, that is a fair statement. Our committee took the position that these funds were to be made available only for the specific projects referred to in the bill. In other words, we made this very specific so that it would not go in the authorization previously made.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I know the situation there. I have no particular objection as to that.

I wonder if the committee has again placed a termination date on the new bill. If so, specifically, when is that termination date for the expenditure of these funds and their related funds?

Mr. ASPINALL. As I remember, the way that is written and the way that is set forth, when these particular projects are completed, and these projects are underway at the present time, and they must be completed within a reasonable time, and this is the reason for this particular sum of money.

Mr. HALL. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it would be open ended so far as the remainder of these funds as to improved renewal capacity of these particular cities are concerned, and there

would not again be a reversion to the Treasury?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct with this exception—our committee will continue its oversight to see that this is not left to be an indefinite program.

Mr. HALL. That is very reassuring and I hope we never pass open-ended legislation again.

I commend the gentleman for the original omnibus act which did set an expiration date and also the fact that these funds did return to the Treasury.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. If I may ask the gentleman from Colorado a question. Did not Alaska have 3 years in which to obligate these funds?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. As I remember the legislation, it was a 3-year period so far as that is concerned. But only two of the eight urban renewal projects listed in the legislation require substantial work and completion.

In other words, we were able under the program formerly authorized to take care of those projects that were planned but two of those were not finished.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, they had three years in which to obligate the \$25 million which was exclusively for urban renewal and it is beyond comprehension that they did not obligate these funds in that period of time.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct, if he refers to the matter of planning for projects, but the federal agency never notified the State of Alaska that the 3-year period that had been provided would run out before these two projects were finished.

Mr. GROSS. I am surprised that the State of Alaska did not inquire as to when the deadline would be for the use of this money.

Mr. ASPINALL. I think perhaps the State of Alaska did not do so because they understood that this money could be held in reserve to continue with development work that had been set forth in the planning stage.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will say that in addition to the information supplied by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the gentleman from Iowa, that the Alaska State Housing Authority did write to the then Department of Housing and Urban Development on April 1, 1966, and asked that the funds for those two cities be reserved pending final plans for their utilization.

I think there is perhaps reasonable room to believe that they were being reserved, because in April 1966 the Department of HUD stated:

Accordingly, while certain unanswered questions still exist, we agree with the approach outlined in your letter and are prepared to recommend it to our regional office.

Hearing nothing further beyond the date of expiration which, as I recall, was June 30, 1967, they presumed it was reserved, and presumably this is the basis for the committee action.

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

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

S. 778

An act to amend the 1964 amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first sentence of section 5 of the 1964 amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act (78 Stat. 505) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "except that any sums so appropriated to carry out section 53 of the Alaska Omnibus Act shall be available after such date for obligation in connection with one or more of the following urban renewal projects authorized for execution prior to June 30, 1967: Alaska R-8, Westchester; Alaska R-19, Kodiak; Alaska R-20, downtown Anchorage; Alaska R-21, Seward; Alaska R-22, Valdez; Alaska R-25, Mineral Creek; Alaska R-26, Seldovia; Alaska R-28, Cordova."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the 1964 amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act is amended to read as follows:

"TERMINATION DATE

"SEC. 6. The authority contained in this Act shall expire on June 30, 1967, except that such expiration shall not affect—

"(1) the authority conferred by section 53 of the Alaska Omnibus Act until the completion of the following urban renewal projects authorized for execution prior to June 30, 1967: Alaska R-8, Westchester; Alaska R-19, Kodiak; Alaska R-20, downtown Anchorage; Alaska R-21, Seward; Alaska R-22, Valdez; Alaska R-25, Mineral Creek; Alaska R-26, Seldovia; Alaska R-28, Cordova; or

"(2) the payment of expenditures for any obligation or commitment entered into under this Act prior to June 30, 1967."

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 778, a bill to amend the 1964 amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act.

In 1964, many areas of Alaska were severely damaged by a large earthquake. Responding to the need for urgent remedial action, the U.S. Congress enacted certain amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act. Section 4 of the 1964 amendments contained a wholly new provision—section 53—authorizing the Department of Housing and Urban Development to enter into contracts for urban renewal projects in certain communities damaged by the earthquake. The obligation authority granted in the 1964 amendments expired on June 30, 1967. As of that date, all but \$850,000 of the \$25,000,000 authorized in section 53 had been committed. In order to bring about the release of the remaining funds, S. 778 was introduced in the Senate on January 31, 1969. It was my pleasure to introduce identical legislation in the House. In November 1969, hearings were held on S. 778 before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Both the administration and the committee supported this measure, and it was subsequently passed by the full Senate. In early May, S. 778 was considered by the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the House Interior Committee and was unanimously recommended to the full committee. Later, the Interior Committee, meeting in executive session, unanimously reported S. 778 to the full House.

The chronology which I have just traced raises a question that must be

faced squarely; that is, why was the full \$25,000,000 not authorized in the 1964 amendments committed before the obligation authority expired in June 1967? It is my opinion that a completely satisfactory answer can be given to this question. In a letter dated April 1, 1968, the Department of Housing and Urban Development requested the Alaska State Housing Authority to clarify its plans relative to the composite financing and allocation of the \$25,000,000. About a week later, the Authority responded by submitting a prepared chart indicating a partial allocation of the funds and setting forth the amount of surplus money to be held in reserve for close-out accounting, or if necessary, to finance unforeseen exigencies. In late April of 1966, HUD acknowledged this report and stated: "Accordingly, while certain unanswered questions still exist, we agree with the approach outlined in your letter and are prepared to recommend it to our central office."

As a consequence of HUD's endorsement, the Alaska Housing Authority assumed the availability of the entire \$25,000,000 authorized by Congress. In view of the fact that the establishment of a reserve fund was clearly indicated in the Housing Authority's finance program, I believe that it was logical and reasonable for the Authority to assume that the funds were fully committed and, therefore, not subject to the June 30, 1967, termination date specified in the 1964 amendments. If the Housing Authority had thought for a moment that the reserve fund would be treated as if it were uncommitted, it would have been a simple matter for the Authority to allocate the remaining \$850,000 to specific urban renewal projects prior to the termination date. Given the requirements of certain project financing plans, such an allocation could certainly have been justified.

If the remaining balance of the \$25,000,000 authorized in 1964 is not soon released, part of the laudatory purpose of the Congress in coming to the assistance of Alaska's disaster stricken communities will be frustrated. Three of the original disaster projects have not yet been completed. In order to make use of Alaska's very short construction season, further work must be undertaken almost immediately. Otherwise, many of the benefits envisioned by HUD and the Housing Authority will not be realized. The remaining work includes the performance of essential tasks, such as site improvement and the acquisition of certain remaining parcels of land. These tasks must be completed if satisfactory building structures are to be provided for all persons and businesses displaced by the 1964 earthquake.

One other very important factor should also be mentioned. In actuality, we are considering a sum of money significantly in excess of the \$850,000 which remained uncommitted as of June 30, 1967. Since the State of Alaska was required to furnish a 10 percent matching grant under the 1964 amendment to the Omnibus Act, the release of the \$850,000 would result in an additional contribution of \$94,514, according to figures compiled by the Alaska Housing Authority. While the

total sum of \$945,142 would still not be sufficient to complete all the remaining work and to pay the accruing interest on outstanding loans, this money would help to alleviate the presently severe financial situation. In addition, it is expected that supplemental funds can be obtained through the use of a financing plan based on a 75 percent Federal-25 percent local division. Such a plan could yield an additional \$580,085. Thus, the release of the initial \$850,000 could generate as much as \$675,000 in further funding. I understand that without the \$850,000, it would not be possible for the cities of Kodiak and Valdez to complete the essential work which remains on the urban renewal projects already begun in these cities.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons outlined above, I respectfully urge the prompt passage of S. 778. The enactment of this measure will go a long way toward improving the economic and social conditions of many Alaskan citizens who still suffer from the ravages of the 1964 earthquake.

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

TO PERMIT USE FOR PUBLIC PURPOSE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9164) to require the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property in the State of Georgia in order to remove a limitation on the use of such property.

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

H.R. 9164

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the conveyance of certain historic properties to the State of Georgia, and for other purposes", approved September 21, 1950 (64 Stat. 896), the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to the State of Georgia all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the real property referred to in paragraph (a) of such Act of September 21, 1950, as the "Rocky Face Ridge Site" and more particularly described as that certain tract or parcel of land lying or being in land lot numbered 148, in the twelfth district and third section of Whitfield County, Georgia, containing six and four tenths acres, more or less; being the same land conveyed to the United States of America by Mattie Springfield under deed dated September 12, 1939, recorded in book 26, folio 527, in the records of Whitfield County, Georgia. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall be made subject to the condition that the State of Georgia use the property described therein for public purpose.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That the United States hereby consents to the use of the land described as the 'Rocky Face Ridge Site' in the quitclaim deed to the State of Georgia executed by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the Act of September 21, 1950 (64 Stat. 896), for any public purpose, notwithstanding the

provisions of said Act and deed limiting the use of the land to use as a part of the park system of the State. Said deed shall be deemed to be corrected accordingly, and an appropriate reference to this Act shall be noted on the records of the county in which said deed is recorded.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 9164, as amended, permits the State of Georgia to use, for any public purpose, certain lands previously conveyed to it for use as a part of its park system.

The bill involves 6.4 acres of land in Whitfield County that was designated in 1944 as a part of the Atlantic Campaign National Historic Site. Subsequently, in 1950, the site was conveyed to the State of Georgia without consideration for public use as a part of the park system. The site has been partially developed as a park and historic site and is now maintained by the State highway department, but is in poor condition and is not attractive to the general public for park purposes.

The State wishes to transfer the 6.4 acres to the State highway patrol for use as a highway patrol headquarters. Barracks and other facilities would be constructed on the site but at locations sufficiently removed from the highway so as not to detract from its park and recreational uses. The area would be renovated and maintained in a condition more attractive to the public.

To permit this use by the State highway patrol, legislation would be required because of the 1950 statutory restriction limiting the use of the area "as a part of the park system." The construction of police barracks and the use of a significant portion of the tract for these purposes would be inconsistent with that restriction.

The amendment adopted by the committee is technical in nature and accomplishes the same objective as that suggested by the Department of the Interior.

There appears to be no good reason to retain the use restriction imposed on the lands by the 1950 act, and the committee recommends enactment of H.R. 9164 to permit full utilization of the land. This would benefit both the State of Georgia and the general public.

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

The title was amended so as to read:

To permit the use for any public purpose of certain real property in the State of Georgia.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONVEYANCE TO PIMA AND MARICOPA COUNTIES, ARIZ., AND TO THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10837) to provide for the conveyance to Pima and Maricopa Counties, Ariz., and to the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., of certain

lands for recreational purposes under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I be assured, first, that there will be restrictions on the use of this land; second, that there will be a reverter clause in favor of the U.S. Government in the event the land is not so used, but is used for other than recreation; and, third, and finally, that this will not be a means of conveying property through other than the General Services Act, for housing development or by the use of entrepreneurs?

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

Mr. HALL. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ASPINALL. I can assure the gentleman that the answer is affirmative in all three instances. The basic law in this particular governs this amendment to the same.

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

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the need for additional recreational land is well known and is common throughout this Nation. The purpose of H.R. 10837, as amended, is to permit three local governmental units to acquire tracts of public land, under provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, and then through their own efforts and financial resources to develop those lands to meet the ever-increasing recreational needs.

The Recreation and Public Purposes Act permits the lease and sale of public lands to States, counties, and municipalities for recreational purposes, at reduced prices. However, that act also places an annual limitation of 640 acres upon sales to any political subdivision of a State.

In the situation before us, the counties of Pima and Maricopa in Arizona and the city of Albuquerque, N. Mex., have had large acreages of public lands under lease for several years. They now wish to further develop these lands for recreational purposes and to place upon them improvements and facilities that will involve several hundred thousand dollars of locally raised public funds. Naturally they wish to acquire title to these lands, rather than continue the present lease arrangement before committing the public money that is now available.

Maricopa County now has under lease 68,758 acres; Pima County, 3,840 acres; and the city of Albuquerque, 7,042 acres. At the present rate of acquisition—640 acres per year—it would take Maricopa County over 100 years, and Pima County, with the smallest acreage, over 6 years to acquire title to the land that is needed.

The present proposal would remove this acreage limitation and permit the two Arizona counties and the city of Albuquerque to acquire the lands without regard to this annual limitation. This would permit the orderly development of the recreational potential of the lands and would also permit these local communities to meet their growing recreational demands.

The committee adopted an amend-

ment which would authorize the sale to Maricopa County of certain lands in adjacent Yavapai County. This land has been under lease for recreational purposes by Maricopa County for several years, and there is agreement on the matter between the two counties.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to see local communities take the lead in satisfying their own recreational needs. Each of the three governmental units have firm and well developed plans for these lands, and they also have the funds available to carry out those plans.

I commend these local governments for their initiative and foresight and strongly recommend enactment of H.R. 10837, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, will an amendment be offered to the bill during its consideration today to provide a reverter clause, or is one contained in the bill? If so, I did not discover it.

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, of course, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand, that provision is contained in the original legislation. The reverter clause is in the original legislation, and also the provision to the effect that the lands involved are to be used for recreational purposes by the agencies involved forever. It is in the basic law.

Mr. GROSS. So then there is a protection as to reversion?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. What is the total value of this land?

Mr. ASPINALL. It would be very difficult to give an exact answer on the total value of the land. Part of this land, of course, is a desert land, which has come to have more value with the passing of the years. But it is part of the original area that was granted under the basic law that applies. I wish the gentleman would ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) that question.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. As the gentleman from Colorado states, it is very difficult to state the value of the land for use as park land. For park purposes the value is certainly quite a bit different than it would be for speculative housing or something of that nature. But the land is fairly close to the metropolitan area.

It is usual, and it is desired, and I think its highest and best use is for our purposes.

I would not want to leave the impression the land is not valuable. It is. If it were sold for any purpose whatsoever, it would certainly bring a rather considerable sum of money. However, I propose to the gentleman this situation too. In the event this land were sold—as the gentleman knows, there are other programs by which the Federal Government helps people to buy green spaces and so on for belts around the cities—I am sure the Federal Government would put more money out of other pockets in order to buy other land for these purposes if we do not go ahead and do it in this way.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any reason for the formula of the fair market value being used or, on the other hand, excluded from this legislation?

Mr. RHODES. Of course, if the fair market value were to be used—incidentally the land is already under use and being used for park purposes by these municipalities—the municipalities would not be able, in my opinion, to buy this land at the fair market value, because it would have to be a speculative thing. It is to be used for a park. There will be a reverter, I assure the gentleman of this. The deed will carry a reversion that in the event the land is not used for park purposes, it will revert to the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman said there will be a reverter. Does he mean the basic law will take care of the reversion?

Mr. RHODES. The basic law provides that the deed must carry a reverter clause. I assure the gentleman this will be done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think there is one question that still needs answering. Are these counties or municipalities going to reimburse the Government for this land?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the original basic law provides for this contract between the Federal Government and the counties involved. All this legislation does is to provide that more than 640 acres can be deeded in 1 year. The basic law provided that only 640 acres can be deeded in 1 year for the purposes set forth, and the rest of that would be under lease.

This provides for the deeding and transfer of title with the reverter clause for more than 640 acres in any particular year, so these communities can plan and develop their recreation in accordance with the best business practices possible. That is all this legislation does.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, what we are attempting to do is to provide that in 1 year more than 640 acres can be purchased. The 640 acres, based at \$2.60 an acre is all this law now says. We will buy the 7,000 acres, and we are going to buy them at the rate of 640 acres per year, but all we are saying is, do not make us wait 9 years to buy all this land, but give us permission to buy it all at one time.

Mr. GROSS. When was the price of \$2.60 an acre established?

Mr. LUJAN. It is under the basic act.

Mr. GROSS. But when was that basic act enacted?

Mr. HALL. In 1926.

Mr. LUJAN. I am sure the price does not make any difference. It is just a way of conveying it from the Federal Government to the municipalities.

Mr. GROSS. The price does not make any difference? The price certainly ought to make a great deal of difference.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa knows if they were to take a fee simple for this land they would be paying much more for it, but all the communities are getting is the right to use it for park purposes. If they do not use it for that purpose, the fee simple reverts. Under these conditions, it would be difficult to get the communities to pay the full market value, because they do not get the full use of it.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman would have to agree with me that they are getting this land at bargain prices, based on the 1926 price of \$2.60 per acre.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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

H.R. 10837

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the acreage limitation in section 1(b) of the Act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741), as amended (43 U.S.C. 869(b)), the Secretary of the Interior may convey to Pima County or Maricopa County, Arizona, or to the city of Albuquerque, New Mexico, for recreational purposes in accordance with the other provisions of that Act, all or any part of the lands that were under lease to such county or city on January 1, 1969.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, following line 10, add a new section 2 as follows:

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the limitation in Section 2 of the said Act of June 14, 1926, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869-1), with respect to the location of the land, the Secretary of the Interior may convey to Maricopa County for the purpose of establishing and maintaining the Lake Carl Pleasant Regional Park, in accordance with the other provisions of that Act, the following described lands in Yavapai County:

Township 7 north, range 1 west, section 25, southeast quarter, 160 acres,

Township 6 north, range 1 east, section 5, north half southwest quarter, southeast quarter, southwest quarter, and southwest quarter southeast quarter; 160 acres; section 8, those portions of the east half northwest quarter and the west half northeast quarter which lie in Yavapai County, about 24.60 acres.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONVEY LANDS IN NEW MEXICO TO CUBA INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS AND VILLAGE OF CUBA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 417) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in New Mexico

to the Cuba Independent Schools and to the village of Cuba.

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

S. 417

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the Cuba Independent Schools, District 20, Sandoval County, Cuba, New Mexico under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869-869-4) the following lands: Township 21 north, range 1 west, New Mexico principal meridian, section 21, lots 4, 5, and 6; section 28, northeast quarter northeast quarter and lot 1;

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey to the Village of Cuba, Sandoval County, Cuba, New Mexico, under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869-869-4) the following lands:

Township 21 north, range 1 west, New Mexico principal meridian, section 22, northwest quarter southwest quarter.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the proposal before us today, S. 417, would permit a school district in New Mexico and an adjoining village to purchase, under the provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act, certain lands now held by the Federal Government. The Recreation and Public Purposes Act permits public lands to be sold at reduced prices if used for certain specific public purposes. However, these lands are not public lands within the meaning of that act as they were acquired by the Federal Government under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Originally, the Department of Agriculture, and subsequently the Department of the Interior, issued a special land use permit to the Cuba Independent School District for the use of these lands. The school district now has a capital investment of over \$800,000 on the land and wishes to make additional capital investment in buildings and other facilities. However, before making any further investment of public funds on improvements on land that it does not own, the school district wishes to obtain title to the land. The village of Cuba wishes to develop a park and a recreation facility on some of the land.

S. 417 would authorize the conveyance of 185.99 acres to the school district for school purposes and 40 acres to the village of Cuba for a park.

The lands would be sold at a reduced price because they would be used for public purposes.

Present authority does not permit the disposal of these lands except through exchange; therefore, enactment of S. 417 is necessary to permit purchase by the school district and the village.

The lands are not valuable for minerals and are not needed for any Federal program. The highest and best use of these lands is for school and recreational purposes, and enactment of S. 417 would permit this use with assurance to the school district that its very substantial investment would be protected.

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

and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING THAT THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16539) to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide that the Secretary of Transportation shall be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone in connection with this bill the real purpose of it?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. The Department of Transportation was not established until 1966. The National Aeronautics and Space Council came into existence in 1958, with the passage of the National Aeronautics and Space Act. Therefore, the Secretary of Transportation, of course, has not been a regular member of the Council because of the fact that the Department was not established until 1966. However, he has actively participated as an invited member of the Council.

There are increasing activities in the field of civil aviation which are pertinent to the functions of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, which require the Secretary of Transportation at present to be an invited member to sit with the Council. This legislation merely formalizes a procedure which is already going on.

Mr. GROSS. The main transportation activity of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration seems to be trips to the moon. What can the Secretary of Transportation contribute to that? Apparently he is having difficulty keeping surface transportation going without indulging in any kind of consultation over trips to the moon.

More importantly, is this going to require an additional staff for the Secretary of Transportation?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. This will not require any additional staff or any additional cost, I would advise my friend from Iowa.

I might also add, with respect to what the gentleman observed, that the National Aeronautics and Space Council deals with aeronautics as well as space. It is in the growing area of responsibility for aeronautics that the Secretary of Transportation's legal presence on the Council would be of considerable value.

Mr. William Anders, Executive Secretary of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, indicated in testimony before our committee that he plans to put increasing stress on aeronautics in the activities of the Council. It would be extremely valuable and in fact necessary for the Secretary of Transportation to be present at these discussions.

Mr. GROSS. To sum this up, would the gentleman say that the Secretary of Transportation is being put on the Na-

tional Aeronautics and Space Council simply to satisfy the ego of one Cabinet member who has been somehow left out up to this point?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Absolutely not. He has been sitting on the Council.

Mr. GROSS. In a consultative capacity?

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. That is correct, as a nonstatutory member. This merely gives legal and formal authority for what is now being done on an informal basis.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad this does more than merely satisfy his ego.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago someone facetiously remarked that perhaps the real reason the Secretary of Transportation was being placed on the National Aeronautics and Space Council was so that he could sell tickets to the moon. I dare say that when the Wright brothers made their historic flight at Kitty Hawk, N.C., in 1903, if anyone had suggested at that time that tickets would one day be sold on airplanes, he would have been laughed out of court. Seriously, I have been disturbed for some time that the first "A" in NASA—aeronautics—has not been accorded the attention which it deserves. The Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology, which I chair, has held a series of hearings in 1968 and 1969 on the subject of aeronautical research and development. We are concerned that this vital area receive increased attention.

This legislation has nothing to do with anybody's ego, but it is in fact a necessity that as the National Aeronautics and Space Council gets increasingly involved in civil aviation, the Secretary of Transportation should have a voice in the deliberations. The Council now consists of the Vice President of the United States, who serves as Chairman; the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The Council advises the President on aeronautics and space programs, assists the President with respect to the policies and performance of aeronautics and space activities, designates and fixes responsibilities and helps in the coordination of aeronautical and space programs, resolves differences among agencies and provides for effective leadership and cooperation among the agencies responsible in these fields. The staff of the Council, led by its hard-working Executive Secretary, the Honorable William A. Anders, is very small, and consists of only 18 members. We hope they can obtain additional staff to assist in the area of aeronautics. I believe it would be very helpful to empower the Secretary of Transportation to become a statutory member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

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

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

H.R. 16539

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

America in Congress assembled, That section 201(a) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2471(a)) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) the Secretary of Transportation;"

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

AUTHORIZING RENEWAL OF CERTAIN FOREST SERVICE CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11953) to amend section 205 of the Act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 736), as amended.

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I fully well understand that the primary thrust of this legislation is to simply clear an uncertainty in the law. My only question is, will this in perpetuity eliminate competitive bidding?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It is certainly not intended to accomplish that purpose at all. It is merely to allow the Forest Service to contract for fighting fires by means of the use of chemicals dispensed from airplanes; to extend what it is doing now with planes, to chemical plants on the ground.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman, and Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

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

H.R. 11953

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205 of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, approved September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 736), as amended by the Act of April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 205. The Forest Service by contract or otherwise may provide for procurement and operation of aerial facilities and services for the protection and management of the national forests and other lands administered by it, including the furnishing, at the airbase, of facilities, equipment, materials and the preparation, mixing and loading into aircraft, with authority to renew any contract for such purpose annually, not more than twice, without additional advertising."

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

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3685, EMERGENCY HOME FINANCE ACT OF 1970

Mr. PATMAN submitted the following conference report (H. Rept. No. 91-1311) and statement on the bill (S. 3685), to increase the availability of mortgage

credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-1311)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3685) to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

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

That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970".

TITLE I—REDUCTION OF INTEREST CHARGES FOR MEMBERS OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM

Sec. 101. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$250,000,000, without fiscal year limitation, to be used by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for disbursement to Federal home loan banks for the purpose of adjusting the effective interest charged by such banks on short-term and long-term borrowing to promote an orderly flow of funds into residential construction. The disbursement of sums appropriated hereunder shall be made under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Board to assure that such sums are used to assist in the provision of housing for low- and middle-income families, and that such families share fully in the benefits resulting from the disbursement of such sums. No member of a Federal home loan bank shall use funds the interest charges on which have been adjusted pursuant to the provisions of this section to make any loan, if—

(1) the effective rate of interest on such loan exceeds the effective rate of interest on such funds payable by such member by a percentile amount which is in excess of such amount as the Board determines to be appropriate in furtherance of the purposes of this section; or

(2) the principal obligation of any such loan which is secured by a mortgage on a residential structure exceeds the dollar limitations on the maximum mortgage amount, in effect on the date the mortgage was originated, which would be applicable if the mortgage was insured by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 203(b) or 207 of the National Housing Act.

(b) Not more than 20 per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be disbursed in any one Federal home loan bank district.

TITLE II—AUTHORITY FOR THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TO PROVIDE A SECONDARY MARKET FOR CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGES

SECTION 201. (a) Section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(b)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) For the purposes set forth in section 301(a), and with the approval of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the corporation is authorized, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, service, sell, lend on the security of, or otherwise deal in mortgages which are not insured or guaranteed as provided in paragraph (1) (such mortgages referred to hereinafter as 'conventional mortgages'). No such purchase of a conventional mortgage shall be made if the outstanding principal balance of the mortgage at the time of purchase exceeds 75 per centum of the value of the property securing

the mortgage, unless (A) the seller retains a participation of not less than 10 per centum in the mortgage; (B) for such period and under such circumstances as the corporation may require, the seller agrees to repurchase or replace the mortgage upon demand of the corporation in the event that the mortgage is in default; or (C) that portion of the unpaid principal balance of the mortgage which is in excess of such 75 per centum is guaranteed or insured by a qualified private insurer as determined by the corporation. The corporation shall not issue a commitment to purchase a conventional mortgage prior to the date the mortgage is originated, if such mortgage is eligible for purchase under the preceding sentence only by reason of compliance with the requirements of clause (A) of such sentence. The corporation may purchase a conventional mortgage which was originated more than one year prior to the purchase date only if the seller is currently engaged in mortgage lending or investing activities and if, as a result thereof, the cumulative aggregate of the principal balances of all conventional mortgages purchased by the corporation which were originated more than one year prior to the date of purchase does not exceed 10 per centum of the cumulative aggregate of the principal balances of all conventional mortgages purchased by the corporation. The corporation shall establish limitations governing the maximum principal obligation of conventional mortgages purchased by it which are comparable to the limitations which would be applicable if the mortgage were insured by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 203 (b) or 207 of the National Housing Act."

(b) Section 5202 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 82) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Eleventh. Liabilities incurred in connection with sales of mortgages, or participations therein, to the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation."

TITLE III—FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORPORATION

SHORT TITLE

Sec. 301. This title may be cited as the "Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation Act".

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 302. As used in this title—

(a) The term "Board of Directors" means the Board of Directors of the Corporation.

(b) The term "Corporation" means the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation created by this title.

(c) The term "law" includes any law of the United States or of any State (including any rule of law or of equity).

(d) The term "mortgage" includes such classes of liens as are commonly given or are legally effective to secure advances on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located, together with the credit instruments, if any, secured thereby, and includes interests in mortgages.

(e) The term "organization" means any corporation, partnership, association, business trust, or business entity.

(f) The term "prescribe" means to prescribe by regulations or otherwise.

(g) The term "property" includes any property, whether real, personal, mixed, or otherwise, including without limitation on the generality of the foregoing choses in action and mortgages, and includes any interest in any of the foregoing.

(h) The term "residential mortgage" means a mortgage which (1) is a mortgage on real estate, in fee simple or under a leasehold having such term as may be prescribed by the Corporation, upon which there is located a structure or structures designed in whole or in part for residential use, or which

comprises or includes one or more condominium units or dwelling units (as defined by the Corporation) and (2) has such characteristics and meets such requirements as to amount, term, repayment provisions, number of families, status as a first lien on such real estate, and otherwise, as may be prescribed by the Corporation.

(i) The term "conventional mortgage" means a mortgage other than a mortgage as to which the Corporation has the benefit of any guaranty, insurance or other obligation by the United States or a State or an agency or instrumentality of either.

(j) The term "security" has the meaning ascribed to it by section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933.

(k) The term "State", whether used as a noun or otherwise, includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CORPORATION

Sec. 303. (a) There is created the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, which shall be a body corporate and shall be under the direction of a Board of Directors composed of the members of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, who shall serve as such without additional compensation. The Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board shall be the Chairman of the Board of Directors. The principal office of the Corporation shall be in the District of Columbia or at such other place as the Corporation may from time to time prescribe. The Corporation shall be a member of each Federal home loan bank and, except as otherwise provided by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, shall have all the benefits, powers, and privileges, and in the exercise thereof shall be subject to all liabilities, conditions, and limitations (except those relating to Federal home loan bank stock and subscriptions thereto and those under provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act preceding section 9) which are provided by the terms of such Act or other Federal statute for members of any such bank.

(b) The Corporation shall have power (1) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; (2) to have succession until dissolved by Act of Congress; (3) to make and enforce such bylaws, rules, and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes or provisions of this title; (4) to make and perform contracts, agreements, and commitments; (5) to prescribe and impose fees and charges for services by the Corporation; (6) to settle, adjust, and compromise, and with or without consideration, or benefit to the Corporation to release or waive in whole or in part, in advance or otherwise, any claim, demand, or right of, by, or against the Corporation; (7) to sue and be sued, complain and defend, in any State, Federal, or other court; (8) to acquire, take, hold, and own, and to deal with and dispose of any property; and (9) to determine its necessary expenditures and the manner in which the same shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, and appoint, employ, and fix and provide for the compensation and benefits of officers, employees, attorneys, and agents, all without regard to any other law except as may be provided by the Corporation or by laws hereafter enacted by the Congress expressly in limitation of this sentence. Nothing in this title or any other law shall be construed to prevent the appointment, employment, and provision for compensation and benefits as an officer, employee, attorney, or agent of the Corporation, of any officer, employee, attorney, or agent of any department, establishment, or corporate or other instrumentality of the Government, including any Federal home loan bank or member thereof. The Corporation, with the consent of any such department, establishment, or instrumentality, including any field services thereof, may utilize

and act through any such department, establishment, or instrumentality and may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, and personnel thereof, and may pay compensation therefor, and all of the foregoing are hereby authorized to provide the same to the Corporation as it may request.

(c) Funds of the Corporation may be invested in such investments as the Board of Directors may prescribe. Any Federal Reserve bank or Federal home loan bank, or any bank as to which at the time of its designation by the Corporation there is outstanding a designation by the Secretary of the Treasury as a general or other depository of public money, may be designated by the Corporation as a depository or custodian or as a fiscal or other agent of the Corporation, and is hereby authorized to act as such depository, custodian, or agent. When designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Corporation shall be a depository of public money, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and may also be employed as fiscal or other agent of the United States, and it shall perform all such reasonable duties as such depository or agent as may be required of it.

(d) The Corporation, including its franchise, activities, capital, reserves, surplus, and income, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to State, territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed. The provisions of this subsection shall be applicable without regard to any other law, including without limitation on the generality of the foregoing section 3301 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, except laws hereafter enacted by Congress expressly in limitation of this subsection.

(e) Notwithstanding section 1349 of title 28 of the United States Code or any other provision of law, (1) the Corporation shall be deemed to be an agency included in sections 1345 and 1442 of such title 28; (2) all civil actions to which the Corporation is a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of all such actions without regard to amount or value; and (3) any civil or other action, case or controversy in a court of a State, or in any court other than a district court of the United States, to which the Corporation is a party may at any time before the trial thereof be removed by the Corporation, without the giving of any bond or security, to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where the same is pending, or, if there is no such district court, to the district court of the United States for the district in which the principal office of the Corporation is located, by following any procedure for removal of causes in effect at the time of such removal. No attachment or execution shall be issued against the Corporation or any of its property before final judgment in any State, Federal, or other court.

CAPITAL STOCK

SEC. 304. (a) The capital stock of the Corporation shall consist of nonvoting common stock which shall be issued only to Federal home loan banks and shall have such par value and such other characteristics as the Corporation prescribes. Stock of the Corporation shall be evidenced in such manner and shall be transferable only to such extent, to such transferees, and in such manner, as the Corporation prescribes.

(b) The Federal home loan banks shall

from time to time subscribe, at such price not less than par as the Corporation shall from time to time fix, for such amounts of common stock as the Corporation prescribes, and such banks shall pay therefor at such time or times and in such amount or amounts as may from time to time be fixed by call of the Corporation. The amount of the payments for which such banks may be obligated under such subscriptions shall not exceed a cumulative total of \$100,000,000.

(c) Subscriptions of the respective Federal home loan banks to such stock shall be allocated by the Corporation.

(d) The Corporation may retire at any time all or any part of the stock of the Corporation, or may call for retirement all or any part of the stock of the Corporation by (1) publishing a notice of the call in the Federal Register or providing such notice in such other manner as the Corporation may determine to be appropriate, and (2) depositing with the Treasurer of the United States, for the purpose of such retirement, funds sufficient to effect such retirement. No call for the retirement of any stock shall be made, and no stock shall be retired without call, if immediately after such action, the total of the stock not called for retirement and of the reserves and surplus of the Corporation would be less than \$100,000,000. The retirement of stock shall be at the par value thereof, or at the price at which such stock was issued if such price is greater than par value. No declaration of any dividend on stock of the Corporation shall be effective with respect to stock which at the time of such declaration is the subject of an outstanding retirement call the effective date of which has arrived.

MORTGAGE OPERATIONS

SEC. 305. (a) (1) The Corporation is authorized to purchase, and make commitments to purchase, residential, mortgages from any Federal home loan bank, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, any member of a Federal home loan bank, or any other financial institution the deposits or accounts of which are insured by an agency of the United States, and to hold and deal with, and sell or otherwise dispose of, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, any such mortgage or interest therein. The operations of the Corporation under this section shall be confined so far as practicable to residential mortgages which are deemed by the Corporation to be of such quality, type, and class as to meet generally the purchase standards imposed by private institutional mortgage investors.

(2) No conventional mortgage shall be purchased under this section if the outstanding principal balance of the mortgage at the time of purchase exceeds 75 per centum of the value of the property securing the mortgage, unless (A) the seller retains a participation of not less than 10 per centum in the mortgage; (B) for such period and under such circumstances as the Corporation may require, the seller agrees to repurchase or replace the mortgage upon demand of the Corporation in the event that the mortgage is in default; or (C) that portion of the unpaid principal balance of the mortgage which is in excess of such 75 per centum is guaranteed or insured by a qualified private insurer as determined by the Corporation. The Corporation shall not issue a commitment to purchase a conventional mortgage prior to the date the mortgage is originated, if such mortgage is eligible for purchase under the preceding sentence only by reason of compliance with the requirements of clause (A) of such sentence. The Corporation may purchase a conventional mortgage which was originated more than one year prior to the purchase date only if the seller is currently engaged in mortgage lending or investing activities and if, as a result thereof, the cumulative aggregate of

the principal balances of all conventional mortgages purchased by the Corporation which were originated more than one year prior to the date of purchase does not exceed 10 per centum of the cumulative aggregate of the principal balances of all conventional mortgages purchased by the Corporation. The Corporation shall establish limitations governing the maximum principal obligation of conventional mortgages purchased by it which are comparable to the limitations which would be applicable if the mortgage were insured by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under section 203 (b) or 207 of the National Housing Act.

(3) The sale or other disposition by the Corporation of a mortgage under this section may be with or without recourse, and shall be upon such terms and conditions relating to resale, repurchase, guaranty, substitution, replacement, or otherwise as the Corporation may prescribe.

(b) Notwithstanding any other law, authority to enter into and to perform and carry out any transactions or matter referred to in this section is conferred on any Federal home loan bank, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, any Federal savings and loan association, any Federal home loan bank member, and any other financial institution the deposits or accounts of which are insured by an agency of the United States to the extent that Congress has the power to confer such authority.

OBLIGATIONS AND SECURITIES

SEC. 306. (a) The Corporation is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, to borrow, to give security, to pay interest or other return, and to issue notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations, or other securities, including without limitation mortgage-backed securities guaranteed by the Government National Mortgage Association in the manner provided in section 306(g) of the National Housing Act. Any obligation or security of the Corporation shall be valid and binding notwithstanding that a person or persons purporting to have executed or attested the same may have died, become under disability, or ceased to hold office or employment before the issuance thereof.

(b) The Corporation may, by regulation or by writing executed by the Corporation, establish prohibitions or restrictions upon the creation of indebtedness or obligations of the Corporation or of liens or charges upon property of the Corporation, including after-acquired property, and create liens and charges, which may be floating liens or charges, upon all or any part or parts of the property of the Corporation, including after-acquired property. Such prohibitions, restrictions, liens, and charges shall have such effect, including without limitation on the generality of the foregoing such rank and priority, as may be provided by regulations of the Corporation or by writings executed by the Corporation, and shall create causes of action which may be enforced by action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in the United States district court for any judicial district in which any of the property affected is located. Process in any such action may run to and be served in any judicial district or any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(c) The Federal home loan banks shall, to such extent as the Board of Directors may prescribe, guarantee the faithful and timely performance by the Corporation of any obligation or undertaking of the Corporation on or with respect to any security (which term as used in this sentence shall not include the capital stock referred to in section 304 of this title).

(d) The provisions of this section and of any restriction, prohibition, lien, or charge referred to in subsection (b) shall be fully

effective notwithstanding any other law, including without limitation on the generality of the foregoing any law of or relating to sovereign immunity or priority.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 307. (a) All rights and remedies of the Corporation, including without limitation on the generality of the foregoing any rights and remedies of the Corporation on, under, or with respect to any mortgage or any obligation secured thereby, shall be immune from impairment, limitation, or restriction by or under (1) any law (except laws enacted by the Congress expressly in limitation of this sentence) which becomes effective after the acquisition by the Corporation of the subject or property on, under, or with respect to which such right or remedy arises or exists or would so arise or exist in the absence of such law, or (2) any administrative or other action which becomes effective after such acquisition. The Corporation shall be entitled to all immunities and priorities, including without limitation on the generality of the foregoing all immunities and priorities under any such law or action, to which it would be entitled if it were the United States or if it were an unincorporated agency of the United States.

(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians. A report on each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The Corporation shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of any such audit as billed therefor by the Comptroller General.

PENAL PROVISION

SEC. 308. (a) Except as expressly authorized by statute of the United States, no individual or organization (except the Corporation) shall use the term "Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation", or any combination of words including the words "Federal", and "Home Loan", and "Mortgage", as a name or part thereof under which any individual or organization does any business, but this sentence shall not make unlawful the use of any name under which business is being done on the date of the enactment of this Act. No individual or organization shall use or display (1) any sign, device, or insignia prescribed or approved by the Corporation for use or display by the Corporation or by members of the Federal home loan banks, (2) any copy, reproduction, or colorable imitation of any such sign, device, or insignia, or (3) any sign, device, or insignia reasonably calculated to convey the impression that it is a sign, device, or insignia used by the Corporation or prescribed or approved by the Corporation, contrary to regulations of the Corporation prohibiting, or limiting or restricting, such use or display by such individual or organization. An organization violating this subsection shall for each violation be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000. An officer or member of an organization participating or knowingly acquiescing in any violation of this subsection shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both. An individual violating this subsection shall for each violation be punished as set forth in the sentence next preceding this sentence.

(b) The provisions of sections 215, 607, 658, 1011, and 1014 of title 18 of the United States Code are extended to apply to and with respect to the Corporation, and for the purposes of such section 658 the term "any property mortgaged or pledged", as used therein, shall without limitation on its generality include any property subject to mortgage, pledge, or lien acquired by the Corporation by assignment or otherwise.

(c) The term "bank examiner or assistant examiner", as used in section 655 of such title 18, shall include any examiner or assistant examiner who is an officer or employee of the Corporation and any person who makes or participates in the making of any examination of or for the Corporation.

(d) The term "bank", as used in subsection (f) of section 2113 of such title 18, shall be deemed to include the Corporation, and any building used in whole or in part by the Corporation shall be deemed to be used in whole or in part as a bank, within the meaning of such section 2113.

(e) The terms "agency" and "agencies" shall be deemed to include the Corporation wherever used with reference to an agency or agencies of the United States in sections 201, 202, 203, 205, 207, 208, 209, 286, 287, 371, 506, 595, 602, 641, 654, 701, 872, 1001, 1002, 1016, 1017, 1361, 1505, and 2073 of such title 18. Any officer or employee of the Corporation shall be deemed to be a person mentioned in section 602 of such title 18 within the meaning of sections 603 and 606 of such title.

(f) The terms "obligation or other security" and "obligations or other securities", wherever used (with or without the words "of the United States") in sections 471 to 476, both inclusive, and section 492 of such title 18, are extended to include any obligation or other security of or issued by the Corporation. Any reference in sections 474, 494, 495, and 642 of such title 18 to the United States Code, except in a territorial sense, or to the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby extended to include the Corporation. Section 477 of such title 18 is extended to apply with respect to section 476 of such title as extended by the first sentence of this subsection (f), and for this purpose the term "United States" as used in such section 476 shall include the Corporation.

TERRITORIAL APPLICABILITY

SEC. 309. Notwithstanding any other law, this title shall be applicable to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories and possessions of the United States.

CONSTRUCTION AND SEPARABILITY

SEC. 310. Except as otherwise provided in this title, or as otherwise provided by the Corporation or by laws hereafter enacted by the Congress expressly in limitation of provisions of this title, the powers and jurisdictions of the Corporation and of the Board of Directors shall be exercisable, and the provisions of this title shall be applicable and effective, without regard to any other law. Notwithstanding any other evidences of the intention of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the controlling intent of Congress that if any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this title, or the application of such provisions to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE IV—GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS

SEC. 401. (a) Section 305(c) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "\$2,500,000,000" and inserting "by \$500,000,000 on July 1, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "by \$2,000,000,000 on July 1, 1969".

(b) Section 305(g) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$2,500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,750,000,000";

(2) by striking out "at par"; and

(3) by striking out in the first sentence all that follows the word "exceed" and inserting in lieu thereof "the dollar limitation on maximum principal obligation that would be applicable to such mortgage if insured under section 235(1) of the National Housing Act."

SEC. 402. The second sentence of section 302(b)(1) of the National Housing Act (as redesignated by section 201 of this Act) is amended by inserting after "(1)" the following: "is insured under section 236 or".

TITLE V—FUNDS FOR FINANCING MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 501. The Congress finds that—

(1) periodic episodes of monetary stringency and high interest rates make it extremely difficult for families of middle income to obtain mortgage credit at rates which they can afford to pay;

(2) periods of monetary stringency and high interest rates are directly related to the Government's monetary and fiscal policies;

(3) a disproportionate share of the burden of sustaining these anti-inflationary policies of the Government falls on families of middle income who are buyers or prospective buyers of homes; and

(4) the Government has a responsibility to lessen the disproportionate burden which such families bear as a result of such policies. It is the purpose of this title to provide, during periods of high mortgage interest rates, a source of mortgage credit for such families which is within their financial means.

MORTGAGE CREDIT FOR MIDDLE-INCOME

FAMILIES

SEC. 502. Title II of the National Housing Act is amended by adding a new section 243 as follows:

"HOMEOWNERSHIP FOR MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES

"SEC. 243. (a) Whenever he determines such action to be necessary in furtherance of the purposes set forth in section 501 of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970, the Secretary is authorized to make, and to contract to make, periodic assistance payments on behalf of families of middle income. The assistance shall be accomplished through interest subsidy payments to the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (hereinafter referred to as 'the investor') with respect to mortgages meeting the special requirements specified in this section and made after the date of enactment of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970.

"(b) To qualify for assistance payments a middle-income family shall be a mortgagor under a mortgage which is (1) insured under subsection (j) of this section, (2) guaranteed under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, or (3) a conventional mortgage meeting the requirements of subsection (j) (3) of this section. In addition to the foregoing requirement, the Secretary may require that the mortgagor have an income, at the time of acquisition of the property, of not more than the median income for the area in which the property is located, as determined by the Secretary, with appropriate adjustments for smaller and larger families.

"(c) The interest subsidy payments authorized by this section shall cease when (1) the mortgagor no longer occupies the property which secures the mortgage, (2) the mortgages are no longer held by the investor, or (3) the rate of interest paid by the mortgagor reaches the rate of interest specified on the mortgage.

"(d) (1) Interest subsidy payments shall be on mortgages on which the mortgagor makes monthly payments towards principal and interest equal to an amount which would be required if the mortgage bore an effective

interest rate of 7 per centum per annum including any discounts or charges in the nature of points or otherwise (but not including premiums, if any, for mortgage insurance) or such higher rate (not to exceed the rate specified in the mortgage), which the mortgagor could pay by applying at least 20 per centum of his income towards homeownership expenses. As used in this subsection, the term 'monthly homeownership expense' includes the monthly payment for principal, interest, mortgage insurance premium, insurance, and taxes due under the mortgage.

"(2) In addition to the mortgages eligible for assistance under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Secretary is authorized to make periodic assistance payments on behalf of cooperative members of middle income. Such assistance payments shall be accomplished through interest subsidy payments to the investor with respect to mortgages insured (subsequent to the effective date of this section) under section 213 which are executed by cooperatives, the membership in which is limited to middle-income families. For purposes of this paragraph—

"(1) the term 'mortgagor', when used in subsection (b) in the case of a mortgage covering a cooperative housing project, means a member of the cooperative;

"(2) the term 'acquisition of the property', when used in subsection (b), means the family's application for a dwelling unit; and

"(3) in the case of a cooperative mortgagor, subsection (c) shall not apply and the interest subsidy payments shall cease when the mortgage is no longer held by the investor or the cooperative fails to limit membership to families whose incomes at the time of their application for a dwelling unit meets such requirements as are laid down by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (b).

"(e) The interest subsidy payments shall be in an amount equal to the difference, as determined by the Secretary, between the total amount of interest per calendar quarter received by the investor on mortgages assisted under this section and purchased by it and the total amount of interest which the investor would have received if the yield on such mortgages was equal to the sum of (1) the average costs (expressed as an annual percentage rate) to it of all borrowed funds outstanding in the immediately preceding calendar quarter, and (2) such per centum per annum as will provide for administrative and other expenses of the investor and a reasonable economic return, as determined by the Secretary to be necessary and appropriate taking into account the purpose of this section to provide additional mortgage credit at reasonable rates of interest to middle-income families.

"(f) Procedures shall be adopted by the Secretary for recertifications of the mortgagor's income at intervals of two years (or at shorter intervals where the Secretary deems it desirable) for the purpose of adjusting the amount of the mortgagor's payments pursuant to subsection (d).

"(g) The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary to assure that the sales price of, or other consideration paid in connection with, the purchase by a homeowner of the property with respect to which assistance payments are to be made is not increased above the appraised value on which the maximum mortgage which the Secretary will insure is computed.

"(h) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to make interest subsidy payments under contracts entered into under this section. The aggregate amount of contracts to make such payments shall not exceed amounts approved in appropriation Acts, and payments pursuant to such contracts shall not exceed \$105,000,000 during the first year of such contracts prior to July

1, 1971, which amount shall be increased by an additional \$105,000,000 during the first year of an additional number of such contracts on July 1 of each of the years 1971 and 1972.

"(2) No interest subsidy payments under this section shall be made after June 30, 1973, except pursuant to contracts entered into on or before such date.

"(i) In determining the income of any family for the purposes of this section, income from all sources of each member of the family in the household shall be included, except that the Secretary shall exclude income earned by any minor person.

"(j) (1) The Secretary is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure a mortgage executed by a mortgagor who meets the eligibility requirements for assistance payments prescribed by the Secretary under subsection (b). Commitments for the insurance of such mortgages may be issued by the Secretary prior to the date of their execution or disbursement thereon, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(2) To be eligible for insurance under this subsection, a mortgage shall meet the requirements of section 221(d)(2) or 234(c), except as such requirements are modified by this subsection: *Provided, however*, That in the discretion of the Secretary 25 per centum of the authority conferred by this section and subject to all the terms thereof may be used for mortgages on existing housing.

"(3) A mortgage to be insured under this section shall—

"(i) involve a single-family dwelling which has been approved by the Secretary prior to the beginning of construction, or a one-family unit in a condominium project (together with an undivided interest in the common areas and facilities serving the project) which is released from a multifamily project, the construction of which has been completed within two years prior to the filing of the application for assistance payments with respect to such family unit and the unit shall have had no previous occupant other than the mortgagor;

"(ii) involve a single-family dwelling whose appraised value, as determined by the Secretary, is not in excess of \$20,000 (which amounts may be increased by not more than 50 per centum in any geographical area where the Secretary authorizes an increase on the basis of a finding that the cost level so requires).

"(iii) be executed by a mortgagor who shall have paid in cash or its equivalent on account of the property (A) 3 per centum of the first \$15,000 of the appraised value of the property, (B) 10 per centum of such value in excess of \$15,000 but not in excess of \$25,000, and (C) 20 per centum of such value in excess of \$25,000."

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 503. Section 238 of the National Housing Act is amended by—

(1) striking out "section 235 (i), 235 (j) (4), or 237" each place it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 235 (i), 235 (j) (4), 237, or 243"; and

(2) striking out "235, 236, and 237" each place it appears in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "235, 236, 237, and 243".

AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION CHARTER ACT

SEC. 504. Section 304(a)(1) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Nothing in this title shall prohibit the corporation from purchasing, and making commitments to purchase, any mortgage with respect to which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has entered into a contract with the corporation to make interest subsidy payments un-

der section 502 of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970."

TITLE VI—FLEXIBLE INTEREST RATE AUTHORITY

SEC. 601. Section 3(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to amend chapter 37 of title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the veterans' home loan program, to amend the National Housing Act with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages, and for other purposes", approved May 7, 1968, is amended by striking out "October 1, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1972".

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

SETTLEMENT COSTS IN THE FINANCING OF FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION ASSISTED HOUSING

SEC. 701. (a) With respect to housing built, rehabilitated, or sold with assistance provided under the National Housing Act or under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs are respectively authorized and directed to prescribe standards governing the amounts of settlement costs allowable in connection with the financing of such housing in any such area. Such standards shall—

(1) be established after consultation between the Secretary and the Administrator;

(2) be consistent in any area for housing assisted under the National Housing Act and housing assisted under chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code; and

(3) be based on the Secretary's and the Administrator's estimates of the reasonable charge for necessary services involved in settlements for particular classes of mortgages and loans.

(b) The Secretary and the Administrator shall undertake a joint study and make recommendations to the Congress not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act with respect to legislative and administrative actions which should be taken to reduce mortgage settlement costs and to standardize these costs for all geographic areas.

EMERGENCY RELIEF FROM INTEREST RATE CONFLICT BETWEEN FEDERAL LAW AND STATE LAW

SEC. 702. Notwithstanding any other law, from the date of enactment of this title until July 1, 1972, loans to local public agencies under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 and to local public housing agencies under the United States Housing Act of 1937 may, when determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to be necessary because of interest rate limitations of State laws, bear interest at a rate less than the applicable going Federal rate but not less than 6 per centum per annum.

TREASURY BORROWING AUTHORITY FOR NEW COMMUNITIES PROGRAM

SEC. 703. Section 407(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary may issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury in an amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable the Secretary to carry out his functions with respect to the guarantees authorized by this title. The obligations issued under the subsection shall have such maturities and bear such rate or rates of interest as shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to purchase any obligations of the Secretary issued under this subsection, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act are

extended to include purchases of the Secretary's obligations hereunder."

REAL ESTATE LOANS BY NATIONAL BANKS

SEC. 704. Section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) is amended—

(1) by striking out "80 per centum" and "twenty-five years" in clause (3) of the third paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof third sentence of the first paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "90 per centum" and "thirty years", respectively; and

(2) by striking out "thirty-six months", each place it appears in the first sentence of the third paragraph, and inserting in lieu thereof "sixty months".

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES

SEC. 705. Section 408(c) (2) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1730a(c) (2)) is amended by striking "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

STATE-WIDE LENDING FOR FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

SEC. 706. Section 5(c) of the Home Owner's Loan Act of 1933 is amended (1) by adding after "their home office" in the first sentence the following: "or within the State in which such home office is located"; and (2) by substituting the word "section" for the word "proviso" used in the last clause of the second proviso.

RESERVES OF INSURED INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 707. Section 403(b) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1726(b)) is amended by inserting after "Provided, That" the second place the term appears the following: "the Corporation may extend the twenty-year limitation hereinabove prescribed by not more than ten years in the case of any insured institution if it determines such action to be necessary to meet mortgage needs: *Provided further, That*".

SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATION AS PENSION TRUSTEES

SEC. 708. Section 5(c) of the Home Owner's Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)) is amended by inserting before the next to the last paragraph a new paragraph as follows:

"Any such association is authorized to act as trustee of any trust created or organized in the United States and forming part of a stock bonus, pension, or profit-sharing plan which qualifies or qualified for specific tax treatment under section 401(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, if the funds of such trust are invested only in savings accounts or deposits in such association or in obligations or securities issued by such association. All funds held in such fiduciary capacity by any such association may be commingled for appropriate purposes of investment, but individual records shall be kept by the fiduciary for each participant and shall show in proper detail all transactions engaged in under the authority of this paragraph."

MAXIMUM LOAN ON SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING

SEC. 709. Section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)) is amended by striking out "\$40,000" in the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "\$45,000".

COLLEGE HOUSING GRANT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 710. Section 401(f) (2) of the Housing Act of 1950 is amended by striking out all that follows "increased by" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$6,300,000 on July 1, 1970".

NATIONAL HOUSING PARTNERSHIPS

SEC. 711. Title IX of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is amended by adding after section 911 the following new section:

"STATE REGULATION

"Sec. 912. Nothing contained in this title shall preclude a State or other local jurisdiction from imposing, in accordance with

the laws of such State or other local jurisdiction, any valid nondiscriminatory tax, obligation, or regulation on the partnership as a taxable and or legal entity, but no limited partner of the partnership not otherwise subject to taxation or regulation by or judicial process of a State or other local jurisdiction shall be subject to taxation or regulation by or subject to or denied access to judicial process of such State or other local jurisdiction, or be so subject or denied access to any greater extent, because of activities of the corporation or partnership within such State or other local jurisdiction."

And the House agree to the same.

JOHN SPARKMAN,
WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
WALLACE F. BENNETT,
JOHN TOWER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
FLORENCE P. DWYER,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3685) to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to a substitute for both the House amendment and the Senate bill. Except for technical, clarifying, and conforming changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference.

TITLE II—AUTHORITY FOR THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TO PROVIDE A SECONDARY MARKET FOR CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGES

HUD regulation of FNMA conventional mortgage activities

The House amendment prohibited FNMA from offering securities to finance conventional secondary market operations when the Secretary of HUD determined that such borrowing would unduly inhibit the financing of GNMA special assistance functions. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. No comparable provision is contained in the conference substitute. However, the conferees intend that in approving FNMA borrowings under the FNMA Charter Act, the Secretary of HUD should exercise his authority to prohibit FNMA borrowings at any time that such borrowings for conventional secondary market operations would unduly inhibit the financing of GNMA special assistance functions.

TITLE III—FEDERAL HOME LOAN MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Tax exemption for corporation obligations

The House amendment provided that income derived from notes, bonds, debentures, and obligations of the Corporation would be exempt from state and local taxation. The Senate bill contained no such provision and none is contained in the conference substitute.

HUD regulation of conventional mortgage activities

The House amendment prohibited the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation from

offering securities to finance conventional secondary market operations when the Secretary of HUD determined that such borrowings would unduly inhibit the financing of GNMA special assistance functions. The Senate bill contained no such provision and none is contained in the conference substitute. However, the conferees intend that, in approving borrowings for the home loan bank system, the Secretary of the Treasury should exercise his authority to prohibit FHLBB borrowings at any time that FHLBB borrowings for conventional secondary market operations would unduly inhibit the financing of GNMA special assistance functions.

GAO audit budget review of conventional mortgage activities

The House amendment contained provisions eliminating GAO audit authority over the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, eliminating the existing requirement that the FSLIC and the FHLBB submit an annual budget to the Bureau of the Budget, and removing the application of Federal Civil Service laws to employees of the FSLIC and the FHLBB. The Senate bill contained no such provision and none is contained in the conference substitute.

The conferees understand that both the FHLBB and the FSLIC are encountering difficulty in obtaining and keeping competent employees necessary for the examination and supervision of savings and loan associations. The conferees urge the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to request from the appropriate committees of Congress additional funds and higher employee classification levels in order to upgrade and strengthen examination and supervision functions. The conferees strongly urge the appropriate committees of Congress to give full and favorable consideration to such a request.

The conferees believe that private mortgage insurance can play an important role in developing an effective secondary market in conventional mortgage loans. We urge FNMA and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation to encourage their participation, under terms and conditions that require sound and ethical practices. Specifically, the conferees expect both FNMA and the FHLMC to take necessary steps by the issuance of rules and regulations and appropriate examination procedures to assure the prohibition of such conflict of interest practices as payment of rebates and commissions or other forms of compensation to officers, directors, or employees of mortgage lenders or groups of mortgage lenders.

TITLE IV—GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION SPECIAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS

The Senate bill reallocated \$750 million in GNMA special assistance funds from the section 305(c) Presidential authority. The House amendment increased by \$1.5 billion the GNMA special assistance funds under section 305(c). The conference substitute retains both provisions, with an amendment reducing the \$1.5 billion new 305(c) authority in the House amendment to \$750 million.

Removal of par purchase requirement

The Senate bill removed the requirement in section 305(g) of the FNMA Charter Act that mortgage purchases under the Congressional program be made at par. The House amendment contained no such provision. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Increase in section 236 mortgage limits

The Senate bill permitted GNMA to purchase FHA section 236 mortgages in excess of the existing \$22,000 per unit statutory limit where such mortgages have the benefit of a local abatement program. The House amendment contains no such provision. The

conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

TITLE V—FUNDS FOR MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

The Senate bill authorized a new interest subsidy program for single-family housing for middle-income families. Housing units assisted under the program must have an appraised value of not more than \$20,000 (or up to \$30,000 in high-cost areas determined by the HUD Secretary), and eligible families would be limited to those whose income is not more than the median for the area in which the property is located. HUD would subsidize interest rates in order to achieve an effective borrowing rate as low as 7 percent per year, or a higher rate as can be supported by payment of at least 20 percent of the mortgagor's income. \$60 million would be authorized annually for subsidy payments for a 3-year period, with not more than 10 percent of the funds being available for existing housing.

The House amendment contained no such provisions.

The conference substitute contains the Senate provisions, with the following amendments:

(1) the interest subsidy payments are also made available for the financing of cooperative housing;

(2) conventional mortgages meeting the requirements of mortgages insured under the new section 243 program and mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans Administration are made eligible for the interest subsidy payments;

(3) HUD subsidy payments would include an amount adequate to cover the administrative and other expenses of the mortgage investor (FNMA and FHMLC) and a reasonable economic return, taking into account the purpose of the title to provide additional mortgage credit at reasonable rates of interest to middle-income families;

(4) 25 percent, rather than 10 percent, of the funds available under the title may be used to subsidize interest payments on existing housing; and

(5) \$105 million, rather than \$60 million, would be authorized to be appropriated annually for a three-year period.

TITLE VI—FLEXIBLE INTEREST RATE AUTHORITY Extension of HUD authority to establish maximum interest rate on FHA-VA mortgages

The Senate bill, among other things, extended to January 1, 1972, the authority of the Secretary of HUD (under P.L. 90-301) to set maximum interest rates on FHA-VA mortgages as necessary to meet mortgage market conditions. The House amendment extended this authority to October 1, 1971. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision, only with respect to the extension of the Secretary's authority to set maximum interest rates on FHA-VA mortgages.

TITLE VII—COMMERCIAL BANK RESERVES—INVESTMENT IN HOUSING

The House amendment provided discretionary authority to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to permit member banks to use a portion of their required reserves as investments in obligations specified by the Board which are issued by Federal agencies for the purpose of directly or indirectly financing the construction or acquisition of residential real property. The Senate bill contained no such provision and none is contained in the conference substitute.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

Lending limit on single-family homes

The Senate bill removed the statutory lending limit of \$40,000 per single family dwelling for savings and loan associations. The House amendment contained no comparable provision. The conference substitute increases the lending limit for savings and loan associations from \$40,000 to \$45,000 per single family dwelling.

Collateral security for public funds

The House amendment authorized savings and loan associations to provide collateral security for deposits of public funds. The Senate bill contained no such provision and none is contained in the conference substitute.

The House conferees were informed by the Senate conferees that in the opinion of the Home Loan Bank Board, existing law was adequate to authorize savings and loan associations to provide collateral security for deposits of public funds. The conferees accepted this opinion and consequently agreed that statutory language would not be necessary. In any case, the conferees expect the FHLBB to move expeditiously to implement this desirable authority.

Savings and loan holding company service corporations

The House amendment authorized savings and loan holding company subsidiaries to make loans to their affiliates for the purpose of financing low- and moderate-income housing. The Senate bill contained no such provision and none is contained in the conference report.

Extension of time for establishing reserves

The House bill increased from 20 to 30 years the time that savings and loan associations may be given to build up their reserves to 5 percent. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The conference substitute contains the House provision with an amendment making clear that increases from 20 to up to 30 years in the case of any insured association may be given only in exceptional cases where the FSLIC determines the extension to be necessary to meet mortgage credit needs.

National bank real estate loans

The Senate bill authorized national banks to make 90 percent 30-year mortgage loans and 60-month construction loans (instead of 80 percent 25-year mortgages and 36-month construction loans). The House amendment contained no such provision. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
WILLIAM A. BARRETT,
LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
HENRY S. REUSS,
WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
FLORENCE P. DWYER,
ALBERT W. JOHNSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. POAGE, and the distinguished ranking Republican member, Mr. BELCHER, we are adding to the program for Tuesday, following the consideration of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1971, the bill (S. 3978) to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1971, which will be considered under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

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

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to yield in order to raise the question that, in view of my understanding of the scheduling for tomorrow, the first order of business is an appropriation bill.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SISK. Which may take 2 hours, and this will come in addition to that. Is that correct?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes. Of course, we will also have the call of the Private Calendar tomorrow.

Mr. SISK. I was wondering, for the purposes of enlightening the membership and so on, in connection with the reorganization bill, if it might not be advisable if we would not attempt to call up the reorganization bill on Tuesday. I have had calls from Members concerned about arranging for their own schedules because of their interest in the reorganization bill. I asked the gentleman to yield merely to raise this question. I am sorry I did not have an opportunity to contact him personally on it.

Mr. ALBERT. If I may say so, the gentleman is familiar with this bill. It is in the nature of a referendum.

Mr. SISK. I am not opposing that bill.

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot answer the gentleman as to how much controversy is involved in it or how long it will take. Of course, the gentleman from California is the manager of the reorganization bill, and if he requests to go over, I am sure, without having consulted with the distinguished Speaker, we would, of course, be desirous of accommodating the gentleman's request.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. If agreeable to the gentleman, can we answer this more definitely later in the day?

Mr. SISK. I think we can discuss it further.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

TO INCREASE AVAILABILITY OF GUARANTEED HOME LOAN FINANCING FOR VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 18253) to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 18253

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter III of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1828. Investment of funds of the national service life insurance fund in first mortgage loans guaranteed under section 1810 of this chapter

"(a) When issuing a commitment to guarantee a proposed home mortgage loan under section 1810 of this chapter the Administrator is authorized and is hereby directed to issue, if such is requested by the lender-mortgagee, a non-assignable commitment to purchase the completed loan from such lender-mortgagee. For each such commit-

ment the lender-mortgagee shall pay a non-refundable fee of not in excess of one-half per centum of the amount of the commitment. Such commitment shall provide for the purchase of the loan from the lender-mortgagee for the price specified in the commitment (which price shall be specified as a percentage of par) if the lender-mortgagee certifies to the Administrator, subsequent to the disbursement of the loan proceeds but not later than one hundred and eighty days from the date of the Administrator's issuance of the loan guaranty evidence, that—

"(1) it has not been successful in effecting a sale of the loan to a private investor at a price equal to or in excess of that specified in the Administrator's commitment;

"(2) it has not charged or collected from and will not charge or collect from the seller or builder of the property, or from any third person or entity, directly or indirectly, any discount (points) in excess of the difference between the face amount of the loan and the price specified in the Administrator's purchase commitment plus the commitment fee specified in this subsection (a);

"(3) the loan is not in default.

The purchase price specified in any purchase commitment issued under this subsection shall not be less than the average price for which one-hundred-and-eighty-day purchase commitments were auctioned by the Federal National Mortgage Association at the last Association auction preceding the issuance of the Administrator's purchase commitment, but in no instance shall the Administrator agree to pay more than par (unpaid principal balance plus accrued interest) nor less than 96 per centum of par for any loan purchased under this subsection. If an auction of purchase commitments by the Federal National Mortgage Association has not been conducted during the three months immediately preceding the issuance of a commitment under this subsection the price to be specified in such commitment shall be determined by the Administrator but any such price determination by the Administrator shall not exceed par nor be less than 96 per centum of par. Upon the purchase of a guaranteed loan pursuant to a commitment issued under this subsection the Administrator's guaranty of the loan shall continue in full force and effect and shall inure to the investment fund established in subsection (b) of this section. Insofar as practicable the Administrator shall utilize the purchase authorization in this subsection in those localities where the discount levels are determined by him to be substantially in excess of the discounts entailed in the Federal National Mortgage Association average auction prices for its one-hundred-and-eighty-day purchase commitments.

"(b) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the national service life insurance investment fund (hereinafter called the investment fund). The investment fund shall be available to the Administrator for all operations under this section, including the payment of expenses and losses, except administrative expenses. To provide the Administrator with the funds necessary to purchase loans as the consequence of commitments issued or to be issued pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall, as authorized by section 720(c) of this title, transfer such funds from the national service life insurance fund (hereinafter called the insurance fund) to the investment fund, except that the aggregate of transfers pursuant to this subsection shall not, in the period between the enactment of this section and June 30, 1974, exceed \$5,000,000,000, and such transfers of funds during any fiscal year within such period—

"(1) may not exceed the sum of the investments of the insurance fund which mature in that fiscal year, and

"(2) may not be in an amount greater than authorized in an appropriation Act.

"(c) The Administrator shall utilize the funds transferred to the investment fund as provided in subsection (b) of this section to purchase loans pursuant to commitments issued as provided by subsection (a) of this section. Wherever the Administrator determines that the effective yield on loans eligible for purchase at any given time would be less than that which would be obtained from an alternative investment in special securities of the Treasury Department, he shall direct that sums then available in the investment fund for purchases of loans shall be invested in such special Treasury securities. The insurance fund shall be paid interest on all funds transferred to the investment fund at the same rate as the average interest rate on loans purchased and special Treasury securities held by the investment fund less 1 per centum but in no event less than the average return on the other invested portion of the insurance fund. All moneys received by the Administrator from the repayment of such loans shall be deposited in the investment fund and shall also be available, until June 30, 1975, for the purchase of loans as provided in this section, except that if the Administrator at any time determines that the balance in the investment fund is in excess of anticipated needs for the purchase of loans, he may so notify the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall then transfer such excess to the insurance fund. To assure against the impairment of the insurance fund on account of expenses and losses resulting from the purchase of loans under this section, the Administrator shall establish and retain within the investment fund an adequate reserve for such expenses and losses. All collections of interest on loans purchased and all nonrefundable commitment fees received pursuant to the authority in subsection (a) of this section shall be deposited in the investment fund by the Administrator, who shall, after determining the amount to be retained in the investment fund as a reserve for expenses and losses, periodically notify the Secretary as to the amount of such interest collections available for transfer to the insurance fund and the Secretary thereupon shall effect such transfers. Such transfers shall constitute the payment of interest to the insurance fund. The Administrator is authorized to invest on an interim basis unexpended balances of the investment fund, including the reserve for expenses and losses, in obligations of the United States Government or agencies thereof. After June 30, 1975, all moneys received in the repayment of loans purchased pursuant to subsection (a) of this section and all interest collections on such loans, except for such sums which the Administrator determines to be necessary for retention in the investment fund as a reserve for losses, shall be deposited in the insurance fund. Such deposits shall be continued until the funds transferred to the investment fund by the insurance fund are repaid in full with interest.

"(d) In the event of a deficiency in the investment fund reserves for expenses and losses, the Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to guarantee the investment fund against loss of interest or principal and shall discharge such guarantee by transferring to the investment fund from available funds of the loan guaranty revolving fund such sum or sums as may be necessary to defray such deficiency. Any deficiency in the investment fund defrayed by the loan guaranty revolving fund shall be paid to such fund by the investment fund as soon as such payment becomes feasible.

"(e) The Administrator may sell, and shall offer for sale, any loan purchased under the authority of this section at a price determined by the Administrator, but not less than the price paid by the Administrator to purchase the loan (that is, the percentage of the unpaid balance of the loan), plus accrued interest. The Administrator may, in respect to loans thus sold, guarantee any such loans

subject to the same conditions, terms, and limitations as would be applicable in the case of loans guaranteed under section 1810 of this chapter. The proceeds of any such sales shall be deposited in the investment fund.

"(f) Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions of this section, the Administrator, when authorized by appropriation Acts so to do, may set aside first mortgage loan assets of the investment fund as the basis for the sale of participation certificates pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of the Participation Sales Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-429), and until June 30, 1974, the proceeds of any sale of such participation certificates shall be deposited in the investment fund and be available for the purposes of that fund. After June 30, 1974, the proceeds of any sales of such participation certificates shall be deposited in the insurance fund.

"(g) In the administration and management of the investment fund the Administrator shall, to the extent feasible, invest the funds thereof in loans which will represent a broad spectrum of the veteran home-buying population in respect to age, income, and location of the properties which will constitute the loan securities. In order to facilitate a more adequate supply of mortgage financing for veterans in the lower and middle income brackets the Administrator shall purchase only loans not in excess of \$30,000 which are secured by single-family dwellings only. The Administrator is authorized to adopt such standards, policies, and procedures and to promulgate such regulations as he considers necessary or appropriate for carrying out his functions and responsibilities under this section. In carrying out such functions and responsibilities the Administrator may contract with private entities for the servicing of any loans purchased by him for the investment fund provided that the servicing fee payable pursuant to any such contract shall not exceed the Administrator's estimate of the cost of the direct servicing of such loans by agency employees."

(b) The analysis of chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1828. Investment of funds of the national service life insurance fund in first mortgage loans guaranteed under section 1810 of this chapter."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (1) of section 1811(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) he is unable to obtain from a private lender in such housing credit shortage area, a loan for such purpose for which he is qualified under section 1810 of this title, at an interest rate not in excess of the rate authorized for guaranteed home loans and at a discount charge to the seller or builder not in excess of the discount (if any) determined to be reasonable by the Administrator who shall, whenever feasible to do so, base such determination on the discount involved in the latest average auction price for the Federal National Mortgage Association purchase commitments but not in excess of a 4 per centum discount in any event; and"

SEC. 3. Section 720 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer from time to time from such fund to the Investment Fund established under section 1828 of this title such amounts as are necessary to purchase loans as a consequence of commitments issued or to be issued by the Administrator pursuant to subsection (a) of section 1828 of this title, and shall transfer from the investment fund to the national service life insurance fund, upon notification by the Administrator, such amounts as the Administrator determines are available for such transfer pursuant to the provisions of section 1828. The funds transferred from the national service life insurance fund under this sec-

tion to the investment fund, together with the interest thereon as computed under section 1823(c) of this title, shall be guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection. Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would accomplish two simple results. It would provide \$3 billion from the national service life insurance trust fund for the purpose of making guaranteed home loans and, second, it would increase the interest yield to such trust fund. The interest going into the trust fund from such investments would be at the rate of 7½ percent. At the present time, the fund is receiving an average of 4.23 percent return in interest.

The bill has been amended in a form which I understand is acceptable to the minority members who have raised objection against the original proposal and I desire at this time to express my particular appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) and to the gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE), who have done considerable work in this field in order to present the bill in this favorable form today.

The bill as we present it here today incorporates two amendments suggested by the ranking minority members of the committee which I am willing to accept. These two amendments would:

First, make the bill subject to annual appropriation action and remove any question of a point of order; and

Second, employ a more conservative funding formula which would make \$3 billion available in the next 5 years instead of \$5 billion as was originally contemplated.

The bill was reported from the Subcommittee on Housing, headed by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. BARING). The subcommittee held hearings over a year ago on this proposal and have done a lot of work on this legislation. The other members of the Subcommittee on Housing are the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SATTERFIELD), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HELSTOSKI), the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER).

The purpose of this bill is to increase the availability of Veterans' Administration-guaranteed home loan financing for veterans desiring to purchase homes and at the same time to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund. The measure would establish on a revolving fund basis in an amount not to exceed \$5 billion, an investment fund from which home loan financing would be available through commercial sources with the proceeds being repaid into the

fund as the loans are repaid each month.

The current interest rate on Veterans' Administration-guaranteed home loans is 8½ percent. Due to higher interest rates in some areas and to the prevalence of "points," there is a dearth of money available for financing of home purchases generally, and for veterans in particular.

The national service life insurance trust fund is a trust fund created from the proceeds of premiums paid, largely by World War II veterans, on their insurance policies. There are now 5,350,178 such policies with a face value of \$36,931,145,000. Generally these policies cover individuals who served on or after October 8, 1940, and before April 26, 1951, when this insurance program ceased receiving new applications. The fund is today invested in interest-bearing obligations of the U.S. Government which has a yield as indicated in the table which follows. The overall yield as of June 30, 1970 is 4.22 percent.

The table follows:

INVESTMENTS IN NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Date	Amount of U.S. (or U.S. guaranteed) securities held at end of period (billions)	Average rate of interest on securities in col. (2) (percent)	Amount of U.S. securities purchased or refinanced in the 6 months ending with date in col. (1) (millions)	Average rate of interest on investment in col. (4) (percent)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Dec. 31, 1959.....	\$5.7	3.00
June 30, 1960.....	5.8	3.06	\$598	3.81
Dec. 31, 1960.....	5.8	3.07	(1)
June 30, 1961.....	5.8	3.07	367	3.12
Dec. 31, 1961.....	5.7	3.07	28	3.38
June 30, 1962.....	5.8	3.09	445	3.25
Dec. 31, 1962.....	5.8	3.09	5	3.27
June 30, 1963.....	5.7	3.11	315	3.37
Dec. 31, 1963.....	5.8	3.11	41	3.46
June 30, 1964.....	5.8	3.16	483	3.63
Dec. 31, 1964.....	5.8	3.16	56	3.59
June 30, 1965.....	5.9	3.21	558	3.63
Dec. 31, 1965.....	6.0	3.21	64	3.80
June 30, 1966.....	6.1	3.33	599	4.38
Dec. 31, 1966.....	6.1	3.43	200	6.03
June 30, 1967.....	6.1	3.51	512	4.61
Dec. 31, 1967.....	6.1	3.53	167	5.46
June 30, 1968.....	6.2	3.65	444	5.65
Dec. 31, 1968.....	6.2	3.77	211	6.11
June 30, 1969.....	6.3	3.89	347	6.22
Dec. 31, 1969.....	6.2	3.93	109	6.73
June 30, 1970.....	6.3	4.23	633	7.51

¹ None.

It is estimated that with the availability of \$5 billion from the NSLI reserves, there would be 256,300 loans guaranteed and purchased. Based on recent VA experience, about 30 percent, or 77,000, would be on newly constructed homes and the remaining 70 percent, or 179,300, would be on existing homes.

If this bill is enacted, the yield will be increased to 7½ percent—8½ percent interest less 1 percent administration fee. The national service life insurance fund would continue to be fully guaranteed by the U.S. Government with no possible loss to a policyholder or his beneficiary.

Thus there would be two simple results flowing from enactment of this legislation; namely, the availability of \$5 billion of mortgage money in yearly increments, and an increase in the interest yield to the national service life insurance trust fund.

Hearings were held on this measure before the subcommittee on housing on May 21 and 22, 1969. All the testimony received—homebuilders, bankers, real estate board—with the exception of the Veterans' Administration, was favorable.

Pertinent statistics on the loan guarantee program follows:

GI LOAN APPLICATIONS

	1967	1968	1969	1970
January to March.....	40,649	51,050	53,304	38,672
April to June.....	68,300	62,471	65,870	48,375
July to September.....	78,667	69,496	62,808
October to December.....	61,600	65,649	51,093
Total.....	249,216	248,666	233,075

GI LOANS

	1967	1968	1969	1970
January to March.....	34,495	50,628	53,216	39,504
April to June.....	40,943	44,527	50,170	41,914
July to September.....	58,461	55,625	57,356
October to December.....	66,523	60,437	53,226
Total.....	200,422	211,217	213,968

COMPARISON OF USE OF LOAN ENTITLEMENT BY VETERANS OF DIFFERENT SERVICE PERIOD IN YEARS IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING ELIGIBILITY

Fiscal year	Loans closed	Eligible veterans at beginning of year	Percent of eligible veterans using entitlement
World War II:			
1946.....	176,000	2,374,000	7.4
1947.....	635,000	12,110,000	5.2
1948.....	521,000	13,074,000	4.0
1949.....	279,000	13,059,000	2.1
Korean conflict:			
1954.....	48,000	1,865,000	2.6
1955.....	120,000	2,740,000	4.4
1956.....	159,000	3,731,000	4.3
1957.....	149,000	4,239,000	3.5
Post-Korean veterans:¹			
1967.....	73,000	3,682,000	2.0
1968.....	113,000	4,052,000	2.8
1969 ²	131,000	4,585,000	2.9
1970.....	120,000	5,459,000	2.2

¹ Veterans with all service after January 1955 (excludes active duty servicemen).

² Eleven months actual, 1 month estimated.

SECONDARY MARKET PRICE NO DOWNPAYMENT GI LOANS (NEW AND EXISTING)

Date	Contract rate (percent)	Price	Yield
July 1955.....	5¼	99.3	5.32
February 1966.....	5¼	95.7	5.73
March 1966.....	5¼	95.6	5.99
April 1966.....	5¼	95.5	6.27
September 1966.....	5¼	92.8	6.59
October 1966.....	5¼	92.9	6.84
April 1967.....	6	97.0	6.35
April 1968.....	6	92.5	6.89
May 1968.....	6¼	94.9	7.36
September 1968.....	6¼	95.8	7.25
December 1968.....	6¼	94.3	7.44
January 1969.....	7¼	97.3	7.83
February 1969.....	7¼	96.9	7.88
March 1969.....	7¼	96.3	7.96
April 1969.....	7¼	96.1	7.99
May 1969.....	7¼	96.0	8.00
June 1969.....	7¼	94.3	8.22
July 1969.....	7¼	93.9	8.27
August 1969.....	7¼	93.8	8.28
September 1969.....	7¼	93.6	8.31
October 1969.....	7¼	93.0	8.39
November 1969.....	7¼	92.8	8.42
December 1969.....	7¼	92.3	8.48
January 1970.....	8¼	94.5	9.22
February 1970.....	8¼	94.6	9.21
March 1970.....	8¼	95.1	9.15
April 1970.....	8¼	95.8	9.05
May 1970.....	8¼	95.8	9.05
June 1970.....	8¼	95.6	9.08

The amendment which is a complete substitute for the bill as reported pre-

serves the original intent of the bill but provides that only that portion of the fund which matures each year may be used for the purpose of making home loans and only when such amounts have been appropriated.

The Veterans' Administration report indicates that, during the first year of operations, this bill would "increase Veterans' Administration general operating expenses by \$2,650,000." This is not

a cost, it is an advance, since the administrative costs of the program would be met by the previously described 1 percent fee. Loans would be made at 8½ percent; 1 percent would be given to the agency for administration, and 7½ percent would go into the national service life insurance trust fund. Thus no cost to the Government because of the enactment of this bill.

I include the following table:

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE TRUST FUND (ESTIMATED CASH INCOME AND OUTGO)

Year	Interest income (1)	Government securities maturing (2)	Cash needs in excess of premium income (3)	Net available [(1)+(2)-(3)] (4)
1970	\$262,000,000	\$325,000,000	\$175,000,000	\$412,000,000
1971	280,000,000	1,008,000,000	185,000,000	1,103,000,000
1972	299,000,000	419,000,000	195,000,000	523,000,000
1973	320,000,000	394,000,000	210,000,000	504,000,000
1974	349,000,000	394,000,000	225,000,000	518,000,000
1975	361,000,000	726,000,000	240,000,000	847,000,000
1976	372,000,000	699,000,000	260,000,000	811,000,000
1977	383,000,000	469,000,000	285,000,000	567,000,000
1978	392,000,000	494,000,000	310,000,000	576,000,000
1979	400,000,000	394,000,000	340,000,000	454,000,000
1980	407,000,000	394,000,000	375,000,000	426,000,000

Note: If the amounts in col. (4) are invested in mortgages, any principal repayments from such mortgages would become available for further investment in the same medium. However, the extent of such repayments is indeterminable.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to further state that we have an information sheet on this bill from the veterans' organizations, if any Members would like to have one.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, my inquiry is very simple. Is the bill that we have under consideration similar to H.R. 9476, which was scheduled under suspensions for today?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The bill is exactly the same, except for two amendments, which satisfied the Members who signed the minority report.

These two amendments would make the money available to be appropriated upon maturity of the securities, and make it come through the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HALL. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think that is very noteworthy and, certainly, a subject for commendation, but the procedure is a little bit disconcerting, and the reason for my basic question is: First, we were supplied a report on the bill, H.R. 9476, and some of us who do our homework were prepared to discuss and support it on the floor, along with the questions involving the individual and minority views.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri is not naive about the way to get needed legislation hastily through the Congress.

I now understand about the amendments that are agreed to by those who signed the minority report. But in the meantime information was received by many of us who interest ourselves in the suspensions and in the Consent Calendar that the bill had been "pulled" from the program today, insofar as H.R. 9476 was concerned, and no further word was available to the effect that we were go-

ing to consider a "clean bill" with no report or committee hearings, but the distinguished gentleman from Texas has answered my question and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that while I still have some reluctance about supporting this bill, I shall vote for it, largely due to the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) and the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Their efforts have improved the bill over its original form.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this bill, although I have reservations about some of its provisions. I am supporting it because its proponents state that it will make funds available for mortgage financing of veterans' housing under the G.I. bill. I have some doubt that the legislation will produce as much mortgage capital as proponents claim. If, however, it will help one single veteran purchase a home that he would not otherwise be able to buy because of the shortage of funds, then I am willing to give it a try. Certainly, the Vietnam veteran should have the same opportunity to buy the home of his choice as his counterpart in earlier conflicts. The legislation that authorized Government guaranteed housing loans for veterans represents an empty gesture when the unavailability of financing prevents them from utilizing this benefit.

Still, Mr. Speaker, I must express my serious reservations about the manner in which mortgage financing would be made available under the terms of the legislation. This bill would authorize the use of national service life insurance trust funds for the purchase of GI mortgages. This trust fund is made up of monthly premiums paid by World War II veterans on their Government life insurance, and the interest that has been earned thereon. It is presently invested

in interest-bearing Government securities.

I fear that, in disturbing this fund, it will be increasingly difficult to resist pressures to finance other, perhaps equally pressing, programs by the same, seemingly painless, means. Federal trust funds now have approximately \$75 billion in assets. The social security trust fund with \$35 billion and the civil service retirement fund with \$22 billion are the largest Federal trusts with their assets invested in Government securities. If we are setting the precedent today for the use of such funds to finance other equally deserving needs of our Nation, then we are traveling full speed down the road to disaster.

A similar bill, Mr. Speaker, when reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on December 12 was opposed by some members of the committee. Their opposition is set forth in the minority views that follow:

MINORITY VIEWS

We oppose the enactment of H.R. 9476.

It is our carefully considered opinion that this legislation will not accomplish its principal purpose—that of increasing the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans. Instead, its contribution to a massive inflationary increase in the budget and in Treasury borrowing from the public will adversely affect the personal finances of the very group it is designed to help—the Nation's veterans.

The bill will require the investment of \$5 billion of the national service life insurance trust fund in home mortgages guaranteed under the GI bill. This fund, with assets totaling more than \$7 billion, represents the reserve funds on GI life insurance policies. Unfortunately, the trust fund is not a cash fund sitting in the U.S. Treasury waiting to be expended. It is already invested in interest-bearing securities. It therefore follows that should these funds be required for the mandatory purchase of housing mortgages, the Treasury would have to raise new funds to replace the special issues now held by the trust accounts.

This procedure would increase the cost of living for everyone, and its greatest impact would be upon the seriously disabled veteran, the veteran pensioner, and others living on fixed incomes. Veterans, as taxpaying citizens, are concerned about the size of the Federal budget and about the inflation which consumes their income and their savings. Yet this bill, reported to benefit the veteran, would increase the Federal budget by \$5 billion at the rate of \$1 billion per year.

The Congress has told the President to hold spending this year at \$192.9 billion, in order to control this inflation. The President has stated on several occasions that he intends to adhere to a ceiling of \$192.9 billion of expenditures in order to slow inflationary pressures in our economy. The enactment of this bill would make a mockery of that ceiling. Not only would it add \$1 billion per year for 5 years of uncontrolled, unplanned expenditures to the budget, but it would remove these massive outlays from the appropriations process in one of the largest backdoor spending proposals ever made.

The report of the Commission on Mortgage Interest Rates made to the President and to the Congress on August 13, 1969, after almost a full year of study, explored the use of Federal trust funds to increase the availability of mortgage capital for Federal housing programs. In commenting thereon, the Commission said:

"It should be emphasized that use of this type of mechanism to assist in the financing of housing makes all the more imperative

the need to maintain an appropriate balance in overall fiscal policy. The times when special assistance for the mortgage market is needed are likely to be the times when general inflationary pressures are calling for economic restraint. Any steps taken then to make more mortgage funds available and increase housing production would add only more fuel to the inflationary fire and thus be highly irresponsible from an aggregate policy point of view—unless offsetting actions are taken to cut other Federal expenditures or raise taxes, or both. Without such offsetting actions, the resulting inflation and increased Federal deficit would only drive interest rates up further, curtail the availability of mortgage credit even more, and thus further frustrate housing production. There simply is no way to get more housing production out of an economy already operating at full capacity unless some other sector is restrained to make room for the additional housing."

Proponents of this measure, in justifying this legislation, state that there is a shortage of money available for financing of home purchases generally, and for veterans in particular. The statistics of the Veterans' Administration relating to home loan activity dispute this statement. Far from suffering disproportionately from a shortage of mortgage funds, 220,000 veterans are obtaining GI home loans this year, a figure unequaled in any year since 1957. Additionally, the following statistics on Veterans' Administration loan activities annually since 1957 reveal that the number of guaranteed home loans closed have increased significantly in each of the last 3 years.

Calendar year	Number	Amount (thousands)
1957	302,047	3,752,651
1958	143,519	1,859,826
1959	210,511	2,781,695
1960	143,287	1,981,691
1961	132,889	1,828,313
1962	187,077	2,648,977
1963	187,889	2,798,223
1964	177,594	2,764,588
1965	159,582	2,615,362
1966	156,918	2,597,284
1967	200,018	3,395,349
1968	210,946	3,771,674
1969	220,000	4,200,000

This record of increasing GI home loans activity is not an accident, but results from the creation by Congress of the Federal National Mortgage Association (FNMA), a private institution designed to assure an adequate supply of funds for GI and FHA loans. It is doing so very effectively. This calendar year alone, FNMA will provide \$1.2 billion or more to finance GI loans, and is now providing funds at an annual rate well above costing a dollar in budget outlays. H.R. 9476, on the other hand, will increase the budget by \$1 billion each year for the next 5 years.

Proponents of this measure have estimated that the \$5 billion from the NSLI reserves will permit 256,300 loans to be guaranteed and purchased. This represents 51,260 GI loans for each of the next 5 years. Unfortunately, these loans will not be in addition to the current number of loans being closed. In fact, NSLI trust fund purchases of new VA guaranteed mortgages under the provisions of H.R. 9476 would not add significantly to the total availability of VA guaranteed mortgages.

FNMA presently is committing to buy new guaranteed and insured one- to four-family mortgages at an annual rate of \$6 billion, which under the auction technique closely reflects the new supply of mortgages. The annual rate has been as high as \$8 billion and is lower now only because of lack of offers. Thirty percent of FNMA's holdings of these mortgages are VA-guaranteed mortgages. Commitment prices, however, currently

range down to 93 percent of par, reflecting the cost of financing for FNMA. Since H.R. 9476 makes it mandatory that the NSLI trust fund purchase GI guaranteed mortgages at a price of not less than 96 percent of par, it is highly unlikely that any lender or mortgage originator would continue to offer the same mortgages to FNMA at 93 percent of par.

Because of its costs of financing and the extreme pressure to support FHA-insured mortgages, FNMA would welcome this shift of some part of the burden of financing VA-guaranteed mortgages to the NSLI trust fund. Accordingly, we believe that FNMA commitments to purchase VA-guaranteed mortgages.

Another reported purpose of H.R. 9476 is to increase the income of the NSLI trust fund. This objective, though laudable, hardly represents sufficient justification for the enactment of this legislation. If the Congress wishes to increase the income to the fund, a fairly simple change in the existing arrangements would achieve this without confusing it with the objective of providing mortgage support. In this connection, it should be noted that the special issue formula under which national service life insurance funds are currently invested reflects a higher current investment of trust funds than contemplated by H.R. 9476. The amount of the interest earned on trust fund investments will continue to rise as long as current market yields are above 3 percent. The statutory formula under which trust funds are invested protects them against any decline below this figure.

H.R. 9476 provides that the national service life insurance fund would be paid interest at the average rate of interest on loans purchased, less 1 percent. Since the interest rate now applicable to VA guaranteed loans is 7½ percent, the rate of interest realized by the trust fund would be 6½ percent. The following table reflecting yields on current investments on a monthly basis since July 1968 reveals that the rate of interest earned on current trust fund investments is greater than the rate of interest the trust fund would earn under the provisions of the bill.

National service life insurance fund	
Date	Percent ¹
1968:	
July	5¼
August	5
September	5½
October	5½
November	5¼
December	5½
1969:	
January	5½
February	5½
March	6
April	6
May	5½
June	6¼
July	6½
August	6½
September	6½
October	7½
November	6½
December	7

¹ Special issue formula rate.

Should the Congress approve the use of trust fund moneys for the acquisition of VA mortgages, it will be increasingly difficult to resist pressures to finance other, perhaps equally pressing, programs by the same, seemingly painless means. This could quickly become an exercise in self-delusion. This bill would set the precedent for the uncontrolled back door spending of up to \$75 billion from the special security trust fund with \$35 billion of assets; the civil service retirement fund with \$22 billion of assets; the unemployment insurance fund with \$13 billion of assets and the railroad retirement fund with \$5 billion of assets. The enactment of H.R. 9476 would be the first, not the

last of a series of similar proposals, each designed from good intentions, but leading to serious damage to our economy, and ultimately, to veterans and other groups we are trying to help.

In summary, we oppose H.R. 9476 because:

(1) It would not increase the flow of mortgage financing into veterans housing.

(2) We believe FNMA commitments to purchase VA guaranteed mortgages will decrease in an amount proportionate to the NSLI trust fund's commitment to purchase VA mortgages.

(3) It will bring a massive inflationary increase in the budget and in Treasury borrowing from the public, thus having an adverse effect upon the personal finances of all citizens, especially those on fixed incomes, such as seriously disabled veterans and pensioners.

(4) More veterans (220,000) are obtaining GI home loans this year than in any year since 1957.

(5) Current investments of NSLI trust funds earn a greater rate of interest than the earnings contemplated by H.R. 9476.

(6) Enactment of this measure will set a precedent for the utilization of up to \$75 billion in other Federal trust funds to finance equally pressing needs through this back door spending method, thus bypassing the established congressional appropriation process.

CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
WILLIAM H. AYRES,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT,
WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT.

Since the reporting of the similar bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), has worked long and arduously to perfect a compromise that would be acceptable to all interested parties. The Saylor amendments are embodied in the substitute bill being considered today. These amendments improve the bill.

The bill insures that trust funds cannot be expended in an amount greater than authorized in an appropriation act and that, in any one year, they may not exceed the sum of the trust fund investments maturing in that fiscal year.

The new bill also contains language that protects the trust fund against lower earnings should the yield on investment in housing mortgages be less than the yield on special securities of the Treasury Department. The bill further provides that an adequate reserve be maintained to insure the trust against expenses and losses resulting from the purchase of loans.

Because the bill has a most laudable objective—to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans—and because it has been improved by the amendments drafted by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I shall support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, on March 19, I received the following communication from Mr. Paul W. Eggers, General Counsel of the Treasury, which very briefly and succinctly sums up the administration's position on similar legislation:

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., March 19, 1970.
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE,
Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: This is in reply to your letter of March 11 to Secretary Kennedy requesting further comments on H.R. 9476, a bill "to increase the availability of guaran-

teed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the National Service Life Insurance Fund."

The Treasury Department's opposition to H.R. 9476 was expressed in detail in my letter of May 21, 1969 to Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, in my letter of November 17, 1969 to the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee on a similar measure, S. 3008, and in Under Secretary's Volcker's testimony on S. 3008 before the Senate Finance Committee on November 19, 1969.

The Department's opposition to H.R. 9476 may be summarized as follows:

1. The bill would rely on increased Federal budget outlays and increased Treasury borrowings from the public, rather than encourage private investment in VA guaranteed mortgages.

2. It would add to inflationary pressures in the economy unless the additional budget outlays required by the bill were offset by spending reductions in other Federal programs.

3. It would bypass the normal Congressional appropriations process through back-door spending.

4. It would be an inefficient and inequitable means of increasing the earnings of the National Service Life Insurance Fund.

5. It would set an undesirable precedent for future use of all Federal trust funds.

6. It would confuse the objectives of the veterans' housing and insurance programs, which have quite different classes of beneficiaries.

7. It would make a fundamental change in Federal credit program and trust fund policies in order to deal with a very limited problem arising from temporary disruptions of the flow of funds from private financial institutions.

8. It would accomplish nothing which could not be accomplished more efficiently and more equitably under programs and procedures already authorized by the Congress.

The Treasury Department remains firmly opposed to H.R. 9476.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL W. EGGERS,
General Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. I am supporting it because it represents a distinct improvement over the bill reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs last December.

I am supporting the new bill because it removes an extremely objectionable feature of the reported bill—that of so-called back door spending.

I am supporting it because it eliminates any possibility that current trust fund investments be liquidated prior to maturity.

I am supporting it because the new bill, unlike the committee reported bill, contains language that protects the trust fund against any loss of interest income resulting from the mandatory purchase of GI housing mortgages.

Finally, I am supporting it because it will assist in making mortgage financing available to veterans desiring to purchase homes under the GI bill.

The bill reported by committee, Mr. Speaker, was not acceptable to some members. As a result, I, together with other members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, opposed the bill. After considerable discussion and painstaking

analysis, I suggested a series of amendments designed to eliminate the undesirable features of the reported bill. The gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, has indicated that these amendments are acceptable to him. The bill before the House today contains the text of the reported bill as modified by the amendments suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The committee reported bill, Mr. Speaker, in effect directed the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer \$1 billion per year for each of the next 5 years from the national service life insurance trust fund to a newly created investment fund. The bill then required the Administrator to purchase GI home loan mortgages with the funds transferred to the investment fund. The executive branch had no control over the expenditures, nor did the Appropriations Committees of Congress. To me, this was back door spending at its finest. The bill before you today makes the transfer of such funds subject to affirmative action by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

The revised bill contains a further limitation, in that funds transferred from the insurance trust to the investment fund in any one year may not be greater than the sum of the securities presently held by the trust fund maturing in that particular year. The committee reported bill would have authorized the mandatory transfer of \$1 billion each year, even if it required the liquidation prior to maturity of currently invested securities.

The mandatory features of the committee reported bill created the possibility of a situation in which the Administrator would be required to purchase GI housing mortgages despite the fact that the yield or interest income from Government securities in which the balance of the trust fund is currently invested was greater than the yield from GI mortgages. This possibility has been eliminated in the bill before you by requiring that whenever the Administrator determines that the effective yield on loans eligible for purchase at any given time is less than that which would be obtained from an alternative investment in special securities of the Treasury Department, then he shall direct the purchase of such special Treasury securities.

Finally, the revised bill contains the added protection to the insurance trust fund against losses or expenses resulting from the purchase of housing loans by requiring that an adequate reserve against such expenses and losses be maintained at all times in the investment fund.

To sum up, the amendments to the committee reported bill and now contained in the bill before the House are these:

First. Requires that the utilization of insurance trust funds for investment in housing mortgages shall be subject to the appropriations process.

Second. The transfer of such funds may not exceed the sum of the invest-

ments of the insurance fund which mature in any one fiscal year.

Third. Funds transferred from the insurance trust shall be used to purchase special securities of the Treasury Department, when the yield thereon is greater than the yield on GI home mortgages.

Fourth. Requires that an adequate reserve against expenses and possible losses be maintained in the investment fund.

Mr. Speaker, this revised bill requires action by the Appropriations Committees of Congress before any of the trust funds can be expended. It protects the insurance trust fund against impairment. Its purpose is to make additional mortgage capital available in the GI loan program.

I urge that it be passed.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I simply asked the gentleman to yield a moment ago to ascertain exactly what we are dealing with. The gentleman says "when this bill was reported out of committee"; that is, H.R. 18253. It is my information that the bill before the House, H.R. 18253, was never reported out of committee.

Then the gentleman proceeded to talk about H.R. 9476. I simply want the House to know that they are not considering a bill that has been reported out of committee; that is all.

It is a strange procedure that we are called upon here today to act upon a bill which has never been reported out of committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. The Housing Subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, has been concerned about housing opportunities for returning Vietnam and other eligible veterans. The housing benefit is one of the major benefits of the GI bill of rights, but in view of the tight money situation which has prevailed for the past several years, returning war veterans have had only limited opportunity to avail themselves of the home loan benefit. Those that have been successful in obtaining a guaranteed loan have been involved in transactions where the seller has been required to pay an excessive discount in the form of points. About two-thirds of the housing activity in the veterans program for the past several years has been in resale of old or existing houses. In earlier days the reverse was true, about two-thirds of the activity was in new housing and only one-third was in old housing. Unfortunately, there has been a very limited opportunity in recent years for veterans to obtain financing for the purchase of a new home.

This bill which we have before us will certainly not solve all of the problems, but it would make available a rather substantial amount of money in the next few years which should improve opportunities for veterans to obtain new housing. We all hope that in the near future the general interest rate picture will improve and that more money can become

available from the investors of the Nation to flow into the housing market.

The bill which we are considering would improve the interest rate return to the national service life insurance trust fund. That fund is presently receiving an average interest yield of 4.23 percent. Funds invested in housing as authorized by this bill would yield the fund 7½ percent. There would be no danger to the trust fund because it would continue to be protected by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government as is now the case since these funds are invested in special Government bonds. I hope that this legislation can be enacted speedily because I believe it will give badly needed help to the sagging housing industry in this country and permit that industry to meet the needs of returning war veterans as it has done in the past.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 18253, which would authorize the use of up to \$5 billion over the next several years from the national service life insurance trust fund for the purpose of providing financing for veterans' home loans.

One of the basic benefits of the GI bill of rights which has been available to veterans of World War II, Korea, and now Vietnam, is the home loan program. Because of the shortage of mortgage financing during the last few years and the high interest rates which are involved, the home loan benefit has increasingly become of less use to returning veterans, particularly young veterans whose income is still at a lower level. Most of the loans which the Veterans' Administration has been guaranteeing have been on old houses which are being resold. Only about one-third VA loans are on new houses. It is hoped that the financing made available by this bill would create an expanded opportunity for new housing.

This bill would increase the interest yield to the national service life insurance policyholders. That fund would continue to enjoy the same protection which it has now, that is, the backing of the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government. At the present time, the fund is invested in the public debt. This bill would permit part of the fund to be invested in VA-guaranteed and direct-housing loans. I believe the priority needs of veterans for housing are sufficiently high to justify this change.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 18253, to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund.

This legislation would establish an investment fund of \$5 billion, to be transferred from the national service life insurance fund over a 5-year period and used to purchase both guaranteed and direct loans. The interest rate would be that which is currently applicable—presently 8½ percent, of which 1 percent would go to the Veterans' Administration to pay the costs of administering the program, and the remainder would be returned to the national service life insurance fund for future investments. At the going interest rate, this would mean a return of 7½

percent from this program. The national service life insurance fund currently invests in special Treasury obligations at an average interest rate of less than 4 percent, so this would be a significant increase of return on investment.

It is argued that 220,000 veterans obtained GI home loans in 1969—more than any year since 1957—through Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—commitments and this figure is expected to be met if not increased in 1970. However, the significance of this figure pales when one takes into account that in 1957, 302,047 guaranteed home loans were financed—82,047 more than in 1969—yet the number of living veterans that might be interested in receiving such loans has increased by some 4 million in those 13 years. And in the last 6 months approximately 495,000 members of our armed services have been released from active duty—over twice the number of all veterans receiving loans in 1969.

H.R. 18253 will require an initial outlay of approximately \$1 billion per year in its first 5 years of operation, and increase VA general operating expenses by \$2,650,000 in its first year of operation. However, as the Veterans' Committee has previously stated, this \$2,650,000 figure is merely an advance of funds, and would soon be reimbursed by the 1 percent fee.

It is my opinion that in the long run the financing of such home loans would be a sound investment program. It will also allow an additional 256,300 veterans over the next 5 years to secure guaranteed and direct home loans in this period of tight mortgage money. This is the least we can do for these individuals who have given productive years of their lives to the service of their country, and for this reason I strongly support H.R. 18253.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the veterans' guaranteed loan program is subject to a limit of 8½ percent. It is set indirectly, by the requirement that veterans guaranteed rates shall not exceed those of FHA insured home mortgage loans, which are subject to a statutory 8½-percent limit.

This bill would establish a 6-percent per annum limit on the interest rate charged on Veterans' Administration guaranteed mortgage loans.

Is there any prospect that loan funds will be forthcoming at 6 percent this year? The prospect is slight, unless the funds are derived from some source where returns are even lower. For example, commercial banks reserves might be required to be held in VA or FHA mortgages, instead of at the Federal Reserve bank, where they draw no interest, or instead of in conventional mortgages where they probably would draw around 9 percent.

But in the absence of such redirection of funds from lower yielding investment, the 6-percent limit would be consistent with movement to funds into VA mortgages under certain conditions which are not beyond possibility.

A reduction of the rate of return demanded by institutional lenders would be prompted by an increased safety preference—a feeling that Government guar-

anteed mortgages are safer immediately and later than are term loans to businesses; by a reduced demand for business loans due to continuing recession; and by anticipation that the decline in purchasing power of current income and of savings has almost come to an end. A forecast of continued recession without inflation, and without war, should make lower mortgage rates attractive to some investors.

The enactment of a statutory 6-percent limit should reinforce expectations, arising from optimism about ending war and inflation, of declining interest rates. The volume of VA loans at reasonable interest rates consequently should grow.

But the enactment would be more than a signal of what the Congress and the Executive think is the likely course of interest rates. It would be a commitment of the Government to take action to achieve lower rates of interest on VA mortgages. The statutory statement of that commitment would become a consideration in the policy decisions of Federal Reserve authorities, in expanding the base on which banks extend credit.

But reinforcing some private expectations, and committing the Government to a goal without prescribing the means, are not necessarily sure-fire routes to lower interest rates and more home loans. The essential aim, to which these are subordinate, is to improve the quantity of adequate housing available for veterans. It is not enough to create some of the conditions which could assist veterans to get housing. The Congress needs to make sure that low-cost financing is available for veterans' housing. To achieve that goal, the Congress should enlarge the VA direct loan program, and provide low-interest-rate loans.

If the guaranteed loan program does not find adequate financing, at the permanent rate established by statute for both VA and FHA loans, then an alternative should be ready.

The Congress should authorize the funds necessary to overcome through direct loans whatever shortages of capital develop in the guaranteed loan program. If, as the economy develops more stability, more VA guaranteed loans are available, the flow of credit through the direct loans can be curbed if guaranteed loan totals rise enough to cover current demand. But the matter which demands attention now, is to enlarge the direct program to finance veterans housing at rates which will be reasonable in future years, rather than the exorbitant rates which must be paid on guaranteed loans in today's critical credit conditions.

Mr. Speaker, my second bill relating to the veterans home loan programs is required if the first is to become fully effective. Money available for direct loans will not move veterans into homes of their own if the amount available per house is suited to home prices of some other time and place.

The bill would make the maximum direct loan \$25,000, rather than \$21,000.

The maximum direct loan is suited better to the small town than to the urban center of even a metropolitan area. It would not pay for a large house in almost any area of the United States. But

it would pay for a house, even in Montgomery County, Md., which would provide comfortable shelter for a family, and be located well enough with respect to schools and community facilities of all sorts to warrant support through a Federal loan program.

The \$25,000 maximum is about the median sales prices of mortgage financed homes in 1969. The median ranged from \$24,800 to \$25,900 during the year.

The \$25,000 maximum would cover the sales price on about three-quarters of the homes sold on VA guarantee in 1969.

A \$25,000 direct loan to a veteran would not finance his purchase of a home comparable to the average which is financed by conventional mortgage. Sales prices on new homes sold with conventional mortgage financing in 1969 ranged from \$30,300 to \$30,700 median price. Approximately 70 to 74 percent of new homes with conventional financing were priced above \$25,000.

VA guaranteed financing has been an important part of the market for homes selling at \$20,000 to \$25,000. VA guaranteed mortgages rise very sharply relative to FHA as a source of financing in this price class, and continue to rise in the \$25,000 to \$30,000 class.

The point of the figures is that veterans find homes which suit their needs and financing capacity in price classes which exceed the present dollar limit on direct home loans by VA. To assure veterans of housing, it will be necessary to enlarge the direct loan program. With mortgage money available to them at 6 percent, they will be able not only to buy houses which they could not buy otherwise because no money was available; but they will be able to afford much better housing on a given income. If direct loans were made at 6 percent, while other mortgages cost 8 percent—and money can be borrowed at that low rate in a few metropolitan areas, such as Philadelphia, New York, and Baltimore, but not in others—the veterans who borrowed at 6 percent could pay principal and interest on say a 25-year loan for \$25,000 with no more monthly outlay than on a \$20,870 loan at 8 percent.

To restate the argument briefly. An increase in the limit on direct home loans to veterans from \$21,000 to \$25,000 would enable veterans to buy homes in the median price range, where builders are experienced in building homes for veterans; it would enable veterans to buy adequate housing, even though they did not compete in the price range where conventional financing is more common; it would enable veterans to buy larger and more satisfactory homes, and to continue to buy even when construction costs and land prices rise somewhat higher, because it would raise the limit price and would reduce the debt service cost per dollar of mortgage enough to permit the veteran to carry the larger mortgage without larger dollar outlay.

Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this bill, H.R. 9476, providing for the use of national service life insurance funds to guarantee home loans to our war veterans, and most earnestly hope it is overwhelmingly approved by the House.

The purpose of this bill is to increase the availability of Veterans' Administration-guaranteed home loan financing for veterans desiring to purchase homes and at the same time to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund.

The provisions of this measure would establish on a revolving fund basis an investment fund, in an amount not to exceed \$5 billion, from which home loan financing would be available through commercial sources with the proceeds being repaid into the fund as the loans are repaid each month.

The national service life insurance trust fund arises out of the proceeds of premiums paid by World War II and other veterans, on their insurance policies.

The fund is now invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States and it has an overall current yield of 3.92 percent. If this measure is approved, that yield will be increased to 6½ percent and the fund would continue to be fully guaranteed by the U.S. Government with no possible loss to a policyholder or his beneficiary.

It is authoritatively estimated that the availability of an additional \$5 billion would make it possible to project 256,300 guaranteed loans and purchases, of which about 30 percent would be on newly constructed homes and the remaining 70 percent on existing homes.

In summary, it is clear that the basic objectives of this bill, to increase the amount of mortgage money available to veterans for home financing, to increase the interest yield in the national service life insurance reserve fund and to stimulate the housing and related industries, particularly at this time, would be in the national interest, and I hope this bill is resoundingly adopted.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. Speaker, since this bill is designed to make funds available for mortgage financing for veterans housing under the GI bill, I support it. Despite this commendable purpose, I have serious reservations about the propriety of attempting to solve the veterans housing problem by the use of insurance trust funds.

When the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported a similar bill last December, H.R. 9476, I joined with those who expressed opposition to this bill by signing the minority views thereon. These views are set forth in House Report No. 91-751.

There were two principal reasons for my objection to the original bill. First, the legislation sanctioned back-door spending; that is, spending money not authorized by the appropriations process. Second, the legislation set the precedent for the utilization of possibly \$75 billion in other Federal trust funds, such as social security, railroad retirement, and civil service retirement, in solving other equally critical needs of our Nation.

The bill before the House today eliminates my first objection to the original legislation, that of back-door spending. Therefore, I shall support the bill. I must, however, express my deep concern at this unprecedented utilization of Federal trust funds for this purpose. Since the

use of such funds will require actions by the Appropriations Committee, however, and since it reportedly will make mortgage financing available for veterans' housing, I will support the bill.

Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the commendable objective sought by the bill, H.R. 18253. I must confess, however, that I have serious reservations about the manner in which this objective would be achieved under the terms of the bill.

Although the bill before the House today has eliminated one of my principal objections to a related bill, H.R. 9476, in that it no longer bypasses the regular authorization-appropriations process, it does, however, adversely affect our Nation's efforts to curb inflation and would set an unwise precedent for the use of other Federal trust funds to solve other pressing problems confronting us.

Because the bill before the House eliminates the so-called back-door spending by making the expenditures subject to the normal appropriations process and because it will alleviate, hopefully, the veterans' housing problem, I shall support the bill. In the interest of clarification, however, I am setting forth my dissenting views expressed in the committee report on H.R. 9476, a similar bill reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs last December. The views expressed herein express my thoughts with respect to the inflationary aspects of this legislation:

DISSENTING VIEWS OF HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

I oppose the enactment of H.R. 9476 because it imposes additional fixed Federal expenditures during a 5-year period while bypassing the regular authorization-appropriations process and because under existing circumstances it will adversely affect our Nation's efforts to curb inflation.

I am fully aware of the unfortunate problem that confronts the veteran today who wishes to purchase a home and realize that it is a direct result of the pressures of inflation which have reduced the ready supply of private capital. Although I share the desire to increase the availability of guaranteed home financing for veterans, I am of the opinion that the mischief which this measure will create outweighs by far whatever assistance it may provide to veterans seeking to purchase a home.

Ostensibly the bill would transfer \$5 billion from trust fund reserves maintained against national service life insurance policies to an investment fund created by the bill which would be used to finance home mortgages guaranteed under the GI bill. Difficulty arises however, by virtue of the fact that the NSLI trust account does not contain funds which can be readily transferred from it to the investment fund. In fact the funds deposited to that account have already been loaned to the Treasury so that its assets now consist of interest-bearing Government securities. The requirement of H.R. 9476 calling for a transfer of funds from this trust account would in turn require the Treasury to raise new funds, not previously anticipated, in order to replace the securities in question.

This bill will clearly impose upon the Treasury, therefore, a requirement to provide an additional \$1 billion a year for the next 5 years for payment into the NSLI trust account. Under the circumstances this requirement which bypasses the regular, established authorization-appropriation process becomes nothing more nor less than a method via the backdoor of the Treasury of financing the

investment fund. In my view this approach is not in keeping with responsible budgeting practices.

Furthermore, it is a fact, based upon current projections of expenditures for this fiscal year, that the Federal Government will be forced to borrow several billion dollars from the general public. This bill will increase the amount thus to be borrowed this year by \$1 billion and will impose the additional burden of raising \$4 billion for this purpose during the next 4 years. In all probability additional borrowing will be required each year in order to raise the funds in question. Quite obviously, this will serve to feed the fires of inflation, which grip this Nation, at a time when we should exert every effort to extinguish them in order to avoid disaster. We should actively seek to lessen the impact of Federal demands upon private capital available in our Nation's money markets rather than increase those demands by enactment of this bill. We will accomplish little indeed if by this attempt to help one segment of our population we contribute to further increases in the cost of living to the detriment of all our citizens, especially those living on fixed income and including those we seek to help.

It is my belief that the undesirable features of H.R. 9476, together with the effects it will have upon our Federal budget, our Nation's economy, and the well-being of our Nation's citizens are of sufficient proportion to warrant rejection of this measure by the House.

DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Sisk). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 18253.

The question was taken.

Mr. TAFT. 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 326, nays 0, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

YEAS—326

Abbutt	Brotzman	Dellenback
Abernethy	Brown, Calif.	Denney
Adams	Brown, Ohio	Dennis
Addabbo	Broyhill, N.C.	Dent
Albert	Broyhill, Va.	Derwinski
Alexander	Buchanan	Devine
Anderson,	Burke, Mass.	Dickinson
Calif.	Burlison, Mo.	Dingell
Anderson, Ill.	Burton, Calif.	Donohue
Andrews, Ala.	Byrne, Pa.	Dorn
Andrews,	Byrnes, Wis.	Dowdy
N. Dak.	Carter	Downing
Annunzio	Cederberg	Dulski
Arends	Celler	Duncan
Ashley	Chamberlain	Dwyer
Aspinall	Clancy	Eckhardt
Ayres	Clark	Edmondson
Baring	Clausen,	Edwards, Ala.
Barrett	Don H.	Edwards, Calif.
Beall, Md.	Clawson, Del.	Ellberg
Belcher	Clay	Erlenborn
Bell, Calif.	Cleveland	Evans, Colo.
Bennett	Cohelan	Evins, Tenn.
Betts	Collins	Fallon
Beverly	Colmer	Fascell
Bingham	Conable	Feighan
Blackburn	Conte	Findley
Blanton	Corman	Fisher
Boland	Coughlin	Flood
Bolling	Cowger	Flowers
Bow	Cramer	Flynt
Bray	Cunningham	Foley
Brinkley	Daniel, Va.	Ford, Gerald R.
Brooks	Daniels, N.J.	Ford,
Broomfield	Davis, Ga.	William D.
	Davis, Wis.	Foreman

Fountain	McDade	Rodino
Fraser	McDonald,	Rogers, Colo.
Frey	Mich.	Rogers, Fla.
Friedel	McFall	Rooney, N.Y.
Fulton, Pa.	McKneally	Rosenthal
Fuqua	McMillan	Roth
Galianakias	Mahon	Ruth
Garmatz	Mailliard	Sandman
Gaydos	Mann	Satterfield
Gettys	Marsh	Saylor
Gibbons	Martin	Scherle
Goldwater	Mathias	Scheuer
Gonzalez	Matsunaga	Schmitz
Goodling	May	Schneebell
Green, Pa.	Mayne	Schwengel
Griffin	Meeds	Scott
Griffiths	Michel	Sebelius
Gross	Mikva	Shipley
Grover	Miller, Ohio	Shriver
Gubser	Mills	Sikes
Gude	Minish	Sisk
Hagan	Mink	Skubitz
Haley	Mize	Slack
Hall	Mizell	Smith, Calif.
Hamilton	Mollohan	Smith, Iowa
Hammer-	Monagan	Smith, N.Y.
schmidt	Montgomery	Snyder
Hanna	Moorhead	Springer
Hansen, Wash.	Morgan	Stafford
Harsha	Morse	Staggers
Hathaway	Morton	Stanton
Hays	Mosher	Steed
Hechler, W. Va.	Moss	Steiger, Ariz.
Heckler, Mass.	Murphy, Ill.	Steiger, Wis.
Helstoski	Murphy, N.Y.	Stokes
Henderson	Myers	Stratton
Hicks	Natcher	Stubblefield
Hogan	Nedzi	Sullivan
Hollifield	Nichols	Taft
Horton	Nix	Talcott
Hosmer	Obey	Taylor
Howard	O'Hara	Teague, Calif.
Hull	O'Konski	Teague, Tex.
Hunt	Olsen	Thompson, Ga.
Hutchinson	O'Neal, Ga.	Thompson, N.J.
Jacobs	O'Neill, Mass.	Thomson, Wis.
Jarman	Passman	Tiernan
Johnson, Calif.	Patman	Udall
Johnson, Pa.	Patten	Van Deerlin
Jonas	Pelly	Vanik
Jones, Ala.	Perkins	Vigorito
Jones, N.C.	Pettis	Waggonner
Jones, Tenn.	Philbin	Waldie
Kastenmeier	Pickle	Wampler
Kazen	Pike	Watson
Kee	Pease	Whalen
Keith	Poff	White
King	Preyer, N.C.	Whitehurst
Kleppe	Price, Ill.	Whitten
Kluczynski	Price, Tex.	Widnall
Koch	Pucinski	Williams
Kuykendall	Purcell	Wilson, Bob
Kyl	Quile	Wilson,
Kyros	Quillen	Charles H.
Landgrebe	Railsback	Winn
Langen	Randall	Wold
Latta	Reid, Ill.	Wright
Leggett	Reid, N.Y.	Wyatt
Lennon	Reifel	Wyder
Lloyd	Reuss	Wyman
Long, Md.	Rhodes	Yates
Lujan	Riegla	Yatron
McCarthy	Rivers	Young
McCloskey	Roberts	Zablocki
McClure	Robison	Zion

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—105

Adair	Culver	Karth
Anderson,	Daddario	Kirwan
Tenn.	Dawson	Landrum
Ashbrook	de la Garza	Long, La.
Berry	Delaney	Lowenstein
Blaggi	Diggs	Lukens
Blatnik	Edwards, La.	McClary
Boggs	Esch	McCulloch
Brademas	Eshleman	McEwen
Brasco	Farbstein	Macdonald,
Brock	Fish	Mass.
Brown, Mich.	Frelinghuysen	MacGregor
Burke, Fla.	Fulton, Tenn.	Madden
Burleson, Tex.	Gallagher	Melcher
Burton, Utah	Giaimo	Meskill
Bush	Gilbert	Miller, Calif.
Button	Gray	Minshall
Cabell	Green, Ore.	Nelsen
Caffery	Halpern	Ottlinger
Camp	Hanley	Pepper
Carey	Hansen, Idaho	Pirnie
Casey	Harrington	Podell
Chappell	Harvey	Pollock
Chisholm	Hastings	Powell
Collier	Hawkins	Pryor, Ark.
Conyers	Hébert	Rarick
Corbett	Hungate	Rees
Crane	Ichord	Roe

Rooney, Pa.	Schadeberg	Watts
Rostenkowski	Stephens	Weicker
Roudebush	Stuckey	Whalley
Rousselot	Symington	Wiggins
Roybal	Tunney	Wolf
Ruppe	Ullman	Wyllie
Ryan	Vander Jagt	Zwach
St Germain	Watkins	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Gaimo with Mr. Eshleman.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Brasco with Mr. Button.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Berry.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Ashbrook.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. McCulloch.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Crane.
Mr. Carey with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Hanley with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Podell with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Burke.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Wolf with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. McClary.
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Lowenstein with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Wyllie.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Rousselot.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Weicker.
Mr. Ullman with Mr. Zwach.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Roe.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Ryan.
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Symington.

Messrs. HOSMER and SCHMITZ changed their votes 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.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9476) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H.R. 18253.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND SECTION 14(b) OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 3889) to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is so much noise and confusion that I am unable to ascertain just what is being proposed by the gentleman from Texas.

Will the gentleman from Texas again state his request?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill, S. 3889, and to pass it with the following amendments—and I believe the amendments have already been read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the title of the bill has been read, but the amendments have not been read.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross) has reserved the right to object.

Mr. PATMAN. I might say that this just extends it for 1 year instead of 2 years.

Mr. GROSS. What are you extending? The \$5 billion cushion for the Treasury and authority to issue securities of one kind or another in that amount?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

It is the same bill that has passed here each 2 years since the beginning of World War II to let the Federal Reserve under certain circumstances buy certain amounts of Treasury obligations up to a certain amount, \$5 billion. They have never used that much. It usually runs around half a billion a year, sometimes it runs up to a billion. But it is very handy for the Government in its financing program.

I was called by a representative of the administration the other day, and was told that they need this badly now, and they asked me and asked the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) to try to get it through now. We did not want to pass it without a hearing, except that we would pass it for a 1-year period, and that is the agreement now, to have it for 1 year only.

Mr. GROSS. If the unanimous-consent request is granted, it will permit the Treasury to have outstanding at the expiration of the next year, since it is a 1-year bill, \$5 billion in what could well be printing press money. And the only way to get that \$5 billion out of the channels of trade, once pumped in through abuse of this law, would be to tax the people of this country.

In other words, without any further

sanction on the part of the Congress, the Treasury could have outstanding \$5 billion worth of additional debt at the end of next year, and this could be in what amounts to printing press money.

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, the gentleman stated the facts correctly, but we have an experience of about 28 years.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I understand.

Mr. PATMAN. And during those 28 years they never did abuse the law.

It is usually smaller sums like \$25 million or \$100 million or something like that.

But there is no danger in this because it has been used for 28 years by both parties, Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. GROSS. I understand. And used with frugality and reason, it provides a cushion for the Treasury. But the Members ought to be aware that they could wake up the end of next year with \$5 billion outstanding and it would be their responsibility.

Mr. PATMAN. We are going to have full and complete hearings on this that we have not had for years and years. Many of our Members do not know as much about it as they should. But we are going to have full and complete hearings during the next year that I think will be helpful because we realize, and as the gentleman says, and I am glad he is cautious about it. I am glad when he raises objection to these things if he feels that there is danger and I congratulate him for doing so. But I do not feel that there is the least danger.

Mr. GROSS. Now to get to the bill, the gentleman is asking for an extension of one year?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; instead of 2.

Mr. GROSS. And that is all?

Mr. PATMAN. That is all.

Mr. GROSS. There is no other change in the law as it has been extended through the years?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. The extension is for exactly 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, but before I do let me say that I am opposed to this proposal today as I have been opposed in the past. I continue to insist that this Government ought to conduct its financial affairs in such manner as to make unnecessary such authority, which, while it apparently has not been abused to date could very well leave the country with a big financial headache.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3889

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 355), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1972" and by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1972".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PATMAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On Page 1, line 5, strike "1972" and insert "1971", and on Page 1, line 7, strike "1972" and insert "1971".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 1 year the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14114) to improve the administration of the national park system by the Secretary of the Interior, and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14114

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress declares that the national park system, which began with establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, has since grown to include superlative natural, historic, and recreation areas in every major region of the United States, its territories and island possessions; that these areas, though distinct in character, are united through their interrelated purposes and resources into one national park system as cumulative expressions of a single national heritage; that, individually and collectively, these areas derive increased national dignity and recognition of their superb environmental quality through their inclusion jointly with each other in one national park system preserved and managed for the benefit and inspiration of all the people of the United States; and that it is the purpose of this Act to include all such areas in the System and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496; 16 U.S.C. 1b), is amended by deleting "and miscellaneous areas administered in connection therewith" and "and miscellaneous areas" wherever they appear.

(b) Section 2 of the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496; 16 U.S.C. 1c), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. (a) The 'national park system' shall include any area of land and water now or hereafter administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service for park, monument, historic, parkway, recreational, or other purposes.

"(b) Each area within the national park system shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of any statute made specifically applicable to that area. In addition, the provisions of this Act, and the various authorities relating to the administration and protection of areas under the administration of the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, including but not limited to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4), the Act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 253), as amended (16 U.S.C. 5) relating to rights-of-way, the Act of June 5, 1920

(41 Stat. 917), as amended (16 U.S.C. 6), relating to donation of land and money, sections 1, 4, 5, and 6 of the Act of April 9, 1924 (43 Stat. 90), as amended (16 U.S.C. 8 and 8a-8c), relating to roads and trails, the Act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1570; 16 U.S.C. 8d) relating to approach roads to national monuments, the Act of June 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 334), as amended (16 U.S.C. 8e-8f), relating to conveyance of roads to States, the Act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), as amended (16 U.S.C. 452a), relating to acquisitions of inholdings, section 1 of the Act of July 3, 1926 (44 Stat. 900), as amended (16 U.S.C. 12), relating to aid to visitors in emergencies, the Act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 873; 16 U.S.C. 10), relating to arrests, sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Act of May 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 381), as amended (16 U.S.C. 17b, 17c, 17d, and 17e), relating to services or other accommodations for the public, emergency supplies and services to concessioners, acceptability of travelers checks, care and removal of indigents, the Act of October 9, 1965 (79 Stat. 696; 16 U.S.C. 20-20g), relating to concessions, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and the Act of July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 355), shall, to the extent such provisions are not in conflict with any such specific provision, be applicable to all areas within the national park system and any reference in such Act to national Parks, monuments, recreation areas, historic monuments, or parkways shall hereinafter not be construed as limiting such Acts to those areas."

SEC. 3. In order to facilitate the administration of the national park system, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to carry out the following activities:

(a) provide transportation of employees located at isolated areas of the national park system and to members of their families, where (1) such areas are not adequately served by commercial transportation, and (2) such transportation is incidental to official transportation services;

(b) provide recreation facilities, equipment, and services for use by employees and their families located at isolated areas of the national park system;

(c) appoint and establish such advisory committees in regard to the functions of the National Park Service as he may deem advisable, members of which shall receive no compensation for their services as such but who shall be allowed necessary travel expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 5703);

(d) purchase field and special purpose equipment required by employees for the performance of assigned functions which shall be regarded and listed as park equipment;

(e) enter into contracts which provide for the sale or lease to persons, States, or their political subdivisions, of services, resources, water available within an area of the national park system, if such person, State, or its political subdivision—

(1) provides public accommodations or services within the immediate vicinity of an area of the national park system to persons visiting the area; and

(2) has demonstrated to the Secretary that there are no reasonable alternatives by which to acquire or perform the necessary services, resources, or water;

(f) acquire, and have installed, air-conditioning units for any Government-owned passenger motor vehicles used by the National Park Service, where assigned duties necessitate long periods in automobiles or in regions of the United States where high temperatures and humidity are common and prolonged;

(g) sell at fair market value without regard to the requirements of the Federal

Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, products and services produced in the conduct of living exhibits and interpretive demonstrations in areas of the national park system, to enter into contracts including cooperative arrangements with respect to such living exhibits and interpretive demonstrations and park programs and to credit the proceeds therefrom to the appropriation bearing the cost of such exhibits and demonstrations.

SEC. 4. The Act of March 17, 1948 (62 Stat. 81), is amended by deleting from section 1 thereof the words "over which the United States has, or hereafter acquires, exclusive or concurrent criminal jurisdiction," and changing section 3 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act, the environs of the District of Columbia are hereby defined as embracing Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, Prince William, and Stafford Counties and the city of Alexandria in Virginia, and Prince Georges, Charles, Anne Arundel, and Montgomery Counties in Maryland."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SISK). Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL).

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14114 is a general measure dealing with the administration of the national park system. It is the result of an executive communication transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior last year, but even before that time members of the committee and members of our staff had discussed some of the problems with which it deals.

The bill now before the House represents an important measure insofar as the day-to-day operations of the Park Service are concerned. It is no glamorous bill. No one will receive any trophies or awards or be acclaimed an outstanding statesman in the field of conservation because of its enactment, but it is an important part of the mechanism that makes all of the more glamorous legislative enactments work.

The Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation conducted hearings on this legislation during the last session and it has been carefully reviewed and perfected since that time. Essentially, the bill aims at one target; to clarify the authority granted by the Congress with respect to the activities of the National Park Service.

As everyone in this House knows, the past dozen years have been among the most productive years in the 100-year history of the national park system. We have expanded the concept of the system to include outdoor recreation as a major consideration for new areas. And, at the same time, we have stretched the idea that significant areas of the public domain should be reserved for public use and enjoyment to comprehend the re-acquisition of remaining nationally significant areas for the public. In accomplishing these ends, the Congress has established some of the traditional types of areas in the national park system, but

we have also added some new categories like national recreation areas, national lakeshores, and national seashores.

With the changes that have evolved, some anachronisms have developed in the general administrative authority. To correct them and update the general law, H.R. 14114 redefines "national park system" to comprehend all of the different types of areas involved so that the administrative authority applicable to a national park, for example, extends uniformly to a national seashore, and so forth.

In addition to clarifying the existing general authority, H.R. 14114 authorizes certain functions for which there has previously been no clear statutory authority. These new authorities are needed in order to improve the administration of the units of the national park system. Very briefly, I want to itemize these features of the bill:

First. It authorizes the Secretary to provide transportation for employees and their dependents to and from isolated areas when commercial transportation is not available and when such transportation is incidental to official transportation.

Second. It authorizes the Secretary to provide simple recreation facilities for employees and their families at isolated locations.

Third. It authorizes him to expand citizen participation in the park program by allowing him to appoint advisory committees to serve without compensation except for travel and per diem expenses.

Fourth. It authorizes the Secretary to purchase specialized equipment for employees needed for particular areas where such equipment is essential to the proper administration of a park.

Fifth. It authorizes him to contract for the sale or use of resources—particularly water—to public or private persons providing public accommodations to park visitors outside the park boundaries.

Sixth. It permits him to install air-conditioning units in Government-owned passenger vehicles which are used in areas where high temperatures or high humidity makes their prolonged use extremely uncomfortable. Obviously, these units will not be needed in all vehicles, but they should be installed in patrol vehicles in hot desert areas and in Park Police vehicles in the National Capital region.

Seventh. It allows him to dispose of products produced at "living exhibits" without regard to the usual rules applicable to the disposal of Federal property.

Mr. Speaker, all of these items are reasonable extensions of the existing general authority of the Secretary. We feel that they will enable him to carry out the responsibilities which have been assigned to him.

The amendments adopted by the committee make it clear that the new authorities are not without reasonable limitations and that adequate provisions should be available to carry out the functions intended at such "living exhibits" as Ford's Theatre and Wolf Trap Farm Park. The committee deleted language contained in the bill which authorized

the Secretary to provide transportation of children to park areas because it was generally agreed that the language was too imprecise and the concept too broad to be included in this legislation.

In conclusion, I want to say that this bill does not specifically authorize any expenditures but some of its provisions will result in some costs to the Government. Naturally, any outlays will have to be included in the budget requests of the National Park Service and they will be subject to the usual thorough scrutiny of our Appropriations Committee. In addition, I can assure my colleagues that the authorizing committee will maintain careful surveillance over the programs involved.

As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I urge the approval of H.R. 14114, as amended.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would explain the last paragraph of the bill that has to do with the nearby counties in Virginia and Maryland being included within the Washington Metropolitan area. I believe this relates to the authority of the Park Police to make arrests in nearby parks, but as it is in my district, and I would like to have the gentleman explain this portion of the measure.

Mr. ASPINALL. Only in those areas over which the National Park Service has jurisdiction, this is a general authority which permits the National Park System of the Capital to perform such services.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the change, if the gentleman will, between the present law and the proposals under this bill?

Mr. ASPINALL. As I understand it, it incorporates the general law, but it also incorporates all the different categories of the National Park System which will be included under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SCOTT. This authorizes the Park Police to make arrests in national parks within the named counties?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct.

Mr. SCOTT. Whether or not there has been a cession of jurisdiction by the States?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct, and it is because of the fact that these are so closely situated to the National Capital and the facilities involved are really a part of the National Capital Park System.

Mr. SCOTT. Would that be for a violation of Federal law or State law?

Mr. ASPINALL. It would be for violation of the Federal law.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

The purposes of this bill are to improve the administration of the national park system, to clarify the general authorities applicable to the system, and to provide new authorities to assist in the administration of the system.

Our first national park, Yellowstone National Park, was created in 1872. The

National Park Service was created some 44 years later, in 1916. Since that time, the growth and development of our national park system has brought together a combination of interrelated resources, which are a cumulative expression of our heritage. Today, our national park system is world renowned. It is the finest in the world.

Today, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is asking the House to pass legislation which will keep our national park system the best in the world. H.R. 14114 will do this, and I ask your support for this legislation.

Specifically, H.R. 14114, as amended, redefines the national park system to include all areas administered by the National Park Service. At the present time, the national park system is defined only in terms of six specific types of areas. Section 2 of the bill unifies all the areas administered by the National Park Service and clarifies the extent to which existing specific administrative authorities are applicable to all areas administered by the National Park Service.

Section 3 of the bill provides new authorities to assist in the administration of the national park system. Included among the new authorities are: Transportation for employees and families in isolated areas; recreation facilities for employees and their families in isolated areas; the appointment of advisory committees; authority to purchase special purpose and safety equipment; authority to contract for services and resources outside national park areas which will enhance the Federal facility; installation of air-conditioning equipment in Park Service vehicles; and authority to dispose of items produced at "living farms" or "live" interpretive exhibits, shows, and so forth, at fair market value, and which are surplus to the needs of the Federal Government.

Section 4 of the bill removes the requirement of exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction as to the arrest authority of the Park Police and redefines the environs of the District of Columbia over which the Park Police previously had no arrest authority.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will greatly assist the administrators of our national park system in their efforts to preserve, interpret, and protect our natural heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of this and future generations of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass this legislation.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in full support of H.R. 14114, to improve the administration of the National Park Service and for other purposes.

First of all, I would like to compliment the distinguished chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), for advancing this legislation to assist in making the administra-

tion of the National Park Service more efficient and responsive to the times.

As we are all aware, the National Park Service is dedicated to preserving and conserving those areas in our country that are of great national significance. However, there has been no updating of the statutes since the Act of August 8, 1953, and the time has come to revise those statutes that are applicable to the Park Service.

As a consequence, there is, at present, a great variance in practice and statute in different areas around the Nation, and between parks, recreation areas, and so forth. This legislation is designed to reduce the variance and make the applicable laws and regulations more uniform in nature and, at the same time, create a uniform set of rules and regulations that will apply to future authorizations.

In addition, this legislation provides the Secretary of the Interior with the authority to further facilitate the administration of the national park system by authorizing him to provide necessary transportation and recreation facilities for employees who work in isolated areas, appoint committees to make possible more participation by local citizenry in park policies and programs, and offer products or services produced at national parks at fair market value.

We cannot operate a 1970 park system with outdated or outmoded rules and regulations; thus, the need for this legislation designed to provide statutes that will be more efficient and responsive to the needs of the 1970's—and the future.

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

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

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his remarks and the committee upon this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I express my hope that this bill will pass as has been requested.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, I support H.R. 14114 which was introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL). A companion bill is being introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

This bill is one which the Director of the National Park Service gives high priority and which the subcommittee recognized as important to the overall administration of our parklands. It is this kind of legislation which makes the national park system work from day to day. Without measures such as this, which bring the law into conformity with the progress which we have made, the administration of the units of the national park system could be severely handicapped.

The gentleman from Colorado has said that this is not a "glamorous" bill. It is a housekeeping bill. It will bring no one fame or fortune, but it will assure the uniform application of general law throughout the national park system and it will enable the Park Service to solve and accommodate some of the special problems associated with the operation of our national treasures.

Mr. Speaker, it is no accident that our chairman is the principal sponsor of the bill now before the House. As everyone in this body knows, he is one of the most conscientious conservationists in the Congress. He does not look for the easy way or the popular way out of a controversy, he looks for the right way to resolve it. He is a strong leader and a knowledgeable legislator who is respected by his colleagues and, silently, admired by many of the Nation's leading conservationists.

It is just like our chairman to be the sponsor of this bill, because he wants the park system which he has nurtured and promoted to operate effectively in the public interest. No other committee chairman in the history of this country has done more for the national park system than WAYNE ASPINALL. I have been on his committee since I first came to Congress 10 years ago. Day in and day out, he is there helping us to perfect the national park legislation which we bring before the House. Through his guidance and leadership, we have authorized the greatest expansion of the national park system since the days of Teddy Roosevelt and William Howard Taft. As a fellow committee member and as a fellow Democrat, I am proud to be associated with this great American.

H.R. 14114 typifies the concern of our colleague for the more mundane, but no less important, affairs of the National Park Service. Its enactment will update the general law as it applies to the national park system and it will make the law uniformly applicable to all types of units of the system.

The bill also adds some continuing authority to the general law which is considered necessary. Some of these provisions will effectively enhance employee relations and morale; namely, the authority to provide transportation and limited recreation facilities and equipment for park personnel and their families at isolated locations. Needless to say, the installation of air-conditioning units in Park Service vehicles which are almost constant use in both arid and humid regions will make those assignments more desirable and acceptable.

Some other provisions deal with specific problems which occur at park areas from time to time and which should be handled in a general way rather than in specific authorizations.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member have made a thorough explanation of the legislation which I need not repeat, but I do want to recommend H.R. 14114, as amended, to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. Sisk). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14114, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. HOSMER. 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 325, nays 0, not voting 106, as follows:

[Roll No. 222]

YEAS—325

Abbt	Fisher	Mayne
Abernethy	Flood	Meeds
Adams	Flowers	Michel
Albert	Flynt	Mikva
Alexander	Foley	Miller, Ohio
Anderson,	Ford, Gerald R.	Mills
Calif.	Ford,	Minish
Anderson, Ill.	William D.	Mink
Andrews, Ala.	Foreman	Mize
Andrews,	Fountain	Mizell
N. Dak.	Fraser	Mollohan
Annunzio	Frey	Monagan
Arends	Friedel	Montgomery
Ashley	Fulton, Pa.	Moorhead
Aspinall	Fuqua	Morgan
Ayres	Gallfanakis	Morse
Baring	Garmatz	Morton
Barrett	Gaydos	Mosher
Beall, Md.	Gettys	Moss
Belcher	Gibbons	Murphy, Ill.
Bell, Calif.	Goldwater	Murphy, N.Y.
Bennett	Gonzalez	Myers
Betts	Gooding	Natcher
Bevill	Green, Pa.	Nedzi
Blester	Griffin	Nichols
Bingham	Griffiths	Nix
Blackburn	Gross	O'Beay
Blanton	Grover	O'Hara
Boggs	Gubser	O'Konski
Boland	Gude	Olsen
Bolling	Hagan	O'Neal, Ga.
Bow	Haley	O'Neill, Mass.
Bray	Hall	Passman
Brinkley	Hamilton	Patman
Brooks	Hammer-	Patten
Broomfield	schmidt	Pelly
Brotzman	Hanna	Perkins
Brown, Calif.	Harsha	Pettis
Brown, Ohio	Hathaway	Phillips
Broyhill, N.C.	Hays	Pickle
Broyhill, Va.	Hechler, W. Va.	Pike
Buchanan	Heckler, Mass.	Poage
Burke, Mass.	Helstoski	Podell
Burlison, Mo.	Henderson	Poff
Burton, Calif.	Hicks	Pollock
Byrne, Pa.	Hogan	Preyer, N.C.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hollifield	Price, Ill.
Carter	Horton	Price, Tex.
Cederberg	Hosmer	Pucinski
Celler	Howard	Purcell
Chamberlain	Hull	Quie
Clancy	Hunt	Quillen
Clark	Hutchinson	Rallsback
Clausen,	Jacobs	Randall
Don H.	Jarman	Rees
Clawson, Del.	Johnson, Calif.	Reid, Ill.
Clay	Johnson, Pa.	Reid, N.Y.
Cleveland	Jonas	Reifel
Cohelan	Jones, Ala.	Reuss
Collins	Jones, N.C.	Rhodes
Colmer	Jones, Tenn.	Riegler
Conable	Kastenmeier	Rivers
Conte	Kazen	Roberts
Corman	Kee	Robison
Coughlin	Keith	Rodino
Cowger	King	Rogers, Colo.
Cramer	Kleppe	Rogers, Fla.
Cunningham	Kluczynski	Rooney, N.Y.
Daniel, Va.	Koch	Rosenthal
Daniels, N.J.	Kuykendall	Roth
Davis, Wis.	Kyl	Ruth
Dellenback	Kyros	Sandman
Denney	Landgrebe	Satterfield
Dennis	Langen	Saylor
Dent	Latta	Scherle
Derwinski	Leggett	Scheuer
Devine	Lennon	Schmitz
Dickinson	Lloyd	Schneebeli
Dingell	Long, Md.	Schwengel
Donohue	Lujan	Scott
Dorn	McCarthy	Sebellius
Dowdy	McCloskey	Shipley
Downing	McClure	Shriver
Dulski	McDade	Sikes
Duncan	McDonald,	Sisk
Dwyer	Mich.	Skubitz
Eckhardt	McFall	Slack
Edmondson	McKneally	Smith, Calif.
Edwards, Ala.	McMillan	Smith, Iowa
Edwards, Calif.	Mahon	Smith, N.Y.
Ellberg	Mailliard	Snyder
Erlenborn	Mann	Springer
Evans, Colo.	Marsh	Stafford
Fallon	Martin	Staggers
Fascell	Mathias	Stanton
Feighan	Matsunaga	Steed
Findley	May	Steiger, Ariz.

Steiger, Wis.	Udall	Wilson, Bob
Stokes	Van Deerlin	Winn
Stratton	Vanik	Wold
Stubblefield	Vigorito	Wright
Sullivan	Waggonner	Wyatt
Taft	Waldie	Wydler
Talcott	Wampler	Wyman
Taylor	Watson	Yates
Teague, Calif.	Whalen	Yatron
Teague, Tex.	White	Young
Thompson, Ga.	Whitehurst	Zablocki
Thompson, N.J.	Whitten	Zion
Thomson, Wis.	Widnall	
Tiernan	Williams	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—106

Adair	Eshleman	Miller, Calif.
Addabbo	Evins, Tenn.	Minshall
Anderson,	Farbstein	Nelsen
Tenn.	Fish	Otinger
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Pepper
Berry	Fulton, Tenn.	Pirnie
Blaggi	Gallagher	Powell
Biatnik	Gialmo	Pryor, Ark.
Brademas	Gilbert	Rarick
Brasco	Gray	Roe
Brock	Green, Oreg.	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Mich.	Halpern	Rostenkowski
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Idaho	Roudebush
Burleson, Tex.	Hansen, Wash.	Rousselot
Burton, Utah	Harrington	Roybal
Bush	Harvey	Ruppe
Button	Hastings	Ryan
Cabell	Hawkins	St Germain
Caffery	Hébert	Schadeberg
Camp	Hungate	Stephens
Carey	Ichord	Stuckey
Casey	Karh	Symington
Chappell	Kirwan	Tunney
Chisholm	Landrum	Ullman
Collier	Long, La.	Vander Jagt
Conyers	Lowenstein	Watkins
Corbett	Lukens	Watts
Crane	McClary	Weicker
Culver	McCulloch	Whalley
Daddario	McEwen	Wiggins
Davis, Ga.	Macdonald,	Wilson
Dawson	Mass.	Charles H.
de la Garza	MacGregor	Wolff
Delaney	Madden	Wylie
Diggs	Melcher	Zwach
Edwards, La.	Meskill	
Esch		

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Eshleman.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Minshall.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Button.
 Mr. Edward of Louisiana with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Berry.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Roudebush.
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Ashbrook.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Pirnie.
 Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. McCulloch.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Corbett.
 Mr. Biatnik with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Burleson of Texas with Mr. Crane.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hawkins.
 Mr. St Germain with Mr. Camp.
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Davis of Georgia.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Cabell with Mr. Bush.
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. Burke.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Wolf with Mr. Halpern.
 Mr. Melcher with Mr. McClary.
 Mr. Stephens with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Powell.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Harvey.
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Lukens.
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. MacGregor.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Charles H. Willson.
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Lowenstein with Mrs. Chisholm.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Wy-
 lie.
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Rousselot.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Diggs.
 Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Whalley.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Schadeberg.
 Mr. Karth with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. Hungate with Mr. Weicker.
 Mr. Ullman with Mr. Zwach.
 Mr. Casey with Mr. Roe.
 Mr. Roybal with Mr. Stuckey.
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. Ryan.
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Symington.
 Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr.
 Dawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight to file certain privileged reports.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING BOUNDARIES OF TOIYABE NATIONAL FOREST, NEV.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3279) to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3279

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That to aid in the protection and management of the various resources of the area, including the protection, improvement, and maintenance of the watershed, wildlife, recreation, and natural environment values of the lands in the Lake Tahoe Basin, and to promote the management and protection of these lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield, the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest are hereby extended to include the area described in section 2 hereof. Subject to any valid claims now existing and hereafter maintained, any lands of the United States within such area are hereby added to such national forest and shall be subject to laws and regulations applicable to the national forests.

Sec. 2. This Act shall be applicable to the following described lands:

Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada

Township 13 north range 18 east: Section 2, lot 1 of the northeast quarter, lot 1 of the northwest quarter, south half; section 3, lots 1 and 2 of northeast quarter, lots 5, 6, and 7, northeast quarter southwest quarter, southeast quarter; section 10, lot 1, east half; section 11, all; section 14, north half, southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter; section 23, west half northeast quarter,

northeast quarter northwest quarter; section 24, north half north half, south half northwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter.

Township 14 north, range 18 east: Sections 1 and 2, all; section 3, lots 1 and 2 of northeast quarter, lots 1 and 2 of northwest quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 4, lots 1 and 2; section 11, northeast quarter, north half northwest quarter, southeast quarter northwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, southeast quarter; section 12, all; section 14, west half; section 15, east half northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter; section 22, lots 2, 3, and 4, east half southeast quarter; section 23, west half; section 26, west half; section 34, southeast quarter; section 35, northeast quarter northwest quarter.

Township 15 north, range 18 east: Section 13, south half; section 14, lots 3 and 4, east half southwest quarter, southeast quarter; sections 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 33, 34, 35, and 36, all.

Township 15 north, range 19 east: Section 18, lot 2 of the southwest quarter; section 19, lot 2 of the northwest quarter, lots 1 and 2 of the southwest quarter; section 30, lot 2 of the northwest quarter.

The area described aggregates 12,919.78 acres, more or less.

Sec. 3. Not to exceed \$12,500,000 of the funds appropriated and available for acquisition of lands, waters, and interests therein, in the National Forest System pursuant to section 6 of the Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 903), shall be available for the acquisition of any lands, waters, and interests therein, within the area described in section 2 of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 3279, as amended, is to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest to include some 12,920 acres along the Nevada side of Lake Tahoe. This extension of the boundaries would assist in the protection of the land and permits its management under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

Besides giving added protection to the lake and its surrounding land area, the acquisition of the new acreage would increase the lake frontage in public ownership by 50 percent and would provide additional badly needed recreational facilities.

Population pressures are at work in the Lake Tahoe area as they are in many other areas. However, here these pressures could be even more harmful to the natural beauty and environment than in areas more able to absorb the expansion. The population of the Nevada portion of the basin has increased from 213 in 1950 to 8,000 by 1969 and in the last 5 years 99 subdivision developments have been filed and approved. The population of the entire basin is now about 28,000 with summertime peaks of over 100,000.

This activity has resulted in siltation and pollution of the lake water from fertilizers, insecticides, salts for ice and snow control, and other soluble chemicals used in our everyday activities. As a result the color and clarity of the lake is

being adversely affected, and there is the beginning of algae and aquatic plant growth in the lake. Enactment of S. 3279 would be a step in the right direction to control this gradual degradation of this area and its environment.

The proposal, as amended, by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, places an acquisition ceiling of \$12,500,000 on the land to be included. This is the amount estimated as necessary by the Department of Agriculture in testimony before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend enactment of S. 3279.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. BARING).

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Interior Committee Public Lands Subcommittee, I want to urge favorable action today on S. 3279, a bill to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest at Lake Tahoe in Nevada.

This is an excellent bill of vital importance to, not just the people in my State of Nevada, but for all Americans who desire the preservation of the scenic wonders of this Nation and the proper utilization of natural resources in our ever-growing United States.

I wish to note to the Members of the House that this bill has already passed the Senate, where it had strong support.

The bill calls for the inclusion of 12,920 acres of beautiful forested and lake-front land on the Nevada side of this high Sierra Mountain lake. This bill will allow proper protection and management of the area under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

This bill further enhances the efforts to protect the crystalline waters of Lake Tahoe.

The American public is the benefactor in this bill as an expanded recreation area will result. I especially want to point out that 6 miles of Lake Tahoe shoreline frontage will be included.

The bill also states, Mr. Speaker, that the limit of \$12,500,000 will be spent for acquisition by the Department of Agriculture of the additional park lands with the funds to come from the land and water conservation fund act.

This bill surely helps protect the natural environmental qualities of the Lake Tahoe area and all of the related natural resources within the expanded Toiyabe National Forest.

I urge passage of this measure.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3279, to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this legislation is to protect the environment, natural beauty, and watershed of Lake Tahoe in Nevada. This will be done by authorizing the Forest Service to acquire approximately 12,920 acres of land along the Nevada side of Lake Tahoe. These lands would then become part of the Toiyabe National Forest by extension of the national forest boundaries to include these lands.

The total cost for acquisition of lands are estimated at \$12,500,000 and the

Forest Service proposes to promote the management and protection of these lands under the principles of multiple use and sustained yield.

Once again, we are called upon to face the threat of an environmental factor—the threat of uncontrolled population. Once again, an area of unusual beauty with a unique body of water is threatened with imbalance and possible destruction because of the neglect of our environment. And, once again, we run to fill the breach with piecemeal land use measures.

Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation clearly demonstrates the need for a national land use policy. In the absence of a national land use policy, I urge the rules be suspended and S. 3279 be passed.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that the land will be obtained at a cost of something like \$1,200 an acre?

Mr. SAYLOR. It would be in that amount in reference to some of it, but right down at the lake, it would cost more than that.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I do not doubt that the land on or within a reasonable distance of the lake would be quite expensive. However, what makes the remainder of the land, located at a distance from the lake, worth \$1,250 per acre or somewhere near that price?

Mr. SAYLOR. I might say to my colleague from Iowa that I happen to know of my own knowledge certain tracts of land on the lake which sold for more than \$12,000 per acre not too long ago. I can also tell my colleague that the land that is removed about 12 miles from the lake also sold for over \$1,000 per acre not too long ago.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is that based on timber yield or any other enhancement other than the location of the land in close proximity to the lake?

Mr. SAYLOR. It is based upon the location of the land, and the proximity to the land to the lake. Land in that area is in tremendous demand for summer homes. It is a tremendous recreation area. One of the reasons that some of this land is being bought away from the lake is in order to protect the lake itself. It just so happens that I went to this lake a short time ago and observed this area. I can remember I will say to my friend from Iowa the time when Lake Tahoe was a gem of beauty, with no pollution at all. However, now observing the area from a height one can see where large areas of this lake are already polluted, and unless something is done to prevent further pollution of it the gem not only recognized by this country but by people throughout the world is about to be lost because of pollution.

Mr. GROSS. Is that because of lack of State enforcement of antipollution measures, or does the State have any jurisdiction?

Mr. SAYLOR. Well, the pollution is on both sides, on the California side as well as on the Nevada side. I might say that both States are moving rapidly to upgrade their antipollution rules and reg-

ulations based upon plans which they have formulated for that immediate area.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SISK). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 3279, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACTS

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 12475) to revise and clarify the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, and for other purposes, as amended. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 12475

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

TITLE I—FEDERAL AID IN WILDLIFE RESTORATION

SEC. 101. The first sentence of section 3 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act of September 2, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669b), is amended to read as follows: "An amount equal to all revenues accruing each fiscal year (beginning with the fiscal year 1971) from any tax imposed on specified articles by section 4181 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (26 U.S.C. 4181) shall, subject to the exemptions in section 4182 of such Code, be covered into the Federal aid to wildlife restoration fund in the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund') and is authorized to be appropriated and made available until expended to carry out the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 102. Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 8(a) of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act of September 2, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669c—669g-1), are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. (a) So much, not to exceed 8 per centum of the revenues covered into said fund in each fiscal year as the Secretary of the Interior may estimate to be necessary for his expenses in the administration and execution of this Act and the Migratory Bird Conservation Act shall be deducted for that purpose, and such sum is authorized to be made available therefor until the expiration of the next succeeding fiscal year, and within sixty days after the close of such fiscal year the Secretary of the Interior shall apportion such part thereof as remains unexpended by him, if any, and make certificate thereof to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the State fish and game departments on the same basis and in the same manner as is provided as to other amounts authorized by this Act to be apportioned among the States for such current fiscal year. The Secretary of the Interior, after making the aforesaid deduction, shall apportion, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the remainder of the revenue in said fund for each fiscal year among the several States in the following manner: One-half in the ratio which the area of each State bears to the total area of all the States, and one-half in the ratio which the number of paid hunting license holders of each State in the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which such apportionment is made, as certified to said Secretary by the State fish and

game departments, bears to the total number of paid hunting-license holders of all the States. Such apportionments shall be adjusted equitably so that no State shall receive less than one-half of 1 per centum nor more than 5 per centum of the total amount apportioned. The term fiscal year as used in this Act shall be a period of twelve consecutive months from July 1 through the succeeding June 30, except that the period of enumeration of paid hunting-license holders shall be a State's fiscal or license year.

"(b) One-half of the revenues accruing to the fund under this Act each fiscal year (beginning with the fiscal year 1971) from any tax imposed on pistols and revolvers shall be apportioned among the States in proportion to the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all the States. Provided, That each State shall be apportioned not more than 3 per centum and not less than 1 per centum of such revenues. For the purpose of this subsection, population shall be determined on the basis of the latest decennial census for which figures are available, as certified by the Secretary of Commerce.

"Sec. 5. For each fiscal year, the Secretary of the Interior shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury and to each State fish and game department the sum which he has estimated to be deducted for administering and executing this Act and the Migratory Bird Conservation Act and the sum which he has apportioned to each State. Any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this Act shall notify the Secretary of the Interior to this effect within sixty days after it has received the certification referred to in this section. The sum apportioned to any State which fails to notify the Secretary of the Interior as herein provided is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act.

"Sec. 6. (a) Any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this Act shall, by its State fish and game department, submit programs or projects for wildlife restoration in either of the following two ways:

"(1) The State shall prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Interior a comprehensive fish and wildlife resource management plan which shall insure the perpetuation of these resources for the economic, scientific, and recreational enrichment of the people. Such plan shall be for a period of not less than five years and be based on projections of desires and needs of the people for a period of not less than fifteen years. It shall include provisions for updating at intervals of not more than three years and be provided in a format as may be required by the Secretary of the Interior. If the Secretary of the Interior finds that such plans conform to standards established by him and approves such plans, he may finance up to 75 per centum of the cost of implementing segments of those plans meeting the purposes of this Act from funds apportioned under this Act upon his approval of an annual agreement submitted to him.

"(2) A State may elect to avail itself of the benefits of this Act by its State fish and game department submitting to the Secretary of the Interior full and detailed statements of any wildlife-restoration project proposed for that State. If the Secretary of the Interior finds that such project meets with the standards set by him and approves said project, the State fish and game department shall furnish to him such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates therefor as he may require. If the Secretary of the Interior approves the plans, specifications, and estimates for the project, he shall notify the State fish and game department and immediately set aside so much of said fund as represents the share of the United States payable under this Act

on account of such project, which sum so set aside shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total estimated cost thereof.

The Secretary of the Interior shall approve only such comprehensive plans or projects as may be substantial in character and design and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such approved comprehensive wildlife plans or projects and if otherwise applied they shall be replaced by the State before it may participate in any further apportionment under this Act. No payment of any money apportioned under this Act shall be made on any comprehensive wildlife plan or project until an agreement to participate therein shall have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

"(b) If the State elects to avail itself of the benefits of this Act by preparing a comprehensive fish and wildlife plan under option (1) of subsection (a) of this section, then the term 'project' may be defined by the purposes of this Act as a wildlife program, all other definitions notwithstanding.

"(c) Administrative costs in the form of overhead or indirect costs for services provided by State central service activities outside of the State agency having primary jurisdiction over the wildlife resources of the State which may be charged against programs or projects supported by the fund established by section 3 of this Act shall not exceed in any one fiscal year 3 per centum of the annual apportionment to the State.

"Sec. 7. (a) When the Secretary of the Interior shall find that any project approved by him has been completed or, if involving research relating to wildlife, is being conducted, in compliance with said plans and specifications, he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State the amount set aside for said project. The Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, from time to time, make payments on said project as the same progresses; but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall not be more than the United States pro rata share of the project in conformity with said plans and specifications. If a State has elected to avail itself of the benefits of this Act by preparing a comprehensive fish and wildlife plan as provided for under option (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of this Act, and this plan has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, then the Secretary may, in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, advance funds to the State for financing the United States pro rata share agreed upon between the State fish and game department and the Secretary.

"(b) Any construction work and labor in each State shall be performed in accordance with its laws and under the direct supervision of the State fish and game department, subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with rules and regulations made pursuant to this Act. The Secretary of the Interior and the State fish and game department of each State may jointly determine at which times and in what amounts payments shall be made under this Act. Such payments shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury, on warrants drawn by the Secretary of the Interior against the said fund to such official or officials, or depository, as may be designated by the State fish and game department and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds of the State.

"Sec. 8. (a) Maintenance of wildlife-restoration projects established under the provisions of this Act shall be the duty of the States in accordance with their respective laws. Beginning July 1, 1945, the term 'wildlife-restoration project,' as defined in section 2 of this Act, shall include maintenance of completed projects. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, funds appor-

tioned to a State under this Act may be expended by the State for management (exclusive of law enforcement and public relations) of wildlife areas and resources.

"(b) Each State may use the funds apportioned to it under section 4(h) of this Act to pay up to 50 per centum of the costs of a hunter safety program and the construction, operation, and maintenance of public outdoor target ranges, as a part of such program. The non-Federal share of such costs may be derived from license fees paid by hunters, but not from other Federal grant programs. The Secretary shall issue not later than the 120th day after the effective date of this subsection such regulations as he deems advisable relative to the criteria for the establishment of hunter safety programs and public outdoor target ranges under this subsection.

"Sec. 8A. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture of Puerto Rico, the Governor of Guam, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, in the conduct of wildlife-restoration projects, as defined in section 2 of this Act, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized to apportion to Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, out of the money available for apportionment under this Act, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding for Puerto Rico one-half of 1 per centum, for Guam one-sixth of 1 per centum, and for the Virgin Islands one-sixth of 1 per centum of the total amount apportioned, in any one year, but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 per centum of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made pursuant to this section shall be available for expenditure in Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved project, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of such year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying out the provisions of the Migratory Bird Conservation Act."

Sec. 103. This title may be cited as the "Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act Amendments of 1970."

TITLE II—FEDERAL AID IN SPORT FISH RESTORATION

SEC. 201. Section 4 of the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777c) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. So much, not to exceed 8 per centum, of each annual appropriation made in pursuance of the provisions of section 3 of this Act as the Secretary of the Interior may estimate to be necessary for his expenses in the conduct of necessary investigations, administration, and the execution of this Act and for aiding in the formulation, adoption, or administration of any compact between two or more States for the conservation and management of migratory fishes in marine or fresh waters shall be deducted for that purpose, and such sum is authorized to be made available therefor until the expiration of the next succeeding fiscal year. The Secretary of the Interior, after making the aforesaid deduction, shall apportion the remainder of the appropriation for each fiscal year among the several States in the following manner: 40 per centum in the ratio which the area of each State including coastal and Great Lakes waters (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) bears to the total area of all the States, and 60 per centum in the ratio which the number of persons holding paid licenses to fish for sport or recreation in the State in the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which such apportionment is made, as certified to said Secretary by the State fish and game departments, bears to the number of such persons in all the States. Such apportionments shall

be adjusted equitably so that no State shall receive less than 1 per centum nor more than 5 per centum of the total amount apportioned. Where the apportionment to any State under this section is less than \$4,500 annually, the Secretary of the Interior may allocate not more than \$4,500 of said appropriation to said State to carry out the purposes of this Act when said State certifies to the Secretary of the Interior that it has set aside not less than \$1,500 from its fish-and-game funds or has made, through its legislature, an appropriation in this amount for said purposes. So much of any sum not allocated under the provisions of this section for any fiscal year is hereby authorized to be made available for expenditure to carry out the purposes of this Act until the close of the succeeding fiscal year, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of such year, such sum is hereby authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying on the research program of the Fish and Wildlife Service in respect to fish of material value for sport or recreation. The term fiscal year as used in this section shall be a period of twelve consecutive months from July 1 through the succeeding June 30, except that the period for enumeration of persons holding licenses to fish shall be a State's fiscal or license year."

SEC. 202. Sections 6, 7, and 8 of the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777e-777g) are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6. (a) Any State desiring to avail itself of the benefits of this Act shall, by its State fish and game department, submit programs or projects for fish restoration in either of the following two ways:

"(1) The State shall prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Interior a comprehensive fish and wildlife resource management plan which shall insure the perpetuation of these resources for the economic, scientific, and recreational enrichment of the people. Such plan shall be for a period of not less than five years and be based on projections of desires and needs of the people for a period of not less than fifteen years. It shall include provisions for updating at intervals of not more than three years and be provided in a format as may be required by the Secretary of the Interior. If the Secretary of the Interior finds that such plans conform to standards established by him and approves such plans, he may finance up to 75 per centum of the cost of implementing segments of those plans meeting the purposes of this Act from funds apportioned under this Act upon his approval of an annual agreement submitted to him.

"(2) A State may elect to avail itself of the benefits of this Act by its State fish and game department submitting to the Secretary of the Interior full and detailed statements of any fish restoration and management project proposed for that State. If the Secretary of the Interior finds that such project meets with the standards set by him and approves said project, the State fish and game department shall furnish to him such surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates therefor as he may require. If the Secretary of the Interior approves the plans, specifications, and estimates for the project, he shall notify the State fish and game department and immediately set aside so much of said appropriation as represents the share of the United States payable under this Act on account of such project, which sum so set aside shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total estimated cost thereof.

"The Secretary of the Interior shall approve only such comprehensive plans or projects as may be substantial in character and design and the expenditure of funds hereby authorized shall be applied only to such approved comprehensive fishery plan or projects and if otherwise applied they shall be replaced by the State before it may

participate in any further apportionment under this Act. No payment of any money apportioned under this Act shall be made on any comprehensive fishery plan or project until an agreement to participate therein shall have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

"(b) If the State elects to avail itself of the benefits of this Act by preparing a comprehensive fish and wildlife plan under option (1) of subsection (a) of this section, then the term 'project' may be defined for the purpose of this Act as a fishery program, all other definitions notwithstanding.

"(c) Administrative costs in the form of overhead or indirect costs for services provided by State central service activities outside of the State fish and game department charged against programs or projects supported by funds made available under this Act shall not exceed in any one fiscal year 3 per centum of the annual apportionment to the State.

"Sec. 7. (a) When the Secretary of the Interior shall find that any project approved by him has been completed or, if involving research relating to fish, is being conducted, in compliance with said plans and specifications, he shall cause to be paid to the proper authority of said State the amount set aside for said project. The Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, from time to time, make payments on said project as the same progresses; but these payments, including previous payments, if any, shall not be more than the United States' pro rata share of the project in conformity with said plans and specifications. If a State has elected to avail itself of the benefits of this Act by preparing a comprehensive fish and wildlife plan as provided for under option (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of this Act, and this plan has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior, then the Secretary may, in his discretion, and under such rules and regulations, as he may prescribe, advance funds to the State for financing the United States' pro rata share agreed upon between the State fish and game department and the Secretary.

"(b) Any construction work and labor in each State shall be performed in accordance with its laws and under the direct supervision of the State fish and game department, subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary of the Interior and in accordance with the rules and regulations made pursuant to this Act. The Secretary of the Interior and the State fish and game department of each State may jointly determine at what times and in what amounts payments shall be made under this Act. Such payments shall be made against the said appropriation to such official or officials, or depository, as may be designated by the State fish and game department and authorized under the laws of the State to receive public funds of the State.

"Sec. 8. To maintain fish-restoration and management projects established under the provisions of this Act shall be the duty of the States according to their respective laws. Beginning July 1, 1953, maintenance of projects heretofore completed under the provisions of this Act may be considered as projects under this Act. Title to any real or personal property acquired by any State, and to improvements placed on State-owned lands through the use of funds paid to the State under the provisions of this Act, shall be vested in such State."

Sec. 203. Section 12 of the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act of 1950 (16 U.S.C. 777k) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 12. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the Secretary of Agriculture of Puerto Rico, the Governor of Guam, and the Governor of the Virgin Islands, in the conduct of fish restoration and management projects, as defined in sec-

tion 2 of this Act, upon such terms and conditions as he shall deem fair, just, and equitable, and is authorized to apportion to Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, out of money available for apportionment under this Act, such sums as he shall determine, not exceeding for Puerto Rico 1 per centum, for Guam one-third of 1 per centum and for the Virgin Islands one-third of 1 per centum of the total amount apportioned in any one year, but the Secretary shall in no event require any of said cooperating agencies to pay an amount which will exceed 25 per centum of the cost of any project. Any unexpended or unobligated balance of any apportionment made pursuant to this section shall be made available for expenditure in Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, as the case may be, in the succeeding year, on any approved projects, and if unexpended or unobligated at the end of such year is authorized to be made available for expenditure by the Secretary of the Interior in carrying on the research program of the Fish and Wildlife Service in respect to fish of material value for sport or recreation."

Sec. 204. This title may be cited as the "Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act Amendments of 1970".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of H.R. 12475 is to revise and clarify the administration of the Fish and Wildlife Restoration Acts. It also has as its purpose to encourage comprehensive planning by the State fish and game departments, to increase revenues available to the States for wildlife restoration projects, and to provide funds to be used by the States to carry out hunter safety programs.

Mr. Speaker, the sports of fishing and hunting are among the most popular forms of outdoor recreation known to man today. Over 30 million citizens of this country participate in these forms of recreation each year. The activities of these sportsmen are made possible mainly through the invaluable assistance provided by the Federal aid in wildlife restoration—known as the Pittman-Robertson Act—and the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration—known as the Dingell-Johnson Act.

The Pittman-Robertson Act was enacted in 1937, and has made available to the States since that time over \$355 million. The funds are used by the States on a 75-25 matching fund basis to carry out wildlife restoration projects, including the purchase and improvement of land and water areas and the management of such areas and its resources. The funds to carry out this program are derived from the 11 percent tax on firearms, shells, and cartridges. The annual nationwide benefits derived from this program include an estimated 50 million man-days of hunting and 33 million man-days of associated recreation such as camping, birdwatching, fishing, and picnicking.

The Dingell-Johnson Act was enacted in 1950 and has made available to the States in excess of \$100 million since its inception. The annual nationwide public benefits derived from this program include an estimated 65 million man-days of fishing and 15 million man-days of associated recreation. Like the Pittman-Robertson Act, the Dingell-Johnson Act programs are carried out on a 75-25 matching fund basis with the States. The funds to finance this act are derived from the 10 percent tax on fishing rods, creels, and artificial lures and flies.

Mr. Speaker, as previously indicated, H.R. 12475 would provide numerous amendments to the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts. Many of the amendments deal with administrative details and would result in reducing considerably certain activities that have been financially burdensome to both the Federal and State governments in the past. I am sure my colleagues will find them relatively minor in nature and noncontroversial. I might add that all of the amendments have the strong endorsement of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners. This association is made up mainly of State fish and game directors, the ones charged with the administration of these two programs.

Mr. Speaker, there are three major changes that would be provided by the legislation and I would like to briefly discuss them at this time.

The first of these major changes would affect both the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts. Section 6 of both acts would be rewritten to give the States the option of using comprehensive long-range plans as compared to plans on a project-by-project basis, which has been the practice in the past.

The comprehensive plan would be required to be based on projections of at least 15 years and to be updated every 3 years. To take advantage of this option, the plan would have to be for a period of 5 years. In view of the projected demand for future urban programs, transportation corridors, forest products, and outdoor recreational uses not related to fish and wildlife, it is imperative that the State fish and game departments enter into the planning process at every level of government and at the earliest possible date. H.R. 12475 would provide the added inducement to mount this concerted planning effort.

The second major change that would be provided by the legislation would involve the Pittman-Robertson Act. This change is designed to increase the revenues available to the States for wildlife restoration projects and at the same time provide funds to be used by the States for carrying out hunter safety programs. Section 101 of the bill would provide that the 10-percent tax on pistols and revolvers now deposited in the general fund of the Treasury would be deposited in the future in the Federal aid in wildlife restoration fund. The revenues derived from this tax would be apportioned among the States in proportion to the ratio that the population of each State bears to the population of all States. It

would provide that no State would be apportioned more than 3 percent nor less than 1 percent of the amount of revenues apportioned for any fiscal year under this subsection. Of the funds apportioned the States would have the option of using up to one-half of the revenues to carry out a hunter safety program, including as a part of such program the construction, operation, and maintenance of public outdoor target ranges. Any projects approved by the Secretary of the Interior could receive up to 50-percent financing from such apportioned funds. The remainder of the cost would be paid for by the State from other non-Federal grant programs.

If a State elects not to carry out a hunter safety program then all of the apportioned funds to that State would be available to carry out regular wildlife restoration projects on a 75-25 matching fund basis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out at this time that the evidence at the hearings on the legislation revealed that the States strongly endorse this provision of the bill. There are over 14 million licensed hunters in this country today. Of those that hunt, over 2 million are under 18 years of age. Today, over 40 States have some form of hunter safety training courses. Approximately 400,000 youths are successfully completing a hunter safety training course each year. Fifteen of those States require graduation from hunter safety programs as a prerequisite to purchasing the first hunting license. Thus, it becomes apparent that a substantial portion of the hunting population is being sold hunting licenses without having received this training. Testimony at the hearings further revealed that with meaningful hunter safety programs in every State, casualties and deaths from firearms accidents could be reduced as much as 80 percent.

Mr. Speaker, every effort should be made to increase hunter safety training activities. H.R. 12475 would provide the greatly needed financial assistance to the States for carrying out such a program. It is hoped that more States will intensify their efforts in this direction.

Mr. Speaker, the third major change that would be provided by the legislation involves a circular issued in May of 1968 by the Bureau of the Budget known as "Circular No. A-87." The circular established rules and regulations for determining costs applicable to Federal grants and contracts with State and local governments. It applied to all Federal agencies responsible for administering such programs and was designed to provide the basis for a uniform approach to the problem of determining costs. Upon investigation, it was determined that under the new regulations indirect costs could amount to as much as 15 to 20 percent of the total costs of a project. Naturally, this would result in Federal funds being used for administrative costs that ordinarily would have been used for acquisition of lands and field work. Upon further investigation, it was discovered that there had been little experience on which to measure the effects of this circular. Several of the States polled indicated that indirect costs were running

around 1 percent of the total funds apportioned and one State indicated its rate was a flat 2 percent of such funds.

In view of this, it was determined that a reasonable limitation should be placed on the amount of overhead or indirect costs that may be charged against such programs or projects.

Accordingly, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries amended section 6 of both acts to provide that indirect charges could not exceed 3 percent of the annual apportionments of such funds to the States in any one fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation was reported unanimously by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. All witnesses testifying at the hearings wholeheartedly endorsed the objectives of the legislation and urged its prompt enactment. The Department of the Interior witness urged prompt enactment provided the bill was appropriately amended. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries adopted all of the amendments suggested by the Interior Department, except for the ones relating to the earmarking of funds—from taxes on pistols and revolvers—for the wildlife restoration fund. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department also raised this same objection, the reasoning being that such earmarking would violate the principle that where earmarking is justified, those who pay the taxes should benefit from the programs financed by the earmarked taxes and purchasers of pistols and revolvers would not appear to be the primary beneficiaries of these programs.

Mr. Speaker, the committee hearings on the legislation revealed evidence to the contrary. The testimony indicated that without question, far more ammunition is expended for the purpose of target shooting in practice or competition than is expended in the hunting of game and yet no part of the revenue collected from the excise tax on sales of firearms or ammunition can be used for firearm safety or range construction programs.

Mr. Speaker, as previously stated, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported the legislation unanimously and I would like at this time to urge its prompt enactment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 12475, which my distinguished colleague from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has so clearly explained.

The fish and wildlife restoration acts are complimentary methods of channeling Federal excise taxes on sporting equipment to the States in an equitable manner to promote the development and management of our fish and wildlife resources.

Title I of this bill amends the Wildlife Restoration Act to add the 10-percent excise tax on handguns to the existing 11-percent tax on firearms and ammunition for deposit in a special fund for distribution under the act.

Title I will also simplify administration of the Wildlife Restoration Act and permit the States to qualify for funds on the

basis of a 5-year management plan rather than as heretofore on a project-by-project basis only. This should insure more comprehensive State planning and a greater utilization of the fund.

Title II of the bill similarly amends the administrative provisions of the Fish Restoration Act. This act earmarks the 10-percent excise tax on fishing equipment for State lake and stream restoration programs.

Mr. Speaker, the fish and wildlife restoration acts have been a major factor in the development of our State management programs. They form an intelligent approach to the utilization of tax revenues and insure that the user of these natural resources contribute substantially to their maintenance.

These programs are insurance that future generations of Americans can enjoy such wildlife abundance as is now available for us to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of H.R. 12475.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 12475, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISHERIES LOAN PROGRAM

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 14124) to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior can make fisheries loans under the Act, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 14124

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(c) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1121), as amended (16 U.S.C. 742c (c)), is further amended by changing the date "June 30, 1970" to "June 30, 1980" where it appears three times.

Sec. 2. Section 4(b) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (16 U.S.C. 742c(b)) is amended by striking out paragraphs (7) and (8) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) An applicant for a fishery loan must be a citizen or national of the United States.

"(8) Within the meaning of this section, a corporation, partnership, or association shall not be deemed to be a citizen of the United States unless the Secretary determines that it satisfactorily meets all of the requirements set forth in section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, for determining the United States citizenship of a corporation, partnership, or association operating a vessel in the coastwise trade.

"(9) (A) The nationality of an applicant shall be established to the satisfaction of the Secretary. Within the meaning of this section, no corporation, partnership, or association organized under the laws of American Samoa shall be deemed a national of the United States unless 75 per centum of the interest therein is owned by nationals of the United States, citizens of the United States, or both, and in the case of a corpora-

tion, unless its president or other chief executive officer and the chairman of its board are nationals or citizens of the United States and unless no more of its directors than a minority of the number necessary to constitute a quorum are nonnationals and noncitizens.

"(B) Seventy-five per centum of the interest in a corporation shall not be deemed to be owned by nationals of the United States, citizens of the United States, or both, (i) if the title to 75 per centum of its stock is not vested in such nationals and citizens free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a national or citizen of the United States; or (ii) if 75 per centum of the voting power in such corporation is not vested in nationals of the United States, citizens of the United States, or both; or (iii) if through any contract or understanding it is so arranged that more than 25 per centum of the voting power may be exercised, directly or indirectly, in behalf of any person who is not a national or citizen of the United States; or (iv) if by any other means whatsoever control of any interest in the corporation in excess of 25 per centum is conferred upon or permitted to be exercised by any person who is not a national or citizen of the United States."

Sec. 3. The provisions of this Act shall be effective July 1, 1970. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4(c) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, any balance remaining in the fisheries loan fund at the close of June 30, 1970, shall be available to make loans for the purposes of section 4 of said Act from July 1, 1970, to the close of June 30, 1980.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 14124 is to extend an existing program to provide financial assistance to commercial fishermen.

The authority for making fisheries loans was originally provided in 1956 because long-term financing was not readily available to owners of fishing vessels. Banks, private institutions, and the Small Business Administration believed that the fishing industry was generally too unstable for loans that were based solely on fishing operations as collateral and as a source of earnings for repayment.

The situation is even more critical now than it was in 1956. Interest rates are as high as 7½ percent and loans are difficult to obtain for almost any purpose. Therefore, a commercial fisherman is faced with a hopeless situation unless he has access to a loan such as that provided by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, as previously stated, the fisheries loan fund was established in 1956. The revolving fund initially had an authorization of \$10 million, but in 1958 it was increased to \$20 million. In 1965 the program was extended for an additional 5 years—until June 30, 1970—at the same level of funding. Only \$13 million, out of the \$20 million authorization, has actually been appropriated to the fund.

Under the program, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make loans

for financing of the cost of purchasing, repairing, or operating new or used commercial fishing vessels or gear. Ordinarily loans are authorized to be made for not longer than 10 years. Where new ship construction is involved, loans can be made for periods up to 14 years.

To date, over 1,000 loans totalling approximately \$28 million have been made. Losses from bad debts have been held to less than 1 percent of the average annual outstanding balance of loans. This amounts to approximately \$40,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, the outstanding success of the program speaks for itself.

H.R. 14124, as introduced would merely extend the program for an additional period of 10 years—until June 30, 1980—and at the same level of funding and upon the same terms and conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the committee reported H.R. 14124, with amendments. When reporting H.R. 14124, the committee did add two new sections to the bill.

New section 2 of the bill, which is explained in detail in the committee report, would merely broaden the program to permit American Samoan fishermen to take advantage of the program. Under present law loans are authorized to be made to citizens of the United States, which include inhabitants of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

The committee felt that the extension of this program to American Samoa would be of valuable assistance in developing that territory's fishing industry and this extension could be made without appreciably affecting the fisheries loan fund.

Mr. Speaker, when the committee ordered H.R. 14124 reported to the House, it anticipated that the legislation would have been enacted into law by this time. Unfortunately, the old law expired June 30. Under that law there was a provision that would require the balance on hand in the fisheries loan fund as of that date to revert to the Treasury. To prevent this balance from reverting to the Treasury—which amounts to approximately \$1 million—a conforming technical amendment is needed to be made to the bill.

This would be accomplished by the language contained in new section 3 of the bill, which was recommended by the chairman, after clearance with members of the committee, to be included in the committee motion.

Mr. Speaker, the bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. All witnesses testifying at the hearings were in support of the bill and there were no Government agencies opposing the legislation. There would be no additional cost to the Federal Government if the legislation is enacted since the bill does not directly amend the authorization for appropriations, set at \$20 million in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt enactment of H.R. 14124, as amended.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

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

What is the rate of interest that these loans now carry?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEITH).

Mr. KEITH. The present rate of interest, I believe, is approximately 7½ percent, plus whatever administration cost is necessary to break even. The cost of administration would be added to the amount of the normal yield of Treasury Bonds.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Massachusetts has said it correctly. Actually loans under the act shall bear an interest rate of not less than—at a rate of not less than (a) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury after taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (b) a reasonable charge to cover administrative costs. We are trying to give these people the best possible break on interest but still not subsidizing the interest rate.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Fish and Wildlife Conservation, Mr. DINGELL, in support of H.R. 14124.

I am sure I need not remind my colleagues of the plight of the U.S. fishing industry which is faced with every growing competition from abroad.

This legislation extends for 10 years a highly successful program which enables our fishermen to obtain loans at reasonable rates of interest. These loans are used principally for upgrading vessels with new engines, and to obtain more modern fishing gear.

The Fisheries Loan Fund was established in 1956, in recognition of the widespread inability of fishermen to obtain commercial loans. Bankers do not favor loans to those engaged in fishing, apparently viewing this industry as too fraught with risk.

The record does not support this unwillingness, however. The loss rate for the Fisheries Loan Fund has been comparable to other Federal loan programs. Nevertheless our fishermen must continue to look to this fund for needed capital.

Since this is a revolving fund with interest rates tied to the Treasury borrowing rate, enactment of the legislation will have no adverse impact on the budget.

Section 2 of the bill simply extends the availability of this program to residents of American Samoa who are nationals of the United States rather than citizens. American Samoa is attempting to build up its fishing industry in conjunction with other efforts to improve the local economy. The Fisheries Loan Fund will provide a modest boost to this effort.

Over 1,000 loans have now been made, totaling nearly \$28 million. The \$13 million appropriated for the fund thus has been used twice, and has now started on a third round.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 14124 has the unanimous support of your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I urge its passage.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the

United States ranks fifth among the fishing nations of the world. The four top-ranking nations, in order of prominence, are: Japan, Peru, U.S.S.R., and Mainland China.

The United States was the leading fishing nation of the world just prior to World War II. Since that time, our Nation's commercial fisheries has experienced a steady deterioration. It now faces overwhelming competition and pressure from modern and aggressive foreign fishing fleets. America's commercial fleets are unable to compete because the equipment, techniques, and vessels are obsolete.

Obviously, our fishing industry needs help, and my bill—H.R. 14124—which seeks to extend the fisheries loan program for an additional 10 years, has provided an extremely valuable form of Federal aid to this vital industry.

The original fisheries loan program was contained in the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956. Its primary objective was to help maintain and upgrade our commercial fishing fleet, by providing longterm financing, which is not otherwise available, to the industry.

When enacted in 1956, the act provided an authorization of \$10 million, but this was increased in 1958 to \$20 million. The program was extended again in 1965, at the same level of funding, and it expired as of June 30 of this year.

As I already noted, H.R. 14124 would extend this program for an additional 10 years, at the same \$20 million level. This program authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to make loans which would be used to finance or refinance the cost of purchasing, constructing, equipping, maintaining or operating new or used commercial fishing vessels or gear. In the past, the industry has had difficulty obtaining loans from the normal sources, because banks and other financial institutions—as well as the Small Business Administration—have felt the fishing industry is a risky investment.

There is an even more critical need for providing Federal assistance in this area now, since interest rates are extremely high and loans are even difficult to obtain for the well-established businesses.

In addition to providing aid to the larger fishery industries, the loan program has also helped the small, individual fishermen, especially the one-boat owner—such as the shell fishermen in the lower Chesapeake Bay. There are times when an entire fishery industry may need emergency loans, because of a severe slump or a crisis, in order to remain in existence.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has often emphasized that the fisheries loan program has been one of the most successful fishery assistance programs carried out by the Federal Government. I concur with that feeling, and I urge enactment of this worthwhile program.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 14124, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-

thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior can make fisheries loans under the Act, and for other purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 3102) to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior can make fisheries loans under the act, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3102

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(c) of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 1121), as amended (16 U.S.C. 742c (c)), is further amended by changing the date "June 30, 1970" to "June 30, 1980" where it appears three times.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DINGELL moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3102 and insert the provisions of H.R. 14124 as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior can make fisheries loans under the Act, and for other purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 14124) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15351) to authorize additional funds for the operation of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15351

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin

Delano Roosevelt", approved August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 694), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. In addition to any other funds authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of this joint resolution, there is authorized to be appropriated \$75,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House bill H.R. 15351 would authorize \$75,000 for the continued operation of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The Commission was established in August 1955, pursuant to Public Law 372 to consider formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The Commission is composed of 12 members appointed as follows: four persons by the President of the United States, four Senators by the President of the Senate, and four Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Commissioners serve without compensation, but are reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission.

In 1959, Public Law 86-214, a 27-acre portion of West Potomac Park between Independence Avenue and the inlet bridge was reserved for the site of the proposed memorial.

Public Law 86-214 also authorized a national competition to be conducted to bring forward memorial designs which would be appropriate and harmonious as to location, design, and land use with the Washington Monument, the Jefferson Memorial and the Lincoln Memorial.

The winning design proved to be controversial to the extent that it was not accepted.

Public Law 87-842, adopted in 1962, directed the Commission to attempt to produce an acceptable modification of the original prize winning design. If the original design could not be modified in an acceptable manner, then the commission should select another design from among those already submitted, or consider a living memorial.

The Commission has struggled through the years with this important and difficult task. The major portion of the funds allocated, to date, has gone toward the development of an acceptable point where it is felt that the final design weeding out process has proceeded to the point where it is felt that the final design approval is within reach. These additional funds are needed to consummate what is believed to be the concluding chapter of the 15-year history of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission's effort to provide a suitable and overdue memorial to a great American.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I wonder if the gentleman could advise the House by whom the design was rejected. According to the committee report, it is not clear. Was it rejected by this commission sitting as an official body of the Congress?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The original design, I might say, awarded as the result of a competition, was brought to the floor of the House by the gentleman from New Jersey under suspension of the rules and was rather decisively turned down—thanks, I might say, to the efforts of my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I did not mean to open an old healed wound, and I certainly do not want to rub any salt in it, but I want to understand the further function of this commission. I understand that they work without compensation except for expenses, and I think the report, as short as it is, has broken down adequately the expenditure of funds to date. Who would determine what is an acceptable design?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The House of Representatives.

Mr. HALL. In other words, this commission will report back finally to the House or to the Congress, and by action of the bodies we will have final approval or not.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman feel in any sense, since he is a student of history and of culture, that one of the reasons for the House rejection was the mammoth obelisks and the amount of time and the opinion of the family—did that have anything to do with the original rejection of the plan?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might say to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, that the design which the House rejected was euphemistically called "the Stonehenge design." It consisted of a number of rather enormous tablets on which were to be inscribed quotations from the late great President Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

With respect to the family—and I say this in due deference to them—there was something less than unanimity among them as to the design. James Roosevelt of California was our colleague at that time. His feelings were ambivalent as were those of other members of the family. So that design was rejected.

Subsequently, but without another contest, the Commission undertook to obtain a design, this time by the distinguished architect in New York, Mr. Marcel Breuer. The Breuer design was not brought to the floor of the House, because the Fine Arts Commission rejected it. This does not mean that the Fine Arts Commission has final say, but obviously what they do have to say is of great consequence.

A majority of the Commission felt, in the light of the opposition to the Breuer design, that there ought to be further consideration.

I might say to the gentleman at this

point, the Commission has at least on a tentative basis and with the support of those in the family with whom we have been able to communicate decided on an infinitely more modest proposition. It is not final, but it will be a rose garden with a modest statute in it, as of our present plan.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, obviously the gentleman is doing his homework and has worked hard on this.

As I understand it, there have been no more designs put in any of the office building halls for us to ponder over and cogitate on before the next vote comes up, and the Fine Arts Commission itself has rejected the second finding or suggestion as to this memorial.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HALL. I will ask the gentleman, based on his being a student of history, is he saying that perhaps we are rushing this thing a little too fast and that we should await the objectivity of history before determining what is most appropriate for this past President?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would say to my friend from Missouri that just this past April, 25 years elapsed between the death of President Roosevelt and April of this year. In a sense, controversial though he may be to some people, President Roosevelt's place in history is secure enough that I, for one, believe—and I believe those on the Commission share the view—that a suitable and modest memorial would be appropriate.

The legislative process is such that the Commission is authorized to solicit funds, but if any public funds are to be asked for the ultimate design—assuming for the moment it is a rose garden with a statue—it would have to be considered. It would be necessary for the Subcommittee on Library and Memorials, of which I am chairman, to have hearings on it and to report it to the Committee on House Administration, and then in turn to bring the legislation to the floor of the House for final approval.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I was interested to hear my friend from Missouri call this an ornamentation, or whatever. I have never been able to find the word to adequately describe what he just called obelisks or something of that kind. I believe the gentleman from New Jersey came near to describing what is the purpose for this memorial.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. With all due respect to our mutual friend Dr. HALL, I do not believe obelisks is as accurate as Stonehenge.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman is correct.

The gentleman will remember we had quite a time trying to find some words which would adequately describe what was proposed for this memorial.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I remember extremely well, especially in view of the fact that I brought the design to the floor needing, under a suspension of the rules procedure, a two-thirds

vote, and nearly achieved getting one-third. It is a very painful memory.

I might pay tribute to the gentleman from Iowa for his part. I know he intended nothing personal. This was, in respect to the few matters on which we have, shall I say, cultural differences, one where the gentleman from Iowa won all 10 rounds.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Let me ask the gentleman this question: \$285,000 has been expended up to this point. The bill calls for another \$75,000, which would bring it to \$360,000. Can we have any assurance here today that with the expenditure of an additional \$75,000 the plans for this memorial will have been completed?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that again, as a member of the FDR Commission, I think I do speak for a majority of the Members when I say that unless we can come up with a final design either involving no further Federal funds or being a final design to the floor, that this would be the last expenditure represented by this money. I will say further that it is requested in anticipation of a final design that we do not come back with any further housekeeping moneys. I can assure the gentleman that they are being very judiciously used.

Mr. GROSS. Has there been some contribution to this preliminary planning from private sources?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes. There has been a considerable amount. I do not have the figures available at the moment, but there are approximately \$18,000 to \$20,000 in a trust fund to be used when a final design is approved for that purpose, and, of course, we would go to the public for the contributions necessary.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me that with this \$75,000 added to the money already spent we have gone about far enough with the planning for this memorial. I am pleased to have the gentleman's statement, which seems to indicate that this will be the last.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey will say that as far as he is concerned he will not be back to the floor for further housekeeping moneys without a final and absolute and acceptable design.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON), has presented to the House a full and accurate account of the activities of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission and concerning the basis for the request for an additional authorization of appropriations to carry its work forward.

As has been pointed out, H.R. 15351 as introduced called for increasing the authorization of \$150,000. The House Administration Committee studied the request and determined that it could safely be reduced to \$75,000 without in any way impairing the work of the FDR Memorial Commission in its efforts to produce design for a FDR memorial which will be generally acceptable. I concur in the committee's action reducing the amount car-

ried in the bill and reporting it to the House.

I agree with the comments of Mr. THOMPSON on the significance of this bill and its need. It certainly is my conviction too that it is entirely appropriate that we proceed in an orderly fashion on the work of selecting a suitable monument to our distinguished and memorable former President, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and I would urge the House to grant its approval to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15351, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I and others who have spoken may revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3685, EMERGENCY HOME FINANCE ACT OF 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 3685) to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House today.)

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out at the beginning of our consideration that this conference report leaves the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 essentially in the same form and content as H.R. 17495, the emergency housing act which was approved by this Chamber several weeks ago. To be sure compromise required changes, but I be-

lieve that these changes rather than weakening the measure, have worked to strengthen it in terms of its application to the national housing crisis.

In its present form, the measure authorizes appropriation of \$1.2 billion to fund three mortgage interest rate subsidy programs. Two of these programs are established in this bill and are designed to aid middle income families which are made to shoulder most of the burden of the present housing crisis created largely by the tight money-high interest rate policies now being applied to the Nation's economy. The bill also establishes two secondary markets for conventional as well as federally insured and guaranteed mortgages.

Housing experts estimate that about 512,000 mortgage loans can be made for low, moderate, and middle income families if the provisions of the act are fully funded and utilized.

Mr. Speaker, it should be stressed that this will constitute a very large and favorable impact not only in terms of meeting our housing needs but also in terms of helping the nearly crippled housing industry and greatly reducing unemployment.

The mortgage assistance provided by the measure could enable the Nation to produce nearly 2 million housing starts. Housing starts are now at an annual rate of 1.3 million units. Another 512,000 units will bring us close to the 2 million mark, something the Nation has not approached since 1950.

Unemployment throughout the Nation now averages 4.7 percent—3.4 million people are out of work. As bad as this is, unemployment in the construction industry is far worse. The rate of joblessness in the construction industry has climbed to nearly 12 percent of the labor force in that sector of the economy which is another way of indicating the disaster confronting homebuilders.

A study conducted for the U.S. Savings and Loan League indicates the enormous benefits that could be achieved through the construction and sale of 512,000 new homes. Data in the study shows that construction of 500,000 new homes, for example, would mean an injection of \$11.3 billion for the housing industry as a whole, ranging from the homebuilder to those people involved in related retail sales.

When the multiplier effect of this amount of money is applied to the total economy, the full impact of this investment amounts to twice that figure, \$22.7 billion. The multiplier effect can be described as income that appears again and again in the economy in the form of income to others as each set of recipients pays it out in consumption expenditure or taxes.

This same study also indicates that construction of 500,000 new homes would result in 475,000 on site construction jobs and 635,000 offsite jobs for people involved in industries providing necessary materials and services.

The total number of jobs that could be created through this legislation then amounts to 1.1 billion, one-third the number of people who are now out of work.

Mr. Speaker, a brief review of the

Emergency Home Finance Act as reported by the conference committee is in order at this point.

Title I remains unchanged. It authorizes an appropriation of \$250 million to subsidize the interest of loans made by the Federal home loan banks to savings and loan associations and other member borrowers of the FHLBB system. The conference report directs the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to make certain that this section of the bill does not result in simply subsidizing savings and loan association profits. It requires maximum benefits possible to be passed to the home buyer.

Titles II and III of the conference report on the bill also remain identical to corresponding sections in the House-passed bill. Title II would expand the scope of the Federal National Mortgage Association to include conventional as well as federally insured and guaranteed mortgages in its secondary market operations. Title III would establish an identical secondary market institution through the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for conventional and federally insured and guaranteed mortgages. Both secondary market operations are designed to provide outlets for the sale of mortgages originated by conventional lending institutions so that a greater volume of mortgage money is available for home loans.

Title IV in the conference report reflects a change in funding for the Government National Mortgage Association special assistance program. The Emergency Home Finance Act, as it passed the House, authorized \$1.5 billion in new funding for the GNMA special assistance, presidential authority. The Senate version of the bill did not authorize any new money. It merely called for transfer of \$750 million from congressional authority to presidential authority. The compromise reached in conference now recommends authorization of \$750 million in new funds and transfer of a like amount from congressional to presidential authority. Appropriation and utilization of this money, when added to the unused balance in GNMA, will mean that a total of \$2.7 billion would be available for immediate use for federally assisted low and moderate income housing.

Title V also represents a compromise between the Senate and House versions of the Emergency Home Finance Act. In substance it represents acceptance by the House conference committee of a Senate proposal to authorize funds to subsidize the interest rate on mortgages for middle income families through FNMA. The proposal as it came from the other chamber called for \$60 million a year for 3 years to enable families whose incomes did not exceed the median for the areas in which they reside to obtain home ownership loans at a 7-percent interest rate. The section provides that the interest rate on such loans will increase as the income of the home owner increases until a market rate is reached at which point the subsidy would cease.

House conference committee members won acceptance of their proposal to increase the amount of the authorization to \$105 million annually.

Mr. Speaker, mortgage assistance provided under title V would be restricted to the purchase of \$20,000 homes in low-cost areas and \$30,000 homes in high-cost areas. Borrowers would be required to allocate at least 20 percent of their income for mortgage payments.

Title VI which provides for renewal of authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to set the maximum allowable interest rates for FHA and VA mortgages remained as it was approved by the House. The Senate had proposed establishment of the so-called dual interest rate structure which would, in effect, have destroyed this authority and eliminated the statutory 6 percent interest rate ceiling on federally insured and guaranteed mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, there is one final section of the conference report that requires explanation. The House conference committee members agreed to recommend elimination of title VII in the original House-passed bill and to move title VIII of the bill into this position. Title VII as it passed the House authorized the Federal Reserve Board to allow member banks of the Federal Reserve System to count as part of their required reserves federally insured and guaranteed housing paper which would promote the construction and ownership of housing.

This proposal was adamantly opposed by Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns. As a result it became perfectly clear that this proposal even if it was approved, would not be utilized to provide funds to meet the current housing crisis. Rather than insisting on acceptance of what came to be an academic point, the House conference committee members made and won acceptance of a counter proposal to increase from \$60 to \$105 million a year the funds that would be available for middle-income family mortgage assistance under title V of the report.

Title VII of the conference report is a miscellaneous section comprised almost entirely of technical changes designed to assist savings and loan associations to increase their deposits and thus make more mortgage funds available to the housing market.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 reflects bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress for every section of the measure. There is nothing in the report that represents domination either by the Senate or House conference committees or domination by members of one party over the other. Moreover, the conference report closely follows the Emergency Home Finance Act approved unanimously in the Senate and endorsed by the administration. Consequently, there is not a reason in the world why the funds authorized in the measure should not be quickly appropriated by Congress and quickly utilized by the administration to help meet the housing crisis.

I urge the House to live up to its responsibility not only to approve the conference report but to provide full funding to make it effective. I urge the President to clear any obstacle hindering utilization of these funds.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 3685, the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. This bill represents an attempt by Congress to provide some assistance to the mortgage credit market and to the prospective American homeowner. There are many items in this conference report that will provide some assistance to the mortgage market and to the homebuilding industry. The basic element in this bill will be Government subsidies to the Federal Home Loan Bank System and subsidies for median income families to assist them in obtaining mortgages at reasonable interest rates.

There are seven titles to the bill. Title I of the bill was the only provision that was recommended by the administration. The remaining titles were all developed by the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees. Whether or not this bill will accomplish its goal of stimulating mortgage credit will depend on the will and aggressiveness of the administration in implementing the provisions of the bill. I would like to also emphasize again that this conference report represents congressional action to assist the mortgage credit market and the homebuilding industry.

There were approximately 30 items in disagreement in the conference. I would say that the House receded on half of these items and the Senate receded on the other half. The conferees met for 2 days, and I believe this report represents an even compromise.

The Congress is providing for the first time a subsidy amounting to \$250 million to the Federal Home Loan Bank System to subsidize their obligations so that the home loan banks may make advances to member savings and loan associations to continue to make mortgage credit available to prospective homeowners. The Congress expects the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board to see that these subsidized obligations are applied to those families he determines to be in the median income range.

Title II and III of this bill sets up a secondary market for conventional mortgages to be operated by both the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Bank System. We hope that this is a first step towards simplifying the complicated procedures that are involved in mortgage credit transactions. I was pleased that the provision in the House-passed bill to exempt the Federal Home Loan Bank Board from the budget review of the Bureau of the Budget, to exempt them from GAO audit, and to exempt Board employees from the Civil Service Classification Act was dropped in conference. I was particularly disturbed with the provision which would exempt the Board and the FSLIC from the Classification Act. I feel that it was a brazen attempt to take this important agency out of the civil service system.

The conferees urge that the directors of the corporation being established by title III exercise their discretion to apply Federal civil service laws to their employees and to submit an annual budget, in the same manner as are now required of the Board and the FSLIC.

Title IV of the House-passed bill pro-

vided a new authorization of \$1.5 billion for the Government National Mortgage Association's special assistance functions. The conferees cut this figure in half to \$750 million in new authorizations for the presidential authority under the GNMA special assistance funds, and also accepted the Senate provision, which re-allocated \$750 million in existing authorizations under the congressional program of GNMA, so that this title provides \$1.5 billion in funds which the President can use immediately. I would hope that the President lives up to his promise and uses these vitally needed funds. The conferees also agreed to remove the existing par-purchase requirement under the congressional authority of GNMA. The net effect of this action in Title IV is to free up for immediate use a total of \$2.750 billion, which can be used by the President to purchase mortgages under the Presidential and congressional GNMA authority. I believe that this is the most effective provision in this bill.

Title V of the Senate-passed bill was not a part of the House bill. As Members recall we had a provision in the committee reported bill which set up a National Development Bank to provide direct funds for the mortgage market. This provision unfortunately was defeated on the floor. I believe that this National Development Bank proposal would have gone a long way toward solving the problems of providing the needed housing for American families. Title V, the Proxmire amendment, would establish a new program of interest subsidies for middle income housing. This subsidy would reduce the effective interest rate for middle income borrowers to approximately 7 percent. The borrowers would have to qualify by income and to the extent that the family's income rose above a certain level, the subsidy would be reduced and eventually be removed. Since the House never considered this proposal, a number of changes were made by the conferees to include veterans housing under this new program, to make cooperative housing qualify, and to increase the amount of subsidy to be provided from \$60 million a year for 3 years to \$105 million for 3 years. I have some reservations concerning this new program, and I hope that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development will report back to the Congress after the program has been in operation for a reasonable period.

The House conferees refused to accept the Senate provision providing for a dual interest rate for FHA and VA mortgages. The House provision extending the existing authority to set the interest rate levels prevailed. This bill extends this authority to January 1, 1972.

The most glaring omission in the conference report was the exclusion of title VII of the House bill, the provision to authorize the Federal Reserve Board to permit commercial banks to use part of their reserves to purchase Federal agency obligations for housing. This provision offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. REES) was an excellent proposal which I supported from the beginning—in committee and on the House

floor—to the very last day in the conference. I was sorry that most of the members of the conference committee rejected this proposal, and I hope that it will be considered again in the future.

The various savings and loan amendments in the House passed bill were retained in most cases with some changes. The provision which would have authorized savings and loan associations to provide collateral security for deposits of public funds was dropped in conference when the Federal Home Loan Bank Board told us that they could, under regulation, permit the same authority that we were providing by law. I would hope that the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board would issue regulations immediately to implement his measure. I believe that savings and loan associations should have the same authority to provide collateral security for public deposits as the commercial banks do. The House conferees also accepted the Senate provision which authorizes national banks to make 90-percent 30-year mortgage loans and 60-month construction loans. Again, I would hope that commercial banks would make immediate use of this new authority. We are giving the commercial banks the impetus to make a greater contribution to the mortgage market. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this conference report.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly joined in signing the conference report on S. 3685, the so-called Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. I will now reluctantly vote for it as the best we were able to do in conference on a bill on which the House had earlier tied our hands by refusing to pass title V of the House bill which had called for direct mortgage loans to middle income families at rates of 6½ percent or less.

A much different title V of the conference bill authorizes appropriations of \$315,000,000 over the next 3 years to subsidize, down to a minimum of 7 percent, the interest rates paid by eligible families in obtaining mortgages at the going market rate of interest. Thus, if the going rate is 8½ or 9 percent, the Government would pay 1½ or 2 percent per year of the outstanding balance as an interest rate subsidy. Eligible families under the conference bill would be those whose total income is at or below the "median" level in their localities.

So, for the first time in our housing programs, we will be paying a subsidy to average income families to buy homes, using their taxes to give them a new type of Federal assistance previously given only to low income families in buying homes.

Unfortunately, the subsidy is not intended to help bring down interest rates generally, but rather will enable the lending institutions to charge whatever the market will bear and receive the full return, with the Government, in effect, adopting a mortgage interest rate "price support" program for savings and loans and banks. This is not what we had hoped to achieve when the Democratic majority of the House Committee on Banking and Currency set out this year to do something forthright and affirmative about bringing down the intolerable level of interest rates on home mortgages.

HOUSE CONFEREES' HANDS TIED BY HOUSE REJECTION OF TITLE V

As I said, however, the House tied the conferees' hands on this by a rollcall vote of 214 to 113 on June 25, rejecting title V of the House bill, H.R. 17495. Our title V had represented an amalgamation of two major approaches within the Banking Committee to the mortgage famine for middle income families: one, the proposal of Banking and Currency Committee Chairman PATMAN to establish a National Development Bank to obtain mortgage funds by requiring compulsory investment in mortgage instruments of 2½ percent of the assets of pension funds and foundations; and the other approach as contained in H.R. 13694, the Sullivan-Barrett bill for direct loans by the Government to families earning up to \$12,000 a year for 30-year mortgages up to \$24,000 at 6½ percent or less. The Sullivan-Barrett bill would have created the Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation to make such loans out of a revolving fund created by appropriations of \$2 billion a year for 5 years. In the form in which the Democratic caucus of the House Banking Committee put the two proposals together in title V of H.R. 17495, the proposed National Development Bank would have made the direct loans to families of median income for mortgages up to \$20,000 at 6½ percent or less. This is the proposal which was then killed in the House on June 25.

SENATE'S TITLE V EXPANDED SOMEWHAT IN CONFERENCE

In conference, therefore, all we had to work from in carrying out some of the objectives we had set out to achieve in our title V was a far less ambitious program contained in the Senate bill's title V which permitted appropriations of up to \$60,000,000 to subsidize the mortgage rates for a limited number of such families. We were able to expand this in conference into a \$315,000,000 3-year program, but the loans will be made at prevailing rates of interest, with the Government then paying part of the cost, as it does now on subsidized mortgages for the lowest income families, and as it does also on college tuition insured loans.

Now, eligible families will have to pay at least 7 percent for their mortgages—how much more depending upon how much of a subsidy is necessary to enable them to meet the amortization costs of principal and interest by devoting 20 percent of their incomes to their purpose. There will be periodic certifications of the incomes of the eligible families so that after 2 years, if a participating family's income has risen, it may then have the subsidy reduced to zero, and it will be paying the 8½ or 9 percent or whatever rate the mortgage calls for. So this will do nothing to bring down the level of interest rates—just permit a limited number of families to get Federal assistance now in buying a home at today's outrageously high interest rates.

MORE THAN HALF BILLION OF INTEREST RATE SUBSIDIES TO LENDERS

Along with another \$250,000,000 of subsidies in this bill for the savings and loans to enable them to borrow money at prevailing rates and lend it out at the

FHA ceiling rate of 8½ percent, this bill now represents a total of more than half a billion dollars in subsidies for supporting the present interest rate level of residential real estate loans.

Not a cent of this money will come back to the Treasury in repayments by anyone.

In contrast, the cost of direct Federal loans which had been proposed in title V of the House bill, and which the House had rejected, would all have come back to the Treasury—every cent—in repayments by the mortgagors. There would have been no subsidy as such for middle-income families, if we assume—as I do—that interest rates paid by the Government on money it borrows over the next 30 years will eventually come down below their present levels, and below 6½ percent. But our title V lost and 6 months of effort in the House Banking Committee to solve the mortgage crisis was "washed out" in this far-from-adequate substitute scheme in which the Nation's middle-income taxpayers, or some of them, will obtain mortgage subsidies paid for through their own taxes.

I will vote for the bill because it is better than no bill; it will assist some middle-income families to obtain homes they can afford to pay for. But it is no long-range solution for the unconscionable level of mortgage rates.

There are other features of the conference bill which are worthwhile, including, for example, a secondary mortgage market for conventional loans, which we had agreed to in the House last year only to have the Senate disagree to it. The conference bill also enables national banks to enter the home mortgage market competitively—another feature we had agreed to in the House bill last year, but which the Senate conferees had rejected in December. At this rate of gradual improvement of our housing laws, we undoubtedly will eventually achieve the kind of direct loan program which the Sullivan-Barrett bill for a Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation had proposed. But progress is painfully slow.

CLOSING COSTS

The conference bill also deals at least partly with some of the problems spotlighted by my Ad Hoc subcommittee on Home Financing Practices and Procedures of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, involving closing costs on residential real estate. The bill calls for studies to be made by the appropriate Government agencies into the current practices in these fields and the adoption of corrective steps to prevent gouging of the home purchaser through excessive closing costs. These represent abuses the home-buying public has been subjected to for years, even on Government-insured mortgages on which regulatory authority has already existed to cope with these matters.

DISMAL RECORD OF THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION ON HOUSING

The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, represents largely congressional, not executive department, attempts to deal effectively with the housing depression. The Nixon administration gave us virtually no help. Its philosophic approach to the

problem has been to advise moderate income families to "wait a year" to buy homes in the hope that mortgage rates might come down. When pressed for more immediate solutions, the administration came forward with what are now the provisions of title I of the bill, subsidizing the lenders in obtaining funds, so that they could continue to extend mortgage loans at market rates and then immediately discount the paper to the secondary markets. The \$250 million in subsidies contained in title I goes not to home buyers but to lenders. And this, as I said, is the major administration contribution to the provisions of this bill.

I am deeply disappointed at how little we were able to do in this bill in really solving the problems of home financing. But I am glad that we at least were able to do substantially more than the administration felt had to be done or should be done. The administration record on housing has been a dismal one, indeed.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

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. 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 Thursday, July 16, 1970, the Clerk had read through section 115, ending on page 30, line 4 of the bill.

If there are no amendments to this section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

SEC. 116. Section 133A(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as enacted by section 112(a) of this Act, is amended by

adding at the end thereof the following: "Whenever any such hearing is open to the public, that hearing may be broadcast by radio or television, or both, under such rules as the committee may adopt."

(b) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"33. (a) It is the purpose of this clause to provide a means, in conformity with acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, and decorum, by which committee hearings which are open to the public may be covered, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by and of such methods of coverage—

"(1) for the education, enlightenment, and information of the general public, on the basis of accurate and impartial news coverage, regarding the operations, procedures, and practices of the House as a legislative and representative body and regarding the measures, public issues, and other matters before the House and its committees, the consideration thereof, and the action taken thereon; and

"(2) for the development of the perspective and understanding of the general public with respect to the role and function of the House under the Constitution of the United States as an organ of the Federal Government.

"(b) In addition, it is the intent of this clause that radio and television tapes and television film of any coverage under this clause shall not be used, or made available for use, as partisan political campaign material to promote or oppose the candidacy of any person for elective public office.

"(c) It is, further, the intent of this clause that the general conduct of each meeting of any hearing or hearings covered, under authority of this clause, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or any of such methods of coverage, and the personal behavior of the committee members and staff, other Government officials and personnel, witnesses, television, radio, and press media personnel, and the general public at the hearing shall be in strict conformity with and observance of the acceptable standards of dignity, propriety, courtesy, and decorum traditionally observed by the House in its operations and shall not be such as to—

"(A) distort the objects and purposes of the hearing or the activities of committee members in connection with that hearing or in connection with the general work of the committee or of the House; or

"(B) cast discredit or dishonor on the House, the committee, or any Member or bring the House, the committee, or any Member into disrepute.

"(d) The coverage of committee hearings by television broadcast, radio broadcast, or still photography is a privilege made available by the House and shall be permitted and conducted only in strict conformity with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

"(e) Whenever any hearing conducted by any committee of the House is open to the public, that committee may permit, by majority vote of the committee, that hearing to be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, but only under such written rules as the committee may adopt in accordance with the purposes, provisions, and requirements of this clause.

"(f) The written rules which may be adopted by a committee under paragraph (e) of this clause shall contain provisions to the following effect:

"(1) If the television or radio coverage of the hearing is to be presented to the public as live coverage, that coverage shall be con-

ducted and presented without commercial sponsorship.

"(2) No witness served with a subpoena by the committee shall be required against his will to be photographed at any hearing or to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting of that hearing, by radio or television, is being conducted. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off. This subparagraph is supplementary to paragraph (m) of clause 27 of this rule, relating to the protection of the rights of witnesses.

"(3) Not more than four television cameras, operating from fixed positions, shall be permitted in a hearing room. The allocation among the television media of the positions of the number of television cameras permitted in a hearing room shall be in accordance with fair and equitable procedures devised by the Executive Committee of the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

"(4) Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

"(5) Television cameras shall not be placed in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

"(6) Equipment necessary for coverage by the television and radio media shall not be installed in, or removed from, the hearing room while the committee is in session.

"(7) Floodlights, spotlights, strobelights, and flashguns shall not be used in providing any method of coverage of the hearing, except that the television media may install additional lighting in the hearing room, without cost to the Government, in order to raise the ambient lighting level in the hearing room to the lowest level necessary to provide adequate television coverage of the hearing at the then current state of the art of television coverage.

"(8) Not more than five press photographers shall be permitted to cover a hearing by still photography. In the selection of these photographers, preference shall be given to photographers from Associated Press Photos and United Press International Newspictures. If request is made by more than five of the media for coverage of the hearing by still photography, that coverage shall be made on the basis of a fair and equitable pool arrangement devised by the Standing Committee of Press Photographers.

"(9) Photographers shall not position themselves, at any time during the course of the hearing, between the witness table and the members of the committee.

"(10) Photographers shall not place themselves in positions which obstruct unnecessarily the coverage of the hearing by the other media.

"(11) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media shall be then currently accredited to the Radio and Television Correspondents' Galleries.

"(12) Personnel providing coverage by still photography shall be then currently accredited to the Press Photographers' Gallery.

"(13) Personnel providing coverage by the television and radio media and by still photography shall conduct themselves and their coverage activities in an orderly and unobtrusive manner."

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 223]

Abbutt	de la Garza	Mayne
Adair	Delaney	Melcher
Addabbo	Derwinski	Meskill
Anderson,	Diggs	Mikva
Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Miller, Calif.
Ashbrook	Esch	Minshall
Baring	Eshleman	Murphy, N.Y.
Barrett	Evins, Tenn.	Nelsen
Berry	Fallon	Ottinger
Blaggi	Farbstein	Patman
Blatnik	Fish	Pepper
Boland	Ford,	Pirnie
Brademas	William D.	Powell
Brasco	Fulton, Tenn.	Pryor, Ark.
Brock	Gallagher	Rarick
Brown, Calif.	Gialmo	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Mich.	Gilbert	Roe
Buchanan	Gray	Rooney, Pa.
Burke, Fla.	Green, Oreg.	Rosenthal
Burleson, Tex.	Gubser	Rostenkowski
Burton, Utah	Halpern	Roudebush
Bush	Hanley	Rousselot
Button	Hansen, Idaho	Roybal
Cabell	Harrington	Ruppe
Caffery	Harsha	Ryan
Camp	Hawkins	St Germain
Carey	Hébert	Schadeberg
Casey	Hungate	Stephens
Celler	Ichord	Symington
Chappell	Karth	Tunney
Clark	Kirwan	Ullman
Clausen,	Kluczynski	Vander Jagt
Don H.	Landrum	Watkins
Clay	Long, La.	Watts
Collier	Lowenstein	Weicker
Conyers	Lukens	Whalley
Corman	McClory	Wiggins
Crane	McCulloch	Wilson, Bob
Culver	McEwen	Wolf
Cunningham	Macdonald,	Wright
Daddario	Mass.	Zwach
Davis, Ga.	MacGregor	
Dawson	Madden	

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 Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17654, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 308 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment which is a technical amendment to section 116.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 30, line 6, insert "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 116."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENNIS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENNIS: Page 30, line 5; strike out line 5, page 30, through line 20 on page 35, both inclusive.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this is a very simple although far-reaching amendment.

It simply strikes out of the bill all provision for television, radio, and still photography, and broadcasting of committee meetings.

I am in favor of this bill; not only that, I am in favor of most of the so-called

reform amendments which have been offered from the floor, and particularly those which go to the reporting and making public of votes in committee, and likewise of teller votes, an amendment which is coming up later on, and so on.

I believe in adequate publicity. But I do not believe in television in the committee hearings. And for several reasons. In the first place, I object to the physical disruption which television entails. I am asked occasionally, as many of us are, to go upstairs and be interviewed on television, and I always like being asked and I enjoy the interview, but I do not like those bright lights in my eyes even for a few moments. I certainly do not want to sit for a couple of hours in a committee room with those bright lights in my eyes. I do not like the commotion all over the place. I do not like photographers stepping in between the committee and the witness during the testimony of the witness, and all the rest of the physical disruption that you are necessarily going to have in the committee.

You can have publicity by means of ordinary newspaper reporting without all that kind of trouble.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. My question is technical only. Does the gentleman's amendment start at line 5, page 30, or line 12 on page 30? Mr. DENNIS. On line 5.

Mr. HALL. Is the gentleman aware that that involves the other body, that is—line 5 through line 11 on page 30?

Mr. DENNIS. I think the gentleman is correct. But I was advised it was desirable to strike the entire section.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. In the second place, television by the nature of the instrumentality itself overemphasizes because it cannot get all of the action, and it is bound to give an undue prominence to and to emphasize a rather small part of the action that it is going to get.

Some of us, or perhaps all of us, are, in varying degrees, prima donnas. We tend to act, sometimes.

I have been in committee meetings not only in the House of Representatives but in the past in the legislature of my own State and it is my judgment, and I think some of you cannot help but agree with me, that if we really want to transact the people's business and get it dispatched, we do not want a lot of television cameras around. Some of us will be spending more time, in my opinion, making hay on the television camera than they will in doing the business that we are there to transact. That is just one of the facts of political life to which we are all heir.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it is my submission to the committee that this is a public interest amendment. This is an amendment to help to get the public business transacted in an efficient manner. I think in the interest of the orderly transaction of the public's business, television would be the wrong type of publicity, and we would be better off, and the public would be better off, if we dis-

pensed with television cameras in the committee hearings.

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

Mr. DENNIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. Assuming for purposes of discussion that the gentleman's description was right, that on occasion if not most of the time, to have television cameras might make the committee work go in something other than an orderly way, if this language stays in the bill, would a committee be compelled to admit television cameras or would it then have the discretion to do so?

Mr. DENNIS. The gentleman has a perfectly valid point. As I read the language, it would merely give the committee the opportunity to do this under certain rules, if it wants to. My answer to that is that the pressure of the media is going to be so strong and so unremitting that either we will have television in all the committees, or we will continually have a struggle back and forth on this subject. I do not think that would help us much.

PERFECTING AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARVEY

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARVEY: Page 30, strike out line 12 and all that follows down through page 35, line 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"33. Whenever any hearing conducted by a standing, select, or special committee of the House is opened to the public, the committee may permit, as a public service and solely under such rules as the committee may adopt, the broadcasting, telecasting, and photographing by still and motion pictures of that hearing, or the recording and filming of that hearing for later broadcasting or telecasting except that—

"(1) no witness may be required, against his will, to give evidence or testimony while the broadcasting or telecasting of that hearing is being conducted or while a recording or filming of that hearing is being made for later broadcasting or telecasting. At the request of any such witness who does not wish to be subjected to radio, television, or still photography coverage, all lenses shall be covered and all microphones used for coverage turned off; and

"(2) no on-the-spot broadcasting or telecasting of that hearing may be conducted under commercial sponsorship, but this prohibition shall not be construed to prevent the broadcasting or telecasting of that hearing as a part of regularly scheduled news broadcasts or telecasts under commercial sponsorship.

The foregoing provisions of this clause do not apply to the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Rules."

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, my perfecting amendment would, first of all strike all of the present language of this section of the bill insofar as it pertains to the House, and second it would turn over a discretionary power to the committee, on the simple theory that a committee that is adequately enough informed to enact legislation which will affect the entire Nation, certainly has enough knowledge on its own to decide

under what rules it should be covered insofar as the electronic media is concerned. My amendment would, however, turn over this discretionary power with two safeguards: the first safeguard which was read by the Clerk would require that no witness be required against his will to give evidence or testimony while telecasting or broadcasting was taking place.

The second safeguard, of course, would be that no broadcast or no telecast could be conducted under commercial sponsorship.

Mr. Chairman, we in the House realize, I am sure, that the other body has permitted televising of its proceedings for years. This has had a considerable effect on America. This is a means of educating the public.

We do not do any lesser work here in the House nor perform any lesser task. We are not beneath the stature of the other body in any regard whatsoever. Yet we say to the American people, Mr. Chairman, "If you have money and can come to Washington, you can sit in on the Ways and Means Committee or any other committee and you can listen to the witnesses give testimony. But if you do not have the money, we will not permit you to stay home and watch it on the electronic media."

So what we are saying really is that we do not want the American people to learn the views of the House of Representatives. If we take this view, Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives is missing a good bet. I do not quarrel with what the committee has done in pages 30 to 35 here, but I disagree with the great detail in which they have written this.

I serve on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, on the Communications Subcommittee, and, believe me, telecasting is an advancing art. It is changing every day. For us to provide so specifically for the number of decibels of sound, the amount of light, where the cameras are going to be situated, the number of AP and UPI who can be admitted, in the rules of the House, to me makes no sense whatsoever.

I think the House has an obligation to educate the American people, and, further, the American people deserve to know what is taking place in our hearings.

My objection is to writing such details into the Rules of the House of Representatives.

First, the rules are general and leave their interpretation and application to the committee in accordance with established precedents. They ordinarily do not include minutia or attempt to foresee every possible situation that may arise and provide for it in advance.

Second, rules of the House are difficult to amend. Should experience show that one or several of the rules are unworkable or unnecessary, the only way to get rid of it would be to get a resolution out of the Rules Committee and have it adopted by the House.

Third, rules are enforced by a point of order, a powerful and peremptory sanction going to the validity of the proceedings.

Fourth, such rigid and detailed provisions are an onerous and unnecessary restriction on committee discretion and its capacity to conduct its hearings. It is an indication of doubt that committees are not competent to conduct televised hearings fairly without detailed instruction.

Mr. Chairman, my confidence in present and future committees is such that I would give them the same latitude over the conduct of televised hearings that they now have over the management of their other business. If committees are as incompetent as the writing of detailed instructions in House rules implies, God save the country from the legislation they provide.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARVEY of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I will yield in 1 minute. I will say for the benefit of the gentleman from Indiana that if we turn over a complete delegation of power to the committees themselves to decide whether they want television coverage, and, if they want television coverage, just under what rules they will have television coverage, then I think we will not have to worry about bright lights, because each committee can decide for itself what sort of lights are suitable in what room; or whether they will permit photographers in a room without flash cameras. As I say, television is a rapidly advancing art and to try to spell out those things in the bill will not work.

I do not think we shall have to worry about television cameramen coming between the Congressmen and the witnesses, but we can do that in the committee rules and not in the House rules.

As far as prima donnas or demagogues in the House are concerned—well, I would not say that about the colleagues with whom I serve. I think if we have in the House of Representatives some of those who would take advantage of the electronic media in this fashion, the American public will soon take care of them.

But I do say the American public has the right to know what takes place in the House of Representatives hearing rooms, just as they do now in the Senate hearing rooms. This is a process of education, and we are putting ourselves in a secondary position—secondary to the Senate, and secondary to the Chief Executive, as far as educating the American people is concerned—unless we adopt an amendment such as I offer here, to turn the power over to the committees.

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

Mr. Chairman, in response to the statements made just a moment ago by the gentleman from Michigan and also the gentleman from Indiana who preceded him, I wish to state that the gentleman from Michigan in his statements is arguing against himself. First he made the statement that the committee bill, this section, was too general in nature. Then, on the other hand, he proceeded to make several points that it was too restrictive.

I should like to point out that, as shown on page 32, lines 13 through 20, any committee of the House has the right to set up written rules for the coverage by radio or TV, as provided for in this section. Then it sets forth under this part of the legislation some 13 points, which definitely sets regulations and controls over how the TV coverage in committee shall be handled.

One of these points, to which the gentleman from Michigan alluded and which is included, I believe, in his amendment, provides that there shall be no TV coverage, nor radio coverage, under commercial sponsorship. That is already taken care of in the bill. This was one of the gentleman's points in his amendment.

The gentleman from Indiana brought up the point that he did not want any television cameras intervening between members of the committee and witnesses, obstructing their view and interfering with the testimony.

I should like to point out, on point 4, on page 33 of this section, a quote from the bill to the gentleman from Indiana:

Television cameras shall be placed so as not to obstruct in any way the space between any witness giving evidence or testimony and any member of the committee or the visibility of that witness and that member to each other.

So the gentleman's objections are taken care of in the legislation.

This section has been carefully thought out by the subcommittee and the Committee on Rules. I believe it is a good section. It sets forth certain fundamental rules and regulations for conducting these hearings before television cameras or radio, yet it also gives to the committee concerned full power to set any additional written rules that the committee may wish to set.

I oppose both the substitute and the amendment.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When the gentleman mentioned my name he indicated I was being inconsistent. I certainly hope I was not inconsistent.

If I left the impression that my criticism as to what is in the pages between 30 and 35 was that it was too general, then I am sorry. On the contrary, it is too specific. It spells out in minute detail. It spells out the number of press photographers who shall be available and even says that preference shall be given to the Associated Press, the United Press, and so forth.

Who are we to provide in the written rules of the House of Representatives what specific photographers are going to cover these meetings?

On the contrary, I should like to turn that authority over to each individual committee. Then they can do this in the committee rules.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MARTIN. Would not the gentleman say that the 13 regulations set up in here are fair to all of the news media,

to the television industry and the radio industry, and that adequate coverage would be given to all segments? It seems to me that the Committee on Rules has come up with a most fair solution in setting forth these regulations.

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

Mr. MARTIN. I am happy to yield further.

Mr. HARVEY. I believe the Rules Committee was very fair. I certainly would not want to leave the contrary impression. I commend the committee for what it has done.

I just believe that rather than being so specific and writing all of these things into the rules we would be a lot better off if we let each committee handle this matter itself under its own rules.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to point out to the gentleman that the subcommittee had extensive testimony from the industry, both the radio and television industries, and these regulations were written into the legislation as a result of the expert testimony from the people who are probably the most knowledgeable in this field, more knowledgeable than anyone else.

I believe it still accomplishes what the House would like to see accomplished.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, as has already been indicated by my good friend from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), this was a subject that was before your subcommittee throughout the 15 months we worked on this legislation. The proposition of opening up committee hearings to radio and television coverage has long been a subject of controversy and of discussion in connection with the House. Certainly your committee recognized that this was a matter of importance. We did do a great deal of study and investigation into the background and into the rulings by previous Speakers of the House in connection with how far the present rules go in this matter. After a great deal of thought and study we proposed some language that would make it possible for coverage of this kind in committees.

During the time we were working on this language and during the time we were proposing the revisions before you here today, we were in touch with the radio and television industries. We did discuss it at great length in meetings with the networks and with individual station people and so on. So far as I know, we used all of the expertise available to us. I recognize that your committee did not have all of the wisdom available, and I am sure the language is not entirely perfect, but we were faced with a situation where a great many Members in the introduction of their bills provided for radio and television coverage. Some went much further than others. We recognize that there was concern on the part of a good many Members as to whether or not this kind of coverage was in the best interests of good procedure as to its effect on the writing of good legislation and upon looking after the public's business.

In an attempt, frankly, to meet a number of objections that were raised by what you might call outright opponents of opening committees to radio and television, we did draw some pretty strict regulations and set up some rather stiff requirements. We have set some definite guidelines, as has already been indicated, in connection with the number of cameras in the room and the matter of setting up or taking down of equipment during the hearing or the time that the hearing is going on, and at the same time we left it up to the committees themselves to make a determination as to other regulations or any restriction they might see fit to impose. However, it was the subcommittee's frank opinion that unless we did draw the lines fairly tightly there would be a very good likelihood that we would not have the support necessary to provide for the coverage of committees.

Now, I for one for a good many years have felt that this was not in the best interest of good business on behalf of the people. However, I have come to the conclusion that here is a part of the media that has been too long denied access to our committee hearings.

Mr. Chairman, in the final analysis, the right of the public to know supercedes such reservations as we might have about some of the problems involved. The language makes it very clear that if the committee does have problems in connection with some particular reporter, photographer or other individual who might be covering for the networks or individual stations, that that committee can take care of that situation.

There is again language that permits them to do so by withdrawing that privilege from that part or portion of the media.

Further, Mr. Chairman, the committee has the right at all times to restrict its coverage and not permit radio or television in the hearing rooms.

And, as I say again in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think that the time has come when we should give this program an opportunity to work. I think it is in the best interest of the House for a variety of reasons.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope the Members read the provision on this in connection with our report because I think it is quite explanatory as to the decisions arrived at by this subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I just think that the committee should be cognizant of the fact that there is really no serious difference between the Harvey amendment and the committee bill. The committee bill provides for no commercialism. The committee bill provides for protection of witnesses under certain circumstances. It provides that the committees may write their rules. So, all of the essential things contained in the Harvey amendment and in the committee bill are the same.

The quarrel between them is merely

one of detail. The gentleman from Michigan feels that the committee has sought to write too extensive and too detailed protections with reference to television broadcasting into the bill and he would write fewer and leave the rest of it up to practical operation later on.

So, Mr. Chairman, the real argument here is between those who want television broadcasting of committee hearings and those who do not. The rest is not the true or crucial issue.

Therefore, I would suggest that the Harvey amendment should be voted down and that we should vote on the merits of the question presented by the amendment which I have proposed. I submit again that, simply looking at the facts of life as they exist and refusing to be pressured by clamor by certain media, clamor as to how we should discharge our functions, that if we want the committees to do their job, as they should, and still have adequate publicity as to what is done, that this amendment, which removes the circus atmosphere of television cameras from the committee hearings, ought to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Ninety-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 224]

Abbutt	Diggs	Morton
Adair	Edwards, Calif.	Murphy, Ill.
Alexander	Edwards, La.	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson,	Esch	Nelsen
Tenn.	Eshleman	Ottinger
Ashbrook	Evins, Tenn.	Pepper
Ashley	Farbstein	Pirnie
Baring	Fish	Powell
Barrett	Fulton, Tenn.	Price, Tex.
Berry	Gallagher	Pryor, Ark.
Biaggi	Garmatz	Pucinski
Brademas	Gilbert	Qule
Brasco	Gray	Rarick
Brock	Green, Oreg.	Reid, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hagan	Rodino
Brown, Mich.	Halpern	Roe
Brown, Ohio	Hanley	Rooney, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Hansen, Idaho	Rooney, Pa.
Burleson, Tex.	Harrington	Rostenkowski
Burton, Utah	Harsha	Roudebush
Bush	Hawkins	Roussetot
Button	Hébert	Roybal
Cabell	Hofffield	Ruppe
Caffery	Hungate	Ryan
Camp	Ichord	St Germain
Carey	Karth	Schadeberg
Casey	Keith	Scheuer
Celler	Kirwan	Sebellus
Chappell	Landrum	Stephens
Clancy	Long, La.	Symington
Clark	Lowenstein	Taft
Cohelan	Lukens	Teague, Tex.
Collier	McClory	Tunney
Conyers	McCulloch	Ullman
Cramer	McDonald,	Vander Jagt
Crane	Mich.	Watkins
Culver	McEwen	Watts
Cunningham	MacGregor	Welcker
Daddario	Madden	Whalley
Davis, Ga.	Melcher	Whitten
Dawson	Meskill	Wiggins
de la Garza	Mikva	Wilson, Bob
Delaney	Minshall	Zwach

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Commit-

tee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17654, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 304 members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

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

Mr. Chairman, during the debate on this bill, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, last week on several occasions I availed myself of the opportunity to remind the Members of the House that 4 years ago there was a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress that had studied in depth many of the issues that we are debating now. In this particular instance I think it is only fair to point out that, as a member of that joint committee, I believe in this particular area the Rules Committee bill is better than was our offering. It permits, under carefully prescribed and carefully drafted rules, regulations and conditions the televising and broadcasting of certain committee hearings. In this area I feel the Committee on Rules has done a better job than the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress did. I think their recommendations are excellent. I think the committee is to be commended because of the obvious care with which this particular section, that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) is attempting to delete from the bill, was drafted.

The Joint Committee on Organization of the Congress unanimously recommended that the televising and broadcasting of some committee proceedings be permitted. The reason we did it was in recognition of the fact that more than half the people in the United States of America have as their primary source of news either television or radio. We felt that because of this, and because some Senate hearings were being broadcast, and because the executive could obtain and control radio and television time so easily, that the House was not performing its functions as a coordinate, co-equal branch of our government by denying the people access to our activities by these modern techniques of the electronic media.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in this debate I referred to the Republican task force on congressional reform and the book it published, "We Propose: A Modern Congress." In that book, there was a chapter on the subject matter of this amendment, written by Congressman Bob Ellsworth.

Since that time, many Congressmen have supported and reintroduced the Ellsworth proposals. We have noted that there is in fact much television and broadcasting permitted in the Halls of Congress, as for example when the President addresses Congress. The people have for too long been denied the right to look or listen as their representatives conduct the business of the Nation. In my opinion this is wrong. The electronic media, in the interests of elementary democ-

racy, should be permitted to bring to the public the debates which will decide their future.

I might also point out, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) in supplemental and minority views which are concurred in by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) as well as myself went a step farther and recommended that under certain circumstances sessions of this House could be televised and broadcast.

We have had historic debates here that should have been televised and broadcast provided, of course—

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. HECHLER) who, as I said earlier, had written supplemental views to the report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, urging in addition to broadcasting committee hearings that we have the same for some sessions of the House.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. I am pleased that the gentleman from New Hampshire, my colleague on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, is supporting the televising of committee hearings.

If it were germane and in order, I would offer an amendment at this point to televise all sessions of the Congress. I believe that that would focus attention on and stimulate new interest on the part of the people in the Nation in the debates of the House of Representatives. It has been argued that this might result in "acting" for the cameras, but the camera is a merciless mirror of reality.

I think, and I hope, that this day will come when all sessions of Congress can be open to television and radio broadcasting. But I would not expect such an amendment would pass at this point, and therefore I will strongly support the televising of committee hearings.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The gentleman makes a good point. Of course, as the gentleman knows and Members know, much of what we are trying to do in this legislative reorganization act can already be done under our existing rules. I do not think that is fully appreciated. No House rule says that you cannot. All that the committee is suggesting is a rule that says you can and then prescribes certain circumstances. As I said, I think they have done an excellent job in drafting this section of the bill and in drawing up certain standards under which this part of the bill would come into effect.

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his statement and join him in supporting the televising of committee hearings.

Mr. CLEVELAND. For the benefit of those who came in late, if that is the way you feel and if you agree with the gentleman from Montana, you will vote "no" on the two amendments that are about to come up and leave what the committee did intact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. CLEVELAND, at the request of Mr. DENNIS, was granted permission by unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENNIS. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from New Hampshire that the Constitution has always provided that trials in courts shall be public, and yet almost universally the courts have rejected the television broadcasting and the reason for that is because it interferes with the orderly transaction of the public business in the courts. I am suggesting that if we permit it in the committees, it would interfere with the orderly transaction of the business of the committee. That is the reason for my amendment which strikes from the bill those provisions which would permit the televising of committee hearings.

Mr. CLEVELAND. The point of the gentleman is well taken, but proceedings in the courts are adversary proceedings whereas in many of our hearings they are for the purpose of getting information not only for the members of the committee but for the people of the country, who are after all our ultimate court, certainly our jury.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS) inasmuch as I am strongly opposed to those provisions of the bill which would permit the televising, broadcasting and photographing of committee hearings. My fear is that the presence of TV cameras would interfere with the orderly conduct of hearings. The temptation would be too great for politicians to be more concerned about how they will appear on TV to their constituents rather than the legislative purpose of the hearing. Committee Members might avoid asking important questions because they might not be well received by television viewers. Contrariwise, they might phrase other questions for their dramatic value and the favorable impression they might make on viewers rather than on their probative value.

In addition, I do not see how we could avoid the circus-like atmosphere which always accompanies the presence of photographers and television and radio crews. No matter what rules and restrictions we adopt, disruption and confusion will inevitably result. I do not feel this atmosphere is conducive to the orderly conduct of congressional business.

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

RETIREMENT OF CARTHA D. "DEKE" DELOACH

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAGAN was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Chairman, today, July 20, a man I am proud to call my good friend, a constituent, and a highly devoted public servant, Cartha D. "Deke" DeLoach, commences a well deserved retirement after 28 years of tireless and

dedicated service with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. "Deke" is planning to enter private industry at this time, in a furtherance of his most outstanding career.

Some time ago, "Deke" indicated to some of his friends that he was considering such a move, that it would be with deep regret, but of his own volition, after much soul-searching and out of consideration of his fine family.

"Deke," as Claxton, Ga.'s foremost native son and renowned national figure, has risen from the ranks of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to become Assistant to Director J. Edgar Hoover in 1965, in which position he has been in direct charge of all criminal investigations and counterspy operations.

I personally am confident that a man of the caliber of "Deke" DeLoach will be a real success in his new endeavor also. Every facet of his impressive background testifies to his strong perseverance and adaptability.

From the time he was an active member of the American Legion and his service as department commander and national vice commander to his present role as chairman of the national public relations commission, there was no doubt that this able and devoted Legion member would earn further plaudits from his peers.

In 1963, "Deke" DeLoach was named man of the year in the Legion by the State Commanders Society of the Legion's national convention. And in September 1964, "Deke" received the annual president's award of the National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs for distinguished public service.

On May 12, 1967, the president of St. John's College in the Nation's Capital presented "Deke" DeLoach the president's medal of St. John's College. And "Deke" was presented the George Washington honor medal by Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge, Pa., in 1967, 1968, and 1969.

He was selected for membership in the International Platform Association in September 1967, by the board of governors of that organization, and selected to be a member of the board of directors of the Ophthalmic Research Foundation in 1968.

The man who was born in Claxton, Ga., and attended Gordon Military College, Barnesville, Ga., South Georgia College, Douglas, Ga., and Stetson University, Deland, Fla.—the young man who played varsity football and received a bachelor of arts degree from Stetson and later attended its law school—the young man who was given a distinguished alumni award by that institution in November 1958, and a similar award by Stetson's Alumni Association in February, 1966—the young man who received an award in 1966 from the Pi Kappa Phi fraternity of which he was a member and honorary doctor of laws degrees from Stetson University in 1966 and Lincoln College, Lincoln, Ill., in 1968—this is Cartha D. DeLoach whom we his friends call "Deke."

He will no doubt go on to even greater heights in his new position in private

industry and I feel my colleagues will unanimously join me in wishing him well and Godspeed in his quest for a place in the business world.

The high esteem in which he is held in the First District of Georgia is attested to by tributes in his hometown newspaper, the Claxton Enterprise, the Savannah Morning News and Evening Press, the Augusta Chronicle, the Evening Star, the Chicago Tribune and by national columnist Ray McHugh.

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

Mr. Chairman, I know that since the rollcall, there have been many Members here who did not hear the discussion of the two amendments, the Dennis amendment and the Harvey amendment to the committee bill, which provides for televising of committee hearings.

I repeat again, the committee bill provides for committee hearings to be televised and provides for radio coverage to be regulated by the bill itself. The Dennis amendment strikes out all television and radio. The Harvey amendment, so its author said, was a perfecting amendment but in the nature of allowing the committees themselves to set the conditions under which they would have radio and TV.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he has anything further he would like to add, so that those of the committee who were not here will understand what is at stake.

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

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, I would say what the gentleman from Illinois says is essentially correct. I have tendered an amendment which would strike section 116, the section providing for televising committee hearings. It merely takes out everything from line 5 on page 30 through line 20 on page 35, my amendment being that televising committee hearings makes for disruption of the orderly business of the committee. Really the things which will be picked out by the media will just be certain things they want and not what the committee or what the chairman wants or what Congress has anything to do with. I believe we will transact our business better without that type of distraction.

The gentleman from Michigan has offered a clarifying amendment which I understand will be voted on first. Essentially it leaves the committee bill intact, the difference being that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) lays down only a very few basic rules but leaves the rest to the committees themselves, but it does permit televising. If that is disposed of negatively—as I hope it will be—we will come then to the main issue, which is my amendment to strike televising provisions from the measure.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Michigan, a member of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if I have represented his amendment correctly?

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, basically I would say yes. My amendment is predicated on the theory that if any of our committees of the House are adequately informed enough to enact legislation, certainly they are adequately informed enough to get out their own rules without all these provisions on pages 30 to 35.

I just believe television is such an advancing art that we cannot possibly spell it out in the rules of the House, that it should be done in the rules of the committee instead, with the safeguards that have been written into my amendment.

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

I take this time to address two or three questions to my fellow Californian who has handled this bill through the Rules Committee and on the floor of the House for some 6 days now.

I ask my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), in the preparation of this legislation, did the Committee on Rules work with representatives of the radio and television industry, specifically to ascertain what their needs would be to prevent a circus atmosphere within the committees under broadcast conditions?

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. SISK. The answer to that question, of course, is "Yes." We did work with experts in the field of radio broadcasting as well as television. We discussed the subjects that we were involved in with experts in lighting, with people in the electronics field, and with representatives of the networks as well as individuals and still photographers.

This was worked out rather carefully. The restrictions were drawn to give them an opportunity to do a job from their standpoint but at the same time to restrict it in such a manner as to keep it from becoming a hindrance to the committee in doing its job. This was rather carefully considered, and it is a rather well-balanced, we believe, series of regulations.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Does the gentleman have any expectation that our committee rooms would be taken over by a lot of strewn cables, or that we would be so obstructed by cameramen or directors or prop men that we could not conduct normal committee business?

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield further, it is my opinion that this will not be the case. This again is the reason for the rather restrictive sentences in connection with these provisions; the requirement that they set up ahead of time, the requirement that they not break down their equipment during the time the committee is proceeding with its sessions, the requirement that the cameras be so located as not to obstruct the view of the spectators, of the committee, or of the witness; and so on and so on. These matters were carefully considered. It is my opinion it will not become a circus

and it will not derogate from the ability of the committee to do its business.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Is it not true that the allowance for at least five cameras is to take care of the needs of regional representatives of the broadcast media, who are not concerned with matters that interest the networks, but are assigned to cover news of specific concern to localities, involving Members whose districts are represented within the localities?

Mr. SISK. If the gentleman will yield further, the answer would be "yes." We attempted here to give that kind of coverage. If we had limited it, for example, to only three cameras, and if we had ABC, CBS, and NBC all desiring to cover, then the independents selecting their own material, doing special kinds of studies, would have been precluded from serving their particular portion of the public. We feel that the number of cameras permitted would adequately serve the purposes the public expects and demands.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I do thank the gentleman for this clarification of the legislation before the Committee of the Whole and for his effort in support of increasing public knowledge of Government. It seems rather strange, more than 50 years after radio has been in a majority of American homes and more than two decades after the majority of American homes have television, that we are even discussing the proper role of electronic journalism here on the Hill.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLFF. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California and say that if the public is entitled to see the results of the operations of the President of the United States that we did some years ago, I think they are entitled to see the operation of the Congress as well.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California. I think we should permit the televising of our committee hearings, and personally I want to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I feel I will vote to support the committee action.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, if the House of Representatives wishes to remain for all time a secondary body in the Congress of the United States, the way to do it is to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MIZE. I think there is some difference in it, though. In the Senate they have much smaller committees. Suppose we get the House of Representatives televised and we get a hot issue before the Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I serve. There are 35 members on this committee. What chance do you suppose some of us down the line will have

to interrogate witnesses and get our point across?

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. I say to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MIZE), that could be taken care of adequately by provisions already in this bill.

Mr. MIZE. I agree. But then what we will start doing is making TV productions out of our committee meetings.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to use my 5 minutes, but I just want to ask the \$64 question. I was here during one Congress when we had television. Is there any regulation in the committee bill that will prohibit television from covering a hearing, let us say, for one station and then clipping out a few clips here and there of the film for showing on nationwide television to produce whatever effect they desire?

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

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Let me say that I think the easy or the correct answer would have to be no. There is no provision that would preclude this from happening. We have attempted, if the gentleman will yield further, to be as strict as we can. We have required that live television will not be commercially sponsored. We have put in regulations in connection with the partisan use of this film. On the other hand, if a newsman, an independent station, or a network wishes to be so capricious and so lacking in meeting their responsibilities to the American public as to do the kind of thing that the gentleman indicated, then I think the thing to do is to throw them out, and that is what I expect and hope the committees will do. Of course, the committee retains that right.

Mr. HAYS. Perhaps the solution would be to say that if you televise a committee hearing, you have to televise it all. I think perhaps that would be something that might discourage the sensationalists.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes except that I would like to make one remark.

Two or three weeks ago I was approaching my automobile and as I was getting in three teen-age girls were walking by. One looked at me and said, "Hey, I know you. I have seen your picture a lot on television." Another girl said, "Yeah. What show are you on?"

I think that is the answer. If we permit television proceedings of the House and the committees, this will become one gigantic show.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

The perfecting amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DENNIS and Mr. Sisk.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 93, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I very strongly support and urge the adoption of this Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, H.R. 17654, with the addition of strengthening amendments.

In a number of past instances, I and many other Members here have felt there was good reason to question the soundness of some House regulations and procedures that can be projected to prevent full Chamber discussion of major issues, deny the opportunity to offer amendments, and require voting action without giving Members a chance to study informative committee reports.

Together with this persistent questioning by Members themselves, there has now developed, especially among our youth, increasingly widespread public doubt about the full openness, fairness, and effectiveness of the legislative process in the Congress. Obviously, no branch of our Federal Government, executive, judicial, or legislative, can effectively operate in the national interest without the confidence and backing of a majority of our people.

This reorganization bill is very timely designed to restore the public confidence and respond to the longstanding desires of a great number of our Members to improve the discussion and determination methods of the legislative processes in the Congress. A doubting public can be given reassurance of the integrity of congressional operations by the adoption of this bill because, among other things, it will provide our people with more complete and accurate information about voting actions in the Chamber and in committee; it will also give the public a greatly needed opportunity to see and hear what actually goes on in ordinary committee proceedings and special House-Senate conferences; it will further afford all House Members a much fairer chance to express our views for or against important legislation; and it will permit desired changes to be made in the selection of committee chairmanships.

Of course, there is no easy way or readily acceptable formula to always and in every instance guarantee perfect order, fairness, and efficiency in a legislative body composed of 435 human beings of varied backgrounds, personalities, and convictions, but we are obliged to make every effort to reasonably accomplish that objective. That is the basic purpose of this bill.

The real challenge that confronts this Congress in these critical days of our national life is to prove to the American people, and to the world, that our form of representative government can truly and effectively legislate in the public interest, and that it can truly and effectively perform its work in full and open public view.

Let us meet that challenge now, by registering our resounding approval of this urgently needed reorganization measure.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I think the following five editorials, selected from many that have been brought

to my attention, argue eloquently for the need to incorporate some meaningful reform in the legislative reorganization bill we are considering this week. The editorials come from newspapers serving north, south, east, and west—and areas in between. These papers serve every variety of community to be found in our land, urban, suburban, and rural. Mr. Chairman, the people demand change.

All of the editorials deal with secret House procedures and operations, and all urge that we abolish such procedures and operations. I intend to support the bipartisan antisecrecy amendments as they are offered this week, because without them any legislative reorganization bill would be a sham. I commend these editorials to any of my colleagues who may be in doubt as to the need for such reforms, and include them at this point in the RECORD. The editorials appeared in the Lynn Daily Evening Item, the Tampa Tribune, the Spokane Daily Chronicle, the Detroit News, and the Wichita Eagle and the Beacon:

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Evening Item, July 14, 1970]

LEGISLATIVE SECRECY

Those who gather and edit the news for American newspapers—and for other media, as well—have long been concerned over unnecessary secrecy among the committees of Congress.

Secrecy undermines the democratic process and saps public confidence, particularly in the House, as a responsive and effective legislative body.

Now, the concern of newspaper people is being shared by members of Congress themselves, Republican and Democratic, liberal and conservative.

Twenty-two members of the House (unfortunately there are no Massachusetts representatives among them) are sponsoring a series of antisecrecy amendments to H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which is due for action in the House this week.

These amendments include recording how members vote on major issues, both in committee and on the House floor, opening committee hearings and meetings to the press and public, and requiring the availability of committee reports and hearings before final House action on legislation.

The democratic process cannot function without the free flow of information. These amendments should pass. The public should demand that they pass. Write to your Congressman.

[From the Tampa Tribune, Friday, May 22, 1970]

THE OLD ORDER PASSES; OR DOES IT?

When John W. McCormack came to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1929, he was known as "that Bolshevik." When, in accord with his announcement this week, he leaves it at the end of the current term, he will take with him the nickname "the Archbishop."

The change represents less transformation in the retiring Speaker than in the times and political temper of the nation. Despite his 78 years, he told a press conference at which he disclosed his retirement, "I don't feel old. . . I'm still trying to look 10 years into the future."

Perhaps so. But the reason it is well that McCormack is now stepping aside (and that some of his elderly colleagues should do likewise) is that his point of view for looking

10 years into the future has remained that of 1928, or 1938, not that of 1970.

He denied that either age or the pressures of younger House members had anything to do with his decision. He would have announced retirement two years ago, he said, except that he did not want to appear to be leaving his party in the lurch after its 1968 election defeat; and his reason was not age, but simply to devote more time to his ailing wife.

Yet, despite his expressed admiration for most of today's youth, the times have passed him by. Two recent events especially make the point—as many more might.

In 1965 a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress proposed important changes to modernize the operation of the House and Senate, which had gone untouched since 1946. In 1967 the Senate overwhelmingly approved most of them, and sent the bill doing so to the House. McCormack was reminded that the 1946 reorganization bill got to the House floor only because the then Speaker bypassed the archaic, power-conscious Rules Committee. McCormack's response was to send the new bill to the Rules Committee, where for almost a thousand days it languished.

Last fall, Speaker McCormack was visibly shaken by disclosure that his principal aide, Dr. Martin Sweig, and an old friend, Nathan Voloshen, a lobbyist, had been using the power of the Speaker's office in efforts to influence Federal agencies in behalf of Voloshen's clients. No one suggested McCormack knew what was going on—but it was clear many of his colleagues and constituents thought that he should have.

The major change that can come from McCormack's retirement is a new attitude in the House leadership toward reform of Congressional operations, by restoring to the Senate-passed bill many of the items the Rules Committee deleted before belatedly ordering to the floor what to many Representatives is a window-dressing with no substance.

Among the deletions are a provision for a permanent Joint Committee on Congressional Operations (which might keep old-timers and outdated practices always on the defensive); a requirement making public how individual committee members vote on all matters; a lessening of the evils of the seniority system, and greater independence and staffing for minority party committee members.

President Nixon, in commenting on Speaker McCormack's decision to step down, praised him as a man who always "put country above party—the national good above self."

That the appraisal is apt does not alter the fact that McCormack's view of the country and of the national good was that of an old order of politics anachronistic and inappropriate for the complexities of 1970's political environment.

It is extremely likely that his successor will be the man he handpicked for the job, Oklahoma's Carl Albert, 62. Whether McCormack's departure really will mark the passing of the old order in the House will best be indicated by the fate of reform of Congressional operations along the lines approved by the more forward-looking Senate.

[From the Spokane Daily Chronicle, July 13, 1970]

VOTES SHOULD BE PUBLIC

Important decisions will be made in the U.S. House of Representatives this week on proposals which would give the public more access to information about the work of the House.

H.R. 17654, which would reorganize the House's information operations, will be up for consideration. But the important votes

will be on anti-secrecy amendments proposed by a Republican-Democratic coalition.

The public has a big stake in the outcome, because it is entitled to more information about how important legislation goes through the House and how its members vote.

The anti-secrecy amendments would:

Require that "teller" votes cast during House debates be put on the public record on the demand of 20 members. Now the House does most of its important business in a Committee of the Whole where votes are cast by members walking through aye and nay "teller" lines but with no official record kept.

Require that votes on legislation in committees and subcommittees be put on the public record. The bill itself would require only a report on the total votes for and against an issue.

Require that all House committee and subcommittee meetings be open to the public unless the committee votes each time, in public and on the record, to close a meeting. At present half of all committee meetings are closed.

Require that each year, 30 days after the budget is presented to Congress, the House Appropriations Committee hold public hearings on the over-all spending program. Hearings now are piecemeal, agency by agency, and in secret.

Require that every committee announce publicly the date, place and subject of every hearing, even if the session is closed.

The congressmen are dealing with the public's business, and the public is entitled to know about it. For example, if a representative votes on an amendment during House debate, the voters in his district have a right to know how he voted. The same is true of votes on legislation in committee.

The anti-secrecy amendment should be approved. There has been too much "secret government" behind the doors of congressional committees.

[From the Detroit News, Saturday, July 11, 1970]

CONGRESS SHOULD OPEN ITS DOORS—WHY THE SECRECY?

More often than the public realizes, the U.S. Congress conducts its business—your business—anonously and behind closed doors.

Members who demand a strict accounting from the executive and judicial branches regularly conceal their own deliberations and actions.

A chance for reform is at hand.

This month, the House of Representatives will act on a bill to reorganize Congress. The bill offers an opportunity, one which comes along infrequently, to write amendments stripping away some of the secrecy that cloaks the federal legislative process.

One proposed amendment strikes at the practice by the House of converting itself into a Committee of the Whole and casting unrecorded votes. This practice provides politicians a haven of anonymity and denies constituents the right to know how their representatives ballot on important and sensitive issues. In the legislative body of a democratic system, voting should be a matter of public record.

Another proposed amendment would require disclosure of voting on committee and subcommittee roll calls. Under present rules, House committees keep a record of how each member votes but that record is not released to constituents or the general public.

In fact, many committee sessions are closed entirely to press and public. About half the hearings and meetings of House committees are closed. The House Appropriations Committee, which has so much to say about the spending of those billions of taxpayer dollars, holds all its meetings and hearings in secret.

Secrecy may be dictated on occasion by national security but in general the committee meetings and the voting should be open and on the record, accountable to the public, which foots the bill and to which the Congress owes its very existence.

The purposes of the reforms, of course, is to make the House a more responsible body. Paradoxically, the fate of the reforms depends on whether the House is responsible enough to approve them. Confronted by an ethical dilemma of this sort, men often need outside guidance. So this is one of those occasions when a letter to your congressman would be particularly appropriate.

[From the Wichita Eagle and the Beacon, July 12, 1970]

CONGRESSMEN SHOULD VOTE AGAINST SECRECY

This week in the House of Representatives they're going to be voting on H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. A great many members of Congress are inclined to regard this matter of legislative reform as a mere housekeeping affair—really nobody's business but theirs.

Nothing could be farther from the truth. Fortunately a group of congressmen of both parties have sponsored some amendments to the resolution which would abolish secrecy in a number of important proceedings.

These amendments, among other things, include recording how members vote on major issues both in committee and on the House floor; opening committee hearings and meetings to the press and public, and requiring the availability of committee reports and hearings before final House action on legislation.

Perhaps one of the most important parts of the amendments is that of so-called "teller votes." The House does most of its important business in a committee of the whole where votes are cast by members walking through aye or nay "teller" lines with no official record of the vote. During the past year key votes cast on this basis included the antiballistic missile, supersonic transport, right to work laws, money for education and anti-pollution programs, school desegregation and limitation of the Indo-China war.

That's bad enough. What's worse is that all appropriations committee meetings at present are closed to press and public, and that's where taxpayer money is spent by the billions of dollars. Particularly at a time such as this when there is a real money crunch it is vital for people to know the rationale for federal spending, and this can be learned only in these appropriations committee hearings.

All this secrecy is bad in principle. It can be even worse in practice. A congressman may take a public position on one side of an issue and vote on the other side without fear of discovery. It is, indeed, impossible sometimes to learn how he voted on some very important issues if he doesn't care to say.

About 50 congressmen have sponsored the anti-secrecy amendments. That isn't enough to pass them, and unfortunately, the vote on them probably will not be on the record.

So we can only entreat the members of the Kansas delegation to vote as a man in favor of freedom of information—to support the amendments.

To do anything less is to tell the public it isn't entitled to know how its business is being conducted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. Mr. SISK. 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 Commit-

tee 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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend and revise their remarks on the reorganization bill, H.R. 17654.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, AUGUST 14, TO WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 689) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 689

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Friday, August 14, 1970, it shall stand adjourned until 12 o'clock on Wednesday, September 9, 1970, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to provisions of section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. At any time during this adjournment of the House, whenever the Speaker of the House determines that legislative expediency so warrants, he shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(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, I take this time because I have been requested by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), to inform the House that on Thursday of this week he will call up the conference report on the bill H.R. 14705, the Employment Security Amendments of 1970.

PLAQUES COMMEMORATING SERVICE OF CONGRESSMEN

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

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Capitol is the national home of the American people. Here its leaders through its almost 200 glorious and colorful years assembled to help develop the legislation that has made this country great. Here

some of the most fateful events of history have been debated by the great, the near great, and lesser lights. Their deeds contributed mightily in making the United States of America the leader of the free world and the citadel of liberty.

Every day visitors to the Capitol are inspired by the statues of the selected great of each State, but nowhere can they read the collective names of the several thousand men and women who also served and served well these almost 200 years of our constitutional history.

Was it meant that they would be relegated to anonymity and the Nation honor but a few? Just as the greatness of this Nation is a composite of hundreds of thousands of deeds of sacrifice throughout our history, the stability of this Nation in war and peace was also achieved through these several thousand dedicated representatives of the people over the course of our history, and I believe are worthy to be remembered. My colleagues of today are deserving of respect and remembrance, by future generations.

I believe that our present generations and generations to come should know of these men and women who have preceded and who shall follow. They are the bricks that make a mighty fortress of democracy. I propose that the congressional districts throughout this land, through the auspices of their various historical societies or their respective legislative bodies, or by private donation, give a small bronze plaque of prescribed size and type of wording to the Congress commemorating each and all Representatives and Senators who have served the State and the congressional districts, and who are now deceased. On the plaque I would recommend that the wording include the name of the person commemorated, the years of his service, party and State, possibly any congressional offices he or she held, and possibly the name of the sponsor of the plaque in very small print. These plaques would then be embedded in an appropriate place, such as the walkways on the east side of the Capitol on a prearranged plan and design. Thereafter, this point of interest would be known as the Walkway of Congress or some such words.

Thereafter, when a Member, or former Member is deceased, his name would then be eligible to be placed on the roll of honor on the walkway, by donation from his district.

Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce a proper resolution calling for a joint committee of the House and the Senate to be appointed to study the feasibility and execution of this project, with a view to having the names of deceased members in place by the celebration of the independence of our Nation, by 1976. Then would the Capitol be a further living embodiment of its own history. Then America each day could pay tribute to those who also served.

GOOD YEAR IN GRAIN EXPORTS

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

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, all Kansans are aware that their prospects for continuing prosperity depend upon grain exports as much as any other single factor. The huge carryover of wheat in Canada and Australia has made grain export a very competitive business the past 2 years, but fortunately for Kansas and other grain-producing States, the administration has made progress in developing good export markets for our crops.

Mr. Charles Pence, raised on a farm near Topeka, is head of the Grain Division of the Export Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Pence has been county agent of Saline County, Kans., and an executive of Great Plains Wheat, Inc. He has been a key member of the USDA team in charge of building dependable export markets.

I am very pleased to note that this past marketing year—June 30, 1969–June 30, 1970—was a good export year for U.S. wheat after an extremely disappointing one a year earlier.

U.S. wheat exports—excluding flour and wheat products—for the year amounted to 535 million bushels—about equal to the combined production of Kansas, Nebraska, and North Dakota. This was an increase of 15 percent from the 465 million bushels exported in 1968–69. Both commercial and food for peace exports increased, and commercial sales accounted for nearly 60 percent of the 1969–70 total. Exports of flour and wheat products increased about 10 percent to make the fiscal year total approximately 610 million bushels compared to 543.8 million last year.

U.S. corn exports also increased during the past year, reaching 590 million bushels, which is more than the production of any Corn Belt State except Illinois and Iowa. This was a gain of more than 20 percent from the approximately 490 million bushels exported a year earlier.

Grain sorghum exports also increased with shipments reaching 116 million bushels—nearly as much as the State of Kansas produces and more than any other State except Texas. This compares with exports of slightly over 100 million bushels a year earlier, a gain of about 13 percent.

Several actions taken by the U.S. Department of Agriculture which contributed to this successful record deserve to be mentioned.

One was the establishment of a new agency, the Export Marketing Service, headed by the General Sales Manager of the Department. This centralized the export operations of the Department and has greatly contributed to its effectiveness.

The Department also was a prime mover in bringing about competitive pricing among world wheat exporters after a minimum price schedule of the international grains arrangement had brought world wheat trade to a virtual standstill.

Improvements were made in the CCC export credit sales program, and export sales under this program nearly doubled as a result. This is a commercial export financing program for dollars that bridges the gap between cash sales and

concessional sales under the food for peace program.

The barter program also enjoyed a fine year as a result of improvements made in its operation. Under this program, U.S. commodities are bartered for goods and services which the Department of Defense, AID, and other Federal agencies need for use abroad and would otherwise have to procure for dollars. Thus, it is a major aid to our balance of payments.

Prospects are bright for another good export year in fiscal year 1971, particularly for wheat. There will be a decrease in the supply of wheat for export in several exporting countries—the European Community, Eastern Europe, Spain, and Argentina. This deficit will be made up by the United States, Canada, and Australia.

The U.S. share of this business will depend on our ability to maintain competitive prices and the necessary credit terms to meet the strong competition of Canada and Australia. The record of the past year is a good indication of our determination to do so.

BIG SPENDERS SHIRK RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, well, not unpredictably, the big spenders in this Congress are weeping crocodile tears and screaming like a wounded banshee because the President of the United States puts the saddle right on them where it belongs.

The Democrat leadership, as well as most of their other rank-and-file candidates for reelection, piously vote for every emotional spending program that comes along, and generously add hundreds of millions of dollars, unbudgeted dollars as you well know, then turn to the electorate with smug satisfaction, and like little Jack Horner, say, "Look what I have done for you—what a good boy am I."

Mr. Speaker, demagoguery was not invented by this Congress, but many more performances like those we have witnessed in the past couple of months will put a label on the 91st that will not be forgotten. Maybe some of our colleagues think they can have it both ways, but the people back home are smart enough to know they are the ones who will ultimately be required to pick up the check—pay the bills, for the indiscretions and excesses of those here who have a compulsion for spending, but lack the courage to enact the tax legislation to pay the bill.

To put it another way, politics seems to cloud their vision, particularly in an election year; thus, the boys use the carrot-on-the-stick approach, dangling all types of budget-busting programs before the "grateful" electorate, portraying great do-gooding, humanitarian postures for health and hospitals, education and children, welfare and the poverty-stricken.

It is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, once or

twice each year the Congress is prevailed upon to increase the national debt ceiling. The Congress has been controlled by the Democrat Party for 34 of the past 38 years—every Congress except two in nearly four decades—probably a clue why our public debt is \$380 billion.

And what are the Democrat leaders saying? Over the weekend, the President literally took the Congress to the woodshed, and scolded those big spenders who lack the courage to enact the taxes to pay for the programs they promote—then the majority leader is quoted as saying the President's statement is "an ill-advised cover-up of the administration's economic shortcomings—and obvious political gimmickry designed to disguise Presidential neglect in such fields as health, education, and housing." All I can say is "hogwash."

Mr. Speaker, such a statement would be laughable if it did not deal with such serious and critical issues. Everyone is suffering from inflation, and as long as the big spenders inflate the dollar by voting to spend more without generating the funds with which to pay, the problem will continue to be compounded.

For example, take the President's veto of the Hill-Burton hospital extension. From a personal standpoint, I voted for Hill-Burton in committee; I voted for Hill-Burton in the House; I voted for the Hill-Burton conference report, but when the President vetoed it and pointed out the mandatory spending provisions, plus the busting of the budget by \$350 million, I agreed with him and voted to sustain him. Does this make me anti-hospital? No, just to the demagogues and uninformed.

Last week the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill zipped by the House with only 25 votes against. Do you know this bill ravished the budget by nearly a half billion dollars, but because of the fear of being labeled anti-education, our Members marched down the line of fiscal irresponsibility—how they moaned when a record vote was demanded.

Mr. Speaker, these chickens have a way of coming home to roost, and it may well be this November, when people will want to know just who is responsible for inflation and big debts. As Honest Abe said:

You can fool some of the people some of the time.

THE AMERICAN WOMAN THEN AND NOW

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

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article written by my constituent, Mrs. Marjorie Longwell of Malibu, Calif.:

THE AMERICAN WOMAN THEN AND NOW

(By Marjorie Longwell)

(NOTE.—Serving as California chairman and national vice-president of the National Woman's Party, Mrs. Longwell has been in-

terested for a long period of time in the role of women in America. She has written various articles that have been published in previous issues of the Bulletin and has authored a book on women in America. Her pertinent comments on "women, past and present" were given at a recent meeting of Phi Chapter.)

Nearly two hundred years ago, when our Founding Fathers were drawing up a code of laws, one Founding Father, John Adams, received a letter from his wife, Abigail, saying:

"MY DEAR JOHN:

By the way, in the new code of laws, I desire you would remember the ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than were your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power in the hands of husbands. Remember, all men would be tyrants if they could.

Your loving wife,

"ABIGAIL".

Not many people are aware of John Adams' answer. He wrote: "Depend upon it, my dear wife, we men know better than to repeal our masculine systems."

Thus were women left out of the Constitution, and have been left out ever since, except on voting days. In 1920 women of the U.S.A. were given the right to vote.

As someone has wisely said: "Behind every man, as a man, stands the Constitution; but behind every woman stands the Old English Common Law which places upon her the stigma of inferiority and bondage."

It is vitally important to remember that our Founding Fathers wrote the U. S. Constitution in the light of the old English common law, and the old English common law did not recognize women as persons.

But lest we tend to blame our Founding Fathers unjustly, we must remember that their world of almost 200 years ago no more resembled today's world than an ox cart resembles a rocket ship.

The 1786 woman, spinning and weaving by candlelight, cooking at an open hearth, making clothes for all 14 of her children, could scarcely read or write. Her daughters, attending a hickory stick school, were not taught long division—that mathematical area being reserved for boys.

Daily needs in 1786 were woman-supplied. Did the family need a new blanket? She wove it. Did a child have an aching tooth? She rode with him on horseback to the doctor who, by dint of pliers, turned dentist. Was a neighbor ill? The 1786 woman willingly shouldered the duty of nurse.

To the 1786 woman, gazing out her curtained window at horsedrawn carriages on cobbled streets, our modern woman would have seemed more improbable than Gulliver's tallest tale. How could she visualize 30 million women marching each morning to jobs outside the home, attending college, becoming lawyers, doctors, scientists? How could she know that women would someday drive their own cars, fly their own planes?

The point to remember is that our Constitution, written in 1786 for men and women, still serves today for men and women, with the exception of the 19th amendment which gives women voting rights.

The 14th and 15th amendments, written in 1868 and 1870, said: "All persons born or naturalized in the U.S. are citizens and have the right to vote."

Susan B. Anthony, considering herself to be a person, registered and voted in 1872. She was arrested, brought to trial, convicted of the crime of voting—because she was a woman, and the word persons mentioned in the 14th and 15th amendments to our Constitution did not mean women.

It is a vital truth that the word persons mentioned in our Constitution does not mean women, because the Constitution it-

self was written in the light of the old English common law which did not recognize women as persons.

If she were alive today, Susan B. Anthony might vote, but she would still see 1000 legal discriminations against women upon various State statute books. This is because in all other legal respects except the right to vote, women of U.S.A. still live under State Laws.

Let us remember that men are in charge of Congress. Today in the U.S. Senate there are 99 men and one woman: Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine. (She became Congressman on the death of her husband, Congressman Smith). She later won election to the Senate.

In the House of Representatives are 425 men and ten women.

Perhaps we can excuse our Founding Fathers for leaving women out of the Constitution, the world being what it was then; but can we excuse today's Senators and Congressmen for keeping women out?

Of course we will not list all 1000 legal discriminations against women on various State Statute Books, but let us glance at a few.

What of Discrimination in Education?
In 1958 the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the decision of the Texas Supreme Court in denying the admission of two women to the Texas A. and M. College, solely on the basis of sex.

In 1960 three women were denied admission there—they wanted courses in floriculture not given in other colleges.

The Texas A. and M. is supported by taxes. (In the payment of taxes there's no trace of sex discrimination.)

On February 6, 1964 the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD had an article that said qualified women had been refused admission to Virginia colleges at the rate of 7,000 a year since 1960. Thus, in the State of Virginia's tax-supported schools, 21,000 qualified women had been denied an education while men students were admitted.

What of Discrimination in Divorce Laws?
In Kentucky a husband may obtain a divorce on suspicion of misconduct on his wife's part. He does not have to prove it. She not only must prove he has been unfaithful, but also must prove that his unfaithfulness is habitual.

In Texas a man may win a divorce because of his wife's unfaithfulness, but she must prove he not only is unfaithful but also has abandoned her. If he continues to live with her, even though unfaithful, she may not secure a divorce.

What of Discrimination in Marriage Laws?
In many states a wife may not enter into a business contract without her husband's consent. She may not sign a promissory note, nor give a deed or mortgage without his sanction.

In New Mexico when the husband and wife own common property, the husband may will away his half but while the husband lives the wife cannot leave one dollar of her half to anyone—not even to her own children.

What of Discrimination in Employment?
Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act forbids discrimination in employment on the grounds of race, creed, color, national origin or sex, but this has been carelessly enforced, and working women have been required to take their employment cases to court—an expensive procedure.

The State of Delaware has repealed all laws regulating working women so Title VII now governs there.

But all over the country, protective legislation is being used as a tool to circumvent Title VII.

You know about protective legislation. It protects women out of the better paying jobs and gives these jobs to men. It began in 1836 when the New England Association of

Farmers and Merchants and other working men expressed the male viewpoint in a resolution which reads: "Whereas labor is a physical and moral injury to women and a competitive menace to men, we recommend legislation to restrict women in industry."

New York State passed a law forbidding women to work after midnight. This affected telephone operators, proofreaders, and waitresses. The latter lost the better tips—at night. Women who scrubbed offices at night were not affected.

If women work only eight daily hours, and men may work as long as they please, who collects the overtime? With millions of women now heads of families, how do you think they feel, having to watch men take home that overtime pay that would have bought better food, more food, for their children?

Protective legislation—health laws—should apply to both sexes.

You may say that the Supreme Court should today take a new look at the Constitution and declare that women are persons. But this is not legally possible because it is the intent of the lawmakers that counts; and it was the intent of the writers of the Constitution to leave women out because they were writing it in the light of the Old English Common Law wherein women were not considered to be persons.

And now we come to the solution of the problem of giving women 100 per cent protection of the Constitution, and that is the adoption of the Equal Rights for Women Amendment which reads: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

The word "women" does not appear in the text of the amendment and women would be given no special privileges. The amendment merely forbids discrimination on the basis of sex, and special laws may still be enacted for citizens in need of special laws. No one today questions special laws for veterans, the blind, etc. Thus, under the amendment, women may still enjoy special laws for mothers, or mothers-to-be.

The National Women's Party has long had as its sole aim the adoption of the Equal Rights Amendment, and other women's organizations, representing approximately ten million women, have endorsed the measure. Ten state legislatures have petitioned Congress for the amendment's adoption, and during the last Presidential campaign every Presidential candidate endorsed the amendment in writing. President Richard M. Nixon recently wrote: "It is my hope that there will be widespread support for the Equal Rights for Women Amendment to our Constitution, which would add equality between the sexes to the freedoms and liberties guaranteed to all Americans."

Many congressmen have promised to vote "yes" when the Equal Rights Amendment comes up for a vote in the House of Representatives, and many senators have endorsed it. Once the Amendment passes the House and Senate, it must be ratified by three quarters of the state legislatures. After that, our country's women will enjoy full citizenship.

PUBLICATION OF CLASSIFIED MATERIAL BY PEACE THROUGH LAW GROUP

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

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of all Members of the House of Representatives an unfortunate—and perhaps unprecedented—

disregard of the system of classification of defense information which exists to assure the security of our country.

An informal and unofficial organization of certain Members of both the House and Senate has been established which calls itself Members of Congress for Peace Through Law. I know little of the operation of this organization, but I understand from the press that the reports issued in its name largely result from contributions of former employees of the Department of Defense under the prior administration.

This group released to the press on July 15 a report analyzing, and proposing reductions in, the defense program for the current fiscal year.

Let me say that it is highly desirable that defense programs be given searching critical scrutiny and that proposals for modification, particularly those that offer savings without sacrificing security, be aired and considered. For undertaking an exercise of this kind, the Members who belong to this group have my commendation and approval.

In the events leading to the release of this report and in the decision to make it public in its present form, however, these Members have shown cavalier disregard for the system of information classification which the Congress authorizes the Department of Defense to employ in order to protect our country.

One week before the release of this report by the Peace Through Law group, a top official of the Defense Department—Richard G. Capen, Jr., Assistant to Secretary Laird for Legislative Affairs—wrote to the appropriate member of the group warning that "a preliminary review of a draft document prepared by your committee indicates that there is classified information included." Mr. Capen offered the Peace Through Law Committee assistance of the Department of Defense in providing a security review of the document prior to publication.

I am told the response to this warning and invitation was dated July 15—the day on which the report was in fact released to the press and public. It simply asserted that the report was prepared from unclassified sources.

The procedure followed in releasing this report, despite the warning that it contained classified information, is shocking. What is at issue here is not simply a question of comity between the legislative and the executive branches of Government. It is much more than that. It is the security of our country.

This matter was the subject of a colloquy on the floor of the Senate on July 17. It is noted that the Senator who released the report on behalf of the Peace Through Law group did not deny that the report revealed classified information. He asserted only that it was drawn entirely from unclassified sources—from newspapers, magazines, and trade journals, and the like. And he complained that the Pentagon often overclassified information.

This is not an adequate defense. Unfortunately, classified information sometimes does find its way into print. By one means or another, the press sometimes

obtains and publishes information which executive agencies have classified secret and top secret. Sometimes, reporters and writers publish speculative stories in which they unwittingly report classified information.

Where breaches of security of this kind occur, they do not justify repetition and confirmation of this information by Members of Congress. As long as the information is presented only on the authority of a private citizen who has no special access to classified information—and perhaps as nothing more than speculation on his part, this information remains unconfirmed. Those who are aware of it cannot be sure that it is accurate.

When a group of Members of the Congress report such information, on the other hand, the information comes to the attention of a wider public audience. It is thereby confirmed. It is certified by men who have access to classified information as accurate.

I regret deeply the unwillingness of the Peace Through Law group to follow the customary and responsible course of action when the Defense Department notified them that their report contained classified information. The access to such information which a Member of Congress enjoys carries with it a heavy responsibility to avoid even inadvertent disclosure.

I serve notice that I shall oppose any attempt to place this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I, for one, will not be a party to an action that would give greater attention to the disclosure of information when such disclosure is detrimental to our Nation.

It is now too late to make amends for the breach of security that occurred when this report was released. I plead with all my colleagues to avoid any action of this kind in the future.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

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

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the President has submitted a reorganization plan of major importance. The plan would establish an Environmental Protection Agency with unified responsibility for assuring environmental quality. Today, agencies with authority to deal with problems such as air and water pollution, solid waste disposal, radiation, and pesticides are scattered among the various departments of the executive.

The regulation and study of chemical inputs into the environment such as pesticides is a prime example of divided, but overlapping responsibilities. The Department of the Interior conducts studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, and pesticides on the fish and wildlife resources of the United States, while the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare establishes tolerances for pesticide chemicals in foods for human consumption. Meanwhile, the Department of Agriculture has important responsibilities for assuring that chemicals needed to protect crops are available, without

posing unacceptable hazards to the environment. It seems clear that combining these functions in one agency will improve coordination and insure that all aspects of the problem receive fair consideration.

I also support the enforcement of radiation standards affecting the environment through the proposed new agency. The Atomic Energy Commission has long maintained that its responsibility for assuring that atomic energy plants meet health, safety and national security standards does not directly encompass consideration of environmental factors. Since the AEC has been charged with promoting atomic energy for peaceful purposes and licensing the plants, there is additional justification for vesting the establishment of environmental standards in a separate agency.

I believe that approval of the President's reorganization plan is a must if we are serious about arresting the deterioration of our environment. There will of course, be some controversy about some of the changes and some temporary dislocations while the transition is made to a unified agency. It seems clear, however, that an Environmental Protection Agency will do a more efficient and effective job than a series of uncoordinated bureaus. It will give new force and focus to the work of Government in making the 1970's the decade of the environment.

THE YOUNG BUILDERS

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

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, far too often in the past attention has focused on the small minority of young dissenters and rioters in this country. Too often we have failed to recognize the builders. Recently, the Sand Mountain Reporter, of Albertville, Ala., published an excellent editorial dedicated to the young builders of this Nation. I am placing this article in the RECORD and urge my colleagues to read how one segment of the younger generation views its role in the future of America:

THE YOUNG BUILDERS

The young dissenters and rioters and burners have been so much in the news in recent months that we have been inclined to forget that most of today's American young people are builders rather than burners and rioters.

There are approximately 3600 major college campuses in this country, and only 60 of these had riots or serious disruptive disturbances last year. Even on these 60 campuses, only a small percentage of the students were actually involved in most cases.

To be sure, even this is too many. But somehow we need to turn more of the spotlight on the builders rather than on the burners—on the vast numbers of responsible and serious-minded young people who are determined to prepare themselves for responsible leadership and productive citizenship. Many of them disagree with some of the trends of the times just as much as the rioters do, but they know that our society provides for orderly processes of registering such dissent.

We were much impressed with the remarks made by young Joe Lane, who was elected

governor of Boys State recently in Montgomery. Here are some of the things he had to say to his 600 youthful peers as he addressed the Boys State Legislature:

"Much too often it is the person who advocates radical change and uses violent means to express himself who steals the headlines from the industrious hard working person trying to improve himself and his community.

"I have seen this past week 610 young men who are working hard to make improvements as they see fit in a constructive manner. I sincerely hope that the people of our state look to this program and consider these builders as the typical Americans taking an active interest in an orderly fashion.

"This week we have undergone a transition—probably one of the greatest steps in our lives toward graduating from boyhood into manhood. In meeting, knowing and exchanging ideas with young men from all over the state, we now have a better understanding of the true principles of today's youth.

"After today's session we will have a challenge to meet, a challenge offered us by the unending generosity of the American Legion, which is responsible for the Boys State program. Our challenge is to take what we have learned and to take our experiences and put them to good use.

"I have confidence in you, confidence in the young people of today, that when they are needed, they will be ready."

This year there are 75,000 other Legion Boys State citizens like these throughout the United States. And we think they better represent the majority of American young people today than do the few thousands of civil disturbers.

We need to encourage and assist this more sensible and responsible segment of our young generation as they prepare for future leadership and worthy citizenship!

BLACK PANTHERS

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, if, up to now, there have been any real doubts as to where the loyalties of the Black Panthers lie, they should certainly be cleared up by reading a telegram recently sent by the Black Panther Party to the Communist dictator of North Korea, Kim Il Sung. In their message, the Panthers praised the barbaric torturer of the *Pueblo* crew as a "sagacious and great leader" and accused the United States of provoking the Korean war. I include in the RECORD the text of the telegram as broadcast over Radio Pyongyang in English:

MESSAGE OF SUPPORT SENT BY U.S. BLACK PANTHER PARTY

PYONGYANG, July 10th (KCNA).—Comrade Kim Il Sung, premier of the Cabinet of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, received a telegram from the Central Committee of the Black Panther Party of the U.S.A. in connection with the 20 years after the U.S. imperialist aggressors provoked the war of aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The telegram reads:

Comrade Kim Il Sung, Premier of the Cabinet Democratic People's Republic of Korea: June 25 marks the 20 years after the U.S. imperialist aggressors provoked a war of aggression against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in 1950. On this day the Black Panther Party pays its regards to Comrade Kim Il Sung, the sagacious and great leader of the 40 million Korean people, and

the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. We know well the long history and victory of the struggle in which Comrade Kim Il Sung has contributed to the world-wide struggle against imperialism and fascism, by leading the 40 million Korean people, the brilliant example of socialist construction set by him under the difficult conditions of the U.S. imperialists' provocative manoeuvres and aggression, a great many outstanding ideological contributions he has made to the socialist camp and particularly his idea of *juche*, and we set store by them. [as received]

We have keenly realized through the historic experiences in the United States, the criminal nature and brigandish logic of the U.S. ruling class, and that there are only two roads, extermination or liberation. The negroes are made victims of an ever more undisciplined military aggression and the U.S. imperialists attempt to stamp out our liberation struggle. Under this condition, we have become further conscious that the expulsion of the U.S. imperialists, the robber, from the territory of Korea and the unification will be a victory not only of the Korean people but also of the world oppressed peoples. We know clearly that the question of Korea's unification is not a matter alien to the struggle for rescuing us Negroes in the fascist United States and other oppressed peoples.

Nixon, the boss of gangsters, and his band of criminals are intensifying murderous suppression of Negroes in the United States while stepping up the moves to plunder Asia. These attacks of the brutes, however, will run up against the revolutionary solidarity manifested in an action of a-match-for-a-hundred fighters in the whole world. In the United States, the den of robbers, and in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and North America, and the U.S. imperialists are bound to be judged by the people.

All powers to the people:
CENTRAL COMMITTEE, BLACK PANTHER
PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

"NO" VOTES ON S. 3279 AND H.R. 15351

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

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, although I did not wish to delay the proceedings of the House by requesting a quorum call and a record vote on S. 3279, I am opposed to this measure and gave a voice vote against it.

This bill would add 12,920 acres along the Nevada shore of Lake Tahoe to the Toiyabe National Forest, at a cost of \$12.5 million. Not only is this a large expenditure of the taxpayers' money, but the reasons given for making this purchase do not, in my opinion, justify it.

During the period when I served as its chairman, the Local Government Committee of the California State Senate held an extensive hearing—February 19, 1968—on attempts to supersede local, by regional, government in California. Testimony taken at that hearing, and on subsequent legislation pertaining to the subject of the hearing, clearly showed that the Lake Tahoe area is being used as a testing ground for programs to take control of land use out of the hands of local government and to transfer it to higher levels of government, not directly responsive to the will of the people in the area under their authority.

This is done in the name of preventing pollution of Lake Tahoe and the Tahoe basin. I strongly support strict laws against pollution, especially in this scenic area. Many such laws are already on the books in California and more may be needed. But pollution can and ought to be curbed without having the Government take over land now in private ownership.

The whole recent history of Federal and State legislation pertaining to the Lake Tahoe basin suggests that S. 3279 is another step toward administration of this entire region, and restriction or displacement of its private property owners, by governmental agencies not subject to local control. Statements made in support of S. 3279 on the floor of the House further confirmed indications in the bill itself and the committee report on it, that it assumes that pollution control requires large-scale confiscation of privately owned land. I reject this thesis and favor retention of land use control in the hands of local government; consequently, I cannot support this bill.

I am also opposed to the expenditure of public funds for the construction of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, as provided for in H.R. 15351 also passed by voice vote today, and did not vote for this measure.

THE ASSASSINATION OF TWO CHICAGO POLICEMEN

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the cruel and barbaric assassination of two Chicago policemen over the weekend should arouse the outrage of every citizen in this country. It is true that Police Sgt. James Severin, 38 years of age, one of my constituents, and Patrolman Anthony Rizzato, 35 years of age, in a nearby district, lived in Chicago. But this kind of wanton, brutal attacks on the police is happening all over America and should be of concern to all Americans.

The law has lost its meaning. The assassins of these two policemen were responding to a most evil, barbaric and unconscionable type of conduct one can ever imagine because they have no fear of the consequences the law should provide.

Two rival gangs wrote a pact, a non-aggression pact, on the near north side of Chicago. Then to celebrate that pact they decided to mow down two white policemen as a tribute to their agreement. This was racism at its highest and must not be overlooked.

This needless crime must arouse the outrage of every American in this country, and certainly it ought to arouse every Member of this Congress.

Somewhere along the line we must restore meaning to the law. The first place, in my judgment, is with the judiciary. We must launch a nationwide crusade which will make the judiciary realize any further coddling of these criminals must not be tolerated.

In another event that has taken place today, a trial began in Michigan. A young

woman was brutally murdered in Ann Arbor, Mich., 1 year ago, and only today her murderer is coming to trial. Justice delayed is justice denied, yet all over this country we see crimes being committed and the criminals spending 2 or 3 or 4 years waiting for prosecution, and in the process of court-condoned delays, wearing out the witnesses and wearing out the whole judicial system. The criminal trial in Michigan again shows how long delays tend to frustrate the machinery of prosecuting criminals for their crimes.

The murder of these two policemen is not only a Chicago affair. It is a tragedy that should concern every citizen in this country and Congress itself. I hope the appropriate committees of Congress will look into the effectiveness of laws we have passed. We have enough laws. No more legislation is necessary.

One thing is certain in the Chicago massacre. Poverty cannot be pleaded. Cabrini Green housing project is one of the most modern and one of the finest in the country. They cannot come around here poor-mouthing that somehow or other society is to blame for this crime. These youthful criminals cannot defend themselves on the grounds that society has failed them. They are barbarians and must pay the price or else we will see this country go down and go the way of other civilizations that failed to realize the keystone of society has to be law and order. When law and order break down, the whole society breaks down with them.

Mr. Speaker, the most amazing thing about this crime is the revulsion the Negro community has shown for this wanton murder of two white policemen. The Negroes in Chicago are the most tragic and frequent victims of crime by fellow Negroes. I was interested to see that it was the Negro community of the Cabrini Green project that was most outraged against the Negro boys who killed these two policemen. My liberal friends here in Congress must understand that this wanton crime is most bitterly denounced by the black people of Chicago for they too want the streets free for their children from barbaric gang warfare. I pray, Mr. Speaker, that we can find some way to deal with the menace of gang murders in America.

PROTECTION OF OUR ENVIRONMENT IS PRESSING ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MESKILL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, we all realize that protection of our environment is the pressing issue of the seventies. The threat of man making his earth uninhabitable becomes more credible with each passing day. Every effort must be expended to protect and reclaim our natural resources.

It is to this purpose that I am introducing today legislation to establish a 15-member Intergovernmental Commission on Long Island Sound. This independent commission, consisting of representatives of Federal, State, and local governments, and the many private in-

terests involved in the future development of the sound, would be authorized to study the sound and adjacent shoreline as well as survey the public and private programs contemplated for its development. With a life span of 3 years, the commission would submit to the President annual interim reports and a final report formulating a comprehensive plan for the future development, protection, and administration of the natural resources of the area.

I am greatly concerned about the future of the Long Island Sound, not only as a public official with a responsibility to safeguard the public interest, but as one who has spent every summer of his life along the Connecticut shoreline. Connecticut is most fortunate to have this great resource span the distance of its southern shore. Few States are blessed with such a valuable asset offering vast potential for multiple uses. But when I think back to my childhood summers and remember the beautiful shoreline landscape, the clean waters, the wonderful fishing just off the shore, I am saddened by what I perceive to be a great threat looming over this natural resource.

Much has changed and it has not been to the benefit or advantage of those who wish to use the sound for recreational purposes. Our very limited knowledge tells us that man's use of this natural playground has had detrimental effects. But what kind of detrimental effects, to what extent, and how lasting are they? These are the unknowns. The bill I am introducing today would set up the mechanism to help us find the answers.

In the years ahead, greater and greater demands will be placed on the Sound, the largest protected expanse of salt water available to this Nation. Serving 11 million people with 15 miles of this shore, in the most highly developed and heavily concentrated metropolitan area in the entire Nation, the potential demands to be placed on this resource in the years ahead boggle the imagination.

Just imagine a huge floating jetport in the sound; an atomic power plant heating the sound's waters to raise the atmospheric temperatures, thereby cutting heating costs during the winter months; a long bridge spanning the Sound and connecting mainland Connecticut to Long Island. These are not the dreams or imaginations of a Jules Verne. These are proposals that have been discussed on the drawing boards.

The question we must ask is whether we will be willing to use all the resources of government, technology, and public spirit to prevent the permanent destruction of this water wonderland. Will we use our knowledge to employ the assets of the Sound prudently?

The answer must be that we cannot afford not to. Already we have delayed too long.

I believe there is universal agreement on the part of government, industry and the public that we must understand what the Sound is if we are to use it wisely in the public interest. But I also believe that few people understand the depth and scope of the investigation that is required.

Ecology, or the science of the inter-relationship of living organisms to the environment, is a science which is rapidly gaining in importance as we daily become more and more concerned with the problems of our environment.

It is this science and experts in the field of this science which must be at the heart of the study of Long Island Sound if we are to learn what is essential for the protection of this expanse.

The Intergovernmental Commission on Long Island Sound would devote its attention to the protection and enhancement of the scenic, scientific, historic, and recreational values of the natural environment; the preservation of existing landscape; the elimination of water pollution and protection against increasing thermal effects on the water resources; the protection of wildlife and marine life; and the protection of adequate open spaces for future generations.

The commission would have a mandate to study the potential alternative beneficial uses of the land and water resources and make recommendations to promote the greatest public benefits. Particular emphasis would be placed on consideration of the long-range goals and priorities of governmental and private programs which affect the Sound.

Finally, the commission would recommend the means to implement its blueprint.

Mr. Speaker, as perhaps you are aware, my bill is almost identical to one previously introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, ABRAHAM RUBICOFF. Senator RUBICOFF has performed an invaluable service to the Nation by initiating this movement to protect the natural assets of the Long Island Sound. But I believe that his proposed legislation could be strengthened in three aspects and this is my intent in introducing my bill.

I am concerned that the composition of the Commission the Senator proposes—11 members, two from New York, two from Connecticut, and seven to be appointed from various agencies of the Federal Government—would be too heavily weighted in the direction of the Federal Government. Although I believe the cooperation, participation and support of the Federal Government is absolutely essential to any comprehensive program for the preservation and balanced development of the sound, I believe it is the States, namely Connecticut, New York, and Rhode Island, which have the greatest involvement and which will have to bear the heaviest burden in the implementation of the Commission's recommendations.

Under the Senator's bill, the representatives of the Federal Government would constitute over one-half of the Commission's membership. I believe more representation should be allocated to the States and that representatives from Rhode Island should be included because of that State's proximity to Long Island Sound.

The Commission composition I propose would be weighted in favor of the States rather than the Federal Government. Consisting of 15 members, the Commission would have three individuals from

each of the three States, to be appointed by the Governors of the respective States, and six Presidential appointees.

The success of this project will be largely determined by the Commission's members and therefore it is imperative that at least two of the Presidential appointees be representatives of conservation interests. The proposal of an independent Commission consisting of members representing the Federal, State, and local governments and the many varied private interests involved in the sound's future development acknowledges realistically the need for cooperation between all levels of government and between government and the private sector. But there must be a guarantee that experts in this complex field of ecology be represented on the Commission itself as well as among the staff. If the study is to be properly directed, coordinated, and supervised, we must have the most highly qualified and expertly trained individuals on the Commission itself and this I have provided for in my bill.

The commission, in addition to having local, State, and Federal representation, is instructed to seek out the advice and participation of State and local groups as well as private interests. The views of all who have a legitimate interest in the sound—conservationists, industry, commerce, municipal and transportation planners, and recreational enthusiasts—must be considered.

It is also essential that we utilize the studies that have already been conducted. There have been a number of independent studies made, delving into limited aspects of the ecology of the sound. We should not overlook the source material which can provide us with a head start. The commission should draw upon the academic communities in New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island for expertise and technology. Our universities, both public and private, many of which have specialized departments in marine biology and environmental studies, are aware of the specific problems of the area and are able to offer us a wealth of knowledge and information.

If the Long Island Sound is to be anything more than a stagnant cesspool, we must act now to protect it. We must take aggressive action to develop and implement a program designed to insure its protection and balanced use.

The Intergovernmental Commission on Long Island Sound would play an integral role in preventing further devastation of the sound. Congress must take the lead in providing coordination and foresight in the development of this Nation's natural resources. Swift congressional action on my bill would set an important precedent.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the bill in full at this point in the RECORD:

H.R. 18533

A bill to establish an Intergovernmental Commission on Long Island Sound

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

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds that several executive departments and agencies of the Federal Government have an interest

in and jurisdiction over the future development and use of the natural resources of Long Island Sound and adjacent areas. The Congress further finds that the States of Connecticut and New York and local governmental units have similar interests and jurisdiction.

The Congress finds that action to develop and preserve the natural resources of Long Island Sound and adjacent areas is of the utmost importance to the United States, and that, as a matter of national policy, these resources should be developed in a manner consistent with greatest public benefits.

The Congress declares that in order to promote the most beneficial uses of these natural resources, the Congress has a responsibility to promote effective coordination in future planning among the interested governing agencies.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) For the purposes of carrying out this policy, there is hereby established an Intergovernmental Commission on Long Island Sound (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") which shall be composed of fifteen members as follows:

(1) six appointed by the President, two of whom shall be actively engaged in conservation activities; and

(2) nine appointed to represent the States of New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, three appointed by the Governor of each such State, at least one of whom shall be a resident of a shoreline area adjacent to Long Island Sound.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(c) The Commission shall elect a Chairman, and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(d) Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall make a full and complete study of Long Island Sound and the adjacent shoreline area in the States of New York and Connecticut and a survey of all Federal, State, and local programs existing or contemplated affecting the sound and shoreline for the purpose of formulating a comprehensive plan providing for the future development, protection, and administration of the natural assets of the area.

(b) The study and plan shall include but be limited to findings and recommendations with respect to—

(1) the protection and enhancement of the scenic, scientific, historic, and recreational values of the natural environment;

(2) the protection of existing landscape, including estuarine and marshland areas;

(3) the elimination of water pollution and protection against increasing thermal effects on the water resources, including a determination of the advisability of discontinuing all refuse dumping in the sound;

(4) the protection of wildlife and marine life of the sound and adjacent areas;

(5) potential alternative beneficial uses of land and water resources, including off-shore islands, taking into account present and proposed future uses for industrial, commercial, transportation, residential, and other purposes;

(a) particular emphasis should be given to a study and consideration of the long-range goals and priorities of all Federal programs affecting the sound and the adjacent shoreline and recommendations made to effect coordination of such programs, goals, and priorities;

(6) protection of adequate open spaces for future generations taking into account potential effects of increased building and urbanization of the shoreline, and the extent to which land or interests therein and scenic or other easements will need to be acquired by the Federal, State, or local governments

and the estimated cost of acquiring, developing, and administering such land or interests therein and scenic or other easements, for public use and benefit;

(7) the type of Federal, State, local, or coordinated action necessary to carry out such plan and otherwise to preserve and enhance the desirable values of the area, including consideration of appropriate and governmental apparatus to administer the area.

(c) The Commission shall consult with and seek the participation of appropriate State, county, town, and village officials as well as other interested groups in formulating the plan.

(d) The Commission shall consult with institutions of higher education in New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island for the purpose of utilizing their expertise and resources, particularly with respect to their activities and programs in the fields of marine biology and environmental study.

(e) The Commission shall submit to the President, and to the Congress annual interim reports with respect to its study and investigation, and a final report with respect to its findings and recommendations not later than three years after the Commission has been fully organized.

POWERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission, subcommittee, or member deems advisable. Any member authorized by the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission, or any subcommittee or member thereof.

(b) Each department, agency and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this joint resolution.

(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, shall have the power—

(1) to appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as he deems necessary, including an executive director who may be compensated at a rate not in excess of that provided for level V of the Executive Schedule in title 5, United States Code, and

(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 5. (a) Any member of the Commission who is appointed from the Federal Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received in his regular employment, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission, other than those referred to in subsection (a), shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission and shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this joint resolution.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall cease to exist ninety days after the submission of its final report.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of Congress not acclimated to the practices and procedures of the House, I soon became aware of the fact that congressional reform should be one of the most important issues facing the 91st Congress. Without being presumptuous as a newcomer, I consider reform in the operations of Congress essential if we are to deal adequately with the many complex problems facing the Nation.

The last major reorganization of the Congress occurred in 1946 with the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Since that time, there have been some piecemeal reforms, but, they have not been sufficient.

Recognizing the need for reform, the Congress created the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in 1965, the purpose of which was to develop recommendations for "strengthening the Congress, simplifying its operations, improving its relations with other branches of the U.S. Government, and enabling it to better meet its responsibilities under the Constitution." The joint committee, after hearing nearly 200 witnesses producing 15 volumes of hearings, submitted its recommendations to Congress in 1966, many of which are contained in H.R. 17654 before us.

After thoroughly analyzing its provisions, it is my feeling that the thrust of the bill before us is very desirable although it does not go as far as I would like in certain areas.

Briefly, I would like to point out those areas of change which I consider highly desirable, as well as additional changes I would like to see made and for which I will or have supported amendments to the bill.

COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

I am pleased to see the cloak of secrecy removed from committee meetings during which the vital elements of any legislation are shaped. I believe that all committee votes should be open to public scrutiny. I have supported an amendment to require a rollcall majority vote in open session to close any meeting and to make such a vote apply to only one meeting, as well as an amendment to require that a record of all rollcall votes in committees be available to the public on request.

However, I am strongly opposed to the provisions of the bill which would permit the televising, broadcasting, and photographing of committee hearings. My fear is that the presence of TV

cameras would interfere with the orderly conduct of hearings. The temptation would be too great for politicians to be more concerned about how they will appear on TV to their constituents rather than the legislative purpose of the hearing. Committee members might avoid asking important questions because they might not be well received by television viewers. Contrariwise, they might phrase other questions for their dramatic value and the favorable impression they might make on viewers rather than on their probative value.

In addition, I do not see how we could avoid the circuslike atmosphere which always accompanies the presence of photographers and television and radio crews. No matter what rules and restrictions we adopt, disruption and confusion will inevitably result. I do not feel this atmosphere is conducive to the orderly conduct of congressional business.

Being a Member of the minority party in Congress, I particularly applaud those provisions designed to protect the rights of the minority and all individual Members to participate in a meaningful way in committee deliberations and to have their views considered both in committee and in the House. I, personally, have been very fortunate in serving on committees and subcommittees where minority Members and junior Members are afforded every possible opportunity to participate. Furthermore, I am sure that such rights are now practiced by many committees to varying degrees. However, I strongly feel that the rules of the House should contain and standardize a certain minimum guarantee of participation to such Members. Among the guarantees in the bill is the entitlement of minority committee members to be allocated at least 1 day of hearings on a matter to call as witnesses persons they select.

On most committees the numbers of staff employees which may be chosen by and for the assistance of the minority Members have been strictly limited, while in a few instances the minority Members are given ample help. I firmly believe that a lack of staff assistance has often handicapped the minority party in developing and presenting its position on matters. Therefore, I support the provisions of this bill which would at least assure a minimum number of staff to the minority members of a committee upon their request.

In addition, I will support amendments offered to permit the minority committee staff to be hired and fired solely by the minority Members of a committee, and to also assure the minority Members at least one-third of the funds appropriated for the committee's operation.

The bill before us provides that three committee members may petition the chairman in writing for the calling of a special committee meeting. I also support a provision allowing a majority of committee members to force the filing of a report within 7 calendar days on legislation assigned to their committee.

The requirements that printed hearings on Appropriation Committee measures be available at least 3 working days prior to a vote and the recommendation that other committees observe similar

practices would be of great assistance to Members. Also, the requirement that committee hearings must be announced at least 1 week in advance will better enable the Members to prepare their statements in connection therewith.

PROCEDURES OF THE HOUSE

Although several desirable changes in the procedures of the House are included in the bill, I am disappointed to find no change in the rules regulating voting procedures which would either speed up the present process or permit greater public disclosure and recording of votes. Of necessity these matters go hand in hand. Without improvements in the existing method of recording votes, the recording of votes beyond the present practice will result in further slowing down the already snail pace of the Congress in considering legislation.

For this reason I am supporting an amendment which I believe will greatly improve the House's efficiency and ability to carry out its legislative responsibilities—an amendment to provide for the recording of rollcall and teller votes and quorum calls by electronic equipment. Figures from the reading clerks reflect that the House spends nearly 25 percent of its time just recording votes. This time could be put to better use considering and debating other legislation.

I will also support an amendment which would authorize record teller votes. This procedure would put on record votes on important amendments which are adopted or rejected upon demand by one-fifth of a quorum, but would only require 12 minutes compared to 30 minutes for a regular rollcall vote. I will also support an amendment to shorten the time required for quorum calls by dispersing proceedings as soon as a quorum is established. Even so, however, each Member would be given a period of 30 minutes to be recorded as present.

I consider it in the best interest of the American people that all important votes be recorded for public information, and I am hopeful that my colleagues will take positive action at this time to accomplish this.

CONGRESSIONAL AIDS

In considering legislation, the House of Representatives and the Senate rely upon resource information from the Government agencies and particularly from the Library of Congress, the research and reference arm of the legislative branch. Similarly the GAO performs oversight functions of Government programs and activities for the Members of Congress. Each repository has accumulated a wealth of information and performs a great service to the Members within their present capabilities to do so. To permit them to be of greater service the bill expands the authority and ability of GAO and the Legislative Reference Service, to be known as the Congressional Reference Service, in order that they may better assist Congress in assessing the administration and accomplishment of existing programs, and the need for changes or even abolishment of such programs. It would also assist the Members in evaluating legislation, estimating proposal results and alternatives.

The bill would create a Joint Committee on Data Processing which would have broad authority to coordinate and supervise the utilization of all the computer systems available to Congress and the agencies responsible for developing and supplying information for Congress. That committee will also be responsible for exploring and developing the capabilities of computerization on order that it may be used to the best possible advantage of Congress. This is the direction in which we must go if Congress is to be equipped to handle the increasing burden being placed on its shoulders.

TOURIST AIDS

Although they do not fall into the category of legislative reform, two provisions of the bill are of particular interest to me and my constituents. One of these will provide for free guided tours for all visitors to the Capitol, whereas in the past those desiring a guided tour were required to pay for it. The bill provides for a Capitol Guide Board and the employment of guides who will be congressional employees with full entitlement to employee benefits.

The other provision proposes a new method of informing visitors about what is happening on the floor during their visit as well as giving them some basic information concerning House procedures and methods of business. The bill proposes that the House galleries be glassed in, that sound equipment be provided which will permit visitors to hear floor proceedings and additionally, that facilities be provided whereby an appropriate commentary and explanation may be made available to gallery visitors.

I hope when this body's consideration of legislative reform is completed that all or most of these provisions will prevail. I have every confidence that the majority of the Members feel as I do that a good sound reform bill will result, for the benefit of Congress and the American public.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. The value of the chemical production in the United States in 1968 was \$52.5 billion. This exceeded the production of the Soviet Union, the second-ranked nation, by more than three times.

THE VETERANS' MEDICAL CARE ACT OF 1970

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, on July 15 I introduced the Veterans' Medical Care Act of 1970, H.R. 18484. This legislation is intended to provide needed improvements in veterans' medical care

Furthermore, this bill would also extend hospital care services to the wife or children of persons having total and permanent service-connected disability, as well as to widows and children who are entitled to death compensation or dependency.

Moreover, this legislation would insure that certain minimum ratios of staff to patients are maintained in veterans hospitals, so that patients are assured the proper attention and care.

The measure is intended also to improve the operation and personnel practices of the departments of medicine and surgery in VA hospitals, and would upgrade health personnel positions to maintain a competitive stance with private hospitals. The bill also provides for higher maximum rates of pay for health personnel, pay differentials, and other miscellaneous administrative changes.

Our veterans are entitled to first-class medical care, and I believe that the Veterans' Medical Care Act of 1970 is a big step toward that goal.

THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY IN CRISIS: DR. HAROLD HYDE REPLIES TO DR. MILLER UPTON

(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, the Cambodian undertaking aroused great feelings on both sides of the Indochina issue, and there has been much heated debate concerning the actions of the academic community at that time. In an open letter to President Nixon, Dr. Miller Upton, president of Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., attempted to apologize for the actions of the academic community in the wake of the Cambodian invasion. I am sure that many of my colleagues have seen this widely circulated letter, indeed, it has already appeared in the RECORD. Dr. Upton strongly attacks the use of violence and the threat of violence on college campuses. He apologizes for what he says has been a pandering to youth and an undue tolerance of intimidation. Much of what Dr. Upton says merits careful consideration, regardless of which side of the Southeast Asia question a person is on. Dr. Upton, a conscientious objector, is opposed to our involvement in Indochina, yet he does not hesitate to condemn the tactics of many of those with whom he agrees on this issue.

Shortly after reading Dr. Upton's open letter, I received a similar open letter from Dr. Harold E. Hyde, president of Plymouth State College, Plymouth, N.H., who takes issue with Dr. Upton's apology. Dr. Hyde argues that there is a great need for adjustment by the academic community to the changing situation, and he says that what Dr. Upton calls a "grotesque failure of the academic community at this hour of national trial and turmoil" is in reality a needed adaptation by that community. Dr. Hyde's remarks seem to cover the problem from a rather different angle, and there is substantial logic in much of his argument.

I believe that these two letters form a

unit; a person who reads them comes away with a deeper understanding of the academic community's reaction to a crisis. I would like to thank my friend, Dr. Harold Hyde, for contributing to the continuation of a meaningful dialog on this most vital subject. I believe that he deserves sincere congratulations for the fine job he has done in dealing with the problems of today's campuses. He has been successful where others of more nationwide renown have failed, and it is a tribute to his leadership that dissent and reason have peacefully coexisted on the Plymouth State campus.

In fact, it is with some pride that I note the relative calmness that prevailed over New Hampshire college campuses this past year, particularly when compared to the rest of the country.

I plan to submit copies of these two letters to Gov. William Scranton, Chairman of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest. I would suggest that the Commission might call Dr. Hyde as a witness during its studies of the college problem. I am sure that Dr. Hyde would add significantly to their deliberations, given his obviously fine qualifications and the fact that he comes from a State where campus problems have by and large been successfully dealt with.

The letters referred to follow:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

BELOIT COLLEGE,
Beloit, Wis., May 11, 1970.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a college president, a past scholar-teacher, and one who has consciously devoted his whole life to the cause of higher education in the conviction that it offers the greatest hope for social progress and the elevation of man to his highest potential, I wish to apologize to you and the nation for the grotesque failure of the academic community at this hour of national trial and turmoil.

I am fully aware of how extremely presumptuous it is for one to represent himself to apologize for the many, but I am constrained to do so nonetheless for the shame I feel for the community with which I have been so intimately related for so long and in which I have placed so much confidence in the past. Those who do not agree with me will, of course, be able and willing to speak for themselves.

Let me establish a point about myself at the outset so that my position can be more accurately interpreted. I was a conscientious objector during World War II, and were I of draft age now I would be a conscientious objector again. But my moral opposition to war, however deeply and conscientiously held, does not entitle me on any ethical or moral grounds to take violent action against those who disagree. I must bear witness to truth as I see it, but I must also respect the right of the other person to do the same. Certainly, I must never hurt or demean another simply because he won't go along with my own conviction.

This commitment to respect for the individual, intellectual openness, and freedom of inquiry is the transcendent value to which an academic community must be subservient. In fact, it is the only value to which the academy can pledge allegiance if it is to be consistent with itself. To elevate any other value is to break faith with this transcendent value and it is at this point that we have violated our public trust as professional educators: we have given in to violence and

threats of violence in support of a particular point of view, and in doing so we have allowed the academic integrity of our individual institutions and the academic community at large to be violated.

Being a conscientious objector to war and one who would issue such an open letter as this, I clearly am not opposed to dissent and protest. But I am vigorously opposed to violence in any form and for any reason, and most of all I am opposed to would-be leaders capitulating to intimidation and violence. Those who respect violence when used against them will inevitably employ violence when it suits their cause.

We in the colleges and universities have tolerated unspeakable intimidation and thought control on the part of radical students, faculty and others, and yet when Vice President Agnew speaks out forcefully against such the only voices that are heard from the academy are those who castigate him and you for repressing dissent. There are few colleges campuses, if any, where Vice President Agnew, or any member of your cabinet for that matter, could speak without disruption and even physical abuse and intimidation. But a convicted murderer, dope peddler, or one committed to the forceful overthrow of the government will receive not only a respectful hearing, but will be paid a handsome honorarium in addition. In the light of his position, I have been embarrassed by some of the Vice President's intemperate language. But surely he has as much right to dissent and to be given a respectful hearing as any of the criminal element of our society.

Much of the academic community is now telling you how to settle the war in Vietnam and being critical of your effort to protect lives and shorten the war by moving troops into Cambodia. I find it highly unbecoming of us to presume to tell you how to fight the war in Vietnam when we aren't even able to settle the wars on our own campuses. Nor do I use the word *war* in this context lightly. The throwing of missiles to do physical harm, the throwing of firebombs to burn buildings, the use of guerrilla tactics via arson and vandalism, the shooting and killing of combatants and noncombatants is every bit as much war as that which prevails in Vietnam, Cambodia, and the Near East. I have often wondered sardonically how many protestors of napalm have themselves thrown fire bombs or engaged in arson.

I have also been appalled by a certain arrogance and inconsistency on our part with regard to the way we are free to tell you and others how to handle your jobs but become deeply resentful, insulted, and even hostile when there is any suggestion of your intrusion into "our" domain. I am quite sure that I am able to run Beloit College better than you, but by the same token I am sure that you are able to deal with the issues of the Presidency of the United States, including fighting the war in Vietnam, better than I. The widespread propensity of members of the "intellectual" community to make judgments without benefit of facts is one of my greatest disillusionments and embarrassments.

As a matter of fact, my early naivete led me to embrace the academic life because of my belief that members therein were committed to intellectual honesty, rational behavior and humanistic concern and compassion. Recent incidents have merely confirmed all the more what my life's experiences have suggested. Academic man is as much motivated by vested interest, is as much controlled by base emotion, and reasons as much from prejudice as any other mortal. My readings of Ecclesiastes, the New Testament and the life of Mahatma Gandhi should have prepared me for this, but they didn't.

We who work closely with young people and should know and understand them best

have not been very helpful to them or to you and others of the adult community in serving as a vehicle of communication. We have too often taken sides ourselves and been critical of one group or the other and not been sufficiently discriminating in our communicative role.

Maybe we can be forgiven on the grounds that the task is such a difficult one. I know that the great bulk of college students are genuinely concerned about the inhumanity and futility of war and deeply question the legitimacy of a life that sanctions and even glorifies indiscriminate killing and maiming. I also know that the great bulk of adults and members of the establishment are sincere, dedicated individuals with the same hopes and aspirations as the young. But I also know that in each group there are examples that support the worst stereotype of each. The great frustration of the day is that despite this great community of interest and concern there is a growing separation based upon the sinful tendency to judge by stereotype and preconception. We in the academic community are frequently party to this sin even though our training should particularly help us to know better.

Although my own sentiments are basically with the young people, I must admit that there is a general pandering to the young at the present time that is both disgusting and irresponsible, disgusting because it prostitutes normal respect and affection. Irresponsible because it is creating an unrealistic cleavage between age groups.

Of course, young people on the whole are wonderful, but what's new about that? The great reward of college work is the opportunity it affords to associate regularly with this age group. The idealism, absolutism, intellectual honesty and great aspiration of the young are the eternal attributes of this age group upon which society is dependent to preserve its vital, dynamic quality. These attributes are the standards of behavior to be expected, not glorified as unique in any narrow time span of human history.

Young people are first and foremost people. Those who are young today will be old tomorrow and having to relate to those who are younger than. As people they represent all types, some taller than others, some fatter than others, some with higher IQs than others, some more criminally inclined than others, some more saintly than others, some more hostile than others, some more vocal than others, etc. There is no general virtue attributable to youth any more than there is general evil. We have done all young people a great disservice in recent years by suggesting to them that they are of a different breed from the rest of us and beyond reproach. They are nothing more than the fresh blood being pumped into the human society, just as we were in the past and their children will be in the future. We in Academe should have known this better than anyone else and not have failed them and you in your common need for understanding.

We have been quick to tell you that you are alienating the youth of America, but we seem to pay little attention to the way we are alienating our own constituencies by our failure to protect the authentic academic integrity of our institutions. Implicitly we are also alienating the youth of America over the long run by our failure to be faithful to our leadership responsibilities.

The pain that hurts most of all is the realization that I bear partial responsibility for the unnecessary deaths of four young people on the campus of Kent State University. The National Guard troops should never have been there in the first place, because we should never have permitted the conditions to develop which necessitated the presence of troops. Once this die was cast, it was simply a matter of time before tragedy would strike. If fault lies anywhere for the Kent State

deaths it lies not with you and the Vietnam War but with the radical acts and excesses we have tolerated in the name of dissent.

I am sure you know, Mr. President, that I do not say these things with tongue in cheek to placate others, to curry favor, to advance partisan interest, or to defend your war policies. Last fall I joined with a number of other college presidents to urge your rapid withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. I reaffirm this plea. But when I consider the whole matter fully and objectively, I have to concede that you have been more faithful to your leadership responsibilities than we in Academe have been to our own.

With respect for the tremendous burdens you must bear for the rest of us and the conscientious way you are bearing them and with apology for the cruel injustices that have been foisted upon you by the professional community of which I am a part, I remain,

Respectfully yours,

MILLER UPTON.

PLYMOUTH STATE COLLEGE,
Plymouth, N.H., June 18, 1970.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have just read the open letter of May 11, 1970 to you from President Miller Upton of Beloit College. This was circulated to educators by Senator Hugh Scott.

I cannot accept President Upton's apology on behalf of the academic community for what he terms its "grotesque failure" at this time of national trial and turmoil.

I would agree that we have many problems in our country and that many of them are being brought into sharp focus on college campuses. Many of us as college presidents would have preferred that some of these problems had been dealt with or settled more satisfactorily by many elements of our total country, but they haven't been. The fact that many of us who prepared for careers as academicians now have to become overnight experts in guerilla warfare tactics, constitutional and local civil and criminal law, the effects of narcotics, the enlargement of the base for college governance, public relations tactics with the mass media, "relevant" education of a continuous nature, etc. does not seem to me to constitute a grotesque failure. It does point up that a group of conscientious and dedicated administrators, hard working boards of trustees, and by far the great majority of faculty and students find an almost overwhelming task facing us. We, in the overwhelming majority, love and are loyal to our country and its duly elected representative government. Because the rights of freedom of speech and assembly, judicial due process, conscientious objection to war, and other rights to liberty and freedom which we have granted our people make the going rough, we should not falter, retreat, or apologize. We do have to adapt, to concede on some previously legally uncontested points, and use our energies and our intelligence to do the best we can, just as I feel confident that you are doing.

On this campus, slightly larger than Beloit, we have had our share of discussion, debate, protest, and other actions by concerned young Americans especially after the Kent State incident. You could have spoken here, as did Elliott Richardson at the 1969 Commencement, and received respectful attention from an audience of loyal Americans. I am sure that this situation would have prevailed at more of our colleges and universities than would the reverse.

We in this usually quiet little state recently had a considerable disagreement about the right of the notorious character from the recent Chicago trials to speak on the main campus of our university system. I do want

to point out that it was to uphold a right of freedom of speech that the meeting was allowed. I would point out further that the decision, a very hard one to make, was made in cooperation and conjunction with this state's chief governmental executive by an intelligent and thoughtful board of trustees who were not free to ignore either the state or federal constitution. When we act as though the academic community is in a world by itself, free to make its own decisions without reference to many other constituencies, we delude ourselves. I, therefore, do not subscribe to the thrust of President Upton's apology for the academic community. We are all deeply involved in a crisis that is demanding our best informed responses as we go along in a very fluid situation.

As one of the directors of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, I can assure you that it is my personal privilege to meet and discuss with some of the most dedicated, concerned, responsive, and responsible men in America today—the presidents of its 270 different institutions. We have offered our help in a consultant capacity at any time you would consider it to be worthwhile. As a president with nineteen years of experience in helping to guide this institution, I cannot sit idly by when the academic community is thus indicted. We have been doing our best to maintain communication, to give liberty without license, to preserve our historical functions while being increasingly responsive to requests to act in the national interest. The way ahead is by no means clear, nor are the answers simple. Please believe that we have been doing and will continue to do our best.

Most respectfully,

HAROLD E. HYDE,
President.

MERCURY CONTAMINATION DANGERS

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on three occasions, November 26, 1969, December 23, 1969, and July 9, 1970, I brought to the attention of the House the potential danger of mercury compounds to human health and safety. I pointed out on the latest occasion the fact of the pervasiveness of mercury contamination in our water—lakes, bayous, rivers, streams, and reservoirs—air and soil together with the potential danger of this substantial and long enduring problem. In this connection I am submitting for the record the editorial entitled "Methyl Mercury," which appeared in the July 17, 1970, issue of Science.

METHYL MERCURY

During this century, in the United States, about 75 million kilograms of mercury have been consumed; little information is available on its final disposition or on the concentration of the element at specific points in the environment. Recently, it has become clear that compounds of mercury present a substantial hazard. Of particular significance is methyl mercury, a highly toxic substance that causes neurological damage, produces chromosomal aberrations, and has teratogenic effects. It is mainly in this form that mercury is found in food fishes. Recent studies have elucidated some of the steps in the accumulation.

Industrial wastes containing inorganic mercury or phenyl mercury find their way into bottom muds of lakes. There they are converted by anaerobes into CH_3Hg^+ or

$(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{Hg}$. The latter compound is volatile, and it escapes into the water column from the sediment. Though quite stable in alkaline solutions, $(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{Hg}$ is converted to CH_3Hg^+ at low pH. This ion is soluble in water, and it is concentrated by living things, usually appearing in the body lipids. In part, the concentration may come by way of the food chain, but apparently fishes may also accumulate the toxic ion directly. The concentration factor from water to pike is of the order of 3000 or more.

Substantial mercury pollution in the Great Lakes became apparent in March of this year. Mercury concentrations as high as 5 parts per million were reported in some pickerel shipped from Canada. Typical concentrations in fish taken from Lake Erie were 1 part per million or less. Further investigations have confirmed the existence of a major environmental problem traceable to the dumping of large amounts of mercury-containing liquid wastes. This discovery comes as a surprise to most scientists and apparently to federal authorities. However, there was ample reason for looking for such a phenomenon. Episodes in Sweden and Japan had pointed to dangers arising when large quantities of mercury are discharged into the environment. In Sweden the use of methyl mercury in a seed dressing had led to a drastic decrease in wild bird populations. Near Minamata, Japan, between 1953 and 1960, 111 persons were reported to have been killed or to have suffered serious neurological damage as a result of eating fish and shellfish caught in mercury-contaminated areas. Among the 111 were 19 congenitally defective babies born of mothers who had eaten the fish and shellfish. Later, at Niigata, Japan, 26 cases of methyl mercury poisoning were noted. The affected persons and their families ate fish with a frequency of 0.5 time to 3 times a day; the fish contained mercury at concentrations of about 5 to 20 parts per million.

Physiological and cytological studies have revealed some of the behavior of methyl mercury. It tends to be associated with red blood cells and nervous tissue, and it easily passes the placental barrier, becoming moderately concentrated in the fetus. It can cause chromosomal disorders. Fruit flies consuming food containing methyl mercury at a concentration of 0.25 part per million had offspring carrying one extra chromosome.

It seems unlikely that anything approaching the Japanese observations will be seen in the region of the Great Lakes. There the concentrations of methyl mercury in fish are lower and fish are a less important part of the diet. Nevertheless, we have a substantial and long-enduring problem; even if fresh pollution were stopped, it would be many years before natural processes could cleanse the lakes.

This episode has not led to demonstrable tragedy, but it should remind us how much we risk when we convert our rivers to sewers and our lakes to cesspools.—PHILIP H. ABELSON.

LITTER ON OUR HIGHWAYS: INDUSTRY MUST HELP

(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, in recent months there has been great emphasis placed on the problem of cleaning up and protecting our environment. Though public clamoring has waned somewhat, the problem of pollution and waste is greater than ever. In figuring ways to deal with this situation, it seems to me that modern industry, with its technology and ingenuity, should be will-

ing and able to design features into their products that would facilitate waste disposal and prevent unsightly litter on our countryside. I have suggested on numerous occasions that automobile companies should build little containers into their cars, without results, unfortunately. This idea would certainly help to cut down on the amount of debris on our highways. In addition, oil companies could make it part of their service to empty these litter containers at their service stations. If auto makers and oil companies could get together on a litter-prevention program, I think that we would see far less trash around our roadways.

Probably the greatest eyesore on our roads is the large number of bottles and cans that people throw away carelessly. Besides causing an obvious safety hazard for motorists, these disposable containers scattered on highways are very unsightly and are a great nuisance to clean. The widespread use of nonreturnable bottles is responsible for much of the trouble. Whereas the built-in litter container would do much to alleviate the problem of disposing of these bottles, I feel that something must be done to control their use. It might be helpful for beverage manufacturers to return to the use of deposit bottles; besides being cheaper for them in the long run, this system would enable the companies to show their concern for the environment, a boon for public relations.

I have received much correspondence during the past few months on the subject of pollution and our environment. One of the more interesting letters was from Mr. Carl Hilgenberg, of Franconia, N.H. Since the problem of roadside litter is a complex one, there are many possible angles from which it may be viewed. Mr. Hilgenberg's letter is written from the viewpoint of an innkeeper in the White Mountains of New Hampshire, and it approaches the problem in an interesting manner. I recommend this letter, which follows, to my colleagues and friends who are concerned with keeping our roads and highways beautiful.

INTERNATIONAL HOUSE MOTOR LODGE,
Franconia Village, N.H., April 11, 1970.
Representative JAMES CLEVELAND,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Roadside litter in New Hampshire is again worse than any other year and consumer packaging is one of the chief causes. Most of the litter seems to be beverage containers which come to the consumer in a wrap package that must be completely opened in order to extract one container.

The manufacturer likes a wrap around package because it is fast to machine pack and more economical to produce as well as a lower incident of before consumer breakage.

The consumer and the country don't need this form of wrap as it is literally impossible to replace empty containers in the original package. As no one likes to have a "empty" rolling about it is thrown out the window.

This problem is the same for cans as well as bottles, soft drinks as well as beer.

I think that legislation to correct this situation would have popular support and be a massive step forward to help lick the roadside litter.

Sincerely,

CARL HILGENBERG.

EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT SPENDING

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the President issued a timely warning on excessive Government spending.

He noted his concern over a persistent and growing tendency by the Congress to approve increased expenditures without providing adequate revenue to pay for them. This, President Nixon pointed out, could produce a massive deficit if not corrected by the Congress.

The President accepted the spending ceiling we imposed upon him. He very logically called upon the Congress to observe it without numerous exceptions and mandatory spending provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the President's statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT ON CONGRESSIONAL ACTION AND GOVERNMENT SPENDING, JULY 18, 1970

I am issuing this statement today because I view with deepening concern the course of events in the Congress affecting the expenditure of the taxpayer's money. There is a persistent and growing tendency on Capitol Hill to approve increases in expenditures without providing the revenue to pay the costs. For just one example, the Congress seems on the verge of approving an education appropriation bill that provides nearly half a billion dollars more than I requested.

Given this situation, it is time to face some hard figures and some troublesome possibilities and to strive for solutions.

Our Federal budget totals over \$200 billion. If we allow these outlays to overshoot the basic revenue-producing capacity of our tax system—as happened particularly in 1967 and 1968—we will produce the same result: inflation of a magnitude that will take difficult and painful measures to eliminate.

In Fiscal Year 1970, which ended June 30, we worked very hard and effectively—in the midst of continuing controversy—to hold the expenditure line. As a result, any deficit will largely reflect a short-fall of revenues from the adjustment of the economy to policies designed to combat inflation.

For Fiscal Year 1971, which began July 1, this Administration transmitted to the Congress a budget calling for expenditures of \$200 billion, and estimating revenues at \$202 billion. If the Congress continues in its present pattern of proposed increases in expenditures, the total for this fiscal year will actually reach a substantially larger figure.

Some \$3.5 billion of increases are caused by mandatory and virtually uncontrollable rises in costs—such as increases in the interest on the national debt (\$1.8 billion) and in public assistance (over \$500 million). The major pay increase for Federal employees added \$1.4 billion over the amount originally budgeted. Some increases are the result of necessary new programs. But much of the total increase is due to threatened Congressional action or inaction.

On the receipts side of the ledger, the Congress has failed to provide necessary revenue. By its action on the tax bill last year, the Congress had already reduced projected revenue for Fiscal Year 1971 by \$3 billion and for Fiscal Year 1972 by \$5 billion below my request. Beyond this, the Congress has as yet failed to take action on my proposals for a tax on lead used in gasoline, an advance in the time of collection of estate and gift taxes and an increase in postal rates. The Congress must produce action on these measures, or

we can expect to collect much less than the \$202 billion estimated in February.

And that is not all. The 1971 expenditures are an inevitable springboard for the budget of 1972. Unless the present trend is corrected by the Congress, the resulting 1972 spending could produce a massive deficit.

It has become almost a cliché to say that all we need do to resolve this dilemma with regard to our Federal budget is to cut space and defense outlays and "change our national priorities." Let's set the record straight. We have changed our national priorities.

In the budget that I proposed for fiscal 1971, spending for defense is exceeded by spending for human resources for the first time in 20 years. In all of the last three administrations, military spending ran far above spending for other purposes. In 1962 under President Kennedy the Federal government spent 48 percent of its budget for defense and only 29 percent for human resources. By 1968, the comparison was 45 percent to 32 percent. My budget for 1971 sharply reversed these priorities. It calls for spending 37 percent for defense and 41 percent for human resources programs. To accomplish this massive change in emphasis, military and space expenditures were cut by some \$6 billion.

As a former member of the House and the Senate, I fully understand that the members consider appropriations and spending bills one at a time. The trouble is that the total of the parts, each in itself attractive and even meritorious, is too large a figure. Unless the Congress makes a very special effort to look at the total picture, the members may not fully appreciate the overall effect of their fiscal actions.

In raising the issue of budget deficits, I am not suggesting that the Federal government should necessarily adhere to a strict pattern of a balanced budget every year. At times the economic situation permits—even calls for—a budget deficit. There is one basic guideline for the budget, however, which we should never violate: except in emergency conditions, expenditures must never be allowed to outrun the revenues that the tax system would produce at reasonably full employment. When the Federal government's spending actions over an extended period push outlays sharply higher, increased tax rates or inflation inevitably follow. We had such a period in the 1960s. We have been paying the high price—and higher prices—for that recently.

We must not let that happen again. It need not happen. Responsible government cannot let it happen. This is a time when the taxpayers of the United States will not tolerate irresponsible spending. The Congress should ask itself in every case: Will this new expenditure, when tied to all the others, require increased taxes or cause a deficit which would bring about an increase in prices. The Congress must examine with special care those spending programs which benefit some of the people but which really raise taxes and prices for all the people.

Recently I signed into law a bill fixing a "ceiling" on Federal spending for the current fiscal year. I accept that ceiling and intend to live under it. But the Congress, by making exceptions and approving measures made a travesty of this legislation.

I now ask the Congress to establish a firm ceiling on total expenditures—a ceiling from which only specific and genuine "uncontrollables" such as interest on the public debt would be exempt—a ceiling within which the President can determine priorities—a ceiling that would apply to the Congress as well as to the Executive. This will require of the Congress—as well as the President—the hard task of adjusting and pruning individual program outlays to hold their total within this ceiling. With this we can reassure citizens generally that Washington will not take spending actions that will im-

pose on their future incomes the burdens of ever increasing tax rates. With this we can pursue vigorous policies of expansion to achieve full employment, rapid improvements in our material levels of living, and a more stable dollar.

"MEET THE MEMBER"—WYOMING'S CONGRESSMAN AT LARGE, JOHN WOLD

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Wyoming's freshman Congressman, and Senate candidate, JOHN WOLD, was honored recently by the distinguished Washington newscaster, Joseph McCaffrey. Our colleague was the subject of Mr. McCaffrey's "Meet the Member" broadcast.

Mr. McCaffrey pointed out that our colleague "brought an unmatched record with him when he entered the House of Representatives a year ago—the largest margin of votes, 63 percent, ever cast in a race for the Wyoming at-large House seat."

Our colleague has been vice president of the 91st Club.

Mr. McCaffrey addressed not only our colleague's broad political experience, but his professional and educational background as well and, wrote the newscaster, "Wold is a Wyomingite by choice, not chance."

Mr. Speaker, I include the script of Mr. McCaffrey's "Meet the Member" broadcast carried over radio station WMAL in Washington, D.C., in the RECORD with my remarks:

MEET THE MEMBER

Congressman John Wold brought an unmatched record with him when he entered the House of Representatives a year ago. He came to Washington with the largest margin of votes (63 percent) ever cast in a race for the Wyoming at-large House seat. His 31,000 vote plurality is the record in the state's Congressional history.

The new Congressman immediately fulfilled his campaign pledge by actively seeking and gaining assignment to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. There he set a precedent by gaining appointment to five of the Committee's six subcommittees: Public Lands, Territorial and Insular Affairs, Indian Affairs, Mines and Mining, and Irrigation and Reclamation. He was also given seniority over his freshmen colleagues on the Committee.

Winning elections did not stop last November. Congressman Wold's drive and initiative won him election as a vice president of the 91st Club—the newly elected members of the 91st Congress—and he now is director of the Club's activities relating to the six states of the western region of the United States.

Long active in Republican politics and a past member of the exclusive Executive Committee of the Republican National Committee on Committees, the prestigious body which makes committee assignments, and to the Congressional Campaign Committee.

Wold's political experience has been varied and considerable. While serving in the Wyoming House, he chaired the Labor Committee. He was elected to the Legislature in 1956 by the largest margin of any Republican up for legislative office.

As a two-term GOP Chairman from 1960-64, Wold led the party to some of its most

sweeping victories. Under his leadership in 1962, all seven Republican nominees on the state and national level were elected. He also served as precinct committeeman, county vice chairman and state secretary. A past chairman of the Western States' Republican State Chairman's Association, his political leadership has become recognized across the country.

Wold's only defeat came in 1964 when he ran for the United States Senate. Despite the loss, he ran some 10,000 votes ahead of the GOP Presidential candidate in the Lyndon Johnson landslide.

Wold was born in New Jersey in 1916. He permanently moved to Wyoming in 1948 after a first trip to the Equality State in 1934. The Congressman took his Bachelor of Arts degree from Union College and received his Master's degree in geology from Cornell University. He was an exchange student at St. Andrews University in Scotland and also did geological field work at the University of Iowa.

Wold served 54 months aboard a destroyer escort in both the North Atlantic and South Pacific during World War II as a commissioned officer.

Governor Stan Hathaway of Wyoming appointed him a director of the Federation of Rocky Mountain States—an organization of the seven Rocky Mountain states dedicated to joint efforts for cultural, social, agricultural and developmental improvement. He was also a vice president of the Rocky Mountain Oil and Gas Association for the states of Wyoming and South Dakota.

Wold is a Wyomingite by choice, not chance and his election to the United States Congress has not diminished this back-home involvement. As he puts it, "I'm still a Wyomingite—just working for the state a few miles away in a different city."

CHAIRMAN PATMAN PRAISES HALE BOGGS FOR FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY STUDIES

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great satisfactions of being chairman of the Joint Economic Committee is the great competence of my colleagues from both Houses who serve on that committee. I believe that the Joint Economic Committee is making an extremely valuable contribution to the Congress on a continuing basis. One such outstanding contribution is the excellent work done by our assistant majority leader, the gentleman from New Orleans, Mr. HALE Boggs, who heads the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. Under Mr. Boggs' leadership, that subcommittee has been working for the better part of a year to formulate a positive foreign economic international policy for the United States during the decade of the 1970's.

On Friday, July 17, Mr. Boggs testified before the full Joint Economic Committee on the outlook for foreign trade. In a most informative and incisive statement he has provided an insight into the international trade picture on a broad perspective that should prove very useful to Members of this body. In addition to his Joint Economic Committee responsibilities, the gentleman is also ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee which is currently considering ex-

tensive foreign trade legislation. So, it would be most difficult if not impossible for anyone to equal him in knowledge and wisdom about the international economic policies of the United States. Accordingly, I include it in the Record:

THE COURSE OF U.S. TRADE POLICY IN THE 1970'S

(Statement of Hon. HALE BOGGS, Congressman from Louisiana, chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, before the Joint Economic Committee, July 17, 1970)

I am gratified to have this opportunity to present my views on U.S. trade policy. A number of current problems and the lack of any well-defined program for the future threaten to alter the course of trade liberalization and international cooperation we have pursued since 1934. At least some of our current difficulties are temporary, and these can be expected to subside now that excess demand has disappeared. A further improvement should occur when the pace of inflation hopefully slows in the coming months. Even so, the validity and utility of our international trade policies are today being questioned with greater skepticism than I can recall in many years.

RETHINKING THE DIRECTION OF TRADE POLICY

Following the hard-won Kennedy Round Agreement to further reduce tariff barriers, the results of these negotiations had to be digested before we could begin to consider seriously further initiatives in trade policy. The last of the phased tariff reductions agreed to during the Kennedy Round will be implemented on January 1, 1972. It is therefore appropriate to be thinking now about what the direction of U.S. foreign economic policy should be in the 1970s if we are to continue our efforts of the last decade to expand world trade for the common benefit of all nations.

As part of the process of developing new initiatives, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy is conducting a series of hearings to establish goals for the 1970s. Our objective is to outline an approach that will appropriately integrate U.S. policies regarding trade, foreign direct investment, and economic development assistance. As you know, the President earlier this year received a report recommending reorganization and reorientation of the foreign aid program, but he has not yet transmitted to the Congress his own recommendations to restructure foreign aid. A Presidential Commission on World Trade and Investment Policy has also been appointed recently. The report of our Subcommittee should be available before the conclusions of this commission are published next year.

THE ROLE OF TRADE IN THE U.S. ECONOMY

During the interim when we are deciding what course to follow in foreign economic policy, the danger arises that current difficulties over imports of particular products or concern over the deterioration in the total U.S. trade balance might cause us to adopt policies that we may subsequently regret. During the hearings recently concluded by the House Ways and Means Committee, over seventy different industries appealed for quota protection from imports. With the exception of only two of these industries—textiles and shoes—the trade bill shortly to be reported out by the committee leaves the implementation of quotas entirely at the discretion of the President.

We must remember the long-term importance of international trade for the United States. For these reasons, before turning to more specific considerations, I would like to put into perspective the role of international trade in the U.S. economy. I will not elaborate on the importance of trade and investment

in international political relations and in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy as broadly conceived. These considerations are obviously important—occasionally more important than strictly economic calculations. Instead, I will let the economics stand alone.

A projection of the U.S. economy in 1980 compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics dramatically indicates the relative roles of purely domestic economic activity and international trade. In 1968 six out of every ten workers in the United States were engaged in the production of services rather than goods, and by 1980 close to seven out of every ten workers will be employed in service-producing occupations. Services are consumed where they are produced, and thus the workers producing them have no fear of competition from imports.

By the end of this decade the proportion of workers engaged in the output of goods will have fallen to three of every ten employees. Goods-producing industries include construction, agriculture, mining, and manufacturing. The construction industry does not compete against imports, and most of U.S. agriculture is so highly efficient that it has no fear of foreign producers. Indeed, our farmers need expanding foreign markets to take full advantage of our superior agricultural productivity. Imported ores might to some extent substitute for domestic mining production, but mining is the smallest of the goods-producing industries. Manufacturing is the largest of this group, and while many manufacturers must be concerned about maintaining a competitive edge vis-a-vis imports, other manufacturers—employing almost as many persons—have an important stake in foreign markets for our exports.

By 1980 approximately eight of every ten workers in this country will be producing services or goods that cannot be imported. Eighty percent of the U.S. labor force will face no threat of losing their jobs as a consequence of import competition. Instead, the chief economic concern of these workers and their families will be to obtain the goods and services they desire at the lowest possible cost.

Imports cannot provide cheap services, but they do offer American consumers goods at lower prices than available from domestic producers and, in addition, help hold down the cost of domestically produced goods by offering the purchaser an alternative to the output of American factories. Both the ability to purchase imports and U.S. industries' reactions in the marketplace to import competition benefit the consumer. In the future a steadily increasing proportion of the American labor force and their families will be concerned about the availability of goods at the lowest possible prices regardless of whether these products are domestically produced or imported.

WHAT WILL THE UNITED STATES EXPORT?

The deterioration of the U.S. trade balance has raised serious questions about the ability of the United States to export in the future, participate if we are to participate in the continued liberalization of world trade.

In the face of the particularly rapid growth of imports during 1968 and the slow recovery from the precipitous deterioration in our trade balance that year, policymakers and academic economists have expressed concern about what will happen if the United States falls to have a substantial net export surplus in the future. These persons have pointed to the reserve-currency role of the dollar, to our security commitments abroad and to the desirability of making goods and services available to the developing countries. In each case an export surplus is necessary to support these activities.

To stimulate and insure our capability to export, the bill drafted by the Ways and

Means Committee provides for Domestic International Sales Corporations. Companies establishing such corporations will be able to defer taxes on the income from export sales as long as this income is retained by their DISC subsidiaries and used to promote further export expansion. This tax deferral scheme will place the export activities of firms in the United States on an equal footing—in terms of income taxation—with the foreign subsidiaries of American corporations. Thus, in addition to increasing domestic employment in the production of exports, the DISC provision will discourage the transfer of manufacturing operations to other countries.

Over the long run, however, if the United States is to fulfill its international monetary responsibilities, is to carry a substantial international security burden, and is also to provide goods and services for development, other countries must help create an environment in which we can successfully carry out these functions.

The devaluation bias of the existing international monetary system makes it more difficult for this country to play its expected role. Since 1949 the currency of every other major industrial country in the world has been devalued one or more times, but only three upward changes in exchange rates have occurred. Therefore, the competitive position of the United States has tended to become gradually undermined.

This devaluation bias as another undesirable effect which I feel we are experiencing at this time. To the individual U.S. exporter or producer competing against imports, the consequences of this bias materialize as a threat to his current market position. Thus, what is actually a general problem of exchange rate misalignment may be perceived in this country as a rash of individual problems giving rise to pleas for protection and intensified demands for the removal of trade restrictions not sanctioned by GATT. As their difficulties have intensified, American producers and workers have looked around for the source of their plight; it is understandable that they have pointed to "adverse foreign wage differentials," "unfair labor standards abroad," and sophisticated trade barriers used by other countries that violate the spirit, if not the actual letter, of the GATT. Certainly many of these complaints are justified, but I believe we should investigate further when they swell into a general cry for protection.

The criterion we should always keep in mind is the level of world trade and the efficiency with which various productive activities are located around the globe—not the net balance of payments or trade balance of any particular country, not even that of the United States. If the industrial nations of the world cooperate, pursue liberal and open-minded policies regarding trade and international investment, and press for continuing international monetary reform, the balance of payments for each country will tend to fluctuate around zero or, allowing for the growth of reserves through special drawing rights, register a small surplus.

But if the United States resorts to protectionism and other countries continue to ignore the principle of reciprocity in admitting imports into their markets, the outcome in terms of net balances will not be significantly different. Each individual nation will end up with approximately the same net position it had initially. The major difference would be a substantial decline in the level of world trade. Thus, opportunities for efficient specialization would be forgone, and the developing countries particularly would suffer from their inability to find markets abroad. If the industrial countries fall into the trap of protectionism and trade restriction, the real incomes of everyone will be lower than they otherwise would be.

Through the use of monetary and fiscal policies, the United States can—and I am confident will—return to full employment. But the real earning power of American workers, just like those in any other country, depends upon their skill and efficiency—in the simplest possible terms—on their relative ability to produce. By restricting imports and subsidizing exports, we will tend to anesthetize our productive capabilities.

When Secretary of Commerce Stans appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to announce the failure of the negotiations with the Japanese, Chairman Wilbur Mills made an observation about the export capabilities of the Japanese which no one can dispute. He said, "They must be doing something right." The Chairman went on to mention a number of techniques the Japanese have used to increase their capability to export, such as easy access to bank financing and price cutting to maintain capacity output. I would like to mention one technique that he did not.

Japanese businessmen and political leaders have understood that they cannot keep an unchanging proportion of their industrial capability in the same industries forever. In the post-war decades, they have continually striven—with the aid of government planning and assistance—to increase the quality of their output and to move into more sophisticated lines of production. They understood well that if their incomes were to increase, they could not go on producing firecrackers, toys, and cheap textiles. These industries are gradually being phased out in Japan and transferred to other Asian countries where labor is more plentiful, such as Korea and Taiwan. Similarly the industrial structure of the United States cannot remain static if the welfare of our workers is to improve. We can initiate such an effort from a much higher base than the Japanese did, and we can achieve our goals without unilaterally resorting to protectionism. Indeed, the needs of our society threaten to swamp its ability to fulfill these needs. Continued improvement in the quality of American life demands that we meet these challenges aggressively.

THE PROBLEMS OF INDIVIDUAL INDUSTRIES, FIRMS, AND COMMUNITIES

Individual firms and communities producing a variety of products are today experiencing severe difficulties as a consequence of import expansion. In considering how to respond, it is obviously unfair to take any action easing the hardships of producers in one industry without making the same type of consideration available to firms and workers manufacturing other products. The same standards should be applied throughout the economy, and the same remedies should be available to all enterprises, communities, and groups of workers.

The solution to these difficulties must be found in an appropriate combination of adjustment assistance and import restraint. During the past year the Tariff Commission has adopted a somewhat easier attitude towards eligibility for adjustment assistance, and the trade bill drafted by the Ways and Means Committee includes provisions to further expand the Commission's latitude for action in recommending such assistance. I heartily approve of assistance to firms and communities demonstrably suffering from import competition; liberalization of the criteria that must be satisfied to qualify would bring the operations of these programs closer to the intent of Congress in the 1962 Act. Training and relocation benefits to workers, financial and technical advice for communities to help them attract new industry, and loans to firms for retooling and the development of new product lines must all be considered as possible options. Blanket industry-wide assistance must, however, be regarded with more caution. To grant such

aid to an entire industry is likely to raise a protective umbrella over the more efficient firms and permit them to reap excessive profits while other enterprises deserving assistance are attempting to strengthen their competitive positions.

Fundamentally the type of adjustment that workers, firms, and communities must make in response to an increased flow of imports is no different from the type of adjustment they have to make in response to wholly domestic changes in consumer taste, technology, and market structure. Also each year our economy must grow to provide jobs for young workers entering the labor force in numbers several times as large as the number of workers displaced by import competition. Thus the problems arising from international trade are minor in comparison with the challenges of fostering competition domestically and of keeping the U.S. economy growing at a healthy rate without excessive inflation. If we have appropriate domestic economic policies, any additional problems arising from imports will certainly be manageable.

In rare instances it may be necessary to temporarily restrict imports for the benefits of domestic interests. When such an extreme measure is utilized, we should do so only following a demonstration of serious injury before the Tariff Commission. The Standards used to determine the seriousness of any such injury must be objective and acceptable to the community of trading nations. In adopting a set of standards specifying when a nation can legitimately restrict imports, the United States has an opportunity to set a responsible example rather than act in a nationalistically protectionist manner.

I believe it would be useful to broaden within the GATT the standards under which firms or groups of workers manufacturing selected products may be judged to have been injured to a degree sufficient to warrant the temporary imposition of import restrictions. Currently, Article XIX of the GATT permits such relief only when the difficulties stem from a previously negotiated trade concession. But I feel that American producers should be able to obtain temporary relief from import competition on the same basis as the proposed liberalized criteria for extending adjustment assistance. Specifically, the GATT should allow for the temporary restriction of imports that cause severe domestic injury regardless of whether these imports enter as a consequence of tariff reductions or other factors.

These expanded GATT criteria would include limitations over the time during which imports could be curtailed and supplementary actions required of the government of any nation curtailing imports. By necessary supplementary actions I am thinking of any type of adjustment assistance needed to eliminate import curbs as soon as possible. Any country whose exports were curtailed as the result of temporary import restrictions could challenge within the GATT the justifiability of these limitations. If the nation imposing the temporary restrictions could not demonstrate their legitimacy according to internationally accepted standards it would be required either to abolish the restriction or compensate the injured country.

I believe that the development of such criteria within the GATT and the use of this organization as an international forum to oversee their application would bring important benefits to the United States and to trading nations generally. First, an objective criteria would be established under which we could challenge the actions of other countries. Such challenges have not been raised effectively to date. Multilateral agreement on realistic and up-to-date criteria to determine when nations may legitimately restrict imports would lead to a more equitable

application of GATT standards and less tolerance for special exceptions. The United States would then be able to insist with greater force on the removal of trade barriers now maintained by the Japanese and the Common Market nations in violation of the GATT. Second, American industries facing the steady growth of foreign competitive ability would know the rate at which they will be required to adjust and the circumstances under which they can qualify for relief. Third, if each country continues to be the judge of its own actions and restricts imports when it alone sees fit, the risks of a retaliation counter-retaliation cycle are substantial. A restrictionist slugging match would collapse the network of multi-lateral trade that has been built up over more than three decades and impair the real incomes of American workers and consumers.

CONTINUING ISSUES

While problems will continue to afflict selected firms and communities, a number of general issues will also remain with us.

Substantial liberalization of trade in agricultural products must probably await reform of the various schemes governments employ to support the incomes of rural populations. We should nevertheless work towards an economically rational distribution of agricultural production and guard against the introduction of new trade restrictions. Special vigilance is required to insure that any arrangement to admit Britain to the Common Market does not create additional discrimination against exports of U.S. farm products.

The activities of multinational corporations in promoting a more rapid international transfer of technology could conceivably impair the future ability of the United States to export. On the other hand, such firms remit a growing stream of foreign earnings to their head offices here. More should be learned about the effects of these organizations before we attempt to influence their decisions. To this end, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy has scheduled hearings for later this month on the growth of direct investment and the operations of multinational corporations.

The developing countries will continue to plead for expanded access to our markets and, so long as the industrialized nations do not admit their goods on a nondiscriminatory basis, our expressions of concern for their welfare will ring hollow. Moreover, any plan to provide for easier access of imports from developing countries must include all industrial countries on an equal basis.

Although the Common Market nations recently announced their resolve to limit the geographical extent of the additional preferential arrangements they will conclude with nonmember states, the precise extent of these limits has not yet been decided and the existing preferences remain in violation of GATT. Moreover, it remains to be seen whether an arrangement to admit Britain, if successfully negotiated, will discriminate against imports of manufactures from the United States and other nonmembers.

In dealing with these issues, I strongly believe that the United States must maintain the initiative it first evidenced with the passage of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in 1934 and carried forward with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. If the U.S. initiative is not maintained, none of our major trading partners can be expected to seize it and press forward for continued trade liberalizations. The Common Market has not consistently adopted policies in keeping with free trade, and some of its decisions have injured the United States. Likewise, the Japanese use licensing and credit rationing to discriminate against imports. They also prohibit foreign investment in a number of major industries. Thus, a basis does exist for rationalizing a shift in our policies.

But I do not see how the United States can expect its industrial counterparts to perform better than we do in encouraging a continued expansion of multilateral trade. If this country deviates from its previous course of reciprocal trade liberalization, that action will be taken as an excuse for others to do likewise. We cannot be assured that others will readily follow constructive U.S. leadership and, to achieve any success, we must be prepared for persistent hard bargaining. But as the country with the effective authority to push the tenor of world trading relationships in one direction or another, we must accept the responsibilities of our pre-eminent position.

CHAIRMAN PATMAN CALLS ATTENTION TO TESTIMONY OF DR. WALTER HELLER BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee is conducting extensive hearings on the state of the economy. In my opinion, our economy is in very serious condition and is in need of positive and resolute action by the administration if we are going to avoid further difficulty. One of the witnesses heard was the former Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Walter Heller, of the University of Minnesota. Dr. Heller's statement provides an excellent analysis of what is wrong with the economic policies of the administration and what should be done to correct them.

I might add that in subsequent colloquy, Mr. Heller approved a proposal which appeals to me very much and which I have urged many times—namely, establishment of a public bank to lend money for housing at low interest rates, particularly for the lower income groups.

I submit Dr. Heller's prepared statement for the RECORD:

OPENING STATEMENT OF WALTER W. HELLER, REGENTS' PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, BEFORE THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, JULY 16, 1970

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, as we struggle to break out of the shadows of inflationary recession and back into the sunlight of non-inflationary expansion, we are well advised to remind ourselves that there are no magic formulas, no pat solutions, no easy ways to reconcile full employment and price stability. No modern, free economy has yet found the combination of policies that can deliver sustained high employment and high growth side by side with sustained price stability. This is not meant to be a counsel of despair, inaction, or over-reaction.

On the contrary, it is a plea to recognize that there is a tradeoff between jobs and prices. In the last analysis, economic policy involves a conscious choice between the human and social costs of more unemployment on one hand and the inequities and distortions of inflation on the other. In today's terms, this requires the policy maker

First, to take stock of our progress in the battle against inflation and prospects, under present policies, of breaking out of our economic slump;

Second, in the light of this stock-taking, to adjust policy so as to strike a better balance between the large and growing cost of unemployment and lost production on one

hand and the further anti-inflationary pay-off of a continued economic squeeze on the other.

I submit that such a review yields some clear and unmistakable signals for the policy maker.

ECONOMIC PROSPECTS TODAY

As we take stock of the U.S. economy in mid-1970, the dominant facts of economic life (skipping qualifications and details for the moment) are these:

Even if the economy managed a little uptick in the second quarter or rises a bit in the third and fourth, *economic sluggishness and growing economic slack will be the order of the day for the rest of 1970, and our GNP gap will grow sharply.* If we average out to a no-growth year, our annual loss in production would reach \$40 billion by the end of 1970. If we settle for a snail's-pace recovery in 1971, that loss could rise to a billion dollars a week a year from now.

Even if the unemployment rate dropped a bit in June, *the employment picture is still weakening, and the human costs of unemployment continue to rise.*

If the Administration honors its pledges to de-escalate in Vietnam, *there is a danger under present policies that the resources thus freed may run to waste in continued economic slack instead of finding prompt constructive use in an expanding economy.*

Even if the cost of living index doesn't show it yet, *inflation is at last on the wane and will take a diminishing toll in economic distortion and inequity as the year progresses.*

Let me take a moment to back up each of these assertions about our economic prospects.

ECONOMIC SLACK

First, as I assess the contending forces—those that would mire us more deeply in recession versus those that would pull us out—I see more or less of a stand-off for the rest of the year. With the steam going out of the boom in plant and equipment investment, with government spending providing no great thrust, with housing just about holding its own at a low level (though not as low as most observers expected), with most surveys showing the consumer in a subdued frame of mind, and with the prospect of serious strikes hanging over the economy, the fires of recovery seem pretty well banked for the rest of 1970. At the same time, there are few signs that the weaknesses in the economy will accumulate into a downward spiral. All in all, we seem to be going through the least severe but most sustained recession (or "recessionary adjustment" if euphemisms are needed) of the post-war period.

This picture could change for the better—If the consumer unexpectedly casts off his apprehensions and pessimism, snaps out of his lethargy, and starts spending a more normal (higher) percentage of his income;

If the Nixon Administration and the Federal Reserve unexpectedly move to a distinctly more expansionary monetary-fiscal policy.

What emerges from this brief rundown is that we should not become preoccupied with the question of whether the economy moves up a bit, down a bit, or sideways. The much more telling consideration is that if the U.S. economy essentially marks time in 1970, its unused potential—the gap between actual and potential output—will reach \$40 billion by the end of the year.

This projection takes as its point of departure the Council of Economic Advisers' analysis of actual and potential GNP (as shown in Chart 8 on page 85 of the *Economic Report of the President, February 1970*). The Council analysis shows actual and potential GNP coinciding in the fourth quarter of 1969 and projects "about a 4.3% rate of growth of potential real GNP." At prevailing levels of GNP, this means approximately a \$10 billion quarterly growth in GNP potential. Little

or no real growth throughout 1970 would therefore open the gap to about \$40 billion by the end of the year. If one further assumes sluggish growth at a 2% rate in the first half of 1971, the gap would be roughly \$50 billion by mid-year.

To put this in operational terms: a continuation of unduly restrictive economic policies runs the risk of letting as much as \$1 billion a week of American productive potential run to waste by the second half of 1971. That is the key point on which employment and output policy should focus. Let me drive this point home by noting that this could occur even without experiencing what, by traditional standards, we would call a "recession." Thus, in an economy whose potential growth is 4.3% annually, four quarters of zero real growth in 1970 and two quarters of 2% growth in 1971 would be enough to produce a \$50 billion gap.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Second, the employment implication of this picture should, in general terms, be self-evident: an economy that stagnates for several quarters and then grows sluggishly for a time will simply not generate job opportunities fast enough to absorb new entrants into the labor force and offset the growth in productivity per man-hour. Without a shift to a more expansionary policy, unemployment will rise substantially in the coming year, to a peak of between 5.5 and 6%. This percentage does not count those who drop out of the labor market or are discouraged from entering it because of limited job opportunities. Nor does it reflect the great concentration of joblessness in certain groups. On that score, one need only remember that at a 4.7% overall unemployment rate last month, the unemployment rate for blacks was twice as high and for black teenagers was a staggering 34%.

VIETNAM DEESCALATION

Third, it is in this context that one should consider the human resources made available by troop pullouts from Vietnam and the associated reductions in military manpower requirements. If economic policy, in effect, continues to dump returning veterans into a soft job market, it would incur not only unnecessary economic costs but grave social risks. Part of the cost would be in the temporary loss of these human resources to the programs that so desperately need them. But beyond this, we would have to count the cost not just in the indignity and hardship of the individual, but in the heightened social tension, militancy, and crime which breed in the atmosphere of idleness and injustice labeled "unemployment."

EBBING INFLATION

Fourth, since the risks and costs we have been reviewing here are being incurred in the name of conquering inflation, we have to consider two further questions before deciding which way and how far monetary-fiscal policy should move:

Are inflationary pressures ebbing as a result of previous restrictive policy and, if so, how much relief is already in sight?

How big a cost in further loss of jobs and output is the country prepared to suffer to bring the inflation rate down below the rates now in prospect?

With respect to the near-term inflationary prospects, I believe that significant, if still not satisfactory, relief is in sight, based on the following considerations:

Moderately restrictive fiscal policy in 1968-69 and brutally tight money in 1969 and early 1970 have replaced excess demand and drum-tight labor markets with excess capacity and wide-spread unemployment, an environment in which price competition and price cutting take on new meaning and huge wage increases will eventually be harder to come by.

As output begins to move up again and operating rates rise, increases in productivity will slow down the rise in unit costs of labor.

There's plenty of evidence at hand that basic materials prices are easing, wholesale prices are rising less rapidly than they did, and some key food prices are likely to fall.

In short, we seem to be moving out of the epidemic phase of our current inflation. A 4% rate of inflation (in terms of the GNP deflator) by the end of the year is a reasonably good bet. As a consequence of the slowdown and slack already generated in the U.S. economy, I would expect further improvement in 1971 even if, as I would urge, monetary policy becomes considerably easier.

Let me make clear, however, that in an economy that has a basic bipartisan commitment to high growth and high employment, I continue to see inflation as an endemic problem that must be faced for the longer run. Unless we condemn ourselves to a chronically slack or stagnant economy, I don't see how we can expect to average much less than 3% annual inflation in the next five years. Just as current prospects permit a move toward more expansionary monetary policy, so the longer-term prospects call for the most serious efforts on the structural policy front.

At the same time, for those who fear that a return to expansionary economic policy spells a quick return to epidemic inflation, one should recall that it took a \$25 billion federal budget deficit and sustained 7% to 8% growth in the money supply—in an economy that was operating at or above its potential—to generate the "Vietnam inflation." I doubt that we are in danger of repeating that mistake.

STABILIZATION POLICY

Short run

As we turn more explicitly to policy measures and policy mix, we should keep in mind that the 1970 slowdown or recession is not something that "just happened." It is our first consciously induced, managed, and engineered economic downswing. The same tools that were used to engineer the downswing can engineer a renewed expansion.

Let's make no mistake about this: in spite of the President's statistics which associated the growth in unemployment with the winding down of war in Vietnam, our present unemployment and slack are the direct outgrowth of a combination of moderate fiscal and harsh monetary restriction, not a result of military cutbacks. With the modern tools of fiscal and monetary policies at its command, the economy as a whole has nothing to fear from military de-escalation (in spite of painful adjustments in certain areas and industries).

As one looks at the actual unfolding of fiscal-monetary policy for our engineered slowdown, one can discern two distinct stages to date. The first was the restrictive stage, begun in 1968 and sharply intensified in 1969. The second stage, initiated early this year, might be called the "let up" stage. Consciously in the case of monetary policy, semi-consciously in the case of fiscal policy, the monetary and fiscal brakes were somewhat eased.

It is now time to enter stage 3, moving from a policy of less restriction to a positive policy for expansion. This requires prompt and decisive action on the monetary front, together with a wary eye cocked on the fiscal policy front lest the automatic growth in revenue potential generate too large a full-employment surplus in 1971.

This recommendation will affront those who demand the unconditional surrender of inflation, those who insist on pressing restrictive monetary-fiscal policy to the point not only of breaking the back of excess demand—as it already has—but of breaking

the will of strong unions and strong management through the "discipline" of unemployment, low profits, and ferociously high interest rates. To this group, one should counter with two reminders:

That "discipline" involves costs, both economic and social, that range from large to catastrophic. One should not forget that the unconditional surrender of inflation in the late 1950's was bought at the cost of 7% unemployment, a GNP gap of \$50 billion (which was 10% of GNP ten years ago, as against 5% today), and profit plunges of 20 to 30%.

These costs are imposed on all segments of the community in order to get at the relatively few with strong market power. Ironically, these few are among the last to be hit by cutbacks in aggregate demand. With respect to the fiscal-monetary mix, I have repeatedly in the past year and a half urged greater reliance on fiscal restriction and less reliance on excruciatingly tight monetary policy. Early in 1969, prompt and full extension of the surtax as President Johnson recommended would have been the right policy medicine for the continued fever of inflation. Again, extension of the surtax this year would have allowed a better policy mix. Indeed, as late as two months ago, I was arguing for a federal tax increase coupled with a flexible and easier monetary policy, not for additional restriction of consumer demand, but to take some of the pressure off of our money and capital markets and reduce the unduly severe policy burden borne by the Federal Reserve System; to meet our aching social needs in a more adequate and responsible way with particular emphasis, in the immediate context, on taking out policy insurance for the victims of our fight against inflation, i.e., the unemployed.

If such a change in mix had been made, we would have been far better off, both economically and socially. Also, if we could will it into being instantaneously, I would continue to urge it. But in the realistic political and economic context which confronts us today—a reluctant or unwilling White House and Congress on one hand and a sluggish economy on the other—the risks of embarking on that course probably exceed the gains. In the face of longer-run needs of a better policy mix and, more important, of more adequate financing of our huge and pressing social needs, I should make very clear that I would now put this proposal temporarily on the back burner, not take it off the stove.

In part, my caution on any immediate moves on the tax front is based on a projection of the probable course of the federal budget surplus in terms of high employment. Even while the actual unified budget bids fair to develop a deficit of over \$10 billion for Fiscal 1971, one has to keep two facts clearly in mind in assessing the budget's impact on the economy:

The annual rate of deficit in the actual federal budget (NIA basis) will probably peak in the current quarter—at \$13 to \$14 billion—and then diminish to less than \$5 billion by the second quarter of 1971.

Meanwhile, the budget surplus in full, or high employment terms, after reaching a low of perhaps \$3 billion in the current quarter, will rise steadily to something like \$10 billion in the second quarter of 1971.

In connection with the foregoing numbers, I should emphasize that I'm factoring in judgments concerning the most likely fate of Administration tax and expenditure proposals in Congress this year and am also taking into account of the short-fall in revenues owing to economic weakness.

Given the prospects for a sluggish economy, rising unemployment, waning inflationary pressures, and a swing toward fiscal restraint during the coming twelve months, one can offer some pointed and positive recommen-

dations for ease in monetary policy. We already have welcome assurances that the Federal Reserve System is alert to the liquidity needs of the economy, will not leave borrowers in the lurch and will serve as a lender of last resort. Indeed, the Federal Reserve must feel just a bit shell-shocked after its first few months of target practice focusing on the new targets of bank credit and money supply, the monetary aggregates. In the face of a foundering Treasury debt operation and a scramble for liquidity in the private financial markets, the Fed was forced to return to its more traditional targets of money market conditions and interest rates. Without abandoning some broad guidelines with respect to the aggregates, monetary policy would be well advised to continue to emphasize interest rates and money market conditions in its targetry.

There are those who argue that the rapid expansion of the money supply—at a rate of nearly 10% for three months this spring—requires an offsetting pull-back and tightening of monetary policy. This conclusion is wrong from every point of view:

For the first six months of 1970, the growth in money supply averages out to somewhat less than half the 10% spurt of the three spring months.

When we move from myopic preoccupation with money supply and take into account also the demand for money, it is perfectly clear that the 10% jump in the money supply was quickly absorbed in the hunger for liquidity. Looking at interest rates, which reflect both supply and demand, one finds the price of money staying very high during those three months of spurting supply. Every indication in the financial and business sector today suggests that the hunger for liquidity is strong and continuing, that it will take an unusual increase in money supply to meet the ready demand.

Putting the money supply picture into still longer perspective, one must remember that the first half of 1969 saw a rate of increase of just a little more than 4%, the next six months at a zero rate of increase, and the last six months again a bit above 4%. So we are still well behind schedule in terms of the normal requirements for real expansion in the economy. There is still a lot of catching up to do.

Finally, the economic picture sketched early in this paper suggests that the increase in money supply should now be stepped up beyond the requirements of normal real expansion in the economy. Using a fall in interest rates and a rise in liquidity as the appropriate targets in the present economic situation, and taking into account the large risks and costs of failure to turn our sluggish economy back toward expansion, I'm confident that the relevant monetary signals call for a significant step-up in the rate of increase in the money supply in the next six months.

Although I understand that my main focus today is to be on fiscal and monetary policy, I cannot resist a comment or two about a favorite subject of mine, namely, voluntary wage-price restraints and government guideposts. By now, I'm afraid that any repetition of my general views on this would be monotonous, but I hope that a comment or two about the recent Nixon innovations in anti-inflationary policy might not be amiss.

First, I should note that I welcome the in-house price watch-dog committee that the President has set up. Also, I hope that the Productivity Commission will do some good in the long run, and I am glad that the Council of Economic Advisers is going to give us an inflation alert from time to time. All of this adds up to a recognition of the facets of the inflation problem that the Nixon Administration had previously ignored or neglected, and this is all to the good.

But I am concerned that the inflation alert is being administered by economists who are declared disbelievers in government guidance, leadership, and intervention in the wage-price process. Being first-rate economists and dedicated public servants, they will do their job in a responsible way. But unless the National Commission on Productivity "takes it from there" and expresses public outrage over things like that 13% truckers' settlement or unwarranted price boosts (and the composition of the Commission is almost an iron-clad guarantee against such a development), there is simply going to be little or no moral restraint, no effective self-restraint, in the wage-price field.

A considerable part of the trouble stems from the surprisingly dogmatic, almost theological, Nixonian adherence to a hands-off policy in the wage-price field—a policy that delights labor, pleases business, puzzles the financial community both here and abroad, and shortchanges the public. Lest that strikes you as a partisan comment, let me recall that important international observers in the OECD, IMF, Bank for International Settlements, and other bodies, have made pointed statements urging the United States to adopt a meaningful incomes policy. *Fortune* magazine, and more recently *Business Week*, have devoted pointed editorials to the same end. Why should government intervention in the trucking settlement have been confined to the mediation service, with its approach of "peace at any price level"?

Direct intervention and leadership—not a straightjacket of mandatory controls—is needed to flank appropriate fiscal and monetary policies for stabilization.

Long run

In pondering the problems of proper policy mix, we should break out of the confines of the 1970 context to consider whether fiscal-monetary policy has been the victim of persistent or recurrent biases or imbalances and what changes might be helpful in striking a better balance in the future. The most conspicuous lesson of recent fiscal history is that failure to act promptly and decisively on the fiscal front in the battle against inflation throws an undue burden on the monetary authorities and, through them, an unbearable burden of tight money on housing, small business, and state and local governments.

Had there been standby authority for temporary income tax increases, subject to Congressional veto, on the books in 1966—in other words, if President Johnson could have activated an anti-inflationary tax increase without a bruising battle in Congress, not only over taxes as such, but over Vietnam—I think the odds are reasonably good that we would have had a surtax in 1966 and a correspondingly less stringent monetary crunch. Or even if such standby authority would have meant that the President could have activated a temporary surtax promptly in August of 1967, rather than going through ten months of fiscal fiddling while the inflationary fires burned, we would have been vastly better off in our battle against inflation.

The reluctance of Congress to give up any part of its fiscal prerogatives is understandable. Its refusal even to consider President Kennedy's request in 1952 to give him limited standby authority to reduce taxes in the face of recession is perhaps even more understandable. But what is more difficult to understand is the unwillingness to consider a carefully circumscribed grant of Congressional authority to Presidents to increase taxes temporarily, always subject to Congressional veto, to help subdue inflation.

Indeed, I'm surprised that the Congress is unwilling to put the anti-inflationary tax monkey precisely where it belongs, namely,

on the back of the President. Let's face it, we live in an inflation-prone economy. If the President is to deal effectively with recurrent upsurges of inflationary pressure in a responsible way—i.e., without passing the buck to the Federal Reserve System and forcing it to turn the monetary screw far too tight—he must be given the power to put on the fiscal brakes in a hurry, not just on the budget but on the tax side.

Even with this power in hand, Presidents may be reluctant to use it. But if they are, the responsibility for failure to cope with inflationary pressures will be clear and unmistakable. And if this failure leads to excruciatingly tight money, again, this blame will be placed where it belongs.

Effective policy calls for sharply focused responsibility. In stabilization policy, that responsibility should be vested in the White House in a clear and unequivocal way. It is not clear how else we are to get the right policy mix and to avoid continued over-reliance on monetary tools to fight inflation—an over-reliance that inevitably hurts home building, the weak and small members of the business community, and the school districts and other state and local governments that find themselves at the far end of the queue in the capital markets.

A direct grant of standby authority to the White House would be the best way to implement the foregoing recommendations. But if the Congress would be less reluctant to lodge the authority in the hands of a special commission or council including, among others, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, this route would be more than acceptable.

It is so important to overcome the too-little-too-late syndrome of fiscal policy that one should try one formula after another in the hope of overcoming Congressional reluctance to yield its authority on this front. If it adamantly refuses to do so, there are a couple of other routes that might be tried:

One would be to have the Congress itself prepare a "pre-cooked" tax increase or tax cut that could be activated quickly by joint Congressional resolution at the request of the President.

Another possibility, suggested by Herbert Stein, would be to have the President each January call for a positive or negative income surtax to be the first order of business for the Congressional taxing committees.

CONCLUSION

The balance of risks in today's economy has clearly shifted. The pressures of inflation are beginning to subside while the perils of idleness and slack continue to mount. It is high time for economic policy—especially monetary policy—to respond to this shift with a decisive and sustained move toward expansion. This is not a plea to open the expansionary throttle wide, but to stop "riding the brake" and start using the accelerator again.

CREDIT UNION ASKS, "CAN WE WAVE OR DISPLAY THE FLAG TOO MUCH?"

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the nearly 24,000 credit unions in this country are living examples of one of the things that have made our country great—people getting together to help one another. This was how America was built and the credit unions, through their neighbor-lending-to-neighbor philo-

ophy, are continuing that spirit of pioneer America.

The very concept of a credit union is highly patriotic in itself, and the Des Moines Telco Credit Union has added to that display of patriotism. The credit union has sent all of its members and friends of the credit union a miniature flag decal, as well as a reproduction of the Constitution of the United States of America. Accompanying the two items is a letter printed on red, white, and blue stationery, signed by Mr. Lyle E. Johnson, manager/assistant treasury of the credit union. In his letter, Mr. Johnson says:

We wish to emphasize that there are no political connotations connected with this letter. We simply feel that the great events of our past, present and future are wrapped up in our flag. It means many things to many people, but most important of all it should mean something right and good to all of us. It is a symbol of this great nation. Join with us. Thank God for our great, free country. Display our flag proudly.

Can we display or wave it too much? You be the judge.

Credit unions are not allowed behind the Iron Curtain. We are very proud of credit unions in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the Des Moines Telco Credit Union for furthering the cause of patriotism and for helping to build a greater America.

CREDIT UNIONS ONCE AGAIN GET THE CALL TO HELP THE LITTLE MAN

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Department of Housing and Urban Development announced that a grant of nearly \$200,000 was being awarded to the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment officials to provide training for credit union leaders in the housing areas. The housing officials will work in cooperation with the National Credit Union Administration in training credit union leaders who, after returning to their public housing areas, will train other volunteers in the area.

This type of program has been highly successful in the past in training hundreds of credit union volunteers in low-income areas. The initial program, Project Moneywise, was established under a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity and later authorization was obtained for funding of the training program through the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare. Unfortunately, funds were not appropriated for this worthwhile project during the current fiscal year and it appears that there is a strong possibility that no funds will be appropriated in the coming fiscal year.

The grant by HUD will help keep Project Moneywise, or a similar version of the program, going but will not provide enough funds to allow the program to operate on a wide-enough basis.

Mr. Speaker, the program of training credit union volunteers has been one of

the most outstanding weapons in the war against poverty, for it is a program of self-help and does not represent a hand-out. Because of this, additional funds should be appropriated for programs such as Project Moneywise.

SURVEY RESULTS

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, during the 8 years it has been my privilege to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives, it has been my practice to seek opinions and comments of the residents of my district through formal public opinion polls. These surveys have afforded a quick and effective means for residents to make known their views on a wide variety of national issues and have been very useful to me in my efforts to speak for the people of the district. Earlier this year, such a poll was taken of the 10th Congressional District of North Carolina and I should like to bring to the attention of the Congress the tabulation of the survey.

The poll consisted of 18 questions and was widely distributed by mail and through newspapers. There was no effort to restrict the distribution of the poll or to affect the results by limiting it to any particular interest or economic group. This tabulation represents, then, I believe, a broad sample of prevailing opinion in the eight counties of my district.

There were 5,452 responses tabulated in these results. In addition, I made the poll broadly available this year for the first time to the district's high schools. It has been strongly indicated to me that students have a deep and continuing involvement in national affairs and I wished to provide them with a chance to express themselves fully. A total of 5,124 students availed themselves of this opportunity and their views are tabulated separately below so that these opinions can be readily compared with the attitudes of the adult population of the district. While the young people, in general, tended to agree with their parents, it was clear from the results of the survey that they have strong and independent views of their own.

Although the issues represented in the poll cover a wide variety of topics, it was clear that thousands of those participating were not satisfied with a declaration of views on a simple "yes" or "no" basis. The thoughtful comments they added provided an understanding of their opinions in far greater depth than would have been possible otherwise. Summarizing these comments statistically is not possible, but I would like to discuss some of the more obvious trends which these explanatory remarks have made possible.

It was clear in the poll that President Nixon's policy of gradual withdrawal of American forces from Southeast Asia and the Vietnamization of the war has had overwhelming support of the people

of the district. A total of 90 percent of the adults responded in support of the policy while 72 percent of the students indicated approval. Six percent of the adults expressed disapproval, most of these advocating immediate withdrawal. At the same time, 15 percent of the students disapproved of the policy. There was a marked undecided factor of 13 percent among the students, although there was less indecision about the question of the war than on any other issue among the young people.

A great majority of the expressions of opinion about the war in this survey were made before the U.S. military operation against the Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia. What effect this event and the subsequent disorders would have had on the outcome of this question is speculative. However, there have been broad and continuing assertions of support for the Nixon policy since that time, as well.

The views in the poll showed concern about inflation to be second only to the war in Vietnam in assessing the problems facing the American people. Congress was criticized for its insistence upon adding additional appropriations which will assure continuing deficit financing. Fifty-seven percent of the adults believed that spending for even the most desirable Federal programs should be cut back until inflation is brought under control. This view was not shared by the student group where cuts in important or essential programs were opposed.

Recognizing the serious threat of increasing textile imports, 77 percent of the adults favored legislation to regulate imports based upon a share of the U.S. domestic market. It is this concept which is part of the Mills bill which is about to be debated in the House of Representatives as a means for assuring the healthy development of our domestic markets. Free trade without restrictions was more strongly supported by the student group, where only 43 percent supported import-curbing legislation.

Pay-TV found a majority of opposition among both adults and students, with older citizens particularly fearful that the fee television will destroy quality programming now available without charge. A broadened school lunch program drew general support so long as additional aid was directed toward children from needy families. For the first time in these polls, however, there was considerable dissatisfaction expressed with Federal subsidies for children from families which can afford to defray all or a greater share of the cost.

Adults and students opposed the plan for public operation of railroad passenger service. Outlawing farm strikes and a settlement of labor disputes by a Farm Labor Relations Board was given strong support, and the question drew particularly sharp comment about what was alleged to be a growing misuse of the right to strike against the public interest.

Reform of the welfare system drew a heavy endorsement. Still, so many of those responding so vigorously opposed the concept of the guaranteed annual income that the results of this question are in doubt. Anticrime laws should also

be strengthened to provide the Federal Government jurisdiction in the prosecution of charges of bribery of State and local officials in illegal gambling matters. Such an anti-Mafia measure received the most overwhelming support of all the issues in the poll.

Far less support was given to the abolition of occupational and educational deferments from the Selective Service System. Only 47 percent of the adults and 24 percent of the students agreed with the plan to do away with these deferments. Still, there were large

undecided factors with large numbers of comments recognizing the inequities of the draft which fall most heavily upon children of poor families. Such remarks indicated strong support for an all-volunteer Army as a possible means for coping with the unfairness in the present system of involuntary military service.

Antiwater pollution programs received strong support as did measures for dealing with air pollution. Mandatory retirement of Federal judges was approved by a large majority, as the increasing powers of the Federal courts

were viewed with concern and disapproval in a large number of comments. A majority of the people in the poll want less spending for space exploration and support studies of population control measures in future years.

Stronger police authority received support as 62 percent of the adults participating and 54 percent of the students would allow entry into premises without knocking where narcotics law violations are suspected.

The detailed results of the poll are as follows:

[In percent]

	Adults			Students		
	Yes	No	Undecided	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Do you support the present policy of gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam and turning over to the South Vietnamese responsibility for their own defense?	90	6	4	72	15	13
2. Do you favor legislation regulating imported products based upon a percentage of the U.S. domestic market?	77	10	13	43	17	40
3. Do you believe inflation requires broad reductions in Federal spending extending even to such fields as education, medical research, and library assistance?	57	31	12	35	42	23
4. Should the United States withdraw all or a substantial percentage of our troops from Western Europe?	50	34	16	43	36	21
5. Do you believe Congress should act to prohibit pay-TV?	60	27	13	55	28	17
6. Would you support a bill to provide free or reduced-price school lunches to an additional 3,200,000 needy children costing \$100,000,000 a year?	56	33	11	66	17	17
7. Should a public corporation be established to take over railroad passenger service to assure that such service continues?	35	43	22	39	26	35
8. Do you favor legislation establishing a Farm Labor Relations Board to review farm labor disputes while outlawing strikes that would cause permanent loss or damage to crops?	64	21	15	59	16	25
9. Do you favor reform of the public welfare program to provide incentives to work and a minimum welfare payment from the Federal Government?	80	11	9	60	16	24
10. Should it be a Federal crime to bribe State and local government officials in matters dealing with illegal gambling?	85	9	6	71	15	14
11. Should changes in the Selective Service Act eliminate occupational and educational deferments except for students of medicine, dentistry, and the ministry?	47	40	13	24	50	26
12. Do you feel the Federal Government should increase spending to acquire park lands for recreational and conservation purposes?	51	38	11	61	20	19
13. Do you favor a program to combat water pollution by constructing municipal waste treatment facilities costing \$4,000,000,000 in Federal funds and \$6,000,000,000 in State and local funds over 5 years?	79	10	11	69	9	22
14. Should the Constitution be amended to provide a mandatory age for the retirement of Federal judges?	75	15	10	47	24	29
15. Do you believe spending for the space program should be reduced?	65	26	9	54	30	16
16. Do you favor a Federal study on U.S. population growth and possible methods of control?	64	24	12	59	19	22
17. Should judges be empowered to issue search warrants allowing entry into premises without knocking in cases where violation of narcotics laws is suspected?	62	32	6	54	28	18
18. Do you favor increased Federal authority and financial assistance in the establishment and enforcement of air quality standards?	70	15	15	53	34	13

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in these days of bitter argument concerning the war in Vietnam, the human values of this tragic conflict are often in question. Too often, it seems to me, expert propagandists cast serious aspersions upon the purposes of our involvement and a distorted view is left with the American people.

A short time ago, Mr. Noah A. Pitts of Morganton, N.C., a young veteran of Vietnam service who is now attending college in North Carolina, wrote a letter of sincere support of the Nixon administration's policies in Southeast Asia. There is no doubt that his views have been strongly influenced by a deeply impressed personal experience with the people of one village in Vietnam. I want to share this young man's letter with the Congress since, as he puts it, it tells another side of the Vietnam story. It is a story of tragedy, persistence, and hope which may be far more typical of the strains in this conflict than many Americans have believed. Mr. Pitts' letter is as follows:

Congressman BROYHILL: I am a senior at Pfeiffer College and I would like to reaffirm my support for the Administration's policy in Viet Nam and President Nixon's decision

to send American troops into Cambodia. I went to Washington last November along with 50 other Pfeiffer College students to sound our support for the Administration's Viet Nam policy then, and I would like to again show my support by letter.

During these past months, especially these past weeks in which the President sent our troops into Cambodia, I have become increasingly despondent over the reaction to the President's decision by the students, the news media, and certain political factions. As a Viet Nam veteran I can assure you that I have seen the other side of the Viet Nam story that few if any Americans know exists. Another side that consists not of Mai Lai, not of the black market, but of a people fighting no less than a battle of survival. These people, the peasants and small farmers of South Vietnam, have shown me such an indomitable spirit under such to an American unimaginable conditions that I feel nothing but despair and shame when I see and hear certain factions demand an early Viet Nam pullout before President Nixon's Vietnamization policy has been fully carried to its conclusion.

I would like to cite one example of this spirit. In February of 1969 my battalion, the 7th of the 15th Artillery in the Bong Son area, learned of a small village in Viet Cong controlled territory that wanted to build a schoolhouse. The old schoolhouse had been destroyed by Viet Cong raiders a year before, and the new schoolteacher, a former villager just returned from the university, contacted our security officer concerning the villagers' wish. Our security officer on his own initiative secured a truckload of cement and other building materials from the 2nd Battalion, 173rd AB Brigade, and several volunteers, myself among them, to take the supplies out to the villagers.

We did this, and within a few weeks their beautiful new schoolhouse was a reality. This should have been the happy end to a minor incident but as we found out it was only the beginning. Within a week after its completion, the school lay in ruins, four women and six children were dead, decapitated, and strung upside down on poles in the village square, and several other boys missing as hostages. The Viet Cong, under cover of darkness and a withering mortar barrage, had invaded the village, wrought this destruction, and warned the villagers that further co-operation with Americans would bring new reprisals.

Again the schoolteacher asked only for new materials for a school, and again we brought the necessary goods, and again the new schoolhouse took shape, and again the Viet Cong struck with horrifying results. This process was repeated a third time, and as we entered the village for the third time, I fully expected to see at least a reluctance at our presence. Instead these stoic and courageous people greeted us almost as brothers. The schoolteacher, himself a doomed man with a \$200.00 Viet Cong price on his head, pleaded with me to tell my people how it is over there when I got home, and I am doing so now. I hope you will tell those who really count how it is over there.

I urge you, sir, to do all in your power to defeat any legislation that curtails President Nixon's powers in South Vietnam and in Cambodia. We have given much, but if we stop giving before the South Vietnamese are fully ready to assume their own defense, then we, the American people will be guilty of the death of a people, not hundreds, not thousands, but hundreds of thousands of them.

Very respectfully yours,

NOAH A. PITTS.

LIMITATION ON PRESIDENT'S POWER TO MAKE WAR

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

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to limit the authority of the President of the United States to intervene abroad or to make war without the express consent of the Congress. A number of bills have already been introduced on this subject in recent months, including particularly H.R. 17598 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL), with a number of cosponsors, and H.R. 18205 by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY), also with a number of cosponsors.

I am in agreement with the sponsors of these measures that it is essential for the Congress to reassert its authority in this area. This is so not only because of our experience in Indochina, but also because in recent weeks President Nixon seems to be asserting that the President, in his role as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, has full authority to carry on hostilities abroad and that this authority is not subject to limitation by the Congress. This assertion of power by the President seems to be in direct contravention of the authority to declare war which was granted to the Congress in the Constitution, and which should not become a nullity simply because declarations of war have in recent decades gone out of fashion.

Upon first examination of the Fascell bill, H.R. 17598, I was much impressed by it, and indeed I introduced an identical bill, H.R. 17915. However, after further reflection and after studying the testimony of a number of witnesses who have appeared before the Subcommittee on National Security Policy and Scientific Development in its hearings on the Fascell bill and like measures, I have come to the reluctant conclusion that what the Fascell bill attempts to do is impossible.

The basic thrust of the Fascell bill is to attempt to define the situations in which the President shall have the authority to deploy Armed Forces of the United States outside the United States or any territory for "other than peaceful purposes." The bill specifically states that "the President of the United States shall not deploy Armed Forces of the United States outside the United States or any territory subject to its jurisdiction" except as provided in the bill.

There are two difficulties with this approach. First, I believe it is simply impossible to spell out all the contingencies in which the President ought to be able to move quickly without the specific authorization of the Congress. As legislators—indeed as human beings—we are simply not wise to enough to be able to think of all the contingencies that might arise. Of course, one could readily draw up a list of contingencies that would be more complete than the ones set forth in the Fascell bill, but the Congress and the American people could never be sure that the list was complete.

The second problem with the Fascell bill approach is that, once the President finds that he has authority to deploy American forces—and presumably engage in hostilities—abroad, all he has to do is to notify Congress to that effect. From then on, he has a blank check to do whatever he pleases. This situation is all too reminiscent of the one that followed the passage of the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

In other words, the Fascell bill, while intending to limit the authority of the President, might in the end greatly broaden it and leave Congress with no mechanism whereby the authority granted to the President might be withdrawn or revoked.

The Findley-Javits bill also attempts to specify the circumstances under which the President may engage in hostilities in the absence of a declaration of war, but provides that the authority so granted may be promptly terminated by joint resolution of the Congress and in any case shall not extend beyond 30 days unless specifically approved in "affirmative legislative action" by the Congress. The bill contains provisions designed to assure that the action of the Congress, either to affirmatively approve what the President has done or to disapprove it, may not be frustrated by use of a filibuster.

Again, the attempt to set forth the contingencies under which the President is authorized to initiate hostilities is, in my judgment, unsuccessful, in the sense that the President's hands might be tied under circumstances that could prove tragic. For example, it is not at all clear that President Truman could have acted as fast as he did in Korea in 1950 if the Findley bill—or the Fascell bill—had been previously enacted into law. It is easy to imagine a similar situation developing in the Middle East if Israel were to be the victim of a sudden attack by the Soviet Union and the Arab States together; I doubt that many Members of the House would want to see the President unable to react immediately. Yet neither the Findley-Javits bill nor the Fascell bill covers such a contingency.

The Findley-Javits bill suffers from another grave drawback, to wit, that, if the Congress does act during the 30-day period to authorize the President to carry on the hostilities in question, then, as in the case of the Fascell bill, the President has a blank check to proceed as he sees fit from there on out. The Congress might well be swept up in the enthusiasm of the moment to give the President authority that it might later regret. Again, our dismal experience under the Tonkin resolution comes to mind.

Bearing in mind what seems to me the shortcomings of the Fascell bill and of the Findley-Javits bill, I have with some trepidation attempted to draft a bill which draws upon both but differs from both. The essential idea of my bill is to give to the President broad authority to move quickly under a variety of circumstances, but to provide that this authority can be annulled at any

time by adverse action in either House of the Congress.

I have attempted to draw up a series of contingencies under which the President would be authorized to engage in hostile action which is broader than the set of contingencies contained either in the Fascell bill or the Findley-Javits bill.

In my bill the President would not be required to obtain affirmative authorization from the Congress within 30 days as provided in the Findley-Javits bill. The main reason for this is to avoid the open-ended authority thereafter that strikes me as so dangerous.

The idea that either House of the Congress should have the authority to annul the President's temporary authority to conduct hostilities has a precedent in the Executive Reorganization Act. There are, of course, differences. First, under the Executive Reorganization Act, the President merely submits a proposal to the Congress which he cannot carry out if either House disapproves, and second, the disapproval by either House must come within 60 days.

Obviously in the case of military hostilities, the President would be unduly restricted if he could only submit a proposal. The question of whether a time limit should be imposed on the power of either House to disapprove is more difficult. I have come to the conclusion that there should be no such time limit. In doing so, I have again had in mind the experience we have had in Indochina under the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

In effect, what my bill is saying is that the Congress should be in a position to change its mind about the desirability of the continuation of certain hostilities at any point in time. Clearly the President has that right. The Congress should have no less.

The question will no doubt be posed, why would it not be sufficient to provide that the Congress acting through joint or concurrent resolution would be able to annul the authority of the President? My feeling about this is that the authority of the President to carry on hostilities against a foreign power is so far reaching and so extraordinary that it should not be extended beyond the point at which one House of the Congress decides by a majority vote that it should be terminated. There is, I believe, a sound rationale for this conclusion.

What we are talking about here is the question to what extent the President should have authority to deploy armed forces overseas and carry on hostilities without a declaration of war or a specific authorization by the Congress. Now either a declaration of war or a specific authorization would require the concurrence of both Houses. If either House decided that it was unwise to give the President such authority that would be sufficient to prevent the authority from being exercised. It follows that, where no express authorization is conferred by the Congress, disapproval by one House should be sufficient to terminate the temporary authority granted under the law to provide for emergency contingencies.

The text of the bill I am introducing is as follows:

H.R. 18539

A bill to limit the authority of the President of the United States to intervene abroad or to make war without the express consent of the Congress

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States, in the absence of a declaration of war or specific authorization of the Congress, shall not deploy Armed Forces of the United States outside the United States or any territory subject to its jurisdiction for other than peaceful purposes and shall not direct or authorize Armed Forces of the U.S. to engage in any hostile action against the Armed Forces, territory or nationals of any foreign power, except that the President is authorized to take such action—

(1) When he finds that the United States or any territory subject to its jurisdiction is under attack or imminent threat of attack; or

(2) When he finds that such action is necessary to protect the lives of United States nationals; or

(3) When he finds that such action is necessary to repulse an attack or imminently threatened attack upon Armed Forces of the United States; or

(4) When he finds that such action is necessary to comply with an obligation of the United States contained in a duly ratified treaty or agreement approved by the Congress; or

(5) When he finds that such action is necessary to prevent the destruction of a friendly state as a result of aggression by hostile forces and that timely collective action pursuant to the Charter of the United Nations or other international organization cannot reasonably be anticipated.

As soon as possible, and not later than twenty-four hours, after making such finding, the President shall notify the Congress of his finding and of all action he has taken pursuant to it, together with the reasons therefor. In the event the Congress is not in session, the President shall convene the Congress in extraordinary session.

Sec. 2. (a) The authority conferred upon the President under Section 1 to deploy Armed Forces of the United States and to direct or authorize such Armed Forces to engage in hostile action, in the absence of a declaration of war or specific authorization of the Congress, shall terminate upon the adoption by either House of the Congress of a resolution disapproving continuance of the action taken.

(b) Any such resolution of disapproval shall, if sponsored or cosponsored by one-third of the Members of the House of Congress in which it originates, be considered reported to the floor of such House no later than one day following its introduction, unless the Members of such House otherwise determine by yeas and nays and any resolution so reported shall immediately become the pending business of the House to which it is reported, and shall be voted upon within three days after such report, unless such House shall otherwise determine by yeas and nays.

(c) Upon the adoption of any such resolution of disapproval, the President shall proceed at once to effectuate the immediate withdrawal to the U.S. or any territory subject to its jurisdiction of the U.S. forces involved, having due regard to the need to protect such forces from attack while in the process of withdrawal.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. BURKE of Florida (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the week of

July 20, 1970, on account of official business.

Mr. RYAN of New York (at the request of Mr. KOCH) for week of July 20, 1970, on account of illness.

Mr. PEPPER of Florida (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. GRAY of Illinois (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAILSBACK) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MESKILL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HOGAN, for 20 minutes, today.
Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTEN) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MINISH, for 10 minutes, today.
Mr. LEGGETT, for 60 minutes, on July 23.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. POLLOCK to revise and extend his remarks before passage of S. 778.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAILSBACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VANDER JAGT.
Mr. SCHERLE in five instances.
Mr. HALPERN
Mr. HORTON in four instances.
Mr. BURTON of Utah in five instances.
Mr. CARTER.
Mr. SPRINGER.
Mr. BURKE of Florida.
Mr. CLANCY.
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. KING in two instances.
Mr. HUNT in two instances.
Mr. MINSHALL in two instances.
Mr. FOREMAN.
Mr. SNYDER in two instances.
Mr. KEITH in two instances.
Mr. ROBISON.
Mr. MORSE.
Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in 10 instances.

Mr. SHADEBERG.
Mr. BESTER.
Mr. LANDGREBE.
Mr. LUKENS.
Mr. HOGAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PATTERN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. MONAGAN in two instances.
Mr. STOKES in three instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland.
Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. EILBERG in three instances.
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. GRIFFIN in three instances.
Mr. ANDERSON of California.
Mr. MURPHY of New York.
Mr. BINGHAM in four instances.
Mr. REES in three instances.
Mr. FOUNTAIN in three instances.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.
Mr. FISHER in four instances.

Mr. HÉBERT.
Mr. HARRINGTON in two instances.
Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in 10 instances.
Mr. HOLIFIELD.
Mr. PODELL.
Mr. SCHEUER.
Mr. BARING in two instances.
Mr. REUSS in six instances.
Mr. TIERNAN.
Mr. CONYERS in five instances.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. WOLFF in two instances.
Mr. ECKHARDT.
Mr. HATHAWAY.

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. 311. An act for the relief of James Glen Ramsay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 378. An act for the relief of James E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Donal E. McConagel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1804. An act for the relief of William H. Morning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1830. An act to provide for the settlement of certain land claims of Alaska natives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2755. An act for the relief of Donal N. O'Callaghan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2834. An act for the relief of John Borbridge, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3138. An act for the relief of Ruth E. Calvert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 14452. An act to provide for the designation of special policemen at the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14453. An act to authorize the Public Printer to grant time off as compensation for overtime worked by certain employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills 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. 1046. An act to protect consumers by providing a civil remedy for misrepresentation of the quality of articles composed in whole or part of gold or silver and for other purposes;

S. 1456. An act to amend section 8c(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and subsequent legislation, so as to permit marketing orders applicable to apples to provide for paid advertising; and

S. 3274. An act to implement the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration reported that that committee did on July 16, 1970, present to the President for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

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;

H.R. 12758. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a volunteers in the park program, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 16595. An act to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 21, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

JUNE 11, 1970.

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

Pursuant to clause 4 of rule XXVII (see rule on page 7), I, MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, move to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 264) entitled "A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women," which was referred to said committee January 16, 1969, in support of which motion the undersigned Members of the House of Representatives affix their signatures, to wit:

1. Martha W. Griffiths.
2. Thomas M. Rees.
3. Charles A. Vanik.
4. Henry B. Gonzalez.
5. Lloyd Meeds.
6. Edith Green.
7. Roman C. Pucinski.
8. Abner J. Mikva.
9. Richard T. Hanna.
10. Margaret M. Heckler.
11. Claude Pepper.
12. William L. Clay.
13. Samuel N. Friedel.
14. Clarence D. Long.
15. Richard L. Ottinger.

16. Henry Helstoski.
17. Shirley Chisholm.
18. Augustus F. Hawkins.
19. John E. Moss.
20. Frank Annunzio.
21. Edwin W. Edwards.
22. Allard K. Lowenstein.
23. Donald M. Fraser.
24. Lionel Van Deerlin.
25. John Buchanan.
26. George H. Fallon.
27. Florence P. Dwyer.
28. Benjamin S. Rosenthal.
29. Harley O. Staggers.
30. James A. Byrne.
31. Floyd V. Hicks.
32. Harold R. Collier.
33. Glenn M. Anderson.
34. Harold T. Johnson.
35. Wayne L. Hays.
36. Mario Biaggi.
37. Thomas E. Morgan.
38. William S. Moorhead.
39. William T. Murphy.
40. Edward I. Koch.
41. Kenneth J. Gray.
42. Jeffery Cohelan.
43. Robert H. Mollohan.
44. Brock Adams.
45. Arnold Olsen.
46. Frank E. Evans.
47. Robert N. C. Nix.
48. Edward P. Boland.
49. Ray J. Madden.
50. David R. Obey.
51. Richard H. Fulton.
52. Joseph P. Addabbo.
53. Spark M. Matsunaga.
54. Cornelius E. Gallagher.
55. Robert W. Kastenmeier.
56. Walter S. Baring.
57. George E. Brown, Jr.
58. Sam Gibbons.
59. Charles H. Griffin.
60. James A. Burke.
61. Don Edwards.
62. John Jarman.
63. Charles W. Whalen, Jr.
64. Samuel S. Stratton.
65. Frank Horton.
66. James G. Fulton.
67. Harold D. Donohue.
68. Philip J. Philbin.
69. Edward A. Garmatz.
70. Andrew Jacobs, Jr.
71. Lester L. Wolff.
72. Joseph G. Minish.
73. Joe L. Ewins.
74. Keith G. Sebelius.
75. John Wold.
76. Edwin D. Eshleman.
77. Paul Findley.
78. William S. Broomfield.
79. Earle Cabell.
80. Richardson Preyer.
81. William A. Barrett.
82. John C. Kluczynski.
83. James Kee.
84. Wilbur D. Mills.
85. Robert M. Gialmo.
86. Tom Steed.
87. William L. Springer.
88. John V. Tunney.
89. Morris K. Udall.
90. Julia Butler Hansen.
91. Glenn Cunningham.
92. Richard L. Roudebush.
93. Wayne N. Aspinall.
94. Seymour Halpern.
95. Tom S. Gettys.
96. John J. McFall.
97. Walter B. Jones.
98. Martin B. McKneally.
99. Robert L. F. Sikes.
100. John E. Hunt.
101. Clark MacGregor.
102. Jonathan B. Bingham.
103. B. F. Sisk.
104. Michael Harrington.
105. Ogden R. Reid.
106. Frank M. Clark.
107. James C. Corman.
108. Thomas P. O'Neill Jr.
109. Alton Lennon.
110. Torbert H. MacDonald.
111. Melvin Price.
112. Carleton J. King.
113. Donald E. Lukens.
114. John M. Slack.
115. John Brademas.
116. Catherine May.
117. Joseph E. Karth.
118. Tom Beville.
119. Otto E. Passman.
120. W. C. Daniel.
121. George E. Shipley.
122. Chet Holifield.
123. John W. Davis.
124. Robert E. Jones.
125. Charles S. Gubser.
126. Gilbert Gude.
127. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr.
128. Frank J. Brasco.
129. John Melcher.
130. Carl D. Perkins.
131. Dante B. Fascell.
132. Thomas S. Foley.
133. Joseph M. Gaydos.
134. Nick Galifianakis.
135. David Pryor.
136. Brad Morse.
137. Phil M. Landrum.
138. J. J. Pickle.
139. John H. Dent.
140. Bill Nichols.
141. Paul G. Rogers.
142. Al Ullman.
143. Frank A. Stubblefield.
144. Charles C. Diggs, Jr.
145. Dominick V. Daniels.
146. Joseph P. Vigorito.
147. Robert O. Tiernan.
148. Bill D. Burlison.
149. Jack Brinkley.
150. William F. Ryan.
151. Barber B. Conable, Jr.
152. Don H. Clausen.
153. Philip M. Crane.
154. Bob Eckhardt.
155. Ed Edmondson.
156. Daniel J. Flood.
157. Edward R. Roybal.
158. Mendel Rivers.
159. Wright Patman.
160. Bill Alexander.
161. John M. Murphy.
162. Thomas L. Ashley.
163. John M. Zwach.
164. Fred Schwengel.
165. Richard D. McCarthy.
166. William D. Widnall.
167. Richard Bolling.
168. Henry S. Reuss.
169. Jerry L. Pettis.
170. Jacob H. Gilbert.
171. William R. Anderson.
172. Lee H. Hamilton.
173. John Conyers, Jr.
174. William H. Natcher.
175. Charles M. Teague.

176. Thaddeus J. Dulski.
177. Ray Blanton.
178. Leonard Farbstein.
179. John L. McMillan.
180. Jack McDonald.
181. Philip E. Ruppe.
182. Guy Vander Jagt.
183. John Young.
184. Lowell P. Weicker, Jr.
185. Daniel E. Button.
186. John Dowdy.
187. Silvio O. Conte.
188. James M. Hanley.
189. John H. Rousselot.
190. J. Irving Whalley.
191. John C. Culver.
192. Watkins M. Abbitt.
193. Peter Kyros.
194. Jim Wright.
195. Thomas M. Pelly.
196. Joel T. Broyhill.
197. James C. Cleveland.
198. Howard W. Robison.
199. Tim Lee Carter.
200. Hale Boggs.
201. Ben Reifel.
202. Charles H. Wilson.
203. G. William Whitehurst.
204. Dan Kuykendall.
205. Wilmer D. Mizell.
206. Charlotte T. Reid.
207. Alvin E. O'Konski.
208. Louis Frey, Jr.
209. James F. Hastings.
210. Sam Steiger.
211. R. L. Coughlin.
212. John J. Duncan.
213. John T. Rhodes.
214. Albert H. Quie.
215. John O. Marsh.
216. Rogers C. B. Morton.
217. Charles A. Mosher.
218. John Dellenback.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2221. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report of a third-country transfer of U.S. origin defense articles to which the U.S. Government has given consent under the provisions of section 505(a)(4) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2222. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Closed Basin division. San Luis Valley project, Colorado, pursuant to section 9(a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) (H. Doc. 91-369); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

2223. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according to certain beneficiaries third and sixth preference classification, pursuant to section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2224. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 12, 1969, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Choptank River, Caroline County, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Rep-

resentatives, adopted June 3, 1959. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been approved by the Chief of Engineers for accomplishment under the provisions of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

2225. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report on the National Visitor Center and all other visitor facilities authorized in accordance with Public Law 90-264; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. PATMAN: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3685 (Rept. No. 91-1311). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 18110. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend the programs of assistance to the States and localities for comprehensive health planning; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1312). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 18275. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the disposal of surplus Federal property for park and recreational uses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Decennial Population Census and Congressional apportionment (Rept. No. 91-1314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1148. Resolution for consideration of S. 3978, an act to extend the time for conducting the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1971 (Rept. No. 91-1315). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1149. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 15913, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1316). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1150. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 18104, a bill to amend section 15d of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase the amount of bonds which may be issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority (Rept. No. 91-1317). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1151. Resolution waiving points of order against 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. 91-1318). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STAGGERS: Network news documentary practices (Rept. No. 91-1319). 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:

H.R. 18516. A bill to amend section 7275

of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970) to permit airline tickets, with respect to the transportation of persons by air which is subject to Federal tax, as well as the advertising related thereto, to show the amount of such tax separately from the cost of the transportation involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 18517. A bill relating to the control of organized crime in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 18518. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 18519. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 18520. 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. MICHEL:

H.R. 18521. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 18522. A bill to provide for a voluntary system of meeting the military manpower needs of the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 18523. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities of the United States to develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning, and to require an effective plan for the elimination of lead-based paint poisoning as a condition of Federal assistance under certain other programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 18524. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself and Mrs. CHISHOLM):

H.R. 18525. 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. BOW:

H.R. 18526. A bill to assure performance of obligations undertaken by operators of international tour groups; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 18527. 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. FOLEY:

H.R. 18528. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOREMAN:

H.R. 18529. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 18530. 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. HAGAN:

H.R. 18531. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer surplus Liberty ships to States for use in marine life conservation and fishery programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 18532. A bill to end conscription under the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, to provide increased military pay and other benefits necessary to effect a voluntary system of meeting the military manpower requirements of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 18533. A bill to establish an Intergovernmental Commission on Long Island Sound; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 18534. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide a program for honoring industry and other private efforts to contribute to the maintenance and enhancement of environmental quality; to the Commission on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 18535. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of a military department to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands or interests under his control; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 18536. A bill to amend appropriate section of Omnibus Rivers and Harbors bill with respect to western Kentucky tributaries, Kentucky; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 18537. A bill to amend section 7275 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (as added by the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970) to require that airline tickets, with respect to the transportation of persons by air which is subject to Federal tax, show the amount of such tax separately from the cost of the transportation involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 18538. A bill to amend title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a Student Loan Marketing Association; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 18539. A bill to limit the authority of the President of the United States to intervene abroad or to make war without the express consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 18540. A bill to permit actions against the United States for damage to the good name and reputation of members of the Armed Forces wrongfully charged with committing certain crimes against civilians in combat zones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 18541. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the Apollo Moon Landing and to assist in the construction of the National Air and Space Museum; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON (by request):

H.R. 18542. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 in order to establish Federal policy concerning the selection of firms and individuals to perform architectural, engineering, and related services for the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.J. Res. 1312. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.J. Res. 1313. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.J. Res. 1314. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.J. Res. 1315. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 19 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.J. Res. 1316. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.J. Res. 1317. Joint resolution proposing and amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 18543. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Waclawa Tosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 18544. A bill for the relief of Dulce Beatrice Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 18545. A bill for the relief of Clyde W. Deal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

425. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to an international conference to discuss the exploitation of fishery resources in international waters adjacent to the Atlantic shoreline; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

426. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to a national wildlife refuge for South San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

427. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to reimposition of the excess profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

547. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the 182d General Assembly, United Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

548. Also, petition of the Association for Grand Jury Action, Inc., Rochester, N.Y., relative to impeachment proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

549. Also, petition of Andrew Huggins, Avon Park, Fla., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Monday, July 20, 1970

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, infinite and eternal, who orders our daily walk and to whom all history belongs, speak to our hearts as we undertake the tasks of this new week. Send us to our waiting work with fresh vigor, high purpose and new wisdom. In all we do make us aware of Thy rulership, knowing that apart from Thee nothing endures. Make strong our faith in the omnipotence of good and the invincibility of righteousness. Keep us

from satisfaction with the second best when perseverance and faith can achieve the very best. As we work lift our eyes to behold beyond the things which are seen and temporal, the things which are unseen and eternal.

In the name of the Sovereign Lord. 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 of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting