

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 21, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. George G. Oliver, minister emeritus, Dunn Loring United Methodist Church, Dunn Loring, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, who in wisdom has established our Nation through the faith and devotion of our fathers, we give Thee praise for Thy gracious guidance and bountiful providence with which Thou hast prospered each generation. Through peril and storm Thou hast led us with the light of truth in the path of liberty. Mercifully Thou hast recalled us from error, division, and strife to holy ways of freedom. Today we humbly pray that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor, and glad to do Thy will. Grant that our statesmen and others in places of authority may have the guidance of Thy spirit as they endeavor to keep our land forever "bright with freedom's holy light." We ask in Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2104. An act for the relief of Milton Kyhos.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS B. STANLEY

(Mr. DANIEL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Virginia has lost a beloved citizen and noble statesman in the passing of Thomas Bahnson Stanley. A life of service and achievement distinguished the career of the illustrious former member of this body and Governor of Virginia, and placed him in the league with giants among men.

Governor Stanley was born on a farm in Henry County, Va., on July 16, 1890, the youngest child of Susan Walker and Crockett Stanley. Although born into an environment where material wealth was absent, Tom Stanley was reared in a home in which priceless character-building ideals were instilled and which later were to serve him well. Early in life, Tom Stanley set sight on his goals and embarked on a course which was to bring him distinction and lasting respect.

Realizing the value of education and using a life insurance policy as collateral, the youthful Stanley borrowed money

from a bank in order to obtain tuition to enroll in Eastman Business College at Poughkeepsie, N.Y. After graduation, he returned to his native county in Virginia and began a long and highly successful business career. Banking was his first calling, and the young man lent his energies as bookkeeper, teller, and cashier to banks in Ridgeway, Martinsville, and Rural Retreat, Va. His experience in this field later earned him the accolade of president and director of the First National Bank of Bassett, Va.

In 1918, Stanley was married to Anne Pocahontas Bassett, daughter of one of the Nation's leading furniture manufacturers who previously had refused a job to the then freshly graduated Stanley. Later, after obtaining an interest in and serving in several managerial capacities of his new father-in-law's furniture factory, Tom established his own plant. Thus, in 1924, the Stanley Furniture Co. was started, and the surrounding community—which owed its birth to the enterprise of young Stanley—was appropriately named "Stanleytown."

At this time, another phase of this energetic young man's career was taking shape. Henry County citizens witnessed the untiring efforts and ability of the young leader in their midst and elected him as their representative to the Virginia House of Delegates in 1930. During his 16-year term in the Virginia General Assembly, Stanley served as speaker from 1942-46 and as chairman of the Rules Committee. In 1946, the Fifth District of Virginia elected him as their Representative in Congress to replace the late Congressman Thomas G. Burch, who had been appointed to fill the unexpired term of the late U.S. Senator Carter Glass.

Stanley served in Congress until submitting his resignation on February 3, 1953, to enter the campaign for Governor of his beloved Virginia. Holding the Governorship from 1954-58, Governor Stanley led the Commonwealth through one of the most difficult periods of her colorful and distinguished history. The Governor from Henry County brought to government operations his expertise in business principles and, although he had inherited a State treasury which was somewhat weak, he left for the succeeding Governor State coffers which contained a substantial surplus. During his term, he was vitally interested in improving the highway system and emphasized highway safety. Also, his Governorship was characterized by industrial development and the reorganization of the State department of mental hygiene and hospitals. Further, he and his charming wife enriched Virginia's historic heritage by the restoration of the Governor's mansion in Richmond.

After completion of his term as Governor, Tom Stanley returned to Stanleytown, where he continued his farming and business interests. Although in semi-retirement, the Governor was more active in later life than many individuals are

during their prime. The Governor and Mrs. Stanley both gave unselfishly of their resources and energies to the betterment of the community and the State. They were philanthropists in the true sense of the word, committing themselves totally to such worthwhile projects as their church, scholarship funds, and the development of Ferrum Junior College—of which the Governor was a trustee. Indeed, the very existence of the Stanley Library at Ferrum Junior College will be an eternal memorial to the generosity and devotion of the late Governor from Henry County, Va.

Governor Stanley is survived by his lovely and devoted wife; a daughter, Mrs. Hugh H. Chatham, of San Francisco, Calif.; Thomas B. Stanley, Jr. and John David Stanley, both of Stanleytown; 10 grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. All the members of his family have my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Stanley was a great and good man. He was more than a Representative and a Governor to me. He was a close personal friend, whose sound advice and counsel was always freely given. He was a man of few words, lacking the golden-tongued oratory of many of Virginia's forefathers. But, he was a man of wisdom; and when he spoke, men listened. Tom Stanley was heralded as a great family man, surely an attribute worthy of the highest recognition. He instilled in his three children the qualities which made him great—frugality, fairness, and tolerance. Tom Stanley was a man of compassion, fairmindedness, and respect for others. He possessed the proper degree of unflinching determination, dedication, and perseverance.

Tom Stanley was a man who loved America deeply. Although without the benefit of formal education, without cultural advantages and devoid of material wealth in early years, the late Governor Stanley recognized that through the free enterprise system, he was permitted to choose a course in life and develop his potential. Tom Stanley was a statesman of the highest quality; superior in character and integrity, yet humble and understanding in his associations; and his life of dedicated service to his fellow man will be an inspiration to future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I mourn the loss of a great friend—but thousands of others share with me that sense of personal grief. However, we share, too, a sense of pride in the uncommon life and eminent career of our late fellow Virginian—Thomas B. Stanley.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD editorials on the late Governor Stanley from the Danville Register, as well as the Stuart Enterprise and Martinsville Bulletin. To preface those, I insert an excerpt about him from an article on Virginia's Chief Executives which appeared in the Commonwealth magazine in February 1969.

The material follows:

THOMAS B. STANLEY

Thomas B. Stanley—or Bahnse, as his fellow Governors called him—aimed never to say one syllable more than he could back up at that very moment. If you asked him at any hour during a campaign whether it was night or day, he would glance first at that orb in the sky to check whether it was the sun or the moon.

When Mr. Stanley announced for Governor, someone asked, casually, why he wanted to be Virginia's Chief Executive. The newsmen waited for resounding phrases—pressures of the people . . . the call to service . . . the challenge of the times . . .

Well, said Mr. Stanley, he always had tried to rise to the top in whatever he undertook.

An aide suggested hurriedly that the candidate might wish to frame a more formal statement.

Mr. Stanley retired to a desk at which he wrote for a while on a pad, and then stood up and said, no, he believed he'd just leave it at that. He wanted to go to the top.

[From the Danville (Va.) Register, July 12, 1970]

THOMAS BAHNSON STANLEY

Death has claimed Thomas B. Stanley just five days before his 80th birthday. The end came in a Martinsville hospital early Saturday morning. His demise brought expressions from all across Virginia, and deservedly so. Tom Stanley was an extraordinary man whose years were filled with achievement and service—a combination that sets one apart.

He grew up a poor farm boy who entered banking and made a success in that field. Then he became aware of the opportunities for industrial development and for personal profit in the fabrication of furniture from Virginia's hardwoods. Instead of entering the furniture businesses of his wife's family, he established a small factory of his own in Henry County and the community that grew around it as the industry grew took his name. It was in name and in fact Stanleytown.

An interest in public affairs led him to offer for the House of Delegates from Henry County in 1930 and he was elected. He became an influential member of the House and, in 1942, was elected its Speaker. He ended his legislative service in 1946 to run for Congress as successor to Rep. Thomas G. Burch of Martinsville, who had moved over to the U.S. Senate by appointment of Governor Tuck. In Congress, Mr. Stanley served until 1953 when he resigned to campaign for governor.

Governor Stanley was inaugurated in January, 1954, and immediately was confronted with a problem. He had campaigned on a no-increase in taxes platform, yet during the two months between his election and his inauguration he had become convinced that continued improvement of Virginia's highways required seeking more funds. He let his conscience be his guide—as he generally did—and asked a General Assembly that was not at all receptive to the idea to impose an increase of 1 cent in the gasoline tax. It did not comply but Tom Stanley had shown the General Assembly and the people of Virginia that he would change his mind when circumstances justified a change in attitude and in program.

There were two other challenges that came to Governor Stanley and measured the man. One was the May 17, 1954, decision of the U.S. Supreme Court holding racial segregation of public schools to be illegal. The other was the outdated system of operating the state's Mental Hospitals System.

Shortly after the court decision outlawing segregation, Governor Stanley summoned a group of 32 outstanding people to consider

all aspects of the problems of compliance and to recommend a course of action for the Commonwealth. This body, known as the Gray Commission after its chairman, Senator Garland Gray, recommended a freedom of choice policy. The General Assembly, reflecting sentiment among the people, took a hard-line stance that became known as Massive Resistance. Governor Stanley exerted himself to see that the policies formulated as a time-gaining procedure for easing the transitions that necessarily would follow, were supported by his administration.

Governor Stanley took some gaff from the press and from the racial militants but he did help smooth the way and frictions were held to a minimum.

The Mental Hospital System had been given lots of lip service but not much modernization over the years. Stanley, who was a short-horn Hereford grower, looked over the hospital "farms" and found the most expensive and also a quite extensive system of dairy cattle operations. As a businessman the cost of milk reaching the patient at the hospitals outraged his sense of propriety. Quietly but effectively, Governor Stanley put all the hospitals out of the farming and dairying business. In earlier years the farms had grown up around the hospitals as part of the occupational therapy available to patients. Even earlier, the insane had been put to such farm work as they could do in the belief that it helped them to pay a part of the cost of their support.

Governor Stanley separated the medical and the administrative operations of the hospitals and placed each in charge of a competent official directly responsible to the Governor. The changes and the results were beneficial. Among them was employment of 550 more people to help care for the mentally ill instead of dairy cattle.

During his term of office there was an inclination in certain intellectual circles to downgrade the businessman governor. This attitude vanished as time proved that Mr. Stanley brought to the office of chief magistrate of the Commonwealth many assets that far outweighed a lack of glibness.

Thomas B. Stanley was a credit to his home community of Spencer, where he was born. He was a credit to Henry County which he served in the General Assembly. He was a credit to the Fifth Congressional District which he served in Congress. He was a credit to Virginia which he governed during trying times. And he was a businessman who was highly successful by all the yardsticks of commerce. He also was a gentleman who won and retained friends because he gave of himself and of his energies and substance where they could be of the greatest assistance.

[From the Stuart Enterprise and Martinsville Bulletin, July 15, 1970]

GOVERNOR STANLEY DIES AFTER LONG SERVICE TO PEOPLE OF VIRGINIA

Henry County's most illustrious citizen is dead.

Thomas Bahnson Stanley, Henry County's senior statesman, died quietly Friday night in Martinsville Memorial Hospital five days shy of his 80th birthday after apparently being on the way to recovery from a mild heart attack suffered at his home five days earlier.

Thus ended a life marked by exemplary proof of the goals one can accomplish through strength of character, determination and dedication.

Thomas Bahnson Stanley was born a poor man but he was reared in a home whose environment engendered respect for others, hard work and independence of thought and action when the rights of others were not infringed upon.

When he was 17 years old, he felt the urge

to move from his environment to other fields and slipped away one night, walked to Bassett and caught a train for Roanoke. He was looking for a job but found none there. He went on to Maybeury, W. Va. He helped clean coal cars and to bring coal out of the mines for two months.

Family ties called, along with a feeling of responsibility, and he returned home to help save that year's crop on his parental farm near Preston.

One thing he had learned on that trip was that a better education was needed if he were to find employment in the business world. He decided he would attend Eastman National Business College in Poughkeepsie, N.Y., about which he had heard from a friend. Using a life insurance policy as collateral, he borrowed tuition money from a bank here and took off in search of a higher education.

He was graduated there and came back home in 1912 at the age of 22. He went to Bassett for a job and was turned down by the late John D. Bassett, Sr., who was later to become his father-in-law.

He then went to Winston-Salem, where he became a bookkeeper for R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. with a salary of \$40 a month.

After working there for a while, he returned to Henry County and looked after the affairs of the E. L. Knight Distillery at Ridgeway. Ambitious, hard-working and efficient, Mr. Stanley looked for even more to do. In 1913, when he was 23, he accepted a supplementary job in the Bank of Ridgeway. He worked in the bank in the mornings and at the distillery in the afternoons and evenings.

He moved from there to the First National Bank of Martinsville, becoming general bookkeeper and teller on July 1, 1914. In less than two years, he was offered a position as cashier of the First National Bank of Rural Retreat and he went there, assuming the additional responsibilities of caring for his mother, who had been recently widowed, and a foster sister.

In October, 1918, after he had been at Rural Retreat for about two years, he was married to Miss Anne Pocahontas Bassett. The Bassett furniture empire was growing steadily and was branching out. Later in 1919 his father-in-law, J. D. Bassett Sr., and the late Bunyan C. Vaughan purchased a furniture factory in Galax and Tom Stanley bought an interest in the firm—Vaughan-Bassett. He served as a vice-president of this new firm for less than a year.

At that time he was asked by the elder Mr. Bassett to come to Bassett to accept managerial responsibilities for the Bassett plants, which he did and in 1923, he decided to establish his own plant and ground for Stanley Furniture Co. was broken in early 1924 on its present site at Stanleytown, which, of course, was named for him.

The business was an instant success and thus two facets of Tom Stanley's life had been established—business and farming—in which he continued an active interest until he died.

The third career was about to begin. In 1929, Henry County Republicans nominated him as their candidate for the Virginia House of Delegates. He declined, saying he had always been a member of the Democratic Party. But Henry County wanted him in the House of Delegates and two weeks later the Democrats picked him as their nominee. He won, took his seat in 1930 and served for 16 consecutive years, with three terms being as Speaker of that body.

It was during those 16 years that Tom Stanley won a reputation throughout Virginia as being fair-minded, competent and impartial in his dedication to his home community and the Commonwealth. He was being mentioned widely as a possible candi-

date for Governor. But, the party, meanwhile, suffered the loss through death of one of its senators, Carter Glass, and the late Congressman Thomas G. Burch was appointed to fill his unexpired term.

Party leaders throughout the Fifth District immediately rallied behind Tom Stanley and he subsequently was elected to Congress, serving from 1946 until 1953, when he resigned to seek the Governorship. He won that office and served from 1954 until 1958—the only native of Henry County ever to earn that distinction.

Mr. Stanley carried his business talents and abilities to Richmond and won the admiration and respect of his fellow Virginians for the competent, calm, discreet and gentlemanly manner in which he went about his duties.

After his term as Governor, he returned to Stanleytown and to his business and farming interests. Nonetheless, he remained a willing counsellor for his party and assisted succeeding administrations in various capacities.

He also continued to devote considerable time to the various philanthropies to which he and Mrs. Stanley were committed, such as their church, scholarship funds, Ferrum Junior College and the like.

Here was a man indeed, who gave himself and his energies and his substance to the service of his community, his county, his state and his nation to an uncommon degree. His influence will long be felt and his memory long respected here in Henry County and throughout the Commonwealth.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to read of the death of our former colleague, the late Governor of Virginia, Tom Stanley, which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL) just announced.

Mr. Speaker, Tom Stanley was one of the finest gentlemen that anyone could ever meet, broad, fine, noble, with an understanding mind, and one of the most public spirited officials I have ever served with during my many years of service in the legislative branch of the Government, the Federal Government, and the State government. His contributions while he was a Member of this body were deep and profound and constructive. His contributions as Governor of the great Commonwealth of Virginia will always be uppermost in the pages of the history of that great State.

I join with the Virginia delegation in extending to the loved ones of our late friend Tom Stanley my deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

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

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL), regarding the Honorable Thomas B. Stanley. Mr. Stanley was a close personal friend of mine. I was associated with him when he was in the house of delegates where he served with honor and distinction. He was speaker of the house of delegates for three terms. He then came to Washington as a Member of the House of Representatives. I came here 2 years after Mr. Stanley. He and I were closely associated all the time he was in the House.

Mr. Stanley was a man of honor, in-

tegrity, and dedication. He was steadfast and faithful. As we say in Virginia, one would not be afraid to go bear hunting with him. He was warmhearted.

I extend to his family my deepest sympathy. Tom was loved by all who knew him.

Tom Stanley was a great Virginian and all Virginia mourns his passing. He was one of the outstanding Governors of Virginia.

He was a great family man, a devoted husband, a kind and loving father and a true friend.

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

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with my distinguished colleague and other colleagues from Virginia and others in mourning the passing of a friend of mine, Gov. Tom Stanley. Tom Stanley and I came to Congress together. He immediately placed his stamp of greatness on the House. He was a strong and a great man, yet he was a lovable and kind man. He was a great Virginian and a great American. Above everything else, he was a great human being.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today the House joins in mourning the passing of former Representative Thomas B. Stanley, of Virginia, who served in this House from 1946 until 1953 when he resigned to run successfully for the governorship of his State.

Tom Stanley was a Member of the House when I took my seat here in January 1949 and I served with him for 5 years. I have many fine memories of our friendship. My recollection of him is that he was a fine gentleman and that he served his district, his State, and the Nation with distinction.

At this time I extend my sincere condolences to Governor Stanley's wife, Anne, and to the Stanley family. Governor Stanley's death is a loss to his community, his State, and to the country.

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

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and the distinguished dean of the Virginia delegation, as well as the distinguished majority and minority leaders, in paying tribute to a man who made a name for himself here in a very short period of time.

Tom Stanley was a man of great integrity and tremendous ability, warmth, and courage. He served his country well, he served his State well, and he will long be remembered as a great American.

Mr. Speaker, I join in extending sympathy to his beloved family.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, thousands of my fellow Kentuckians and I were saddened a few days ago to learn of the passing of Thomas B. Stanley of Virginia.

Over the years, we knew him as something more than an outstanding public servant. He was a good neighbor. As Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, he went out of his way to be helpful to my State; and this cooperative spirit is embodied in the establishment of the Breaks Interstate Park.

Kentucky and Virginia are joined in an interstate compact to operate this fine park facility on their borders. It is located in one of the most scenic areas of America, where the Big Sandy River breaks through a major mountain barrier, ultimately to make its way on down to the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers.

It was a wild, inaccessible region, and was probably due to remain unknown except to the strip mine operators; but Kentuckians and Virginians of vision and determination—men like Thomas B. Stanley—intervened and saw that it was preserved as part of the heritage of all Americans.

I first knew Tom Stanley as a Member of this Chamber when I first took my seat here nearly 22 years ago. He had been elected in 1946, and I always admired his grasp of legislative affairs, and his reasonableness in dealing with Members with whom he disagreed.

We are all rather proud when, in 1953, his fellow Virginians called him to the Governorship of his Commonwealth. He knew Virginia intimately through his lifelong study of her ways and her history, and through 16 years as a member of the State legislature, including 4 years as speaker of the house of delegates.

Many able men have occupied the Governorship of Virginia. None was more able than Thomas B. Stanley. And none was more admired and respected than he when he died recently, just a few days before his 80th birthday.

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

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the Virginia House delegation and the other Members of the House of Representatives in paying honor to the late Honorable Thomas Stanley who served as a Member of this body with great distinction. We were all saddened to learn of Judge Stanley's passing and I want to express my deepest sympathy to the members of his family. The late Congressman Stanley left a wonderful record as a legislator and I am happy that I had the privilege and pleasure of serving with him during the time he was representing the State of Virginia in the Halls of Congress. I watched his activities during the time he was serving as Governor of the

great State of Virginia and I do not know of any Governor who did more for the State of Virginia than the late Governor Stanley. I feel that our country and the State of Virginia gained an awful lot through the public services of the late Congressman Stanley. Again, I want to express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to learn of the death of my former colleague from Virginia, the Honorable Thomas B. Stanley. It was my good fortune and pleasure to serve and, on occasion, travel with Tom during his service in this great body from 1946 to 1953.

Tom Stanley was a fine gentleman and a very capable legislator and, of course, he was a friend. He came to Congress with strong credentials as speaker of the Virginia House of Delegates, a body in which he served for 16 years.

He continued to serve his State and the Nation in an able and highly effective manner. The voters of Virginia's Fifth District reelected him three times, before he gave up his seat in Congress to run for Governor of Virginia.

The people of Virginia realized the great qualities of Tom Stanley, and in 1954, he was elected to a 4-year term as Governor of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, Virginia and the Nation have lost one of their finest citizens and most dedicated public servants. Mrs. Andrews and I extend our deepest sympathy to the Stanley family at this time of their great loss.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last week, the hearts of Virginians throughout the Commonwealth were saddened as Thomas B. Stanley's body was returned to the red clay of Henry County in the Piedmont section of the State from which he had sprung almost 80 years before. Tom Stanley was a quiet Virginian who had served his State and Nation steadfastly in public office for almost 30 years.

Mr. Stanley's service was climaxed and concluded by a term as Governor in the trying days of the mid-1950's. Before that time, he had served 7 years here in the House of Representatives and 17 years in the General Assembly of Virginia, during 6 of which he filled the speaker's chair in the house of delegates.

A successful farmer, businessman, industrialist and banker, Tom Stanley was an unassuming self-made millionaire. His personal and business life were dedicated to sound financial principles and he carried these principles with him throughout his career in government. It is rare indeed for an individual to serve in a high executive post in government and leave his constituents at the end of his service in better financial condition than it was when his service began, but that is exactly what Tom Stanley did as Governor of Virginia.

There is no better measure of a man's life than the quality of his service to his fellow man. Tom Stanley was devoted to

Virginia and the Nation both of which he served admirably.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the Congress nearly 18 years ago, one of the first to befriend me was the Representative of Virginia's Fifth Congressional District, which joins our Sixth District on the east.

Tom Stanley was known to me, not personally but by reputation, before I came to the Congress. Even at that time, he had already left his footprints indelibly imprinted in the sands of time. I was, therefore, most flattered when he tendered a frightened freshman Congressman a genuinely warm welcome to this body. More than flattered, I was profoundly grateful.

The word "genuine" somehow seems suited to the character of Tom Stanley. Indeed, in all that he thought, said and did, he was genuine, earnest, sincere, so much so that those about him could not fail to recognize it. During the spring and summer of 1953, the relationship ripened into a friendship which I valued most highly. That fall, he campaigned successfully for Governor of Virginia against my law partner. It is a measure of the strength of our friendship that it was not fractured or marred either by the campaign or the election. The following January, my partner and I jointly attended the Governor's inauguration. As always, he was kind, gracious and gentlemanly.

Mrs. Poff and I join the innumerable caravan of his friends in expressing to his loved ones our most heartfelt sympathy in their time of sorrow.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of a great statesman, the Honorable Thomas B. Stanley of Virginia. In the 7 years that I had the privilege to serve in the House of Representatives with Tom Stanley, I came to have a very deep appreciation for the outstanding ability and dedication of this son of the Old Dominion. This splendid gentleman came to the Congress already a skilled legislator. His 16 years in the Virginia House of Delegates, including 4 years as speaker, gave him a rare insight into legislative procedure, and all of us who knew him benefited from his remarkable parliamentary knowledge and skill. Seldom has a man come to the House so well prepared to take up an active and constructive role in the proceedings of this body, and few men have so vigorously applied their abilities to make the Congress function smoothly and effectively.

It was fitting that this experienced statesman was selected to the Committee on House Administration where he served with distinction, rising to become chairman. Similarly, in his service in the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee he made a meaningful contribution to legislation affecting transportation, communications, and public health. We were fortunate, indeed, to have Tom Stanley in the House of Representatives during those difficult years following World War II.

When Tom Stanley left the House it was to campaign for the Governorship

of Virginia. He won the support of the people, as he had so many times in the past, and served as Governor for 4 productive years. His life is a great American success story—the story of a man who worked his way up from a farmhouse in Henry County, Va., to the Governor's mansion in Richmond.

Mr. Speaker, the Commonwealth of Virginia has produced many great statesmen who have helped to build our Nation. Tom Stanley served in the wonderful tradition of the early Virginia patriots, and I will always appreciate the opportunity I had to know him and to work with him. Although I can speak of his character, his ability, and his accomplishments, words are really inadequate to tell of my feelings for this great man. Tom Stanley was a good and a true friend, and I miss him. My thoughts and prayers are with his family.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I join with others today in paying tribute to the memory of Thomas B. Stanley, former Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia and former Member of the House of Representatives. Governor Stanley's life stands as a monument to public service. The contributions he made to his State and to his country are evidenced by his years of distinguished service here and as the chief executive of the State he so dearly loved.

In looking at his career, he stands forth as a leader. This leadership was not limited just to legislative service here in this body or to executive service in the statehouse. He was a leader in industry and in the economic well-being of his community and of his State. The sound practices of his business and corporate management were reflected in the sound approach to the operation of government and decisionmaking in the legislative process. His judgment, commonsense approach and warm human insights inspired confidence in others and influenced them to follow him.

Devoted to his family, his passing marks not only a deep loss to them, but Virginia has lost one of her most distinguished sons. I join with my colleagues and his other countless friends in extending to his family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I share the regret which has been expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DANIEL) and others, about the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Tom Stanley. It was my privilege to serve with Congressman Stanley, to know his family, and to appreciate the warm friendship which they accorded me. Congressman Stanley, who later became one of Virginia's illustrious Governors, served with great credit and distinction in the House. He was highly regarded on both sides of the aisle for his patriotic motivation and for the able contributions which he made in debate on behalf of the enactment of sound legislation. I continued to enjoy his friendship through the years since he left the Congress and I feel a deep sense of bereavement at his death. My sincere sympathy is extended to all of his family.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character and service of the late Honorable Thomas B. Stanley.

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

There was no objection.

COMMENDATION TO BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE FOR REPORTING BILL TO GIVE PRESIDENT AUTHORITY TO IMPOSE PRICE, WAGE, RENT, AND SALARY CONTROLS

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

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to extend my congratulations to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, and to the members of that committee for having the foresight to report out today a bill giving the President authority to impose price, wage, rent, and salary controls.

Previously we have given the President the same power in respect to credit controls.

I consider it rather anomalous to read in the press each day about inflation and then to see this administration continue a policy which has proved to be totally inadequate in dealing with inflation; namely, to attempt to control inflation by monetary policy alone.

We have had a \$300 billion loss in the securities market in the last 18 months, and we have had increasing unemployment. In some sections of the country we have something that approaches not a recession but a depression, and at the same time the price structure continues to go up.

So I congratulate the gentleman from Texas and the members of his committee for having the foresight to give the President the authority, if he wants to use it.

THE STRONG ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the economy of the United States is strong enough to withstand the words of doom and gloom of the gentleman from Louisiana. The economy of the United States is healthy now and will get healthier in the months ahead because of the sound economic policies of the Nixon administration.

This morning at 11:30 the announcement was made by the Department of Labor that the consumer price index was again at a 0.4-percent increase, which is the second month in a row where it has maintained that level.

The facts are that we are winning the battle against inflation. In the first 3

months of calendar 1970 the cost of living went up slightly over 6 percent.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In the last 3 months—

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman let me conclude?

Mr. BOGGS. Certainly.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In the last 3 months the cost of living has increased at approximately a 4-percent rate.

Let me say with emphasis there is no recession and the words of the gentleman from Louisiana trying to talk us into one will go for naught. The economy is healthy. It will get better. If we continue doing the things that are right, we can win the battle against inflation, which is one that was inherited by this administration from its predecessor.

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Since this administration came to power, the annual rate of increase in the cost of living has been over 6 percent, highest in almost two decades.

The minority leader finds solace in the June increase in cost of living, running at 0.4 of 1 percent for the month. Admittedly, that is slightly improved over the excessive increases since the Republicans assumed office, but it is still increasing faster than the worst rate under Democrats. The average annual rate in 1968 was 4.2 percent, and was at less than 4 percent when Mr. Nixon became President. The 1969 rate, under the Republicans, was 5.4 percent and the 1970 rate has averaged over 5.5 percent in the first 6 months.

Now the gentleman allegedly left the White House some weeks ago and said that the chances of a recession were nil. I wonder what the reaction was on Wall Street where the loss in the security market had been \$300 billion or I wonder what the reaction was of the stockholders of Penn Central who have lost \$2 billion or I wonder what the reaction might be in many places in this country where unemployment is 6 and 7 percent.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if I might, let me make this statement. The nationwide unemployment under the Kennedy administration averaged approximately 5.5 percent. In 1961 it was 6.7 percent. In 1962 it was 5.5 percent. In 1963 it was 5.7 percent. Unemployment under your last two administrations was always higher than it is at the present time except when the manpower commitment in Vietnam increased beginning in late 1964.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

BATTLE AGAINST INFLATION

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this

time only to ask a question which I hoped to be able to ask while the gentleman from Michigan had the floor.

If we are winning the battle against inflation, why is the President, every 2 or 3 days, blaming the Congress for causing inflation?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ALBERT. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The President's concern is not the problem of winning the battle against inflation. Right now we are achieving that result. But unless we act responsibly at the present time in fiscal affairs in the Congress of the United States, all of the good that has been accomplished as of now will go down the drain. That is why Congress must act responsibly on spending authorizations and appropriations. If we do not, we will lose the inflation battle we are winning right now.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the gentleman has given me an answer or not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION FOR HOUSE MANAGERS TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 17619, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 17619) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1971.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1321)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17619) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, 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 amendments numbered 18, 19, 20, 21, 44, and 65.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 41, 48, 49, 50, 51, 59, 61, and 64, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$64,622,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,895,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,159,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$17,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,074,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$11,563,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,591,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$117,986,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,715,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, \$31,310,-

000, of which \$3,465,000 shall be available until expended to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts through assistance to groups and individuals pursuant to section 5(c) of the Act and for support of the functions of the National Council on the Arts set forth in section 6; \$4,125,000 shall be available until expended to the National Endowment for the Arts for assistance pursuant to section 5(g) of the Act; \$11,060,000 shall be available until expended to the National Endowment for the Humanities for support of activities in the humanities pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act; and \$2,660,000 shall be available for administering the provisions of the Act: *Provided*, That in addition, there is appropriated in accordance with the authorization contained in section 11(b) of the Act, to remain available until expended, amounts equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each endowment during the current and preceding fiscal years, under the provisions of section 10(a) (2) of the Act, for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated, but not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the funds appropriated to the National Endowment for the Arts for the purposes of sections 5(c), 5(g), and 6 and not to exceed 3 per centum of the funds appropriated to the National Endowment for the Humanities for the purposes of section 7(c) shall be available for program development and evaluation."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 7, 14, 25, 26, 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 42, 53, 56, 57, 60, 62, and 63.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
DAVID R. OBEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
BEN REIFEL,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
WENDELL WYATT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
GALE W. MCGEE,
J. CALIB BOGGS,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17619) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$58,605,000 for management of lands and resources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$58,940,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$3,310,000 for construction and maintenance as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,215,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$217,-

615,000 for education and welfare services instead of \$218,645,000 as proposed by the House and \$218,678,500 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the amount provided by the Senate includes \$500,000 for teaching and guidance personnel in the public schools, \$250,000 for development courses in Indian language, history, and culture and teacher training programs in local Indian culture and values, \$200,000 for higher education scholarships, \$50,500 for counseling and guidance in public schools, and \$63,000 for teacher aides in public schools.

The conferees are in agreement that \$50,000 included in the bill for the Navajos shall be available for expenses of the faculty at the Navajo Community College.

It is further agreed by the conferees that not less than \$1,300,000 of funds available under this appropriation item shall be made available for operation of the vocational center at the Lewis and Clark Job Corps Center, Fort Lincoln, Bismarck, North Dakota.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$64,622,000 for resources management instead of \$65,690,000 as proposed by the House and \$64,122,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount provided by the Senate includes \$150,000 for forestry development, \$200,000 for soil and moisture conservation, and \$150,000 for development of housing programs.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$19,885,000 for construction instead of \$18,935,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount provided by the Senate includes \$585,000 for the boys' dormitory, Eufaula Indian Boarding School, Oklahoma, and \$500,000 for the San Carlos Indian Irrigation Project, Arizona.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with language as proposed by the Senate to provide \$150,000 for assistance to the Wagner, South Dakota, East Charles Mix Independent School District No. 102, for planning an addition to the District school facilities.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with Senate language which provides that not to exceed \$365,000 may be used for enlargement, remodeling, and improving the Sioux Museum and Crafts Center, Rapid City, South Dakota.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$20,200,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authority) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Provides an increase of \$400 over the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year for police-type vehicles instead of \$300 as proposed by the House and \$500 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$3,895,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$3,825,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,995,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount provided by the House includes \$50,000 for nationwide planning and \$20,000 for preparation of a study of the Mormon Battalion Trail.

Land and Water Conservation

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$4,159,000 for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation instead of \$3,459,000 as proposed by the House and \$4,759,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$357,400,000 for the Land and Water Conservation Fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$168,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$185,400,000 for payments to States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$63,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$96,600,000 for the National Park Service instead of \$95,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$56,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The increase over the amount provided by the Senate includes \$800,000 for Cape Cod National Seashore, and \$800,000 for the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$32,741,000 for the Forest Service as proposed by the Senate instead of \$13,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$8,000,000 for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,541,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$500,000 for the Bureau of Land Management as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to provide \$1,000,000 to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for supplemental allocations to the Federal agencies.

Amendment No. 19: Deletes technical correction proposed by the Senate.

Office of Territories

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$509,000 for the Office of Territories as proposed by the House instead of \$539,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$17,350,000 for administration of territories as proposed by the House instead of \$17,380,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$367,000 for expenses of the Office of the Government Comptroller for the Virgin Islands as proposed by the Senate instead of \$330,000 as proposed by the House.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$49,750,000 for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$106,392,000 for surveys, investigations, and research as proposed by the Senate instead of \$108,057,000 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$46,422,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of \$45,122,000 as proposed by the House and \$45,272,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the Senate allowance includes \$1,000,000 for studies of mining environmental problems and for removal of coal waste banks, and \$150,000 for sampling and characterization of incinerator residues and raw refuse.

Office of Coal Research

Amendment No. 26: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$17,160,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$16,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the Senate allowance includes \$620,000 for the solid electrolyte high temperature fuel cell, \$90,000 for the multi-cell

coal-fired fluidized bed boiler project, and a reduction of \$50,000 for the electrofluidic coal processing project.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$27,893,000 for management and investigations of resources as proposed by the Senate instead of \$28,168,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 28 and 29: Provide language as proposed by the Senate which cite the most recent authorizing legislation and include provision of that Act that funds for anadromous and great lakes fisheries conservation will remain available until expended.

Amendment No. 30: Provides language as proposed by the Senate for administration of Pribilof Islands, which states that of the amount appropriated, so much as may become available during the current fiscal year shall be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 31: Technical correction as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Provides an increase of \$400 over the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year for police-type vehicles instead of \$300 as proposed by the House and \$500 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$56,840,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$56,356,000 as proposed by the House and \$56,705,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House allowance includes \$74,000 for restoration of Steamboat Bertrand, \$150,000 for acquisition of additional waterfowl production areas in North Dakota, \$100,000 for research on the red tide in the New York Bight area, and \$160,000 for an evaluation study on oil spills, atomic waste, steelhead, and additional Columbia River Dams.

Amendment No. 34: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$4,983,000 for construction instead of \$4,175,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,497,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House allowance includes \$220,000 for a water reconditioning system, Lahontan National Fish Hatchery, Nevada; \$292,000 for a water reconditioning system at Leetown National Fish Hatchery, West Virginia; \$196,000 for fish production facilities at Valley City National Fish Hatchery, North Dakota; and \$100,000 for additional facilities at Ouray National Wildlife Refuge, Utah.

Amendments Nos. 35 and 36: Provide language as proposed by the Senate which cite the most recent authorizing legislation and include provision of that act that funds for anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation will remain available until expended.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 37: Provides an increase of \$400 over the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year for police-type vehicles instead of \$300 as proposed by the House and \$500 as proposed by the Senate.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$57,990,000 for management and protection instead of \$57,670,000 as proposed by the House and \$58,035,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the Senate allowance includes \$25,000 for promotion of domestic travel and \$20,000 for master planning.

The conferees are in agreement that of the total amount provided in this appropriation account, \$75,000 shall be available for the student conservation program.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with contingency language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with contingency language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$48,543,000 for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$48,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$16,259,000 for construction instead of \$16,385,000 as proposed by the House and \$17,583,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the Senate amount includes reductions of \$776,000 for anticipated slip-page, \$712,000 for construction of an airport at Jackson Hole, Wyoming, \$11,000 for planning of developments in North Cascades National Park, and increases of \$100,000 for restoration of facilities at Fort Scott National Historic Site, Kansas and \$75,000 for administrative headquarters, Redwood National Park, California.

The conferees are in agreement that the reduction of \$776,000 for anticipated slip-page shall include \$90,000 for the Anchorage Airport, \$322,000 for visitor center improvements at the Everglades National Park, \$300,000 for development of the National Sculpture Garden, and \$64,000 for Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area, Montana.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$17,650,000 for parkway and road construction (liquidation of contract authority) instead of \$16,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$17,660,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction below the Senate allowance includes \$10,000 for planning roads and trails in the North Cascades National Park.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$6,801,000 for preservation of historic properties as proposed by the House instead of \$6,672,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 45: Provides an increase of \$400 over the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year for police-type vehicles instead of \$300 as proposed by the House and \$500 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$7,074,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$6,924,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,229,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the amount proposed by the House includes \$150,000 for legal operations.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates \$11,563,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$11,353,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,771,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions, Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 48: Provides language as proposed by the Senate for air-conditioning equipment for passenger motor vehicles.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$199,617,000 for forest land management as proposed by the Senate instead of \$213,412,700 as

proposed by the House. Construction funds previously under this account have been transferred to the new construction account.

Amendment No. 50: Deletes language, as proposed by the Senate, relating to the appropriation of funds for acquisition of lands under the Weeks Act.

Amendment No. 51: Technical correction as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$45,591,000 for forest research instead of \$46,671,000 as proposed by the House and \$45,294,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the Senate allowance includes \$325,000 for urban forestry, \$172,000 for forest economics research, and a reduction of \$200,000 for research on black cherry and white ash at the forest research facility, Warren, Pennsylvania. \$1,280,000 of construction projects included under this appropriation item by the House were transferred to the new construction appropriation account.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$15,467,700 for construction instead of \$14,188,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House allowance includes \$297,000 for construction of a visitor information center at Seneca Rocks, West Virginia, \$55,000 for planning of an addition to the Forest Research Laboratory at Princeton, West Virginia, and a reduction of \$10,000 for the Kerr Arboretum and Nature Center, Oklahoma.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Health Services and Mental Health Administration

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$117,986,000 for Indian Health Services instead of \$114,692,000 as proposed by the House and \$118,436,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$300,000 for the California Rural Indian Health Board, and \$150,000 for the Urban Indian Health Pilot Program. Of the additional \$1,269,000 provided for additional hospital positions, not to exceed \$160,000 shall be used for operation of the Albuquerque Tuberculosis Sanatorium.

The conferees are in agreement that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Council on Indian Opportunity and the Indian Health Service should work jointly with the individual states to develop a joint policy to provide adequate health services to all Indians residing in urban areas and isolated rural areas.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$18,715,000 for Indian Health Facilities instead of \$17,950,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,510,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$500,000 for additional sanitation facilities, \$138,000 planning funds for a hospital at Zuni, New Mexico, and \$157,000 for converting the Albuquerque Tuberculosis Sanatorium to an outpatient clinic.

National Capital Planning Commission

Amendment No. 56: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$891,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$1,070,000 as proposed by the House and \$941,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction below the amount proposed by the Senate includes \$50,000 for the Regional Airport Facilities Study. Notwithstanding this reduction, the conferees are in agreement that within available funds \$100,000 shall be utilized for the Regional Airport Facilities Study.

Amendment No. 57: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and

concur with language proposed by the Senate for the transfer of \$229,000 of the balance of the appropriation granted under "Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system" for salaries and expenses.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates \$31,310,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$33,310,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the Senate allowance includes a reduction of \$2,000,000 for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 59: Deletes language, as proposed by the Senate, for the appropriation of funds for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. This item has been included in the bill as a separate appropriation account.

Amendment No. 60: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment providing \$34,702,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$35,737,000 as proposed by the House, and \$35,066,000 as proposed by the Senate. \$750,000 included in the House amount has been transferred to a separate appropriation account for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

The reduction below the amount proposed by the Senate includes decreases of \$100,000 for increased pay costs, \$100,000 for the Joseph H. Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, \$18,000 for the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute, \$40,000 for the Radiation Biology Laboratory, \$6,000 for the Office of Ecology, \$150,000 for the Environmental Sciences Program, \$25,000 for the Smithsonian Institution Press, and increases of \$10,000 for the Center for Study of Man, \$25,000 for the Division of Performing Arts, Festival of American Folklife, and \$40,000 general funding for the Museum of History and Technology.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates \$950,000 for restoration and renovation of buildings as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,080,000 as proposed by the House.

Salaries and Expenses, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the provision of \$750,000 as proposed by the Senate under a separate appropriation account.

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission

Amendment No. 63: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the provision of \$373,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$167,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 65: Deletes Sec. 303 proposed by the Senate.

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN O. MARSH, JR.,
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.,
DAVID R. OBEY,
GEORGE MAHON,
BEN REIFEL,
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
WENDELL WYATT,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CREDIBILITY GAP—RHETORIC VERSUS PERFORMANCE

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

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I listened quite clearly when the charge of a credibility gap was leveled against our past President, but no place have I seen a more dramatic demonstration of the difference between rhetoric and performance than on page 3 of the Wall Street Journal this morning. In that very credible newspaper there is the statement made by President Nixon that the business downturn "has bottomed out," and the last half of 1970 "will definitely see the economy turning up."

Right alongside the statement there is a little box in which it says that factories operated at an average 77.9 percent of capacity in the second quarter of this year, the lowest level in more than 9 years, and it is the fourth consecutive quarterly drop in a row. If that is the way you arrive at an upturn, it seems to me that we are still taking too many downturns to be really turning upward.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE VOTES IMPORTANT NEW WEAPONS FOR PRESIDENT TO USE AGAINST INFLATION AND RECESSION

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include a statement by Speaker McCormack on standby price and wage controls.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee this morning reported out the renewal of the Defense Production Act of 1950 which includes an important new section giving the President authority to stabilize wages, prices, salaries and rents.

The wage-price section—title II of the bill—will give the President an effective and essential tool in combatting inflation and recession. This is standby authority to be invoked by the President when and if he determines economic conditions warrant its use.

The authority expires February 28, 1971. In the intervening months, this standby power will give the President a full opportunity to bring the economy under control and to put an end to the twin economic evils of inflation and recession which have plagued the country in recent months.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Democratic members of the Banking and Currency Committee who stood together and steadfastly refused to go along with attempts to water down this important fight against inflation and recession. The 21 Democrats on the committee are recorded—in their votes on this title—for a stable economy. Their votes are a firm and strong indication that the Congress intends to give the President all the power that he might need to bring about a much-needed improvement in our economy. The vote is another indication

that this Congress is willing to do whatever is necessary to end inflation and to prevent ruinous recession.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House will be given an early opportunity to act on this legislation and that it will be passed by an overwhelming majority. The American people are demanding action on the economy and the bill passed by the House Banking and Currency Committee this morning is in accordance with these demands.

I include at this point a statement on this subject by Speaker McCormack:

STATEMENT BY SPEAKER MCCORMACK ON
STANDBY PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

This morning the House Banking and Currency Committee favorably reported H.R. 17880 granting the President standby authority to freeze prices, rents, wages and salaries. I strongly endorse the Committee's action. Last year the Congress granted the President standby authority to control credit. The proposed authority to control prices and wages is complementary to that legislation. With standby authority to control prices and wages, the President will then possess all of the tools necessary to stop the galloping inflation which we are now experiencing.

The House Democratic leadership will make every effort to expedite and pass this vitally needed legislation.

OUR DETERIORATING NATIONAL BUDGET SITUATION

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the House will consider this afternoon the \$18 billion Labor-HEW appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1971. Amendments will be offered to increase the total of the bill, which is already \$92 million above the budget appropriation requests.

The precarious fiscal situation confronting the country has, in recent days, again come to the fore. Over the last weekend, in fact on Sunday, the Washington Star carried a banner headline on the front page, "Nixon Berates Hill on Spending."

I think it is healthy that we discuss the spending situation and look where we are going. In the debate this afternoon I shall undertake to discuss the precarious situation confronting the country and I would be glad to exchange views with Members on the problems which confront us today.

PRESIDENT THREATENS VETO OF TRADE BILL

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President said that he would veto the trade bill, if the language of the bill went beyond textile quotas. He was strangely silent on the pernicious language of the trade bill which freezes into law the oil quota import privileges which costs the taxpayers and the U.S. consumers between \$4½ to \$7 billion a year, according to the Government's own figures.

The trade bill which so blatantly and arrogantly protects the privilege of oil should never be permitted to reach the President's desk. The quota system on oil imports is a horrible disregard of the public interest.

SHIFT IN U.S. ECONOMY

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, the July 1970 "Business Roundup" in Fortune magazine states this about the economy:

The U.S. economy has turned the corner on its 1970 readjustment.

It seems clear that—without either stumbling into a deep recession or renewing the inflationary boom—the Nation is successfully negotiating a massive redeployment of priorities and resources, from an economy based on defense and business investment to one directed more toward consumption, housing, and social welfare.

We are now at a time when, for the first time in 20 years, we will devote more money to domestic and social causes than we do to defense, and as we move in that direction, there will be more unemployment in defense-oriented industries during the period of adjustment. We have heard this noon of wage, price, and rent controls, and I might suggest that one of the merits of that program is that it does take care of unemployment. The last time we had such controls it took a quarter of a million Americans to administer the program.

PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT HE WOULD VETO A TRADE BILL

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

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's announcement yesterday that he would veto a trade bill imposing broad quotas is a welcome relief to those of us who have seen the specter of a devastating trade war looming on the horizon. The President acted with both courage and wisdom in making this announcement. He said:

Quota legislation, mandatory quota legislation, is not in the interest of the United States. We are an exporting nation rather than an importing nation.

Although the President did say that he does favor a limited quota on textile imports—a position which I personally question—he went on to state in unequivocal language:

If the bill goes beyond that, if it, for example, includes other items, I would not be able to sign the bill because that would set off a trade war which would have all the repercussions that I have tried to describe earlier.

The repercussions he spoke of were two. He said:

First, it would cost us more jobs in the exports that would be denied us, the export markets that would be denied us; and, second, even more important, it is highly inflationary, as anybody who has studied tariffs and quotas through the years is well aware.

I would express the hope that the President's statement will cause the entire quota proposal, including the textile provision, which the President, I regret to say, does support, and including the freezing of the oil quotas, to which the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) just referred, to die a quiet, unobtrusive death in familiar surroundings where it now lies in the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I would just like to make this observation to my friend. A friend of mine coming to the Capitol this morning read the headline to which the gentleman referred, and his observation was, "My God, the President is in the hands of the Philistines."

Mr. FINDLEY. I will say to the gentleman that in the long run protectionism is going to cost a lot of American jobs, whereas trade expansion will create a lot of jobs, as it has in the past. In the short and long run, protectionism hurts the consumer.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I would like to point out that in the State of New Hampshire in the next few weeks a textile firm will close. It is the main industry in the town in which it is located, and employs 600 people. Those people will lose their jobs. What would the President recommend that those 600 unemployed people do?

Mr. FINDLEY. The President has proposed an expanded program of relief for affected industries, including retraining allowances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

FREE TRADE SHOULD BE FAIR TRADE

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

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the gentleman from Massachusetts has just left the floor. The two companies the gentleman referred to in his remarks are not only going to close, but they have closed. The announcement was made last week. These were J. P. Stevens textile mills, one in Franklin, N.H., and one in Tilton, N.H.

I think it is fair to point out in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) that it is my understanding the President has said he will not veto a bill with textile quotas. The two plants the gentleman from Massachusetts referred to are textile mills. I am glad to see he is back on the floor, and I will yield to him later—if I have time. In my opinion if the principles for quotas for textiles are reasonable and fair, and they are, then some provision

must be made for other important products such as shoes or electronics.

The point I wanted to make, before I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is this, and I address it to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY): I am for free trade, but I want free trade to be fair trade.

We cannot export any more jobs to countries which do not assure to us free trade, or which do not allow fair competition at home, or legislate good working conditions for their workers. Nor can we allow the national security to be seriously imperiled by unwise and unfair trade policies as we are doing with the miniature and instrument precision ball bearing industry.

MILITARY BALANCE MUST BE RESTORED AND MAINTAINED IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, there is a clear and present danger to world peace caused by the Soviet rearming of the Egyptians. This arms race danger is even compounded by the fact that Russians are manning both the missile sites in Egypt and flying jet fighters and bombers against the Israelis.

President Nixon was emphatic recently on television when he told the American people, and the world, that the threat to world security is greater in the Middle East than it is in Indochina.

The time to act is now. Delay could be catastrophic. I am deeply opposed to an arms race, except one we face in the Middle East; namely, the race to restore and maintain a balance of strength.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to furnish Israel with the means of providing for its own security by authorizing the President to transfer to Israel, by sale, credit, or guarantee, such aircraft as may be necessary to counteract any increased military assistance provided to other countries of the Middle East.

The threat to democracy in the Middle East is clear. Its defense is mandatory now.

STANDBY WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

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

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to reply to the comments made earlier by the chairman of my committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, in which he pointed out the committee today voted out an extension of the Defense Production Act and included in that a provision for standby wage and price controls.

Of course, the gentleman made it seem to appear that this provision for standby wage and price controls would be the panacea for all the economic ills we in-

herited from the previous administration. What the gentleman did not bother to point out is that this whole business of wage and price controls is a great fraud on the American public. When members of the committee were given the opportunity to vote either for or against price controls, they preferred not to take a position.

I say that is a political fraud, because if the economic conditions continue at the rate of inflation we have seen in the last few months, then the Democrats on the committee can say that if the President had exercised the standby controls we gave him, we would not have the problems, but on the other hand, if the President's economic policies are working—and I think they are working as well as we expect—then the inflation would not be a campaign point this fall, and the same Democrats who would not take a position on it today would not take a position on it next fall.

We all know the wage and price controls would involve the employing of hundreds of thousands of new Federal employees, and it would take months to set up such devices. To pretend that wage and price controls for a 6-month period would work is a great fraud.

VICE PRESIDENT AGNEW SUBSTITUTES FOR RADIO NEWS COMMENTATOR PAUL HARVEY

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, there were newspaper reports that Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW would deliver a broadcast for radio news commentator Paul Harvey.

In all fairness to Mr. AGNEW, I should report that when Hubert Humphrey was Vice President, he wrote numerous articles for national magazines in which he expressed opinions on major issues.

During his third term, President Franklin D. Roosevelt did a series of articles for Colliers magazine on the organization of the Supreme Court.

No canon of ethics seems to exist which would bar a President or Vice President from working as a news commentator while holding public office.

I think this is a dangerous situation which should be corrected as quickly as possible. What could prevent a President from offering his services as a news commentator to some network 3 nights a week? With the communications business so fiercely competitive, a network might conceivably jump at the opportunity to swamp its rivals in the ratings by featuring the President in a nightly 15-minute presentation of his views.

What a devastating propaganda weapon could accrue to a President or Vice President who by virtue of his office already enjoys an enormous advantage over his opposition when it comes to airing views. What is more, television reaches into more homes and carries more impact than any one national magazine does.

Because freedom of dissent and guaranteed expression of minority views is so vital to democracy, I think we must consider some prohibition to forbid the President or Vice President from engaging in news interpretation and opinion in a private capacity.

The easier it is for a national leader to drown out his opposition, the greater temptation there is for tyranny.

I am today asking the Federal Communications Commission to investigate the issue and promulgate a policy.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

JOSE LUIS CALLEJA-PEREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1747) for the relief of Jose Luis Calleja-Perez. Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

DR. ANTHONY S. MASTRIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15760) for the relief of Dr. Anthony S. Mastrian. Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

ATKINSON, HASERICK & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10534) for the relief of Atkinson, Haserick & Co., Inc.

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

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

There was no objection.

CLAUDE G. HANSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13807) for the relief of Claude G. Hansen.

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

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

JOHN R. GOSNELL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13469) for the relief of John R. Gosnell.

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

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

There was no objection.

CAL C. DAVIS AND LYNDON A. DEAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2427) for the relief of Cal C. Davis and Lyndon A. Dean.

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

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

There was no objection.

CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS EMPLOYED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE AT KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10150) for the relief of certain individuals employed by the Department of the Air Force at Kelly Air Force Base, Tex.

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

H.R. 10150

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That each individual named in section 3 of this Act is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount set forth opposite his or her name, which amount represents an overpayment of compensation, due to administrative error, received by him or her before July 1, 1960 (and to which the waiver provisions of section 5584 of title 5, United States Code, do not apply), as a civilian employee at Kelly Air Force Base. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each individual named in section 3 of this Act an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him or her, or withheld from sums otherwise due him or her, with respect to the liability to the United States which is relieved by the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. The individuals referred to in the first section of this Act, and the amount of the liability of each of them, are as follows:

INDIVIDUALS WHOSE CLAIMS FOR OVERPAYMENT WERE PARTIALLY WAIVED UNDER SECTION 5584 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

Name:	Amount of overpayment not waived
Bryant, John M.	\$124.80
Courvier, Joe	97.32
Gillum, Richard A.	542.45
Green, William R.	43.44
Hernandez, Santos A.	89.60
Herrera, Jimmie	93.40
Huntly, Dick M.	89.60
Green, William R.	43.44
Moore, Harvey L.	84.81
Rosel, Consuelo O.	21.60
Springs, Zea A.	121.89
Vaughn, Betty L.	106.90

INDIVIDUALS WITH CLAIMS (EITHER IN WHOLE OR PART) FOR OVERPAYMENT TO WHICH SECTION 5584 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, DOES NOT APPLY

Name:	Amount of overpayment
Seay, Henry A.	\$20.78
Snyder, Donald A.	109.84

SEC. 4. No part of the amount appropriated in section 2 of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, in the list of individuals overpaid, after "Huntly, Dick M.—\$89.60" strike "Green, William R.—\$43.44".

Page 3, line 2, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

SAMUEL R. STEPHENSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10704) for the relief of Samuel R. Stephenson.

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

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

There was no objection.

DAVID L. KENNISON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15272) for the relief of David L. Kennison.

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

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

There was no objection.

GEORGE F. MILLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15415) for the relief of George F. Mills.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. FERNANDE M. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15478) for the relief of Mrs. Fernande M. Allen.

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

H.R. 15478

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Fernande M. Allen, of Alpena, Michigan, the sum certified to him by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to section 2.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall certify to the Secretary of the

Treasury the total additional amount of widow's pension benefits to which the said Mrs. Fernande M. Allen would have been entitled under title 38, United States Code, had she filed her application for such benefits on October 1, 1960, instead of on June 8, 1962.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in the first section of this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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.

REFERENCE OF H.R. 1390 TO CHIEF COMMISSIONER, COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called House Resolution 108, referring H.R. 1390 to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims.

Mr. DUNCAN. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THOMAS J. BECK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4982) for the relief of Thomas J. Beck.

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

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

There was no objection.

KEUM JO KIM

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2043) for the relief of Keum Jo Kim.

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

H.R. 2043

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Keum Jo Kim may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in her behalf by James and Shirley Franks, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in this case.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 8, after the words "of the" strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided*, that the brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed

and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Keum Ja Franks."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OK YON (MRS. CHARLES G.) KIRSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4670) for the relief of Ok Yon (Mrs. Charles G.) Kirsch.

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

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

There was no objection.

LOW YIN (ALSO KNOWN AS LOW YING)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5655) for the relief of Low Yin (also known as Low Ying).

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

H.R. 5655

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Low Yin (also known as Low Ying) shall be deemed to be an immediate relative within the meaning of section 201(b) of that Act and may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act.

With the following committee amendment:

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

"That, for the purposes of section 203(a) (1) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Low Yin (also known as Low Ying) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Tom Nom Low and Cleo H. Low, citizens of the United States: *Provided, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*"

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.

TAE PUNG HILLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12400) for the relief of Tae Pung Hills.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tae Pung Hills may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b) (1) (F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Frederick A. Hills and Lee Hills, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8 after the words "of the"

strike out the word "Act." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Act: *Provided, That the natural parents or brothers or sisters of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such relationship, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.*"

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.

MAUREEN O'LEARY PIMPARE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12962) for the relief of Maureen O'Leary Pimpare.

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

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

There was no objection.

MARIA DE CONCEICAO BOTELHO PEREIRA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 12990) for the relief of Maria de Conceicao Botelho Pereira.

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

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

There was no objection.

VINCENZO PELLICANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13712) for the relief of Vincenzo Pellicano.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARIA ELOISA PARDO HALL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13895) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Eloisa Pardo Hall.

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

H.R. 13895

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Maria Eloisa Pardo Hall shall be held and considered to be an immediate relative as defined in section 201(b) of that Act and the provisions of section 204 of the said Act shall not be applicable in this case.

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.

ANAN ELDREDGE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2849) for the relief of Anan Eldredge.

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

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

There was no objection.

MRS. MARCELLA COSLOVICH FABRETTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13383) for the relief of Mrs. Marcella Coslovich Fabretto.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 225]

Adair	Daddario	Meskill
Addabbo	Davis, Ga.	Montgomery
Alexander	Dawson	Ottenger
Anderson, Tenn.	Delaney	Pollock
Baring	Diggs	Powell
Berry	Dulski	Rarick
Blatnik	Edwards, La.	Reid, N.Y.
Brock	Fraser	Rogers, Colo.
Brooks	Gallagher	Roudebush
Burke, Fla.	Gilbert	Rousslet
Burleson, Tex.	Gray	Roybal
Burton, Utah	Green, Oreg.	Ruppe
Button	Hébert	Ryan
Cabell	Ichord	Scheuer
Caffery	Kee	Sisk
Camp	Keith	Steiger, Wis.
Celler	Kirwan	Stephens
Clay	Kuykendall	Stuckey
Collier	Long, La.	Taft
Crane	Lukens	Welcker
	McCarthy	Yates

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, due to a longstanding prior commitment, I was not present on the floor of the House yesterday during consideration and passage of H.R. 9476. This measure, which I heartily support, provides for the use of national service life insurance funds to guarantee home loans to our war veterans. I have long been a proponent of this program and I enthusiastically endorse the action taken in this Chamber yesterday in passing the bill 326 to 0. I can assure my colleagues that if I had been present the vote would have been 327 to 0.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 18515, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1151

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18515) 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, all points of order against said bill for failure to comply with the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI are hereby waived.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1151 is a resolution waiving points of order against certain provisions of H.R. 18515, the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

Legislative authorization for several activities, for which funds are included in H.R. 18515, expired at the end of fiscal year 1970. These are all activities currently in progress; funds for all are carried in the budget; legislation to extend them all is in the legislative process. The activities involved are listed on page 42 of the report on the bill.

Because the authorizations have not been enacted, points of order are waived against the bill for failure to comply with the first provision of clause 2, rule XXI. By mistake, the second provision was covered by the rule—so I have an amendment at the desk to correct the resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as stated there is a clerical error in the rule and at the proper time I shall send to the desk a committee amendment to correct the clerical error.

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

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

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

Mr. GROSS. With regard to waiving points of order, the gentleman just said that he expects to offer an amendment to limit it to eight areas or provisions of the bill; is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. There were several provisions, as I have stated, relating to programs that are in progress currently but for which the authorizations expired at the end of the last fiscal year.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking minority Member, together with others from the Committee on Appropriations appeared before the Rules Committee and asked that the points of order be waived with regard to these specific provisions.

Now, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that the rule, through a clerical error, waived points

of order against two other provisions which were not intended to be waived. That is why I previously stated that a committee amendment would be offered to correct that situation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, in reading the report, on page 42, I find only one reference to a legislative provision in this bill.

The gentleman from Texas is talking about waiving points of order on a multiplicity of provisions.

Is the report faulty in that it lists only one legislative provision under the heading of limitations and legislative provisions.

Mr. YOUNG. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that it is my understanding that the points of order are waived insofar as the application of the first provision of clause 2, rule XXI applies to this list of items, because they are appropriations without authorizations having been signed into law.

The second provision has to do with legislation on an appropriation bill which would violate the rules of the House.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the waiver of points of order is not to protect the cutting of the salaries of anyone. So it must be to protect language in the bill or items in the bill that have not previously been authorized.

Rule XXI, clause 2, would protect both, but I cannot conceive of anybody around here cutting anybody's salary.

I thank the gentleman for his explanation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG) and wish to associate myself with his remarks in explaining House Resolution 1151.

For the information of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), my understanding is that the language which will be offered as an amendment will waive all points of order against appropriations carried in the bill which are not yet authorized by law—just those. They are listed on page 42 of the report.

As an example, the Clean Air Act, H.R. 17255, passed the House on June 10. Hearings are being held in the Senate, but no action has been taken.

The Solid Waste Disposal Act, H.R. 15847 passed the House on June 23, but has not yet been acted on by the Senate.

The Public Health Service Act, H.R. 18110 was ordered reported on June 23.

H.R. 14237 is the Mental Retardation Facilities and Construction Act. A rule was granted on that on July 8, and it has been set for floor action later this week.

The rule waives points of order on the appropriations for these subject matters where the authorizations have not yet been signed into law. They are listed on page 42 of the report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in accordance with the amendment to be offered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

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

I just took a clipping off the wire service in which remarks of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) were quoted after he had come out of the White House, saying that congressional big spenders were distorting President Nixon's budget, and adding funds where they were not needed.

Pressed by newsmen to name fiscally irresponsible Congressmen, FORD named me and my colleague, JEFFERY COHELAN, Democrat of California.

The minority leader has been decrying Federal spending for Health, Education, and Welfare programs for years and there is nothing new in his utterance.

I suppose that he does not like the fact that I joined other Members of the House in voting for the so-called Joelson amendment which added several hundred million dollars for education; that he was referring to the fact that I voted to override the President's veto on the extension of the Hill-Burton Act—and I may say in passing that a number of his own colleagues on the Republican side did that as well—and I suppose the minority leader was referring to the fact that today I am joining with several other members of the Committee on Appropriations in offering an amendment to add approximately \$360 million in funds over the budget in order to take care of the medical and dental needs of the people of this country. I believe the funds are necessary. The health of our people is of utmost importance.

Even Mr. Nixon recognizes that there is a crisis in our health care system although he has done little about it. The President himself a year ago said that there was a massive crisis in the area of health care, and unless action was taken to meet the crisis we were going to break down in our medical care system that would have consequences affecting millions of people.

That is what the President himself said; but his budget did not begin to take care of the people's health needs.

We propose to try to deal with that medical crisis in the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. And when the President says Democratic spending is distorting his budget, it is well-known the President's budget was distorted even at the time it was first issued. However, it is the President's economic policies that have placed his budget out of kilter, policies that clamped companies in a tight money vise that brought earnings to a halt.

The President's budget would be in fairly good shape today if the revenues he anticipated for the Nation's earnings had produced the taxes he counted on.

In great measure the deficit is caused by the dramatic drop in Federal revenues and the tremendous increase in costs of financing the national debt because of high interest rate. Major unemployment has resulted.

Mr. Speaker, unprofitable businesses and unemployed men do not pay any taxes. Federal tax revenues are down by hundreds of millions of dollars as a result of the administration's economic policy. The programs that we believe

should be financed—the educational appropriation bill, which the President says he is going to veto—and the HEW bill which we are considering today—if Mr. Nixon asks us, and if the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) asks us to balance the budget by slashing money for education and by cutting funds to build desperately needed hospitals and by keeping health manpower appropriations at a level which is disastrously low in this country, well, Mr. Speaker, I, for one, am not going to help do so.

I am not going to help him to balance that budget by denying children a chance for a good education and by forcing citizens to obtain necessary medical treatment in some obsolete under-equipped hospitals or by denying the Nation's citizens the doctors, dentists and technicians who are needed to protect their health.

Let Mr. Nixon and Mr. Ford shift their priorities. They think it is proper today to spend more than \$1 billion for the SST—\$290 million this year. I offered the amendment to cut all SST funds. We can certainly wait on that program.

They insist on spending billions of dollars for the ABM. I offered the amendment to cut out all funds for deployment of the ABM. It is not needed at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I consider that the children of our country are entitled to a decent education, the people of our country are entitled to adequate health care, care that is deteriorating rapidly because of the lack of funds. I consider these to be of the utmost priority and deserving of help from the Federal Government.

If Mr. Ford considers this viewpoint as budget busting he is closing his eyes to reality, for everybody—I repeat, everybody—recognizes that there is an enormous and growing crisis in our Nation's health care system. Even President Nixon who put it this way a year ago:

We face a massive crisis in the area of health care and unless action is taken both administratively and legislatively to meet the crisis within the next two or three years, we will have a breakdown in our medical care system which could have consequences affecting millions of people.

The "everybody" who talks about the crisis in medical care is very much like Mark Twain's "everybody" who talks about the weather. Nobody does anything about it. Certainly, the President has done little about it. Even though he recognized the massive crisis which confronts our people, the amounts he recommended for dealing with the projects in his budget this year were outrageously inadequate. Words will not solve this problem. Dollars are needed. As an editorial in the Evening Star pointed out recently, there can be no serious grappling with the paltry supply and spiraling costs of medical services until the critical shortage of medical personnel and facilities is alleviated. The outlook for that is gloomier than ever. Many medical schools are in desperate financial straits, largely because of declining grants, and curtailments of already insufficient programs.

The physician shortage is estimated at more than 50,000 and is getting worse each year by 5,000.

At least 25 percent of nursing posts throughout the country are not filled.

Medical schools annually turn down thousands of qualified applicants for lack of space.

While thousands of American college graduates are attending foreign medical schools, we are importing almost as many doctors every year as our medical schools turn out.

More than half the Nation's medical schools are receiving distressed grants and these are being scaled down.

For an administration which recognized "the existence of the massive crisis," the amount made available in the budget is like throwing a rope 30 feet long to a man drowning 50 feet away.

The Committee on Appropriations is not profligate in its allowances. Ordinarily it will take the budget requests as a ceiling and cut appropriations below the budget. But the committee was shocked by the inadequacies of this administration's budget requests and rejected many of them out of hand.

I commend the committee in its effort to meet the crisis but I think they still grossly underestimated it. They were timid, rejecting the determined attack that a massive crisis requires.

It increased the highly critical program for medical manpower institutional support by only \$18 million over the budget.

For the Hill-Burton program which the Congress insisted be carried out over the President's veto, it granted \$122 million in additional funds, a figure roughly \$200 million below the amount authorized by the Congress.

Community mental health centers were increased by \$20 million and the National Heart and Lung Institute were increased by \$6 million.

All these are critical areas and the amounts allotted by the committee are woefully inadequate.

Even the Boland amendment cannot be described as a massive attack on the medical crisis but it at least provides reasonably adequate funds to deal with the problems at hand. It does attack the health care crisis in some of its major aspects. It concentrates on the training of people, people who are desperately needed in all aspects of medicine.

It is an attempt to balance the need for more physicians with the need for more hospital beds. It recognizes the necessity of providing aid not only for the students but also the institutions which must train them.

In the United States of America in the year 1970, medical care is still not available for our people. The Boland amendment proposes to remedy the medical care gap.

A member of the New York Academy of Medicine has said:

If we practiced medicine properly, we would have empty hospital beds all over the country instead of their being overcrowded in some areas and unavailable in others.

The modernization needs of our hospitals alone amount to \$11 billion.

Seven years ago, in 1963, that figure was \$3.2 billion. Hospital needs have more than tripled in less than a decade.

It is amazing that as the needs increase and grow more serious, congressional support for the program has dwindled. Attributable in greatest measure, I believe, to the habit of the Appropriations Committee in clinging to the budget requests.

In 1968 the Congress appropriated \$293,357. In 1969, it appropriated \$258,368. In 1970 the amount approved dropped to \$172,270, which is the same figure the committee recommends for this year.

But if the committee insists that it is making available the same amount this year as it did last year, it is in error because the program has lost 5 percent to 6 percent due to inflation, and secondly, the construction of teaching hospitals has been transferred to the program.

Thus, this year the Hill-Burton program is required to do a greater job with less money—this in the face of congressional determination to move ahead with the hospital bed construction as was so recently evidenced by its voting to override the President's veto on the Hill-Burton bill.

We must make the same kind of progress and delivery of health care that has been made in the conquering of disease. The triumphs that have been achieved in the laboratory mean little if they cannot be transferred to our entire society. The gap between what we know and what we do is so great that thousands of people die needlessly every year. I am told that with regular checkups we could prevent most of the deaths from all forms of cancer, and I must congratulate the committee upon recognizing the needs for additional funds for cancer research and providing them in this bill.

Heart disease is still the Nation's No. 1 killer and the committee's increase will not provide the additional momentum needed to cut down the deaths from this killer.

The Boland amendment gives recognition to the feeling of urgency that must be generated if this Nation is to halt the burgeoning deterioration of our medical care system.

This country has the brains and the resources to provide the best medical care of anywhere in the world and we are not doing it.

We can reach out and bring an end to diseases which still plague our people. We must develop a medical care system that delivers health rather than merely treats an illness.

The health of our children, all of our people, is a paramount priority. We must give it recognition by supporting the additional funds in the Boland amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG: Strike out lines 5 through 7 of the resolution and insert in lieu thereof the following: "purposes, all points of order against appropriations carried in the bill which are not yet authorized by law are hereby waived."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The previous question was ordered.
The resolution was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

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

[Roll No. 226]

Adair	Cunningham	Mathias
Anderson,	Davis, Ga.	Meskill
Tenn.	Davis, Wis.	Monagan
Baring	Dawson	Montgomery
Berry	Delaney	Murphy, N.Y.
Bingham	Diggs	O'Neill, Mass.
Blatnik	Dulski	Ottlinger
Brock	Evins, Tenn.	Patman
Brown, Calif.	Gallagher	Pollock
Burke, Fla.	Garmatz	Powell
Burleson, Tex.	Gray	Rarick
Burton, Utah	Green, Oreg.	Reid, N.Y.
Button	Grover	Rogers, Colo.
Caffery	Hanna	Roudebush
Camp	Hawkins	Roussetot
Carey	Hébert	Ruppe
Cederberg	Heckler, Mass.	Ryan
Celler	Ichord	Scheuer
Chappell	Kee	Slisk
Clay	Kirwan	Stubblefield
Collier	Long, La.	Taft
Cramer	Lukens	Welcker
Crane	McCarthy	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 363 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18515) 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; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 18515, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is the third appropriation bill the Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, has brought to the House this year. This is an unusual, extraordinary, and historical effort by a subcommittee of the great Committee on Appropriations.

This year we separated the Office of Education bill from Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, to expedite it and to be sure that the people responsible for the budgets, and the administration of these programs in the school districts back home would have more time to know what Federal funds would be available and to plan the local programs.

On February 19—and I wish you would note these dates to show you how we have worked—we brought to the House the Labor-HEW bill to replace the one vetoed by the President on January 25. You will recall that veto.

On March 3, Mr. Chairman, we were back with the conference report on that bill.

To show you how this committee has acted with diligence and expedition, Mr. Chairman, believe it or not the very next day, at 10 o'clock in the morning on March 4th, we started hearings on the Office of Education appropriation bill for 1971 to which I referred a minute ago. We brought you that bill on April 14. Of course, you now know, Mr. Chairman, we brought in the conference report on that bill to the House just last Thursday.

On the day after the Office of Education bill was passed by the House, we started hearings on the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare bill that we bring to you today.

This is for those who for various reasons would cast aspersions upon what this House does and what the Members do, day and night and month after month. There is exhibit "A."

Before we drew up this bill, Mr. Chairman, we held 2 solid months of hearings—every morning, every afternoon except Saturdays and Sundays—and long mornings, and I mean, long, mornings and long afternoons, with no stop and no letup, hour after hour. Just to show you—these hearings are printed—take a look at that table—at the committee table in front of me here. These are printed in seven volumes and they total 7,400 pages.

We have not had the time to count the number of witnesses that we heard, but I assure you it runs into the hundreds. Did you ever try a lawsuit? Do you know what hundreds of witnesses mean? Well, we heard them—including 193 nongovernmental witnesses—the so-called public witnesses, who asked to be heard. It

is not a closed corporation. Those in this Nation who wished to be heard on this tremendously important bill which affects every man, woman and child in this country were heard. Most of them testified with regard to what they saw as deficiencies in the budget. So, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that we have not acted in haste, nor have we acted on the basis of inadequate information.

This is an important point on this bill: All members of the subcommittee, every member of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle, Democrat and Republican, believes that under all the circumstances—and they are difficult, many, varied, and highly complicated—this is a good bill. The subcommittee was unanimous.

Some are dissatisfied with the bill. Well, well, well. Can you imagine in this marvelous institution, this House of Representatives, that someone would not be? What is wrong with dissent? You know my ancestry: DANIEL JOHN FRANCIS ALOYSIUS FLOOD. What is wrong with dissent? My people have been dissenting for a thousand years. There is nothing wrong with that, provided they do not get carried away, as some of my people did, literally and figuratively.

But these knights in shining armor have amendments as pendants on their lances. Only they are the pure in heart who learn and are concerned about what is needed in this Nation for labor, health, education, and welfare. Only they alone? Oh, no. Take a look at this subcommittee. There is no more dedicated group of people, a group who have worked for hour after hour, for months and years, this subcommittee, with great compassion, understanding and, in addition, they are informed, which is something else.

Now, as I said, not everyone is satisfied with this bill. We have limited dissenting views attached to the committee's report. However, I would just like to point out that of the 51 members of the Appropriations Committee, these dissenting views are signed by an overwhelming number of five. That should stagger one. And I repeat for the purpose of emphasis, not one of the members of this subcommittee who heard this over 2 months and over 7,000 pages of testimony on this bill from all parts of this Nation—not one of them signed these separate views.

The Members know me, my record here speaks eloquently for itself, better than I. I have been on this side of this aisle for 25 years through five Presidents—I would fly in the face of that record today? Not I.

The bill in round figures, Mr. Chairman, includes \$18,800 million. That is \$18,800 million. Why, that is not hay, even for my friends with the bleeding hearts on this subject.

The report on this bill should be kept in the pockets of Members until each Member reads every word. Keep it for your radio and television broadcasts and for your newsletters and for your speeches back home and for your visits back home. And when you hear, "What have you done for us?" you have answers in that report.

Oh, please do not anyone mention what we have done for the war in Viet-

nam, this can of worms, this frightful heartrending thing. I speak of this appropriation bill for this fiscal year, and if a wand could be waved and that horrible thing stopped, it would not affect this bill by 5 cents. Do not trot that out in mock horror when we know this is the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971 that has already begun.

This bill is \$2,300,000,000 over the comparable appropriations for 1970. That is \$2,300,000,000. It is \$93 million over the President's budget for 1971.

So the committee does not know and does not understand and does not feel? Oh, Mr. Chairman, these people come before us, and these are all good people, these witnesses, dedicated and honest and sincere and knowledgeable and learned. There is not a top man in the National Institutes of Health who could not leave there in the next minute and make much more money next year. Why are they there? They are dedicated and sincere.

The public witnesses who come in all have their special causes. Their integrity is *san peur et sans reproche*—with a few exceptions—hundreds of them. Oh, they say to us, to the committee, "We want to see the budget balanced." Then the inevitable, in capital letters, "But take care of my most worthwhile project or program." Heart. Cancer. Stroke. Arthritis. Children. Hospitals. Medical schools. Whatever it might be—"But take care of us." That is the pain your committee must go through. That we did.

There are only two increases over the budget, outside of the National Institutes of Health, that amount to as much as \$2 million.

The first of these is \$20 million more, \$20 million above the \$60.1 million requested for the staffing of community mental health centers. We took that budget of \$60.1 million and added \$20 million because of what we know and what we believe should be done. But we also know and believe, in our heart of hearts, from our information and knowledge, that is enough. That will do this job this year. That is all we are talking about today.

The budget included only enough for staffing grants in 1971 to continue those that were staffed in 1970 and nothing for the new centers. This to us presented a rather ridiculous situation. When the local people and the Federal Government have spent considerable money, and especially the local people, a lot of time and effort to set up the facilities and to do all the planning to get these centers ready for operation, and then to be told, "There is no money to operate," after all that—"no money to operate"—it is ridiculous.

The \$20 million added to the bill will certainly provide for these new centers. I believe it will provide all the staffing funds needed in 1971. We heard the testimony. That is what we believe.

The second large increase, aside from the NIH, is \$92.2 million over the request for construction of hospitals and other medical care facilities. Now hear these figures. There is \$338.3 million worth of construction provided in this bill. That

is an increase of \$92.2 million over the request and an increase of \$166 million over the 1970 appropriation.

We ignore these things? We are unaware? We are callous pennypinchers?

And let me say this, too, Mr. Chairman: that is the largest amount ever provided since the Hill-Burton Act became law. Now put that in your pipe and smoke it. Oh, do not tell me about the parade of Members, including me, who voted to override the President's veto on the Hill-Burton Act. That was an authorization bill. I would do it again tomorrow, but I am sure that the overwhelming majority of the Members who voted to override the President's veto will not destroy an appropriation bill. It is a different thing.

What is even more important to many people is that this increase over the budget is all in grant funds so that as much is available for grants in 1971 as in 1970. That is grants. The budget request was only for \$50 million in grants, but there is \$172.2 million recommended in the bill. This will be especially helpful to hospitals that started construction with partial funding—remember those 35 hospitals we have heard so much about—they require their share of a continuation of the grant program for completion of the facilities, and the dough is there. It will also be most helpful for those hospitals that cannot under their current State laws borrow money.

Both the request and the bill include \$5 million to start this newly authorized interest subsidy program. This will be sufficient to subsidize interest payments on \$166 million of mortgage loans.

For the research components of the National Institutes of Health, Mr. Chairman, the overall request that came to us was a standstill budget. There were a few increases for things like the virus-cancer program and the cardiovascular research centers, but they were made at the expense—and we did not like this—they were made at the expense of cutting other research and research related activities below even the 1970 program level.

That is what came to us. Now, what did we do—this heartless, thoughtless, penny-pinching subcommittee on appropriations? The first thing this subcommittee did was to add \$38,461,000 to restore every one of those activities, every one of those that were cut below the 1970 program level. Then we added enough to make the total increase—now hear this—we then added enough to make the total increase for the Cancer Institute \$25 million. And that brings the National Cancer Institute to almost one-quarter of a billion dollars.

There are a few other items at NIH that we increased. They are in this report that we plead with you that you read. In total the bill contains \$92.7 million more than the budget request for all of the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. Chairman I have discussed about 95 percent of the increases so far as total dollars are concerned. We also made 15 or 20 decreases but two account for most of the total. One of them is Work Incentives.

This is a program that we sponsored, that we are for 1,000 percent and have been for from the first day of its existence, but under the circumstances we made a reduction of \$50 million from the \$170 million requested for the program.

The objective of this program is admirable beyond your words or mine. That is going pretty far. It is to get people off the welfare rolls and into gainful employment. We have supported and encouraged this and urged this from the very beginning. However, this program is badly behind schedule. This distresses us but it is so. The amount we recommend in this bill, even with the \$50 million cut, is \$18 million above that appropriated in 1970. We are satisfied that this program will not be restricted by the cut. Otherwise we would be no party to it.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we come to the Office of Economic Opportunity, where \$34 million is cut from the requested \$2,080 million. Now, let us be frank about this, Mr. Chairman. This is nothing more than a plain open and aboveboard, naked cut, exclamation mark. That is all it is, nothing else. Why? I am one of its friends and believe me I have been from the day it was born. Ask them. They knew and we knew that whatever they asked for a cut would be made. So, it was made. But they still have \$98.2 million over 1970. They will not bleed. If I thought so I would have an amendment on the floor today, make no mistake about it.

Mr. Chairman, the other items we cut are relatively small and mostly salaries and expenses items. The committee is concerned about the ever increasing number of people on the payroll of these agencies, especially the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We plan to look into this matter in more detail before next year's hearings.

There is one language item I should mention. Many States were concerned about section 208 that the budget recommended be included in the bill. This would have affected nearly 40 States to various degrees. This section would have placed a limitation on the public assistance funds which would prohibit paying to any State for 1971 more than 110 percent of the amount they received for 1970 for social services, staff training, and administrative expenses. This would have been grossly inequitable between States. Those States that had built up their programs to a proper level would have been allowed enough to continue at that level; those who had been slow to get started and have inadequate programs would have been kept from improving them. The subcommittee has not included this proposed provision in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It deserves the support of the whole House, the Congress and the President.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his eloquent remarks, and

for the bill which the committee has reported.

I was particularly interested in the gentleman's remarks about the Hill-Burton portion. As the gentleman knows, I have been concerned about the fact that some hospitals in the nation, particularly the Mary Lanning Hospital in Hastings, Nebr., in my district, and two in Lincoln, Nebr., St. Elizabeth's and Madonna Nursing that had been promised funds under the Hill-Burton Act, and that had proceeded with construction, but have not been completely funded. These hospitals are in serious financial plight today because of this fact.

In view of the appropriations recommended in the bill, and the remarks of the gentleman in the well, is it the intent of the committee that the director of the Hill-Burton program fund these hospitals that have been promised the money, but have not had it forthcoming?

Mr. FLOOD. As far as this subcommittee is concerned, I assure the gentleman the answer is "Yes." The question was raised in the full committee, and the question was raised—and properly so—when we went to the Committee on Rules yesterday, and it is the feeling of this subcommittee that there should be sufficient funds for the State agencies that control, to a great extent, the allocation of these funds to individual projects to take care of the needs of the hospitals to which the gentleman refers. We want their needs cared for and we certainly expect they will be under this bill.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, did any member of the Committee on Appropriations vote against the bill when it was reported out of committee?

Mr. FLOOD. Against the bill?

Mr. YATES. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. Not that I know of.

Mr. YATES. It had the full vote of the committee, did it not, even though it was \$93 million above the budget, all Democrats and all Republicans who were present voted for the bill; is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. As far as I know there was no vote against the bill in the full Committee on Appropriations. That is why, I might add to my friend, that all of a sudden, out of the clear, blue sky, I am surprised to find solicitations are being made to enlist colleagues to present amendments to the bill today.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for bringing out this bill. He is aware, of course, of my interest in hospitals that have not been fully funded. I would like to take this opportunity, to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) for the courtesies that he has extended to me and for his understanding in this long process we have been through. I appreciate very much the effort of the committee in making these funds available

for hospitals such as I have in my district.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, we will continue to do that—we will never stop that—within the rule of reason.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I thank the gentleman. Of course, I understand that.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if the administration had requested any increase in funds for child welfare this year?

Mr. FLOOD. No. I have before me a table prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I read item No. 6 on page 13, "Child welfare services." It is \$46 million across-the-board—they asked for nothing more than was appropriated for last fiscal year.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. That is the same amount that they asked for last year; is that not correct?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. They asked for \$46 million for 1970, that amount was appropriated for 1970, and they again asked for \$46 million for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I was wondering if the gentleman would be surprised to learn that the administration indicated to our committee, the House Committee on Ways and Means, that they were going to seek an increase in funds in this particular item. The facts are these—that is one of the most scandalous conditions existing in our Nation today. This deals with the most underprivileged children in America. This item deals with those children who are thrown upon the State—and the Federal Government only contributes 6 percent to their upkeep, while in the case of AFDC the Federal Government contributes from 75 percent to 83 percent, which is a reasonable amount. For the life of me, I cannot understand why this administration or any other administration should justify this very unfair and inequitable action where they will only contribute 6 percent toward the upkeep of children who are without parents and without guardians and are thrown upon the State and assigned into institutions and some of them farmed out in homes, 10 or 12 of them for about \$2 or \$3 a week, for their upkeep.

I cannot understand why the administration has not kept their word and has not come in here and brought this appropriation at least up to the authorization, which is \$110 million right now.

I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has done an outstanding job. I know that he cannot cover all the bases, but I am merely pointing out here that in this area the Federal Government has a lot to answer for and we have a lot to answer for here in failing to properly take care of these children under child welfare who are the most disadvantaged children in America—little black children, little Indian children, little Puerto Rican children who are without any political muscle and with no one to speak for them in America. Yet, this appropriation is held down to the meager amount of \$46 million.

It is my intention, and I want to inform the gentleman, to offer an amendment later increasing the amount at least up to the authorization figure of \$110 million. I hope that this House will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) has consumed 40 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. BOW. In view of the colloquy that has just taken place, I should like to again refer to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. There have been substantial increases in this bill over the last 10 years.

I believe it would be useful to read into the RECORD what has happened to spending for just health, education, and manpower since 1961.

In 1961, during the Kennedy administration, total spending for these purposes was \$2,372,000,000.

In 1962, it was \$2,871,000,000.

In 1963, it was \$3,125,000,000.

Then, in 1964, during the Johnson administration, it was \$3,765,000,000.

In 1965, \$4,263,000,000.

In 1966, \$7,066,000,000.

In 1967, \$11,856,000,000.

In 1968, \$16,684,000,000.

Now, the amounts for the Nixon administration are as follows:

In 1969, \$18,521,000,000.

In 1970, \$20,803,000,000.

In 1971, \$23,086,000,000.

These are actual outlays, not just amounts appropriated.

So you see, throughout the years there have been increases, and a substantial increase in spending for these programs has been achieved during the Nixon administration. It is a fallacy to charge that this administration is not concerned with the health and education of the people of this country. It seems to me that we must be realistic and fair. These figures clearly point out that spending for health, education, and manpower during the Nixon administration exceeds the amounts spent for these purposes during both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

I thank the gentlemen for yielding.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee (Mr. Flood) has made his usual colorful and eagerly looked for presentation. It is a real pleasure for us to work so closely with him and all the members of our subcommittee throughout the days and weeks and months of hearings. You see those volumes of printed hearings there on the desk—better than 16 inches high and covering nearly 8,000 pages of testimony. Today is the day of decision for all the deliberations that fill those pages of testimony.

For over 180 years the members of the House Appropriations Committee have had a similar task, and our efforts are wasted unless we can convince the other Members of this House that the funds appropriated are justified and arrived at only after complete and objective hearings. I hope to be able to do that in my

presentation here this afternoon. Members of the Appropriations Committee normally cannot fund the various agencies and projects empirically. We must rely on the testimony given to us by departmental heads, expert witnesses, and concerned parties. This is both good and bad.

Good, because we must try to remain unemotional when funding projects—such as cancer research and hospital construction—or else spend wildly in that one area to the detriment of other, and just as important, areas. Bad, because at times we may not be fully aware of the needs of a particular program or institution and fail to properly fund it.

Nevertheless, it is our duty on the Appropriations Committee to come up with the best and most viable bill we can and at the same time assure the American public that they are getting a dollar's worth of benefits for a dollar spent.

I believe H.R. 18515 is such a bill.

In his book "The Power of the Purse," Richard Fenno says this about Federal appropriations:

A necessary condition for the survival or stability of any political system is that it do what people want it to do in a way that people want it done. A political system, that is to say, must satisfy expectations in order to survive. But two questions immediately arise: what expectations and whose expectations?"

The Appropriations Committee faced this problem during our lengthy hearings. On the one hand there is a crying need for more and better health services, research projects, pilot programs—you name it. On the other side of coin we had to be conscious of the fact that we still are confronted with a problem of inflation.

The committee has tried to compromise this paradoxical situation in H.R. 18515 by giving everyone something and at the same time refusing to over fund in any one area.

Now let us get to the milk in the coconut.

BUDGET ESTIMATES

The Labor and HEW bill for 1971 contains funds in the amount of \$18,824,663,000, an increase of \$92,926,000 over last year. These funds are exclusive of education appropriations which, for the first time this year, were considered as a separate bill.

In addition, the bill incorporates funds for the construction of certain

Government activities without consideration by Congress during the annual appropriations process. These trust funds for 1971 amount to \$53,775,871,000—a net increase of nearly \$5 billion. In total, then, we are talking about a bill that encompasses \$72,600,534,000.

Of the \$18.8 billion in the bill, over \$11.5 billion is classified as "relatively uncontrollable" in the budget of the President. These funds include grants to States for public assistance programs, including medicaid, payments to the social security trust funds, and unemployment compensation for Federal employees and veterans, so controllable items amount to approximately \$7.5 billion.

Nonreimbursable details of personnel—Under this section of the bill, the committee believes that the borrowing of staff from other agencies without reimbursement should be reserved for situations which are of a temporary or emergency nature, and that the Office of Management and Budget should take steps to assure that the 1972 budget estimates reflect full, not partial, costs of all interdepartmental committees, councils, and similar groups.

Returning paramedical personnel should be encouraged to remain in the medical field when they return to civilian life. It is the opinion of the committee that this effort is not being made with the energy it deserves. These paramedical people can make a valuable contribution toward relieving our serious shortage of medical care personnel. We urge both the Department of Labor and HEW to give this matter their closest attention.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Within the Department of Labor, manpower development and training activities received \$671,696,089 in 1970. This year their request of \$747,494,000 was whittled down in committee to \$744,494,000, a reduction of \$3 million in the areas of employment security services, State institutional training services, on-the-job training services, planning and technical assistance and labor market information and job matching. The committee felt these cuts were justified.

For example, in the area of planning and technical assistance it seemed to us that as a program is implemented, the amount of money for planning and technical assistance should decrease, not in-

crease. Then too, it was felt that there was some dual funding taking place within OEO and the Department of Labor with respect to labor market information and job matching.

Nevertheless, MDTA funds for 1971 will provide for 26,600 more slots in public service careers in institutional programs, 3,940 in the Job Corps and 600 in Operation Mainstream which is an attempt to increase job opportunities in rural areas. This is a vital program if we are ever going to be able to solve the problem of over-crowding in our urban areas. To make rural living attractive, we must provide good-paying, career-type employment in these areas.

Again, the committee has allowed all funds requested for training and allowance payments but has reduced the amount requested for program services by \$3 million. This still leaves an increase of about \$18.5 million for these services, most of which would be for job banks programs and closely related activities.

Moving on to the Manpower Administration, salaries and expenses section of the bill, an increase of \$3,092,800, over 1970 was asked for by the Manpower Administration. This increase—half of which has been allowed—will provide sufficient funds to cover mandatory cost increases and about one half of the program increase requested. Summarizing, the bill includes \$42,165,000, a reduction of \$1,502,000 from the request, and an increase of \$6,149,000 over the 1970 appropriation while allowing the creation of 115 new positions mainly in the area of training employment.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Manpower Administration asked for and received an additional \$85,502 over 1970 appropriations of \$6,872,498. The increase was due to mandatory pay increases.

The committee was pleased to note that this particular Bureau has developed and installed 4,000 new apprenticeship programs during the period 1960 to 1970. The number of apprentices, while still falling far short of meeting the need for trained people in the apprenticeable occupations, has reached a record high of 110,000 apprentices over the more than 331,000 participants in 1969 in Federal and State registered programs.

For a more complete picture of the distribution of registered apprentices now in industry, I would like to insert the following figures:

DISTRIBUTION OF REGISTERED APPRENTICES BY INDUSTRY AND SELECTED OCCUPATIONS¹

	1968	1969	1970	1971		1968	1969	1970	1971
Construction.....	164,441	181,719	189,570	194,910	Public utilities and transportation.....	13,294	9,597	10,295	12,045
Brick, stone and tile workers.....	11,944	13,265	13,839	14,228	Electrical workers (P and L).....	640	991	1,060	1,241
Carpenters.....	34,946	37,434	39,051	40,151	Linemen.....	3,116	2,422	2,594	3,035
Electricians.....	34,409	35,435	36,966	38,007	Carmen.....	835	1,321	1,420	1,662
Ironworkers.....	10,329	11,448	11,943	12,279	Trades, services and miscellaneous.....	30,923	36,079	56,800	54,750
Plumbers-pipefitters.....	33,247	34,345	35,829	36,838	Auto mechanics.....	10,010	12,458	15,448	16,423
Sheetmetal workers.....	17,609	18,172	18,957	19,491	Auto body builders.....	2,623	3,226	3,968	4,763
Manufacturing, metal.....	58,956	79,109	73,840	76,650	Maintenance mechanic.....	7,729	9,020	13,632	14,632
Machinists.....	23,711	28,442	26,582	27,594	Butcher.....	4,761	5,237	5,761	6,337
Tool and die makers.....	26,249	31,644	29,536	30,660	Draftsmen.....	3,519	3,935	5,680	6,022
Patternmakers.....	2,886	3,164	2,954	3,066	Mining.....	2,601	2,979	3,195	3,285
Manufacturing, nonmetal.....	18,496	21,184	21,655	23,360	Total.....	289,000	331,000	355,000	365,000
Compositors.....	5,661	5,932	6,063	6,307					
Pressmen.....	4,742	5,296	5,414	5,840					
Lithographers.....	3,079	3,601	3,681	3,971					

¹ Selected occupations are listed under industry in which the majority of apprentices are employed.

An uncontrollable item within the Department of Labor is unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen and trade adjustment activities. The bill includes \$200,100,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$12,170,000 over the 1970 appropriation. The additional funds are due, in part, to the over 150,000 military separations in the first half of this year.

Grants to the States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration include appropriations of \$717,700,000, an increase of \$51,928,000 over 1970. These funds will be transferred from the employment security administration account of the unemployment trust fund.

The only program increase included in the request was \$5,787,000 for the computerized job matching program which permits a much more rapid and effective matching of job vacancies with the skills of the persons unemployed or seeking better paying jobs. This amount is offset by a projected savings of \$12,181,000 due to management improvement and cost reduction savings.

The bill authorizes \$4,274,000 for unemployment insurance service. It is estimated that in 1971 unemployment compensation payments will run over \$145 million from last year.

Average annual unemployment rate, 1960-70

Year:	Average annual unemployment rate
1960	5.5
1961	6.7
1962	5.5
1963	5.7
1964	5.2
1965	4.5
1966	3.8
1967	3.8
1968	3.6
1969	3.5
1970	4.3

¹ January-April average, seasonally adjusted.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

We now come to the Labor-Management Services Administration. The request for \$17,169,000 was reduced by \$669,000 but was \$3,362,000 in excess of the 1970 appropriation. The larger increases requested were \$1,408,000 to provide support to the President's program against organized crime and \$1,767,000 for activities required under Executive Order 11491 which vests in the Assistant Secretary for Labor-Management very broad responsibilities in the field of Federal labor-management relations which in many ways are similar to the responsibilities of the National Labor Relations Board in the private sector.

The sum of \$45,000,000 was appropriated for wage and labor standards. While not the full request, it is an increase of \$4,180,430 over 1970. An item in the appropriation figure includes \$1 million for 90 new positions to handle the heavy backlog of employees compensation cases. To get an idea of the proliferation of cases of this kind, let me cite a few figures: In 1963 wage and labor standards handled 17,504 compensation cases. In 1969 there were 30,718 cases and in 1970 this rose to 32,000.

Also included in this portion of the bill was an increase of \$926,000 for the construction safety program which will provide for 45 new positions.

Requested appropriations for employees' compensation claims and expenses this year amounted to \$109,800,000 which was an increase of just over \$54 million for 1970. Payments under this appropriation are prescribed by law and are not subject to administrative control.

Increased medical costs and the liberalization of benefits under 1966 amendments are the main causes for the 100 percent increase in payment and expenses. In addition to these estimated figures in 1971, it will be necessary to pay over \$25 million from the 1971 appropriation to cover the shortage of funds in the 1970 appropriation. In the opinion of the committee the request is less than the amount that will eventually be required for 1971.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics requested \$27,578,000, or an increase over 1970 of \$3,484,546. The appropriations bill includes \$26,150,000, a reduction of \$1,428,000 from the request but an increase of nearly \$3.5 million over the preceding year.

Increases are for providing better data on international prices with the aim of improving our competitive position in export markets; to provide better information on the costs of consumer items to aid the buyer when spending his income; to furnish a better data base for improving employee-management relations in State and local government and to institute a project for the development of data on State and local area economics.

The committee recommendation provides for all mandatory cost increases and one-half of the \$2.8 million requested for program increases. The committee intends that the amount recommended provide the full amount of the increase of \$870,000 budgeted for revision of the Consumer Price Index.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has come up with the following figures concerning the increase in defense-related employment during the Vietnam buildup.

Concluding my summary of Department of Labor appropriations, the Bureau of International Labor Affairs was granted \$28,000 in additional funds over last year. The special foreign currency program request was \$9,044 less than 1970. Funds of \$75,000 will be available only for the purchase of surplus foreign currencies that have been generated under Public Law 480 and, thus, are no drain on the Federal Treasury but only a bookkeeping transaction.

The Office of the Solicitor requested and received an additional \$162,500. This will cover all mandatory cost increases and will provide for an increase of six positions. The total funding for this Department is \$6,041,000.

Funds for the Office of the Secretary of Labor were increased by \$3,654,100 over 1970 with only a 50 percent increase for evaluation allowed. The full appropriation for 1971 is \$10,340,000. In view of the increase in the manpower program and some backlog of audit work, the committee has allowed the increase of \$275,000 requested for this purpose.

TITLE II

Under title II of H.R. 18515 we have the department of HEW appropriations. Again I say, the committee has endeavored to fund every worthwhile project and at the same time hold the line wherever possible.

Food and Drug Administration is the first item. FDA requested \$81,617,500. This is an increase of \$7,931,500 over 1970, of which \$1,806,000 is for so-called "built in" or mandatory costs. Our bill calls for \$89,546,000. The sum of \$6,125,000 is for a general strengthening of several programs: \$4.6 million for the food and pesticides program; \$800,000 for drug and medical devices, and \$700,000 for product safety.

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

The air pollution control section of the committee bill includes \$106,003,000, the amount of the request, and \$891,000 above the amount appropriated for 1970. Faced with the grave situation of air pollution, the committee has approved the agency request which will provide program increases of \$5,052,000 for abatement and control; \$4,511,000 for research, development and demonstration; and \$411,000 for manpower training. This is one section of the appropriations bill that I feel we must fully fund and I am sure Members of this body will support the committee in this respect.

Another important area is environment control. The bill includes \$52,580,000, an increase of \$1,800,000 above the request and \$3,385,000 above the appropriations for 1970 by a straight comparison, but as our committee report states, "when transfers are taken into consideration the increase over 1970 on a comparable basis is \$1,253,000." Also, on a comparable basis the budget request is \$547,000 less than the funds available for the same activities in 1970.

Increases for 1971 include \$200,000 for noise and byssinosis in the cotton-textile industry and \$1,800,000 was added to the \$1,200,000 budgeted for solid waste management.

In the Office of the Administrator of EHS some transfer of funds was involved making the appropriated level of \$4,244,000 the same as last year. This bill allows for no new positions.

Appropriations for Health Services and Mental Health Administration are \$1,384,090,000, an increase of \$114,210,000 over the amount requested and \$329,633,000 over 1970.

Funds for mental health are in excess of the requested \$346,656,000. The bill includes \$368,516,000 for this very vital field. The committee added \$20,000,000 to the bill for staffing grants for new mental health centers around the country. Without these funds, the new centers, which in many instances were constructed with Federal money would not be able to open. This seemed completely unreasonable and therefore we granted the additional funds.

We now have in the bill \$31.5 million for community mental health centers staffing grants for a total of \$80.1 million. The sum of \$5.3 million for narcotic addiction, drug abuse, alcoholism, violence and early child care. The sum of \$4.7 million for community narcotics and

alcoholism rehabilitation programs, \$3.0 million for additional aftercare and rehabilitation services for drug users, and \$720,000 for public information on drugs and alcoholism.

Just a few facts at this point might be of interest and give the Members an idea of why the committee felt it necessary to fund the amounts we did.

There are between 4 to 6 million alcoholics in the country. Over 20 percent

are women with 200,000 new cases each year and 13,000 deaths a year attributed to alcoholism. Over 50 percent of all traffic accidents involving fatalities are attributed to drinking. The cost to industry is \$4 billion annually. Finally each alcoholic affects an average of four family members.

The committee granted \$1,025,000 to expand research on alcoholism and to fund 18 new centers for community re-

habilitation. Each of the centers will be able to treat 500 patients.

Narcotic addiction and drug abuse is a major concern these days. The committee was told that there are from 100,000 to 150,000 users of hard narcotics in the United States. We have allowed ample funds for treating this cancerous condition in our society. The following chart gives the amounts being spent in this area:

NARCOTIC ADDICTION REHABILITATION GRANTS—NEW AWARDS

ALCOHOLISM REHABILITATION GRANTS—NEW AWARDS

	1970 estimate		1971 estimate			1970 estimate		1971 estimate	
	Number	Amount	Number	1971 amount		Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Staffing: New projects	16	\$2,671,000	7	\$2,340,000	Staffing: New projects	18	\$3,175,000	21	\$4,200,000
Training and special projects: New projects	3	300,000	5	500,000	Training and special projects: New projects			10	1,000,000
Planning and initiation: New projects			2	100,000	Planning and initiation: New projects			10	500,000
Consultation services: New projects			3	100,000	Consultation services: New projects			15	300,000
Total	19	2,971,000	17	3,040,000	Total	18	3,175,000	56	6,000,000

St. Elizabeths Hospital will receive the budget request of \$14,823,000 which is \$644,000 above the 1970 appropriation. The amount included in the bill will cover mandatory cost increases and provide for an increase of approximately 48 new employees.

Health service research and development was fully funded in the amount of \$57,403,000 which is an increase of \$14,901,000 over last year. Priority items under this section of the bill include the

costs of hospital care. At present, three projects are under way to find ways to contain medical costs. Also the committee gave consideration to the 10 to 15 OEO neighborhood health center which are being spun off to HEW.

A very urgent program—medex—is funded under health service research and development. This program is underway to utilize the talents of returning medical corpsmen from the armed services. This is a 5-year study involving 700 corpsmen.

The committee also allowed full funding of comprehensive health planning and services. The \$247,178,000 in the bill was the amount requested and \$39,376,000 above the 1970 appropriation. There is funding in the program for 10 new comprehensive health services projects; \$16 million for rubella, german measles, and \$15 million for rat control. Inserted at this point is a chart showing the location of rubella immunization projects:

RUBELLA IMMUNIZATION PROJECTS

Grantee and location	Coverage of projects	314(e) funds		Total	Non 314(e) grantee support	Total
		Fiscal year 1969 supplement	Fiscal year 1970 appropriation			
Vermont State Department of Health, Burlington, Vt.	Statewide	\$27,050	\$41,250	\$68,300	\$124,568	\$192,868
Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Boston, Mass.	do	259,400	393,900	653,300	2,382,040	3,035,340
Maine Department of Health and Welfare, Augusta, Maine	do	58,500	99,919	158,419	422,512	580,931
New Hampshire Division of Public Health Service, Concord, N.H.	do	35,340	55,740	19,080	80,050	171,130
Rhode Island Department of Health, Providence, R.I.	do	50,800	70,575	121,375	332,006	453,381
Connecticut State Department of Health, Hartford, Conn.	do	91,377	174,195	265,572	226,144	491,716
New Jersey State Department of Health, Trenton, N.J.	do	180,260	429,497	609,757	309,858	919,615
Philadelphia Department of Public Health, Philadelphia, Pa.	Philadelphia	102,900	192,537	295,437	117,912	413,349
City of New York Department of Health, New York, N.Y.	New York City	313,000	657,513	970,513	3,076,434	4,046,947
Delaware State Board of Health, Dover, Del.	Statewide	46,850	63,855	110,705	108,572	219,277
Kentucky Department of Health, Frankfort, Ky.	do	185,025	281,194	466,219	163,988	630,207
Mississippi State Board of Health, Jackson, Miss.	do	188,600	280,705	469,305	203,200	672,505
South Carolina State Board of Health, Columbia, S.C.	do	171,000	267,820	438,820	686,748	1,125,568
Chattanooga Hamilton County Health Department, Chattanooga, Tenn.	Hamilton County	47,250	52,993	100,243	97,334	197,577
Knox County Health Department, Knoxville, Tenn.	Knox County	50,940	55,232	106,172	85,470	191,642
Memphis Shelby County Health Department, Memphis, Tenn.	Shelby County	112,500	128,140	240,640	93,516	334,156
Metropolitan Health Department, Nashville, Tenn.	Nashville, Davidson County	68,550	76,508	145,058	58,392	203,450
Alabama Department of Public Health, Montgomery, Ala.	Statewide	270,050	387,987	658,037	251,594	909,631
Florida State Board of Health, Jacksonville, Fla.	do	316,200	516,430	832,630	113,698	946,328
Georgia Department of Public Health, Atlanta, Ga.	do	218,244	386,727	604,971	200,000	804,971
Chicago Board of Health, Chicago, Ill.	Chicago	263,950	436,113	700,063	359,772	1,059,835
Illinois Department of Public Health, Springfield, Ill.	Excluding Chicago	185,700	381,766	567,466	310,460	877,926
Division of Public Health-Health Corp., Marion County, Indianapolis, Ind.	Marion County	53,550	78,299	131,849	153,500	285,349
Barrien County Health Department, St. Joseph, Mich.	Tri-County, SE Michigan	26,830	35,230	62,060	21,490	83,550
Detroit Department of Health, Detroit, Mich.	Detroit	135,600	172,300	307,900	180,200	488,100
Saginaw City Health Department, Saginaw, Mich.	Saginaw	13,750	16,309	30,059	21,318	51,377
Ohio Department of Health, Columbus, Ohio	Statewide	265,700	628,415	894,115	6,116	900,231
Wisconsin Division of Health and Social Services, Madison, Wis.	Excluding Milwaukee	83,470	207,630	291,100	45,400	336,500
City of Milwaukee Health Department, Milwaukee, Wis.	Milwaukee	55,650	74,377	130,027	313,854	443,881
Indiana State Board of Health, Indianapolis, Ind.	Statewide	125,360	200,744	326,104	22,714	348,818
Kansas State Department of Health, Topeka, Kans.	do	133,080	225,031	358,111	95,548	453,659
Iowa State Department of Health, Des Moines, Iowa	do	213,400	343,219	556,619	6,138	562,757
Minnesota Department of Health, Minneapolis, Minn.	do	64,200	89,874	154,074	15,790	169,864
South Dakota State Department of Health, Pierre, S. Dak.	do	148,000	243,064	391,064	60,674	451,738
Missouri Division of Health, Jefferson, Mo.	Excluding Kansas City, St. Louis					
St. Louis Division of Health, St. Louis, Mo.	St. Louis	76,922	98,839	175,761	413,974	589,735
Nebraska State Department of Health, Lincoln, Nebr.	Statewide	83,650	117,189	200,839	20,818	221,657
Kansas City Health Department, Kansas City, Mo.	Kansas City	46,500	60,307	106,807	76,628	183,435
North Dakota State Department of Health, Bismarck, N. Dak.	Statewide	33,200	57,390	90,590	10,150	100,740
San Antonio Metropolitan Health Department, San Antonio, Tex.	San Antonio	73,000	100,145	173,145	124,980	298,125
Arkansas State Health Department, Little Rock, Ark.	Statewide	118,400	189,133	307,533	306,600	614,133
Texas State Department of Health, Austin, Tex.	Excluding Houston, San Antonio	388,880	669,078	1,057,958	158,126	1,216,084
Louisiana State Department of Health, New Orleans, La.	Statewide	216,200	355,298	571,498	200,414	771,912
Oklahoma State Health Department, Oklahoma City, Okla.	do	123,900	191,288	315,188	106,350	421,538

RUBELLA IMMUNIZATION PROJECTS—Continued

Grantee and location	Coverage of projects	314(e) funds		Total	Non 314(e) grantee support	Total
		Fiscal year 1969 supplement	Fiscal year 1970 appropriation			
New Mexico Department of Health, Santa Fe, N. Mex.	do.	\$65,440	\$119,428	\$184,868	\$40,000	\$224,868
City of Houston Health Department, Houston, Tex.	Houston	122,428	178,517	300,945	339,582	640,527
Idaho Department of Health, Boise, Idaho	Statewide	79,500	97,998	177,498	14,060	191,558
Montana State Department of Health, Helena, Mont.	do.	63,200	89,817	153,017	31,936	184,953
Utah State Department of Health and Welfare, Salt Lake City, Utah	do.	62,326	102,656	164,982	7,334	172,316
Wyoming Department of Public Health, Cheyenne, Wyo.	do.	27,679	35,319	62,998	4,266	67,264
Colorado Department of Health, Denver, Colo.	do.	109,300	177,727	287,027	51,124	338,151
Pima County Health Department, Tucson, Ariz.	Pima County	27,560	35,614	63,174	112,962	176,136
Reno Sparks Wash County Health Department, Reno, Nev.	Sparks, Wash County	20,350	22,604	42,954	20,446	63,400
Oregon State Board of Health, Portland, Ore.	Statewide	99,164	146,307	245,471	14,206	259,677
Arizona State Department of Health, Phoenix, Ariz.	Excluding Pima Company	91,300	140,096	231,396	23,050	254,446
District Health Department, Las Vegas, Nev.	Clark Company	38,760	47,463	86,223	48,930	135,153
California State Department of Public Health, Berkeley, Calif.	Statewide	1,205,272	1,839,045	3,044,317	2,645,808	5,690,125
State of Hawaii Department of Health, Honolulu, Hawaii	do.	70,000	100,590	170,590	530,972	701,562
Alaska Department of Health and Welfare, Juneau, Alaska	do.	68,910	74,819	143,729	383,400	527,129
Washington State Department of Health, Olympia, Wash.	do.		150,000	150,000	173,291	323,291
Grand total		9,600,000	16,000,000	25,600,000	22,743,231	48,343,231

Note: Total number of grants 70.

Another program in which the full request was granted by the committee in the area is maternal and child health. The bill includes \$225,339,000 which is \$30,758,000 more than the amount available for the same activities in 1970.

The principle increase is \$10,715,000 for family planning activities. Most of their funds will be used for project grants to State and local health department and nonprofit organizations to provide family planning services for women who want such services but cannot afford them, through expanding existing clinics and creating new ones.

It was interesting to note that in 1969, 450,000 women availed themselves of family planning services while in fiscal year 1970 some 700,000 women, in both city slum and rural poverty areas, have used family planning services.

There is also an increase of children receiving health services. In 1969, 362,000 registered in 57 projects. In 1970, 59 projects handled an estimated 380,000 youngsters.

A recent study conducted by a planned parenthood group showed that although one-fifth—or 5 million—of the estimated 25 million women of reproduction age in the United States were in need of subsidized family planning services, only 750,000 were actually reported in 1968 and were patients of all known public and private agencies offering family planning services. The study also revealed that only 1,800 of 3,000 counties in the country offer family planning services. Nine-tenths of the approximately 4,000 nonprofit general care hospitals, in which most low-income mothers deliver babies offer no family planning programs at all. Yet, we have learned that mothers who have just given birth are highly motivated concerning family planning.

We must have ample funds for this program and to correct a situation where we find something like 2.2 to 2.7 million unwanted births in the country during 1960 to 1965. Think about that for a moment. There are between 370,000 to 445,000 unwanted babies born annually and most all of them have parents who

are poor or on the borderline of poverty. The problem is a critical one.

We were happy to learn in committee that 53 of the 55 prospective programs of the regional medical programs are finally in operation after much confusion and delay. These programs are helping hospitals, other medical service providers and communities to identify and address specific and broad health problems and needs. They are mobilizing human and physical resources required to meet their problems and needs and are extending professional expertise and leadership to provide maximum assurance that improvements will be meaningful and lasting.

For example, at the national clearinghouse for smoking and health studies show that there is new evidence that smoking among children, which appeared to be declining is no longer doing so and may be rising again.

At the same time total cigarette consumption is declining and the number of adults who were successful in giving up smoking last year is now estimated at 2 million. The regional medical programs portion of the bill includes \$96,502,000, the amount of the request, and a reduction of \$98,000 from the amount appropriated for 1970, however, that reflects unobligated balances and transfer of funds.

Funds this year for communicable disease amount to \$41,938,000 with an increase of \$400,000 over the agency request which will restore the venereal disease program to last year's level. With the incidence of venereal disease reaching epidemic proportion in America, the committee felt the program should be continued at full strength.

More money than requested has been appropriated for rubella vaccination. While grant funds for rubella are in the appropriation "comprehensive health planning and services" the communicable disease center furnishes the technical assistance to the States in implementing the program. The committee strenuously urges that this program move ahead with all possible speed.

Medical facilities construction funds

includes \$181,521,000, an increase of \$92,200,000 over the request and are \$5 million above 1970. The sum of \$338,200,000 is slotted for construction of hospitals and other medical care facilities with \$5 million going for interest subsidies.

The \$338 million plus figure is an increase of \$166 million above the amount provided in 1970.

The patient care and special health services has been granted the full \$79,889,000 of its request which is \$2,424,000 above last year. The PHS system of hospitals and clinics has as its responsibility the provision of comprehensive medical care to American seamen, owners and operators of fishing vessels, the Coast Guard, the Public Health Service, and individuals afflicted with leprosy.

The next item is beyond administration control; \$19,501,000, an increase of \$2,801,000 over 1970 has been allotted for retire pay of commissioned officers.

The \$9,668,000 funded for national health statistics will provide \$166,000 and 18 new positions for initial funding of family growth studies. There is an additional \$150,000 and 10 positions for operation of a uniform national system for the statistical reporting of family planning activities. The full NHS funding was a reduction of \$250,000 from the request and \$498,000 above the appropriations for 1970.

The Office of Administrator of NSMHA was given its full request of \$11,812,000 which was \$1,223,000 above the 1970 appropriations.

THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Let me move on now to the renowned National Institutes of Health. The bill includes \$1,634,739,000 which is \$92,700,000 above the NIH request. As we say in our committee report, we think it vital to continue to insure the citizen of the country with the best health standard possible. This will be difficult with the current fiscal problems, but we have tried, at least, to maintain the momentum of NIH and avoid any backsliding of the standards the Institution has set.

A sum of \$38 million has been added to

restore all research components that were cut below the 1970 level. Also \$25 million has been added to the Cancer Institution in order to go forward with their special emphasis areas in virus cancer research. Finally, \$10 million has been funded to the National Institute of General Medical Services to launch a major program in genetic research.

There is reason for considerable optimism of medical breakthrough in all these fields and the committee in all good conscience could not refuse the required money to aid NIH in their fight against disease, disability and premature death.

The Division of Biologics Standards funds includes \$8,838,000, an increase of \$198,000 over the amount requested and \$615,000 over last year's appropriations. This Division is responsible for some 300 products licensed for treatment and prevention of human diseases.

Among the projects it is currently engaged in is the development of a sufficiently sensitive and reliable test for hepatitis virus in blood and blood products so that hepatitis infections that sometimes follow transfusions may be prevented. You might also recall that Biolo-

gies Standards played a major role in the developing and licensing of the rubella vaccine.

The amount in the bill for the National Cancer Institute is \$227,383,000, an increase of \$25,000,000 over the amount requested; \$46,685,000 over last year, and \$46,051,000 over 1970 funds after a few relatively minor small transfers are taken into consideration. We are trying to do everything in the area of cancer research as witnessed by the fact that this year's funds represent an increase of \$91,383,000 over 1961 appropriations of \$111,000,000.

It is estimated that there will be 325,000 deaths in 1971 which can be attributed to cancer or one every 2 minutes.

Using 1940 as an index of 100, it is demonstrable that by 1967 the cancer mortality index reached a level of 196 compared with an index of 150 for growth in population of the United States.

It is encouraging that the private sector of our country is putting in about \$100 to \$150 million for cancer research.

The National Cancer Institute is also making forward strides in its fight against childhood leukemia. Listen to these figures: In 1960—9 percent of af-

flicted patients survived 2 years after diagnosis; in 1961, 18 percent; 1962-63, 29 percent; 1964-65, 42 percent; 1966-67, 52 percent; and 1969-70, 75 percent. This is encouraging.

The increases in National Cancer Institute funds are \$18.8 million for studies of virus cancer research and an increase of \$2 million for the chemical carcinogenesis program. The rest of the \$25 million is left to the Institute.

The appropriations bill provides \$178,479,000 for the National Heart and Lung Institute. This is an increase of \$6,732,000 over the amount requested.

The bill includes \$2,225,000 for new activities in connection with lung research and \$7 million for special cardiovascular research and training centers.

It is estimated that over 1 million deaths occur annually due to heart disease. There are 3.7 million Americans who have heart disease including 1.4 million who have already had at least one heart attack. The Institute is making progress in the area of heart disease and for a detailed description of what has been done in the heart transplant field, I include the following chart:

REPORT OF HUMAN HEART TRANSPLANTS, AS OF APR. 1, 1970

Number	Recipient		Donor		Date of transplant	Survival	Reported cause of death	Country
	Age	Sex	Age	Sex				
1	53	M	25	F	Dec. 3, 1967	18 days	Infection/rejection	South Africa.
2	(1)	M	(1)	M	Dec. 6, 1967	6½ hrs.	Metabolic/respiratory acidosis	United States.
3	58	M	24	M	Jan. 2, 1968	593 days	Chronic rejection	South Africa.
4	57	M	43	M	Jan. 6, 1968	15 days	Internal hemorrhage	United States
5	58	M	29	F	Jan. 10, 1968	8½ hrs.	Left ventricular failure	Do.
6	27	M	20	F	Feb. 16, 1968	3 hrs.	Pulmonary hypertension	India.
7	66	M	23	M	Apr. 27, 1968	2 days	Embolism/brain damage	France.
8	40	M	43	M	May 2, 1968	3¼ days	Deprivation of oxygen/pulmonary embolism	United States.
9	47	M	15	F	May 3, 1968	204 days	Rejection	Do.
10	45	M	26	M	do.	45 days	Multiple pulmonary emboli	England.
11	48	M	15	M	May 5, 1968	3 days	Leukopenia/pneumonia	United States.
12	62	M	36	M	May 7, 1968	7 days	Renal and hepatic failure	Do.
13	65	M	35	M	May 8, 1968	2 days	Pulmonary injury/cerebral air embolism	France.
14	56	M	39	M	May 12, 1968	523 days	Rejection	Do.
15	54	M	17	M	May 21, 1968	146 days	Cardiac arrest/rejection	United States.
16	53	M	48	M	May 25, 1968	7 days	Total rejection	Do.
17	24	M	40	M	May 26, 1968	28 days	Rejection	Brazil.
18	54	M	47	M	May 31, 1968	5 days	Cerebral embolism	Argentina.
19	59	M	38	F	June 1, 1968	1 day	Low-output heart failure	Canada.
20	39	M	29	M	May 31, 1968	0 hrs.	Malfunction of right ventricle	United States.
21	41	F	26	M	June 7, 1968	1½ hrs	Acute rejection	Do.
22	49	M	23	M	June 28, 1968	156 days	Asphyxiation following indigestion	Canada.
23	24	F	32	M	do.	133 days	Cerebral embolus	Chile.
24	48	M	50	M	July 2, 1968	149 days	Chronic rejection	United States.
25	49	F	46	M	July 9, 1968	5 hours	?	Czechoslovakia.
26	58	M	33	F	July 20, 1968	266 days	Probable arrhythmias	United States.
27	57	M	16	M	July 23, 1968	170 days	Chronic rejection	Do.
28	47	M	34	M	July 25, 1968	2 days	Ventricular failure	England.
29	49	F	40	F	July 29, 1968	56 days	Sepsis/GI hemorrhage, thrombocytopenia	United States.
30	18	M	21	M	Aug. 8, 1968	82 days	Acute respiratory infection	Japan.
31	5	F	11	M	Aug. 18, 1968	7 days	Cardiac arrest/acute rejection	United States.
32	50	M	37	F	Aug. 19, 1968	68 days	Herpes sepsis, pneumonia	Do.
33	43	M	21	M	Aug. 22, 1968	46 days	Pneumonia	Do.
34	43	M	17	M	Aug. 24, 1968	Surviving		Do.
35	58	M	35	F	Aug. 30, 1968	11 days	Stroke	Canada.
36	50	M	39	M	Aug. 31, 1968	Surviving		United States.
37	50	M	20	F	do.	do.		Do.
38	46	M	22	M	Sept. 1, 1968	443 days	Rejection	Do.
39	48	M	39	M	Sept. 2, 1968	409 days	do.	Brazil.
40	50	M	25	F	Sept. 4, 1968	476 days	Acute M.I.; chronic rejection	United States.
41	47	M	17	M	Sept. 5, 1968	8 days	Cardiac arrest	Do.
42	52	M	36	F	Sept. 8, 1968	Surviving		South Africa.
43	48	F	27	M	Sept. 10, 1968	132 days	Hepatitis	United States.
44	58	M	16	M	Sept. 11, 1968	117 days	Pulmonary infarction	Canada.
45	21	M	25	F	Sept. 13, 1968	14 hours	Renal failure	India.
46	52	M	20	M	Sept. 15, 1968	111 days	Monilia brain abscess	United States.
47	(?)	F	(?)	F	do.	14 hours	Pulmonary insufficiency	Do.
48	44	M	46	F	Sept. 17, 1968	2 days	Acute kidney insufficiency	Spain.
49	45	M	27	F	Sept. 18, 1968	6 hours	Irreversible ventricular fibrillation	Venezuela.
50	16	M	36	M	do.	Surviving		United States.
51	51	M	19	M	do.	62 days	Herpes viremia and cerebral pseudomonas abscess	Canada.
52	57	M	46	M	Dec. 16, 1968	88 days	Lung infection	United States.
53	50	M	37	M	Sept. 20, 1968	446 days	Pneumonia	Do.
54	46	M	17	M	Sept. 23, 1968	22 days	Cardiac arrest	Do.
55	21	M	17	M	Oct. 1, 1968	Surviving		Chile.
56	46	M	43	M	Oct. 2, 1968	5 days	Acute rejection	United States.
57	54	F	28	F	Oct. 5, 1968	61 days	Pneumonia	Do.
58	42	M	33	M	Oct. 9, 1968	204 days	Rejection	Canada.
59	54	F	28	F	Oct. 12, 1968	157 days	Bowel perforation	United States.
60	19	F	35	?	Oct. 15, 1968	15 hrs.	Complication in blood coagulation	Argentina.

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF HUMAN HEART TRANSPLANTS, AS OF APR. 1, 1970—Continued

Number	Recipient Age Sex	Donor Age Sex	Date of transplant	Survival	Reported cause of death	Country
61	50 M	20 M	Oct. 18, 1968	177 days	Ruptured colon	United States.
62	45 F	20 ?	Oct. 20, 1968	60 days	Acute rejection	Canada.
63	49 F	30 M	Oct. 21, 1968	Surviving		United States.
64	57 M	30 M	Oct. 23, 1968	45 days	Hemorrhage following surgical complications	Australia.
65	19 F	19 M	do	7 days	Acute rejection	United States.
66	42 M	41 F	Oct. 24, 1968	6 hours	Cardiac arrest	Do.
67	52 M	49 F	Oct. 25, 1968	126 days	Chronic rejection	Do.
68	35 ?	25 ?	do	54 days	Rejection	Canada.
69	54 M	20 ?	Oct. 26, 1968	Surviving		United States.
70	45 M	20 M	Oct. 29, 1968	9 days	Pneumonia/infection	Canada.
71	23 M	24 M	Oct. 30, 1968	18 days	Rejection	United States.
72	40 M	42 M	Nov. 3, 1968	4 days	Failure of liver/kidneys	Do.
73	52 M	28 F	do	Surviving		Canada.
74	50 M	27 M	Nov. 5, 1968	7 days	Rejection	United States.
75	25 F	19 M	do	1 day	Acute rejection	Russia.
76	55 M	27 F	Nov. 9, 1968	47 days	Bacterial pneumonia	United States.
77	44 M	15 ?	Nov. 11, 1968	38 days	Acute rejection	Canada.
78	34 M	50 M	do	13 days	do	France.
79	54 M	22 M	Nov. 13, 1968	7 days	Cerebral embolism	Canada.
80	44 M	44 M	do	14 hrs	Ventricular fibrillation	Australia.
81	50 M	38 F	Nov. 16, 1968	497 days	Pneumonia/rejection	United States.
82	53 M	50 F	Nov. 17, 1968	40 days	Rejection	France.
83	54 M	18 M	do	Surviving		Canada.
84	56 M	? ?	Nov. 20, 1968	3 days	Stroke	United States.
85	56 M	? ?	do	do	do	Do.
86	47 M	47 F	do	do	Cardiac failure/rejection	Do.
87	49 M	? ?	Nov. 22, 1968	281 days	Irregular heart action	Do.
88	30 F	14 M	do	3 hrs.	?	Chile.
89	33 F	18 M	do	18 hrs	Liver ceased functioning/failure of blood to clot	Turkey.
90	37 M	47 ?	Nov. 24, 1968	14 hrs	Irreversible kidney failure	France.
91	48 M	46 ?	do	400 days	Rejection	Do.
92	26 M	50 M	Nov. 25, 1968	1 day	Cardiac insufficiency	Turkey.
93	56 M	26 M	do	70 days	Rejection	United States.
94	56 M	33 M	Nov. 26, 1968	20 hrs	Cardiac arrest	France.
95	48 M	25 M	Nov. 27, 1968	Surviving		Do.
96	54 M	40 M	Nov. 29, 1968	13 days	Rejection	United States.
97	54 M	23 ?	do	105 days	Cerebral thrombosis	Canada.
98	38 M	22 ?	Dec. 1, 1968	Surviving		United States.
99	43 M	? M	Dec. 5, 1968	14 days	Kidney failure/pneumonia/rejection	Israel.
100	22 M	21 ?	Dec. 16, 1968	43 days	Congestive heart failure	United States.
101	28 M	(?) ?	Dec. 22, 1968	225 days		France.
102	(?) M	(?) M	Dec. 25, 1968	5 hrs.	Cardiac failure	United States.
103	50 M	48 M	Dec. 27, 1968	91 days	Rejection	Do.
104	64 M	48 M	Jan. 1, 1969	114 days	Acute rejection	Do.
105	35 M	26 M	Jan. 4, 1969	0 hrs.	Right ventricular failure/pulmonary hypertension	Poland.
106	59 M	14 M	Jan. 5, 1969	37 days	Rejection	United States.
107	44 ?	54 ?	do	7 days	Pulmonary hypertension	Do.
108	49	44 M	Jan. 6, 1969	do	Brain hemorrhage/pneumonia	Do.
109	52 M	28 M	do	83 days	Pulmonary embolus	Brazil.
110	49 M	38 M	Jan. 17, 1969	4 hrs.	Progressive pulmonary hypertension	United States.
111	47 M	13 ?	Jan. 23, 1969	2 days	Brain damage/edema of brain	Do.
112	7 F	8 M	Feb. 8, 1969	30 days	Lung infection/rejection	Do.
113	43 M	? ?	do	Surviving		Do.
114	36 M	39 F	Feb. 13, 1969	1 day	Traumatic coronary thrombosis pre-transplant	Germany.
115	55 M	24 M	Feb. 15, 1969	10 days	Rejection	United States.
116	36 M	57 M	Feb. 20, 1969	64 days	do	Do.
117	58 M	23 F	do	41 days	Hemorrhagic pneumonitis	Do.
118	56 M	26 M	Mar. 4, 1969	99 days	Hepatitis	Do.
119	43 M	24 M	Mar. 16, 1969	306 days	Kidney/liver failure	United States.
120	38 M	28 M	Mar. 22, 1969	1 day	Cardiac arrest	Germany.
121	42 M	? ?	Mar. 29, 1969	39 days	?	United States.
122	40 F	? ?	Apr. 3, 1969	5 days	Rejection/hepsis	Do.
123	35 M	41 F	Apr. 4, 1969	49 days	Acute rejection	Canada.
124	47 M	40 F	Apr. 7, 1969	1 day	Pseudomonis septicemia	United States.
125	63 M	43 F	do	64 days	Rejection	South Africa.
126	54 M	27 M	Apr. 14, 1969	91 days	Unidentified infection	Switzerland.
127	58 M	20 M	do	Surviving		United States.
128	44 M	30 M	Apr. 15, 1969	31 days	Acute rejection	Do.
129	38 F	33 M	Apr. 17, 1969	Surviving		South Africa.
130	55 M	29 F	Apr. 24, 1969	14 days	Parasitic pneumonia/rejection	United States.
131	35 M	35 F	Apr. 26, 1969	6 days	Acute rejection	South Africa.
132	48 M	16 F	May 11, 1969	35 days	Rejection	United States.
133	59 M	29 F	May 16, 1969	107 days	Cardiac arrest	England.
134	? ?	? ?	May 22, 1969	Surviving		United States.
135	54 M	20 M	June 2, 1969	41 days	Rejection reaction	Do.
136	52 M	25 M	June 3, 1969	142 days	Systemic infection	Do.
137	56 M	32 F	June 28, 1969	42 days	Pneumonia/renal failure	Do.
138	46 M	28 M	July 7, 1969	74 days	Arrhythmia	Switzerland.
139	46 M	31 M	July 10, 1969	9 hrs	Fibrinolysis and irreversible bleeding	Germany.
140	52 M	? ?	July 16, 1969	136 days	Rejection	United States.
141	59 M	17 F	July 25, 1969	4 days	Pulmonary emboli/renal failure	Do.
142	47 M	18 M	July 28, 1969	5 days	Pneumonia/renal failure	Do.
143	58 M	35 M	Aug. 13, 1969	Surviving		Do.
144	54 M	? ?	Aug. 16, 1969	10 hrs	High blood pressure in lungs/lack of oxygen	Do.
145	45 F	? ?	Sept. 3, 1969	Surviving		Do.
146	64 M	32 M	Sept. 14, 1969	60 days	?	Do.
147	54 M	41 F	Sept. 25, 1969	26 days	Pneumonia	Do.
148	48 M	24 M	Sept. 29, 1969	Surviving		Do.
149	44 M	20 M	Oct. 13, 1969	29 hrs	?	South Africa.
150	43 M	50 F	Dec. 25, 1969	8 days	Lung rejection/pneumonia	United States.
151	40 M	? ?	Jan. 4, 1970	Surviving		Do.
152	52 M	36 F	Jan. 8, 1970	do		Do.
153	34 M	? ?	Jan. 13, 1970	4 days	Rejection	Do.
154	44 M	24 M	Jan. 16, 1970	13 days	Kidney/liver failure	Do.
155	49 M	? ?	Jan. do	Surviving		Do.
156	49 M	? F	Feb. 10, 1970	do		Do.

¹ Recipient, 17 days old; donor, 2 days old.

² Received 2d transplant Nov. 18, 1968, see. No. 86.

³ Recipient, 2 months old; donor, 1 day old.

⁴ Received 2d transplant Nov. 20, 1968, see. No. 85.

⁵ Received 1st transplant May 3, 1968, see. No. 9.

⁶ Recipient, 8 days old; donor, 2 days old.

⁷ Received 2d transplant Jan. 16, 1970, see. No. 154.

⁸ Also received 2 lungs.

⁹ Received 1st transplant Mar. 16, 1969, see. No. 119.

Note: 156 transplants (153 patients)—surviving 23.

CARDIOVASCULAR AND PULMONARY DISEASES—DEATHS FROM CARDIOVASCULAR AND PULMONARY DISEASES DURING 1967

[Division of Vital Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics]

	Total, males and females—				Total, males and females—		
	Under 65	65 and over	Total		Under 65	65 and over	Total
Arteriosclerotic heart disease (includes coronary disease or heart attacks).....	158,701	414,452	573,153	Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease.....	8,930	5,246	14,176
Cerebrovascular lesions (includes strokes and other blood vessel diseases in the brain).....	36,761	165,423	202,184	Other cardiovascular diseases.....	20,432	40,779	61,211
Hypertension.....	15,542	45,584	61,126	Diseases of cardiovascular system.....	250,977	751,134	1,002,111
Nonrheumatic chronic endocarditis and other heart muscle degeneration.....	8,794	43,903	52,697	Chronic bronchitis and emphysema.....	13,418	22,595	36,013
General arteriosclerosis.....	1,817	35,747	37,564	Total.....	264,395	773,729	1,038,124
Males—				Females—			
	Under 65	65 and over	Total		Under 65	65 and over	Total
Arteriosclerotic heart disease (includes coronary disease or heart attacks).....	122,592	222,562	345,154	Arteriosclerotic heart disease (includes coronary disease or heart attacks).....	36,109	191,890	227,999
Cerebrovascular lesions (includes strokes and other blood vessel diseases in the brain).....	19,572	73,499	93,071	Cerebrovascular lesions (includes strokes and other blood vessel diseases in the brain).....	17,189	91,924	109,113
Hypertension.....	8,552	18,573	27,125	Hypertension.....	6,990	27,011	34,001
Nonrheumatic chronic endocarditis and other heart muscle degeneration.....	5,897	19,990	25,887	Nonrheumatic chronic endocarditis and other heart muscle degeneration.....	2,897	23,913	26,810
General arteriosclerosis.....	1,116	15,473	16,589	General arteriosclerosis.....	701	20,274	20,975
Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease.....	4,020	1,968	5,988	Rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease.....	4,910	3,278	8,188
Other cardiovascular diseases.....	12,628	22,284	34,912	Other cardiovascular diseases.....	7,804	18,495	26,299
Diseases of cardiovascular system.....	174,377	374,349	548,726	Diseases of cardiovascular system.....	76,600	376,785	453,385
Chronic bronchitis and emphysema.....	9,592	18,339	27,931	Chronic bronchitis and emphysema.....	3,826	4,256	8,082
Total.....	183,969	392,688	576,657	Total.....	80,426	381,041	461,467

Funds will, of course, also be available for work on respiratory conditions. Presently, approximately 36,000 people die every year from chronic respiratory conditions apart from cancer of the lung or respiratory infection. In addition, another 20,000 infants die each year from hyaline membrane disease.

With the money provided this year by the committee, hopefully more Institute programs can get off the ground and into practical application to fight heart and lung disease.

This year we also have boosted slightly, funds for the National Institute of Dental Research. The sum of \$34,563,000 was requested by the Institute and the committee increased that amount by \$6,703,000 making the total appropriation of \$35,257,000.

Dental decay affects 98 percent of our population. Studies conducted through the Armed Forces show that for every 100 Army inductees there are 600 fillings, 112 extractions, 40 bridges, 21 crowns, 18 partial dentures and one full denture. Considering that there is only one dental researcher for every 44 active non-Federal dentists and only one Ph. D. researcher for every 53 such dentists make it imperative that we grant funds for an intensified program of research and development that—we are told—may well lead to the means for almost complete prevention of dental decay by the end of the decade. The committee feels this is a very worthwhile project.

A few facts might help illustrate the value of the funding: In 1967, of the 6,800 philanthropic foundations listed in the Foundation Directory, only three mentioned dentistry as one of their areas of interest and only one limited its interest to dentistry.

Tooth decay, in the meantime, is developing three times faster than available manpower can beat it. Approximately \$2 billion is spent each year for treatment of tooth decay by 40 percent of the population and the estimated care for all cavities incurred each year is \$10 billion.

Cleft lip palates makes up 13 percent of all birth anomalies. When you consider that 250,000 people in America have some form of oral cleft and that 6,000 babies born this year will have similar problems, the seriousness of the situation becomes evident.

There is hope, however, in the fight. For instance, it has been found out that children living in communities enjoying the benefits of water fluoridation, generally have 50 percent to 65 percent less tooth decay.

The \$5 million in the bill will help sustain this type of research in the dental decay field. Incidentally, the appropriation increase for the National Institute of Dental Research is the largest, percentage-wise, of any institution.

Another National Institute of Health—the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, received an increase over requested funds of \$6,000,000. They wanted \$132,152,000 and the committee funded \$138,339,000. The members of the committee were informed that arthritis and rheumatoid diseases afflict more than 16 million people in the United States and their afflictions are estimated to adversely affect the economy by about \$3.6 billion annually. We learned that diabetes alone affects more than 4 million people and that the prevalence of the disease has doubled since 1950. The 1971 appropriation will allow the Institute to extend their research in this area over the next year.

In the area of kidney disease the Institute is moving both in the areas of kidney machines and transplantation. They presently have developed an artificial kidney which is about the size of a large flashlight and commercial production is

about to begin. The cost, however, is still prohibitive. I offer the following information from the report on the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases:

Cystic fibrosis (CF) is a grave disease of children and young adults caused by an inborn error of metabolism. The basic chemical defect is not yet fully understood, but it is known to be genetically transmitted. Estimates of the incidence of cystic fibrosis in the population today range as high as 1 in 1,400 live births. As a cause of death in children under 15 years, cystic fibrosis outranks many of the better known diseases such as poliomyelitis, rheumatic fever, and diabetes, and now that it is being diagnosed with increasing frequency throughout the world, it is recognized as a serious public health problem.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's research activities in cystic fibrosis are centered in the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases of the National Institutes of Health; service activities of the Department related to this disease are centered in the Maternal and Child Health Service of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration.

The Federal Government is deeply committed to a broad multi-disciplinary research program on cystic fibrosis through the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, a component of the National Institutes of Health. The research conducted and supported by the Institute is aimed at specifically defining clinical manifestations and biochemical aberrations responsible for this inherited metabolic disorder. In addition to the research being conducted in the Bethesda laboratories, this Institute provides grant support to many cystic fibrosis research projects at medical centers and institutions across the country. Among promising new findings this past year is a cellular model for a more direct approach to learning the biochemical abnormality of cystic fibrosis.

OBLIGATIONS FOR PROGRAMS IN CYSTIC FIBROSIS

	1967	1968	1969	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
National Institutes of Health: National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.....	\$1,385,000	\$2,000,396	\$2,588,000	\$2,883,000	\$2,947,000
Health Services and Mental Health Administration: Maternal and Child Health Service.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Total.....	1,385,000	2,000,396	2,588,000	2,883,000	2,947,000

¹ Not identifiable.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases

Cystic fibrosis is characterized by an abnormality in the products of the body's exocrine glands which secrete fluid to body surfaces, the skin and the gastrointestinal and respiratory mucosal linings. The basic metabolic disorder of exocrine secretion results in three principal clinical problems. The first of these is the production of sweat with a high salt content. Due to this defect, patients are unable to conserve salt and the very young are in constant danger of developing profound dehydration, or "heat exhaustion" in the summer months, which may lead to death.

A second facet of the disease stems from the abnormal functioning of the mucus-secreting glands of the body. In cystic fibrosis, the mucus-producing glands fail to secrete normal, clear, free-flowing fluid. Instead they produce an abnormally thick, viscous mucus which tends to obstruct the ducts or openings of the glands. When the viscous mucus accumulates in the ducts of the pancreas, it interferes with the ability of this gland to supply digestive enzymes to the intestinal tract, thus leading to poor digestion and malabsorption of a number of nutrients. Depending on the severity of this complication, the patient may suffer from varying degrees of malnutrition—one of the major factors resulting in general underdevelopment, poor musculature, and retarded bone growth.

The third and most serious complication involves the lungs. Nearly all cystic fibrosis patients develop progressive chronic lung disease. Thick mucus obstructs the smaller air passages in the lung, causing labored breathing and a chronic productive cough. In time, bacteria multiply in the accumulated secretions, and the child may fall victim to chronic bronchitis or pneumonia, a leading cause of death in these patients. Chronic lung changes may increase resistance to pulmonary blood flow and thus, may lead to an increased blood pressure in the lung; this can result in chronic heart strain and eventually in heart failure.

Research developments and trends

Cystic fibrosis research presents difficult problems because a variety of organ systems is involved. At present, no one hypothesis can link all the diverse and often conflicting observations which have been made concerning the widespread malfunction of exocrine glands in cystic fibrosis. In particular, it is not yet possible to give a reasonable explanation for the abnormal behaviour of mucus and sweat glands in this disorder. Recent studies, however, have helped to narrow the field for speculation and to clarify some of the mechanisms of the disease.

New Techniques May Pinpoint Molecular Defect

Cystic fibrosis is inherited from parents who carry the genetic trait for the disorder (both parents may be asymptomatic). When both parents carry the trait, the chances are one in four that cystic fibrosis will be manifested in the severe and classical form in the offspring. If only one parent carries the trait, it may be transmitted to the offspring; and although the child will be asymptomatic, the trait may in turn be inherited by his offspring. Thus, for every overt case, there is a large reservoir of hidden carriers, recently estimated at 2 to 5 percent of the general population. Clearly, since the genetic character of cystic fibrosis makes the disorder particularly pernicious, a method of identifying such carriers would be a major achievement for facilitating effective genetic counseling.

Institute-supported scientists at the Cornell University Medical Center two years ago

pinpointed a cellular difference between normal persons and those in affected or carrier states of cystic fibrosis. Using a special staining technique, this genetic cell marker was seen in fibroblasts, the flat elongated cells which form fibrous tissue. Cell cultures of fibroblasts from healthy individuals and from persons with a variety of other diseases showed only occasional cell metachromasia—a condition in which portions of the cell fail to stain uniformly and in the same color as surrounding cells. In all cultures from children with cystic fibrosis, and their parents, cell metachromasia appeared in over half of the fibroblasts. Although the test permits identification of carriers of the trait for cystic fibrosis in cases where potential parents have requested genetic counseling, the fibroblasts require a month in culture before they will react positively to staining.

This past year, employing an extension of the special staining technique, the Cornell University scientists have reported a short-cut method that can detect the abnormal cystic fibrosis gene in patients and carriers in a family within a week of obtaining a blood sample, by culturing shorter-living white blood cells, instead of the cell fibroblasts.

In addition, early results in the screening procedure have shown that different familial lines of cystic fibrosis patients exhibit two distinctly different cell-staining types, and a third variety that may or may not be related to either of these. This finding may lead to a more definitive picture of cystic fibrosis because it suggests that the disease is inherited in at least two varieties based on two major distinct patterns of staining.

One variety is classified either Ia or Ib; both of these types appear to have the same degree of aberration of some mucopolysaccharides (a group of complex carbohydrates). In contrast, class II, found in nearly 75 percent of patients and carriers examined, shows a distinct elevation of all mucopolysaccharides; this elevated cell carbohydrate content has long been identified as part of the chemical abnormality in cystic fibrosis.

While these staining properties would indicate that cystic fibrosis is inherited in at least two separate forms, no difference in the clinical picture has been seen as yet. A familiar correspondence however, does appear in all three varieties. Thus, if a patient is found to belong to class II, the other affected persons among his relatives (be they homozygous patients or heterozygous carriers) also will have class II metachromasia in their white blood cells.

Since the new cell test does not differentiate between patients and carriers, it would not be specific enough to indicate the presence of a homozygous fetus destined to become a cystic fibrosis patient is performed with a fetal cell sample taken by aspiration from the uterus of a pregnant woman. The identification, however, of carriers enables rational marriage and genetic counseling before the chance is created that the children of a family would be afflicted with CF.

One of the most important implications of the recent findings will lie in the results of subsequent investigations into the molecular defect of this metabolic disease. Up to now, clinical and chemical studies have indicated that cystic fibrosis is a generalized exocrine disorder. These new findings hint that the defect in cystic fibrosis is not limited to a single class of cells but involves, among others, the body's connective tissue, as well as blood cells. Further biochemical analysis of the metachromatic cellular substance may prove to be a step forward in elucidating this theory.

Salivary Gland Secretion Studies

Since the components of external secretions play such important roles in the path-

ogenesis of cystic fibrosis, intensive studies are being conducted to isolate the abnormal factors in such exocrine gland secretions as saliva.

Previous studies revealed elevated sodium concentrations in sweat and saliva of patients with cystic fibrosis. Two years ago Institute grantees at the University of Wisconsin demonstrated that perfusion of the rat parotid (salivary) gland with sweat and saliva from patients with cystic fibrosis caused a large increase in sodium output of the rat salivary glands. The implication of this finding is significant: the same factor in the sweat and saliva from patients with cystic fibrosis which causes salty saliva in rats may be responsible for the high salt content of the patient's own sweat and saliva. Studies are continuing in the effort to isolate such a factor to aid in elucidating the inherited molecular defect which causes cystic fibrosis.

Calcium concentration in saliva also is known to be high in cystic fibrosis patients, suggesting a defect in calcium metabolism. Little is known, however, about the mechanisms of calcium transport into the gland or the manner in which it is stored. Institute scientists are designing new studies to understand better the role of the automatic nervous system in normal salivary gland secretion mechanisms. These studies should define the mechanisms that are disrupted in such diseases as cystic fibrosis.

Glucose Intolerance

Several recent studies have suggested that the increased life span of patients with cystic fibrosis is accompanied by a rise in the frequency of glucose intolerance, or inability to handle dietary sugar. Since glucose intolerance is often the first indication of the diabetic state, Institute scientists began comparing cystic fibrosis patients who exhibit this intolerance with young victims of diabetes to see whether the cystic fibrosis patients might also be suffering from coexisting classical, inherited diabetes.

The researchers discovered that four out of every ten patients with cystic fibrosis exhibited moderate to severe glucose intolerance. None of these patients, however, had clinical complications or abnormal tissue changes that are characteristic of diabetes, and none had a significant family incidence of diabetes. Subsequent post mortem examinations of cystic fibrosis patients with glucose intolerance revealed that the pancreas had been massively invaded by fibrous tissue but that the individual specialized insulin-producing cells (the so-called beta cells) were well preserved; the later is not the case in classical juvenile diabetes.

Thus, the glucose intolerance which may accompany cystic fibrosis was attributed to anatomic disorganization of these nests of beta cells as an aftermath of fibrotic processes of this disorder and not to the concomitant presence of classical inherited diabetes.

As a byproduct of this investigation, the resting levels of growth hormone in patients were found to be normal, rising appropriately following insulin-induced hypoglycemia (low blood sugar). Retarded growth has been considered in the past as an almost constant companion of cystic fibrosis. Therefore, the findings that growth hormone levels in CF patients are in the normal range is of special interest because it is contrary to the widely held belief that growth retardation is an obligatory innate feature of cystic fibrosis. When growth retardation does occur it is probably the effect of severe chronic illness and, possibly of chronic malnutrition due to intestinal malabsorption and not the result of growth hormone deficiency.

Micropuncture Studies of Sweat Glands

Further evidence of the pathogenetic roles of inhibition of normal sodium reabsorption

in exocrine gland ducts of cystic fibrosis patients has been provided by applying micro-puncture and microanalytical techniques to the study of the function of normal and pathologic human sweat glands.

Institute scientists have employed these techniques in cystic fibrosis patients to help clarify the genesis of excessive salt content of sweat. Fluid was obtained from the sweat gland coil (site of production of sweat) of patients with cystic fibrosis. Evaluation revealed salt content of sweat in this location was near normal; elevated sodium and chloride concentrations appeared only on the skin surface. These findings resolve an important area of controversy by showing for the first time that the abnormality in sweat gland function in cystic fibrosis does not occur in the formation of the precursor solution in the coil, but is confined, most likely, to the sweat gland excretory duct and probably consists of a disturbance in salt reabsorption at that site. Current studies are designed to explore further the function of this duct in order to determine the abnormality in salt reabsorption.

Cystic Fibrosis Factor Inhibits Cilia Movement

Present in the air passages in lungs of all mammals, including man, the microscopic eyelash-like cilia normally sweep moisture droplets, foreign particles and mucus collections from the lungs to the trachea and pharynx, from where they are coughed out. In recent years several studies have indicated the presence of an abnormal factor in the serum of cystic fibrosis patients that causes cessation of ciliary action in the bronchial mucosa of experimental animals.

It is suspected that the same inhibition of bronchial ciliary action in man is one contributing factor to the characteristic lung congestion in CF. The previously observed abnormal cilia-inhibiting serum factor can be used in identifying CF patients and carriers, according to researchers at the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston, who accomplished inhibition of ciliary action in oyster gills with serum from CF patients and from their parents (carriers).

The serum tested was taken from 47 CF patients, 19 CF carriers, 25 allergic asthmatic children, and 39 healthy individuals. Serum from both the normal and allergic groups failed to inhibit the motion of oyster cilia; movement persisted as long as 40-50 minutes after contact.

The typical reaction produced by serum from CF patients was an immediate expulsion of debris from tubules between the gills, indicating the compound produced tissue injury, followed by cessation of ciliary movement within 30 minutes. None of the serum from CF patients and their parents permitted ciliary action for as long as did serum from the normals. Further, saliva from CF patients, but not from normal individuals, often inhibited ciliary action within 20 minutes.

At Duke University Institute grantees demonstrated several years ago that an abnormal factor existed in serum taken from CF patients and their parents which inhibited ciliary synchrony in rabbit tracheal explants. Possibly, this factor is identical to the one inhibiting ciliary action in oyster gills.

Intestinal Malabsorption

Because cystic fibrosis impairs pancreatic functions, consequently affecting intestinal digestion, infants and young children with cystic fibrosis with absent or decreased pancreatic digestive enzymes have traditionally received pancreatic replacement therapy. It has been a clinical observation, however, that malabsorption symptoms such as azotorrhea (excessive loss of nitrogen in the feces) and steatorrhea (excessive loss of fats in the feces) in CF patients generally improve with age despite absence of pancreatic function.

The question posed by Institute scientists was: did these symptoms gradually disappear because other gastrointestinal enzymes capable of digestive action similar to pancreatic enzymes were being elaborated later in life? For this study adolescents and young adults with cystic fibrosis were given a battery of tests over a period of several weeks to measure intestinal absorption, to re-evaluate pancreatic function (found to be absent in all cases) and to determine the amount of fecal fat and nitrogen while on a known dietary intake.

Results were surprising: malabsorption in cystic fibrosis may be minimal despite massive steatorrhea, and the latter may be compatible with a good state of nutrition. In fact, some obese patients with massive fecal fat loss had the least problem with nutritional status. It was apparent also that steatorrhea may be absent even in the presence of pancreatic deficiency.

Further, the amount of fat excretion varied greatly among patients; the degree of azotorrhea and steatorrhea bore little relation to growth, nutritional state, respiratory tract involvement or pancreatic function. Thus, previous assumptions that intestinal digestion and absorption are impaired in direct relationship to absence of pancreatic function have been invalidated.

Treatment

Short life span of children with cystic fibrosis has been an agonizing realization that doctors, patients and parents eventually must face. Can the lives of these patients be prolonged? Studies by a grantee at the University of Nebraska Medical Center have shown that one way to reach this goal may be immunization against *Pseudomonas* infections. This microorganism, which appears frequently in dead tissue, is notoriously resistant to antimicrobial therapy. It attacks lungs weakened by chronic broncho-pulmonary diseases, such as cystic fibrosis. A vaccine that already has had some trial use against *Pseudomonas* in severe burn cases will be tried in cystic fibrosis patients in hope that immunity can be built up before *Pseudomonas* infection occurs.

Since chronic obstructive lung disease is responsible for death in 90 percent of cystic fibrosis patients, control of pulmonary infection is an important component of cystic fibrosis therapy. Recently, a grant supported scientist at Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine in Cleveland has had encouraging results in eradicating pulmonary infections caused by *Pseudomonas* bacteria with a new antimicrobial agent, carbenicillin, a semi-synthetic penicillin.

Patients with acute chronic pulmonary lung disease also have been treated with a new antibiotic Gentamycin, in combination with the usual regime of vigorous pulmonary toilet, by Institute investigators during the past year. Gentamycin is bactericidal against the two most commonly cultured organisms in sputum of cystic fibrosis patients—certain types of *Staphylococcus* and *Pseudomonas*. The drug appears to be one of the first which has a favorable effect on the clinical complications due at least in part to bronchial tree infection by *Pseudomonas*. Continued evaluation of this drug in the clinical setting is currently in progress.

Scientific Communication and Information

The Institute has consistently made efforts to communicate, effectively and promptly, diagnostic and therapeutic developments in cystic fibrosis to practicing physicians and research workers throughout the country. One particularly effective means of communication will be the new comprehensive scientific exhibit on cystic fibrosis presenting the latest research findings and therapeutic applications. This exhibit, along with detailed practical literature, will be brought to the attention of thousands of

practitioners and research workers at medical meetings and conferences throughout the United States early this year.

Clinically, Cystic Fibrosis Outlook
Clinically, cystic fibrosis is a disease of many disguises. For the basic research scientist, it offers puzzling fragments which have yet to be linked together in a way essential to a full understanding of the disease's basic mechanism. Yet, promising findings in basic research, as well as new methods of diagnosis and treatment, have opened up new avenues for investigating cystic fibrosis, while bringing about a more optimistic outlook for patients with this disorder. Mainly as a result of research supported or carried out by the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, the average life span of children afflicted with the disease has been increased considerably and the quality of their life has been improved. Now that a significant number of girls with the disease survive to childbearing age it has become even more important to develop reliable and simple tests to detect carriers of cystic fibrosis and to initiate active genetic counseling wherever indicated. Institute scientists and grantees fully expect to meet this and the other challenges posed by cystic fibrosis.

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

Maternal and child health service

Forty-four State crippled children's agencies accepted children with cystic fibrosis for diagnosis, treatment and care in Fiscal Year 1969. As of June 30, 1968, crippled children's agencies reported to the National Cystic Fibrosis Research Foundation that 4,506 children were treated at a cost to these State agencies of more than \$2,750,000.

For every child with suspected cystic fibrosis, who is referred for diagnosis, 7-10 children with chronic pulmonary or gastrointestinal conditions (not cystic fibrosis) are found. Thus, a large group of children with unmet chronic health problems are uncovered.

Again, the appropriation includes an increase of \$6,187,000 over the budget request to maintain at the 1970 program level those activities that were cut below that level in the budget.

Our next consideration is the funding for the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke. The amount of the bill is \$100,807,000, an increase of \$452,000 over the request and \$3,875,000 above 1970.

The major emphasis of the programs of the neurology institute is on research leading to effective treatment and, eventually, the prevention of neurologic disorders which affect some 20 million Americans.

A dramatic example of success is the effort in the effective treatment of Parkinson's disease with a new drug, L-DOPA. In the area of multiple sclerosis, the missing enzyme which breaks down the particular fat that is otherwise stored in the brain has now been identified in six of the so-called lipid storage disorders, including Tay-Sachs disease in babies. There is now hope that treatment can be developed for these disorders and that they can possibly be eliminated.

Funds also were made available for the treatment of spinal cord injury. It is thought that 100,000 persons are paralyzed due to spinal cord injury, resulting, mainly, from auto, motorcycle, and sports accidents.

There are now over 100 medical schools doing work in this field and appropriations have been made available for the establishment of additional spinal cord injury treatment centers and for the maintenance of those already in existence. Inserted at this point is a chart giving the location of the medical schools doing research in spinal cord injury:

MEDICAL SCHOOLS—FACULTY IN 2 SPECIALTIES

	Clinical neurology	Neuro- logical surgery
1. University of Alabama	10	10
2. Albany Medical College	13	2
3. Albert Einstein College of Medicine	21	11
4. Arizona University	3	3
5. Arkansas University	3	3
6. Baylor University	10	1
7. Boston University	21	6
8. Bowman-Gray Medical College	11	5
9. Brown University	0	0
10. California College of Medicine	0	0
11. University of California (Davis)	1	3
12. University of California (Irvine)	4	7
13. University of California (Los Angeles)	18	10
14. University of California (San Diego)	7	7
15. University of California (San Francisco)	21	20
16. University of Southern California	17	10
17. Case Western Reserve	20	10
18. Chicago Medical School	5	1
19. University of Chicago School of Medicine (Pritzker)	10	9
20. University of Cincinnati	11	10
21. University of Colorado	24	10
22. Columbia University (College of Physicians and Surgeons)	34	14
23. University of Connecticut	0	2
24. Cornell University	19	5
25. Creighton University	10	4
26. Dartmouth University	1	4
27. Duke University	29	7
28. Emory University	11	13
29. University of Florida	9	6
30. Medical College of Georgia	8	7
31. George Washington University	12	11
32. Georgetown University	28	10
33. Hahnemann Medical College	9	4
34. Harvard University	28	15
35. Hawaii University	6	4
36. Howard University	21	4
37. Illinois University	16	14
38. Indiana University	14	4
39. Iowa University	13	2
40. Jefferson Medical College	21	4
41. Johns Hopkins University	12	12
42. University of Kansas	8	4
43. University of Kentucky	8	6
44. Loma Linda University	10	8
45. Louisiana State University	15	3
46. Louisiana State University (Shreveport)	0	0
47. Louisville University	4	6
48. Loyola (Stritch School of Medicine)	5	4
49. Marquette University	11	11
50. University of Maryland	8	10
51. Medical College of Virginia	11	11
52. Meharry Medical College	1	2
53. University of Miami	12	7
54. University of Michigan	9	2
55. Michigan State University	0	0
56. Minnesota University	36	13
57. University of Mississippi	5	6
58. University of Missouri	3	7
59. Mount Sinai School of Medicine	34	5
60. University of Nebraska	6	4
61. New Jersey College of Medicine (Seton Hall)	3	2
62. University of New Mexico	6	4
63. New York Medical College	15	5
64. New York University	32	18
65. State University of New York (Brooklyn)	27	7
66. State University of New York (Buffalo)	21	16
67. State University of New York (Stony Brook, Long Island)	0	0
68. State University of New York (Syracuse)	7	6
69. University of North Carolina	6	2
70. University of North Dakota	3	1
71. Northwestern University	7	6
72. Ohio State University	21	4
73. University of Oklahoma	7	3
74. University of Oregon	17	9
75. University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine	23	6
76. Pennsylvania State University (Hershey)	0	0
77. University of Pittsburgh	14	12
78. University of Puerto Rico	3	5

	Clinical neurology	Neuro- logical surgery
78. University of Rochester	18	6
79. Rutgers Medical School	0	0
80. St. Louis University	10	6
81. Medical College of South Carolina	11	7
82. University of South Dakota	4	1
83. Stanford University	14	5
84. Temple University	10	11
85. University of Tennessee	16	9
86. University of Texas Southwestern Medical School	22	11
87. University of Texas (Galveston)	14	3
88. University of Texas Medical School (San Antonio)	11	9
89. Tufts University	18	6
90. Tulane University	25	3
91. University of Utah	13	1
92. Vanderbilt University	5	7
93. University of Vermont	7	5
94. University of Virginia	10	3
95. Washington University (Missouri)	19	6
96. University of Washington	10	9
97. Wayne State University	21	10
98. West Virginia University	6	3
99. University of Wisconsin	14	4
100. Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania	48	1
101. Yale University	13	9

POSTGRADUATE MEDICAL SCHOOLS—FACULTY IN 2 SPECIALTIES

	Clinical neurology	Neuro- logical surgery
1. Mayo Graduate School of Medicine, Rochester, Minn.	24	8
2. University of Pennsylvania	10	5
3. New York University	27	17

This year the increase in funds will restore the activities of the Institute that were cut below the 1970 level by the budget, back to that level.

The National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases was allowed an increase of \$843,000 over its request. The full amount is \$102,249,000. Approximately 22 million Americans suffer from some form of allergy and the number is growing as the environment is increasingly inundated by synthetic pollutants.

In 1968 there were 250 million reported cases of infectious disease in the United States, resulting in 144 million lost schooldays and 130 million lost workdays. The economic loss is more than \$3 million. One hundred thousand people die each year because of infectious disorders.

The field of hepatitis research has been stimulated by the recognition of a particle, called Australia antigen, which may be related to the causative agent of serum hepatitis.

Early testing of an experimental vaccine against lobar pneumonia, a disease which claims 25,000 to 40,000 American lives each year, is scheduled to begin this year. In short, the Institute has been productively busy and the funds are justified.

The National Institute of General Medical Sciences is an organization that supports projects that would automate clinical laboratory procedures. Since most patients spend at least 1 day in the hospital for testing, by reducing hospitalization by 1 day some \$1.7 billion a year would be saved. This amount is equal to the entire Federal expenditure for medical research and development.

This is the main reason the committee increased the 1971 appropriation for the Institute by \$65,000 over the request, or to \$166,072,000. In addition, the bill provides \$10 million for a genetic related task force. As we say in our report:

The committee feels that this is an idea whose time has come. It recognizes the importance of the synthesis of the gene and other equally dramatic developments in the science of inherited human qualities.

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development portion of the bill includes \$94,436,000, an increase of \$1,133,000 over the amount requested and \$20,262,000 over the amount appropriated in 1970. The \$28.3 million of the bill is for family planning which is an increase of \$12.8 over last year.

The mission of the institute is perhaps the broadest of all the research Institutes of NIH—that is, the study of human development from conception through old age.

Testimony from the National Eye Institute indicates that 3.5 million Americans have some type of visual impairment. In 1 million the defect is serious enough to interfere with work and some 400,000 Americans are legally blind. Other visual disorders include 70 million people over 40 years of age and 56 million under age 15.

These figures expand as the population continues to grow. The total amount of the bill is \$30,986,000 which is \$5,300,000 over the request and \$8,150,000 over last year.

Funding for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences include \$20,620,000, an increase of \$777,000 over the amount requested and \$3 million over 1970.

The institute is doing work in pesticides, heavy metals such as lead due to the number of automobiles in use, tobacco and nitrates. It is interesting to note that the tobacco industry has been cooperating fully with the department in their studies of smoking and health.

The John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study maintains assessment of medical education, examination of ethical problems arising from the application of medical research findings in clinical practice and advances in human genetics, environmental pollution and family planning.

The bill this year includes \$3,582,000, an increase of \$918,000 over the amount requested and \$631,000 over 1970 appropriations. The center's program this year will bring 12 to 18 distinguished scientists to the center who will become involved in scientific activities at NIH.

HEALTH MANPOWER

Health Manpower funds were increased by \$18,700,000 over the amount requested and \$48,219,000 over 1970. The full amount of the bill is \$260,934,000.

In the health field there is a grave shortage of qualified professionals. We need 50,000 more physicians, 17,800 more dentists, 150,000 more nurses, and 227,700 more qualified people in the allied health field. The physician augmentation program calls for 448 places in 29 medical schools in 1970. In 1971 there will be 502 first year places.

An increase of \$27.3 million will be used to place emphasis on, first, improving grants for schools of health professions and nursing; second, nurse scholarships; third, grants for the development of training programs for new types

of health workers, and fourth, allied health traineeships.

The \$2.7 million has been added by the committee for formula grants for schools of veterinary medicine and \$10 million for a total of \$22 million for direct loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and so forth, and \$6 million for a total of \$15.6 million for direct loan funds for students of nursing.

Health education loan funds appropriations cover the interest payment on these loans in the amount of \$2,126,000 and \$957,000 on interest due to holders of participation certificates. From fiscal year 1968 through 1970 about 54,000 loans have been made to students in schools of medicine, dentistry, optometry, podiatry, osteopathy, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, and nursing.

The request for direct loans to students in health areas was \$12 million, a reduction of \$3 million from 1970 after the reduction under section 410, and \$11,781,000 less than carried in the 1970 appropriations. The committee has increased the amount requested to \$22 million.

Dental health has been funded in the amount of \$10,954,000 which was the sum requested and an increase of \$130,000 above the 1970 appropriation which was mandatory.

The Institute is working on projects on financing dental care in cooperation with OEO; improving the quality and delivery of dental care and projects to train team dentistry. With the assistance of the dental health program, dental schools will teach students how to head a dental team and how to delegate clinical procedures to auxiliaries in order to increase the productivity of the dental team.

The Institute also concerns itself with fluoridation in our water supply and the following information on fluoridation may be of some interest to Members:

COMMUNITY WATER FLUORIDATION AND TOTAL FLUORIDE INTAKE

In determining the fluoride level for drinking water which will have optimal dental health benefits but no adverse effects, the intake of fluoride from dietary sources has been taken into account. Studies have shown that the average diets of children and adults provide from one-fifth to one-half milligram of fluoride per day.¹⁻⁶ Further information on adult dietary fluoride intake is being obtained in a current Public Health Service-supported study. Atmospheric fluoride has been found to contribute relatively little to human intake (maximum: 0.046 milligram per day).⁷⁻¹¹ The available fluoride from pharmaceuticals, other than for those formulated as fluoride supplements for specific and known therapeutic use, is negligible.¹²

Because fluorides occur so commonly as natural constituents of water supplies, research scientists have had a great natural laboratory in which to work for several decades.¹³⁻²⁰ Studies of large numbers of long-time residents have been made in areas of the United States having naturally fluoridated water with up to eight parts per million or more fluoride. In these areas, the water was used for drinking, cooking, and food processing. These studies include 10-year medical investigations of large groups of individuals, roentgenologic surveys for bone changes, postmortem examinations and chemical analyses of tissues, and metabolic

assessments.²¹⁻²² Extensive research also has been done using laboratory animals.²³⁻²⁴ Health statistics in high-fluoride and low-fluoride areas have been compared.²⁵⁻²⁶ The findings from these studies have provided consistent evidence that, in addition to all food and ambient sources of fluoride, humans may daily ingest water having up to at least eight times the amount of fluoride provided by optimally fluoridated water without adverse effect other than mottling of tooth enamel. Mottling, however, does not result from the use of optimally fluoridated water.²⁷⁻²⁹

The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council has stated that fluoride is a normal constituent of all diets and is an essential nutrient (1968).⁴⁰ The American Institute of Nutrition has recognized fluoridation as a safe, effective, and low-cost means of improving nutrition.⁴¹ The U.S. Department of Agriculture Extension Service regards fluoridation as an important community health benefit.⁴² Each of these organizations is directly concerned with proper nutrition; each endorses community water fluoridation.

In recognition of the dental benefits that accrue from fluoridation—benefits which continue in adult life⁴³⁻⁴⁵—the United States Army, Navy and Air Force provide fluoridated water at all bases where children are in regular residence.⁴⁶⁻⁴⁸ For the military personnel who come to the bases at an age when water fluoridation is not effective, the Armed Forces have a dental preventive program which includes the clinical application and personal use of fluorides.⁴⁹⁻⁵¹

Dental researchers who are exploring new techniques for combating tooth decay are not seeking to supplant water fluoridation. Rather, their successes will provide decay resistance for persons who have not had the protective benefits of water fluoridation and possibly provide some additional resistance for those who have.⁵²⁻⁵⁴ However, not all of the new decay preventive methods envisioned will be adaptable to public health.⁵⁵

The policy of the Public Health Service on fluorides and fluoridation is founded on extensive scientific knowledge. The Service makes every effort to develop, obtain, and evaluate current relevant information by supporting research, by reviewing current scientific literature and the popular press, and through interdisciplinary contacts with other governmental and professional organizations. The Service also makes every effort to share what is learned through these mechanisms with interested organizations, institutions and individuals.

Fluoridation has undergone a nearly constant process of reevaluation since its inception. Detailed reports have been published on all aspects of fluoridation from cities in the United States and other countries that have been fluoridating for 25 years, and from others with extensive but shorter experience.⁵⁶⁻⁶⁴ Publications of the National Research Council and the American Association for the Advancement of Science concerning the relationship of fluorides to dental health and general health appeared as early as 1942 and as recently as 1968.^{6-40 65-70}

The accumulated dental, medical, and public health evidence concerning fluoridation has been reviewed and judged at various times by committees of experts and special councils of most of the world's major national health organizations. Their findings and conclusions are public information.⁷¹⁻⁷³ In several of the more than 30 other countries where fluoridation is practiced or planned, commissions have been appointed to obtain and review all information relevant to fluoridation and to make recommendations according to their findings. Some of these commissions made special efforts to seek out and consider the statements of both professional and lay critics of fluoridation. Such commissions reported to their respective governments in Great Britain in 1952 and 1962; in

Canada in 1955 and 1961; in New Zealand in 1957; in Australia in 1954, 1963, and 1968; in Ireland in 1960; in South Africa in 1966; and in Norway in 1968.⁷⁴⁻⁸⁰ In July 1969, the delegates to the World Health Organization of the United Nations, meeting as a body, considered the Director General's evaluatory report on water fluoridation.⁸¹ They approved a resolution, cosponsored by 37 nations, that embodied their findings and recommendations, which, like those of the other commissions, supported and encouraged fluoridation of community water supplies.⁸²

The impressive body of information available concerning community water fluoridation and fluorides is constantly increasing and continues to support the validity of community water fluoridation as a safe and effective public health measure.⁸³ There is no evidential basis for questioning the medical safety, effectiveness, and practicality of community water fluoridation as a public health measure for preventing dental caries.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Cholak, J.: "Fluorides: A critical review," *Journal of Occupational Medicine* 501-511, September 1959.

² McClure, F. J.: "Fluorine in foods. Survey of recent data," *Public Health Reports* 64: 1061-1074, August 1949.

³ McClure, F. J.: "Ingestion of fluoride and dental caries: Quantitative relations based on food and water requirements of children 1 to 12 years old," *American Journal of Diseases of Children* 66: 362-369, 1943.

⁴ Cox, C. J.: "Fluorine and dental caries," in *National Research Council, Food and Nutrition Board: "A survey of the literature of dental caries," National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1952, Publication No. 225.*

⁵ Muhler, J. C., and Hine, M. K.: "Fluorine and dental health. The pharmacology and toxicology of fluorine," *Indian University Press, Bloomington, Indiana, 1959.*

⁶ Galagan, D. J.: "Climate and controlled fluoridation," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 47: 159-170, August 1953.

⁷ Weaver, N. K.: "Atmospheric contaminants and standards. Status report," *Journal of Occupational Medicine* 11:445-61, September 1969.

⁸ U.S. Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, Division of Dental Health: "Relationship of air pollution to community water fluoridation," CPB-10, September 1969.

⁹ Yunghans, R.: "Fluoride air surveillance in the U.S.A.," paper given at the Second Conference of the International Society for Fluoride Research, at Barcelona, Spain, January 1969. Author from National Air Pollution Control Administration, Cincinnati, Ohio.

¹⁰ Ministry of Health, Province of Ontario, Canada: "Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into and report upon the pollution of air, soil, and water," Queen's Printer, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, September 1968, pp. 111-113.

¹¹ U.S. Public Health Service, National Center for Air Pollution Control: "Proceedings Powell County, Montana, Intrastate Air Pollution Abatement Conference," August 16, 1967, pp. 1-30.

¹² Crisp, Malcolm P.: "Report of the Royal Commissioner into the fluoridation of public water supplies," Government Printer, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia, 1968, pp. 180-181.

¹³ U.S. Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, Division of Dental Health: "Natural fluoride content of community water supplies, 1969," Bethesda, Maryland.

¹⁴ McKay, F. S. and Black, G. V.: "Investigation of mottled teeth," *Dental Cosmos* 58: 477, 627, 781, 894, 1916.

¹⁵ McKay, F. S.: "Mottled enamel," *Dental Cosmos* 67:847-860, Sept. 1925.

¹⁶ Dean, H. T.: "Chronic endemic dental fluorosis (mottled enamel)," *Journal of the American Medical Association* 107:1269-1272, 1936. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 45-49.

¹⁷ Russell, A. L., and Elvove, Elias: "Domes-

tic water and dental caries: VII. A study of the fluoride-dental caries relationship in an adult population." *Public Health Reports* 66: 1380-1401, 1951. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 166-172.

¹⁵ Dean, H. T., Arnold, F. A., and Elvove, Elias: "Domestic water and dental caries. V. additional studies of the relation of fluoride domestic waters to dental caries experience in 4425 white children, aged 12 to 14 years, in 13 cities in 4 States," *Public Health Reports* 57: 1155-1179, 1942. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 126-137.

¹⁶ Dean, H. T., and Elvove, Elias: "Further studies on the minimal threshold of chronic endemic dental fluorosis," *Public Health Reports* 52:1249-1264, 1937. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 49-56.

¹⁷ Dean, H. T.: "The investigation of physiological effects by the epidemiological method," in "Fluorine and dental health," Moulton, F. R., editor, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C., 1942, (Publication No. 19), pp. 23-31.

¹⁸ Leone, N. C., Shimkin, M. B., et al.: "Medical aspects of excessive fluoride in a water supply," *Public Health Reports* 69:925-936, 1954. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 402-411.

¹⁹ Geever, E. F., Leone, N. C., Gelser, P., and Lieberman, J.: "Pathologic studies in man after prolonged ingestion of fluoride in drinking water," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 56:499-507, 1958. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 437-441.

²⁰ Leone, N. C., Stevenson, C. A., Hilbish, T. F., and Sosman, M. C.: "A roentgenologic study of a human population exposed to high-fluoride domestic water," *American Journal of Roentgenology, Radium Therapy, and Nuclear Medicine* 74:874-885, 1955. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 414-420.

²¹ Geever, E. F., Leone, N. C., Gelser, P., and Lieberman, J. E.: "Pathological studies in man after prolonged ingestion of fluoride in drinking water, II," *Public Health Reports* 73:721-731, 1958. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 452-460.

²² McCauley, H. B., and McClure, F. J.: "Effect of fluoride in drinking water on the osseous development of the hand and wrist in children," *Public Health Reports* 69:671-683, 1954. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking water," pp. 394-402.

²³ Zipkin, I., McClure, F. J., Leone, N. C., and Lee, W. A.: "Fluoride deposition in human bones after prolonged ingestion of fluoride in drinking water," *Public Health Reports* 73:732-740, 1958. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 442-448.

²⁴ McClure, F. J., McCann, H. G., and Leone, N. C.: "Excessive fluoride in water and bone chemistry," *Public Health Reports* 73:741-746, 1958. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 448-452.

²⁵ Zimmerman, E. R., Leone, N. C., and Arnold, F. A.: "Oral aspects of excessive fluoride in a water supply," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 50:272-277, 1955. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 411-413.

²⁶ Leone, N. C.: "The effects of the absorption of fluoride," *American Medical Association Archives of Industrial Health* 21:324-325, April 1960.

²⁷ Largent, E. J.: "Fluorosis: The health aspects of fluoride compounds," Ohio State University Press, Columbus, Ohio, 1961.

²⁸ Machle, W. F., and Largent, E. J.: "The absorption and excretion of fluoride. II. Metabolism at high levels of intake," *Journal of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology* 25:112, 1949.

²⁹ McClure, F. J.: "Water Fluoridation," National Institute of Dental Research, Bethesda, Maryland, 1970, Chapter 13: "Biology and Safety," pp. 191-244 (61 references).

³⁰ Leone, N. C., Geever, E. F., and Moran,

N. C.: "Acute and subacute toxicity studies of sodium fluoride in animals," *Public Health Reports* 71:459-467, May 1956.

³¹ McClure, F. J. (editor): "Fluoride Drinking Waters," National Institute of Dental Research, Bethesda, Maryland, 1962 (PHS Publication 825), "Fluoride metabolism and retention in calcified tissues," pp. 495-560.

³² Hagan, T. L., Pasternack, M., and Scholz, G.: "Waterborne fluorides and mortality," *Public Health Reports* 69:450-454, May 1954.

³³ Hegsted, D. M.: "Fluoride and mineral metabolism," *Annals of Dentistry* 27:134-143, December 1968.

³⁴ Blayney, J. R., and Hill, I. N.: "Fluorine and dental caries," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 74:233-302, January 1967.

³⁵ Hilleboe, H. E., Schlesinger, E. R., et al.: "Newburgh-Kingston caries-fluorine study: final report," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 52:290-325, March 1956.

³⁶ Russell, A. L.: "Dental fluorosis in Grand Rapids during the seventeenth year of fluoridation," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 65:608-612, November 1962.

³⁷ National Research Council, Food and Nutrition Board: "Recommended daily allowances," Seventh revised edition, Publication 1964, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1968, p. 55.

³⁸ American Institute of Nutrition: Resolution on fluoride adopted at the annual meeting April 15, 1966 (See in reference 72).

³⁹ U.S. Department of Agriculture: "Facts for extension agents about fluoride programs for improving dental health in rural areas," Extension Service Circular 492, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., July 1954.

⁴⁰ Russell, A. L., and Elvove, Elias: "Domestic water and dental caries: VII. A study of the fluoride-dental caries relationship in an adult population," *Public Health Reports* 66:1380-1401, 1951. Also appears in "Fluoride drinking waters," pp. 166-172.

⁴¹ Englander, H. R., and Wallace, D. A.: "Effects of naturally fluoridated water on dental caries in adults," *Public Health Reports* 77:887-893, October 1962.

⁴² Keene, H. J., et al.: "Prevalence, incidence, and geographic distribution of caries-free naval recruits," *U.S. Navy Medical News Letter* 54:42-43, October 1969.

⁴³ U.S. Department of the Air Force, Medical Service: "Air Force Regulation No. 160-98: Fluoride content of water supplies at Air Force bases," Washington, D.C., November 28, 1956.

⁴⁴ U.S. Department of the Navy, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: "Bumed Instruction 11330.1A: Adjustment of fluoride content of communal water supplies at military installations," Washington, D.C., November 29, 1957.

⁴⁵ U.S. Department of Defense, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical): "Department of Defense Instruction: Adjustment of fluoride content of communal water supplies at military installations," Washington, D.C., August 30, 1956.

⁴⁶ Grossman, F. D.: "Practical approaches to large-scale stannous fluoride applications," *Journal of the American College of Dentists* 35:58-64, January 1968.

⁴⁷ Kyes, F. M.: "Three ways to beat the nation's dental problems," *Journal of the Connecticut Dental Association* 42:70-74, April 1968.

⁴⁸ "Dentistry: fluorides for adults," *Time*, April 8, 1966.

⁴⁹ Muhlemann, H. R.: "Dietary fluoride and dental caries," *International Dental Journal* 15:209-217, June 1965.

⁵⁰ Pearlman, Sholom: "American Dental Association statement on dentifrice advertising claims," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 57:546-561, October 1958.

⁵¹ Cueto, E. I., and Buonocore, M. G.: "Sealing of pits and fissures with an adhesive

resin: its use in caries prevention," *Journal of the American Medical Association* 75:121-128, July 1967.

⁵² Soriceilli, D. A.: "Letters to the editor: Philadelphia fluoridation—a factual evaluation," *Archives of Environmental Health*, 10:134-138, January 1965.

⁵³ Gilmore, N. D.: "The effect of dental caries activity of supplementing diets with phosphates: A review," *Journal of Public Health Dentistry* 29:188-207, Summer 1969.

⁵⁴ American Dental Association: "Council classifies Colgate with MFP (sodium monofluorophosphate) in Group A," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 79:937-938, October 1969.

⁵⁵ Summitt, R. W.: "Research in preventive dentistry," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 79:1194-1201, November 1969.

⁵⁶ Buonocore, M. G.: "Adhesive sealing of pits and fissures for caries prevention, with use of ultraviolet light," *Journal of the American Dental Association* 80:324-328, February 1970.

⁵⁷ "National Institute of Dental Research celebrates twentieth anniversary with report on oral health research," *The NIH Record*, June 11, 1968, National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland.

⁵⁸ National Dairy Council: "Nutrition in oral health: research and practice," *Dairy Council Digest* 40:31-34, November-December 1969.

⁵⁹ "Policy statement on alternatives on water fluoridation," *International Dental Journal (Federation Dentaire Internationale)* 17:782-783, December 1967.

⁶⁰ McClure, F. J.: "Water fluoridation," National Institute of Dental Research, Bethesda, Maryland, 1970, Chapter 9, "Fluoridation trials—United States," and Chapter 10, "Fluoridation trials—foreign," pp. 109-152.

⁶¹ U.S. Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health: "Fluoridation Census 1969," Division of Dental Health, Bethesda, Maryland, 1970.

⁶² Moulton, F. R., editor: "Fluorine and dental health," American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C., 1942, Publication No. 19.

⁶³ Moulton, F. R., editor: "Dental caries and fluorine," American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C., 1946.

⁶⁴ National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council: "Report of the ad hoc committee on fluoridation of water supplies," NAS-NRC Division of Medical Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1952, Publication No. 214.

⁶⁵ Food and Nutrition Board, National Research Council: "Control of tooth decay," National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1953.

⁶⁶ Food and Nutrition Board, National Research Council: "The problem of providing optimum fluoride intake for prevention of dental caries," National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., 1953, Publication No. 294.

⁶⁷ Shaw, J. A., editor: "Fluoridation as a public health measure," American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C., 1954.

⁶⁸ McClure, F. J.: "Water fluoridation," National Institute of Dental Research, Bethesda, Maryland, 1970, chapter 14, "Approval," pp. 245-261.

⁶⁹ U.S. Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health: "National organizations endorsing fluoridation: statements," Division of Dental Health, Bethesda, Maryland, 1967.

⁷⁰ Ministry of Health, Great Britain: "The fluoridation of domestic water supplies in North America as a means of controlling dental caries: report of the United Kingdom Mission," Her Majesty's Stationary Office, London, 1953.

⁷¹ Ministry of Health, Great Britain: "The

conduct of the fluoridation studies in the United Kingdom on the results achieved after five years," Her Majesty's Stationery Office, London, 1962.

⁷⁵ Canadian Department of National Health and Welfare: "Mass control of dental caries by fluoridation of a public water supply: dental effects of water fluoridation," Dental Health Division, Ottawa, November 1955.

⁷⁶ Canada (Ontario), Office of the Lieutenant Governor: "Report of the committee appointed to inquire into and report upon the fluoridation of municipal water supplies," Toronto, Ontario, January 1961.

⁷⁷ New Zealand Commission of Inquiry: "Report of the commission of inquiry on the fluoridation of public water supplies," Report No. H. 47, Government Printer, Wellington, New Zealand, 1957.

⁷⁸ Australia (Victoria): "Report of the special committee appointed by the Commissioner of Public Health," 1954.

⁷⁹ Australia (New South Wales): "Report of Dr. M. J. Flynn to the Minister of Health, concerning fluoridation," 1963.

⁸⁰ Crisp, Malcolm Peter: "Report of the Royal Commissioner into the fluoridation of public water supplies," Government Printer, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia, 1968.

⁸¹ Department of Health, Ireland: Reports made by the Minister of Health and the various local health authorities to the Oireachtas concerning the Health (Fluoridation of Water Supplies) Act of 1960, Department of Health, Dublin.

⁸² Republic of South Africa: "Report of the commission of inquiry into fluoridation," The Government Printer, Pretoria, 1966.

⁸³ Norway: Royal Ministry of Social Affairs: "Report from the committee on fluoridation," Ministry of Social Affairs, Oslo, Norway, 1968.

⁸⁴ World Health Organization: "Fluoridation and dental health," World Health Organization Chronicle 23.

⁸⁵ World Health Organization: Twenty-Second World Health Assembly: "Resolution on Fluoridation and Dental Health," Boston, Mass., July 1969.

⁸⁶ Bernhardt, M. E.: "Fluoridation international," Journal of the American Dental Association 80:731-737, April 1970.

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association, Jan. 19, 1970, vol. 211]

LAW AND MEDICINE

LEGAL STATUS OF FLUORIDATION

After a stormy decade, how does the fluoridation of public drinking water stand legally? A 1969 case indicates that despite a few victories, its opponents have not given up the fight. In *Graybeal vs McNevin* (439 SW 2d 323) the Kentucky Court of Appeals considered the legality of fluoridating the public water supply of Somerset, Ky. A chiropractor obtained an order from a lower court preventing fluoridation claiming it violated a law governing the dispensing of drugs, his religious freedom, and his Constitutional rights. Testimony supporting fluoridation was given by an impressive array of public health figures who had extensive experience with the process. Included were the State Commissioner of Health, the executive secretary of the state dental association, a pedodontist, the dean of a dental school, and a consulting engineer. The purport of their testimony was that it has been well-established scientifically that there is a significant reduction in tooth decay among children who drink fluoridated water. Their testimony further indicated that no adverse effects are known.

In opposition, the chiropractor testified that sodium fluoride is a virulent poison, which was not denied, and that its use caused him to fear for his own safety and that of his family. Other witnesses, including an instrumentation engineer, a practicing physician, and an individual with a master's degree in public health, testified that fluoride was used

originally as a rat and roach killer, that it corrodes water pipes, that it does not reduce dental caries, and that possible side effects of its use in drinking water were not known. In reversing the opinion of the trial court, whose holding it characterized as "clearly erroneous," the court said:

"Nearly every great medical and scientific discovery has fought the battle of 'trial and error' and has been opposed by the skeptics and the incredulous. But progress demands that research persist unhampered by the courts."

HISTORY OF FLUORIDATION

As far back as 1892, the opinion was expressed in scientific circles that increased dental caries in England might be related to a fluoride deficiency (*Hastings Law Review* 3:1, 1952, citing materials collected by the California State Department of Public Health). Extensive tests have been conducted over the years and community fluoridation programs were inaugurated in 1945 in Grand Rapids, Mich., Newburgh, N.Y., and Brantford, Ontario. The programs were extended in 1946 to Sheboygan, Wis., and Marshall, Tex., and in 1947 to Evanston, Ill., and Lewiston, Idaho. The results uniformly indicate that fluoridation was followed by reduction in dental caries.

In 1950, The American Dental Association recommended fluoridation of municipal water supplies. In 1951, the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association endorsed the principle of fluoridation of community water supplies. In 1956, the AMA's House directed that the Council on Drugs and the Council on Foods and Nutrition review the matter. A joint resolution of these councils concluded:

"1. Fluoridation of public water supplies so as to provide the approximate equivalent of 1 ppm of fluoride in drinking water has been established as a method for reducing dental caries in children up to 10 years of age. In localities with warm climates, or where for other reasons the ingestion of water or other sources of considerable fluoride content is high, a lower concentration of fluoride is advisable. On the basis of the available evidence, it appears that this method decreases the incidence of caries during childhood. The evidence from Colorado Springs indicates as well a reduction in the rate of dental caries up to at least 44 years of age.

2. No evidence has been found since the 1951 statement by the Councils to prove that continuous ingestion of water containing the equivalent of approximately 1 ppm of fluorine for long periods by large segments of the population is harmful to the general health. Mottling of the tooth enamel (dental fluorosis) associated with this level of fluoridation is minimal. The importance of this mottling is outweighed by the caries-inhibiting effect of the fluoride.

3. Fluoridation of public water supplies should be regarded as a prophylactic measure for reducing tooth decay at the community level and is applicable where the water supply contains less than the equivalent of 1 ppm of fluorine.

This report was adopted by the House of Delegates of the AMA in December 1957.

Practically every scientific authority of note, including the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the American Public Health Association, the Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health, and the College of American Pathologists, has endorsed fluoridation of public drinking water as a safe and practical method of reducing the incidence of dental caries. Scientific literature supporting it is voluminous.

COURT ATTACKS ON FLUORIDATION

The legal history of fluoridation has been extensive and the theories put forth in opposition to it are many and varied. The legal challenges are collected and analyzed by Clark and Sophy in "Fluoridation: The

Courts and the Opposition" (*Wayne Law Rev* 13:338, 1966). The authors point out that the challengers have sued in a variety of capacities as residents, citizens, taxpayers, consumers, electors, and as members of religious sects. Some have argued that municipalities lack specific power to fluoridate and that it is unreasonable to imply such power from a general authority to provide for public health. Connecticut (Title 19, Section 19-13 [G]), Illinois (Title 111½, Section 121 g), and Minnesota (Section 144, 145) are the only states which have expressly permitted or required fluoridation by law. The 1965 Connecticut statute directs those who supply water to communities of 20,000 or more to maintain a stated fluoride level. The Illinois and Minnesota statutes provide for addition of fluorides to maintain a specified range of fluoridation.

Those claiming fluoridation is an abuse of municipal authority have asserted it is unnecessary, unsafe, wasteful, unlawful class legislation, a breach of contract between a municipality and its water users, an illegal use of public funds, a nuisance, compulsory medication, socialized medicine, or that reasonable alternatives were available.

Still others have claimed the process violates religious freedom by compelling them to consume water additives against their religious convictions.

Finally, there has been a group of objections based on specific statutes such as those relating to poisons, adulteration of foods, and the unauthorized practice of medicine, dentistry, or pharmacy. With regard to the unauthorized practice argument, the Supreme Court of Oklahoma remarked:

"The City of Tulsa is no more practicing medicine or dentistry or manufacturing, preparing, compounding or selling a drug, than a mother would be who furnished her children with a well-balanced diet, including foods containing vitamin D and calcium to harden bones and prevent rickets, or lean meat and milk to prevent pellagra (*Douell vs City of Tulsa*, 273 P 2d 859, 1954, review denied 348 U.S. 912, 1955)."

In court tests, fluoridation has been upheld in 15 states (Kentucky, California, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Ohio, Washington, Wisconsin, Oregon, Iowa, Missouri, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, South Carolina, and New York). The U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly refused to review fluoridation cases on the ground that they do not present a cognizable federal question.

No court has struck down fluoridation on the ground that it is harmful. The handful of cases in which its attackers have been successful has been decided on procedural grounds. In *McGurren vs City of Fargo* (66 NW 2d 207, 1954), the North Dakota Supreme Court sent a case seeking to halt fluoridation back to a lower court for trial because it was of the opinion that the facts alleged stated a cause of action if they could be proved. The Indiana Supreme Court held, in *Miller vs City of Evansville* (219 NE 2d 900, 1966), that fluoridation was not proper in the absence of a city ordinance authorizing the process. A California court found that where 15% of the voters in a community objected to fluoridation, the city council should have presented the matter to the citizens for a vote (*Hughes vs City of Lincoln*, 232 Cal App 2d 741, 1965). In *New Haven Water Co. vs City of New Haven* (210 A 2d 449, 1965), the Connecticut high court said that where one water company furnished water to 13 municipalities through a single system, the ordinance of two of the municipalities directing that their water be fluoridated was invalid and that the state reserved control of water companies serving more than one community.

CONCLUSION

Chlorine, which like fluoride is toxic in concentrated form, and which was used as a gas in World War I, has been added as a

purifying agent to public water supplies for some years and has not caused a fraction of the public controversy that has attended fluoridation. Distinctions can be drawn between the two situations but even so the amount of controversy is difficult to understand. Much of it has not been confined to the public health merits of fluoridation. Some have suggested that the "antis" have the advantage, for all they need to do is create doubt and fear. Others have pointed out that true public acceptance comes slowly through education. Nevertheless, when New York city began to fluoridate its public water supply in September of 1965, it was estimated that some 65 million Americans were drinking artificially or naturally fluoridated water. There will be further efforts to halt fluoridation in the courts and in the public forum but, for all practical purposes, the process is gradually being accepted and no longer qualifies as a major public "issue."—RICHARD P. BERGEN.

The committee, recognizing the increased need for adequate research on animals prior to the application of new therapeutic treatment to man, has added \$2.5 million for a total of \$15 million for animal research centers under the Division of Research Resources of NIH. This

total appropriation amounts to \$66,201,000, an increase of \$3,509,000 more than 1970.

The bill includes \$126,100,000 for the construction of health educational, research and library facilities. This was the amount requested and the same as 1970 funds.

At the end of 1969, 175 awards totaling over \$550 million have created over 4,900 new first year student places in schools of health professions. Twelve new schools of medicine and six new schools of dentistry were also federally funded. These same funds have also made possible an enrollment increase of 2,000 first year medical students and over 900 new first year dentistry places.

The \$94.5 million is for grants for teaching facilities at schools of medicine, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, veterinary medicine, and public health. The \$23.6 million is for schools of dentistry and \$8 million is for schools of nursing. The following chart gives more complete information on construction expenditures:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Amounts appropriated cumulative 1965-70	Approved applications, Federal share cumulative	
		1965-Mar. 31, 1970 (actual)	1965-June 30, 1970 (estimate)
Health professions schools.....	678,100	1,056,405	1,237,344
Nursing schools.....	81,000	101,500	113,300
Allied health professions schools.....	4,800	10,582	10,582
Health research facilities.....	193,400	293,162	293,162
Mental retardation research centers.....	120,000	22,043	22,043
Medical library facilities.....	11,250	28,520	28,520

¹ In addition, \$6,000,000 was available from 1964.

² In addition, there were approved applications from 1964 totaling \$10,062,000.

The National Library of Medicine faces a tremendous workload and the committee was impressed with its ability to meet this heavy responsibility when it is up against a hold-the-line budget and rising costs. The library has begun charging a \$2 user fee for foreign institutions that might be making inquiries and this becomes important when you consider that about 25,000 loans are made abroad annually. Also this year steps will be taken toward development of a computer-based system for toxicology information programs.

The library was funded the full amount of its request, \$19,769,000 which is an increase of \$397,000 over 1970.

In the Office of the Director of NIH the bill includes \$8,206,000, the amount requested and an increase of \$895,000 over last year. The increase covers mandatory costs and NIH handling of added departmental services. There will be a reduction of one position in the activities covered by these funds.

The scientific activities overseas of NIH received the full amount of its request of \$32,444,000, an increase of \$28,989,000. These funds appropriated for this program are paid to the Treasury for foreign currencies already owned by the United States but which must be spent in their country of origin in accordance with Public Law 480. The committee feels that this is an excellent way to use these surplus foreign currencies.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

The social and rehabilitation services was funded in the amount of \$9,500,092,000. This was a reduction of over \$66 million but an increase of nearly \$2 million over 1970.

A few facts at this point should be enlightening. In my State of Illinois, for example, public aid costs have jumped nearly 39 percent in the past year. This means \$53 million a month in payments as compared to \$41 million a year ago.

Each month in Illinois some 5,500 to 6,000 cases are added to our rolls. The average AFDC payment is \$68.28 a month compared to last year's payment of \$60.61. Disabled persons get \$175.49 compared to \$171.21 last year.

There are 622,000 on the rolls in Illinois—every small increase becomes a major budget item. The State buys 500,000 prescriptions a month for public aid families, so a nickel increase in prescriptions will cost \$300,000 per year. Forty-five percent of the State's \$53 million a month welfare budget is supplied by the Federal Government.

Eighty-three thousand persons were added last year.

Our director, Harold O. Swank, feels that the real problem is the growing number of recipients. The reason for the increase he feels is threefold: First, fathers are deserting their families at a growing rate, forcing more mothers to seek ADC. Unemployment, jobs that pay

too little, families too big, and debts from installment buying are reasons for desertion. Second, about 200 welfare families a month move to Illinois from other States with lower benefits; chiefly, Missouri, Kentucky, and Mississippi. Third, free birth control services are not used—last year 7,000 children were born to mothers already receiving ADC.

The largest single appropriation in the bill under "social and rehabilitation services" is grants to States for public assistance. The amount is \$8,651,950,000—which was requested, and is an increase of \$1,153,646,000 over 1970. Of the total appropriation, \$8,588,100,000 is for the Federal matching of State welfare and medicaid costs, which is noncontrollable. The appropriation is 46 percent of the total amount in the bill and a 47-percent increase over 1970.

The 110-percent limitation proposed in the request was deleted, but I am going to offer an amendment at the appropriate time to put it back in the bill.

Work incentive funds include \$120 million, a reduction of \$50 million from the request, but an increase of \$18 million over the amount available in 1970. The objective of the work incentives program is to help people get off the welfare rolls and to place them in productive jobs. While the committee supports the program, it has just not been getting off the ground for several reasons, such as poor day care standards for children. The \$50 million cut is budgeted for costs which will be incurred by the States in fiscal year 1972.

The bill includes \$655,640,000—a reduction of \$5 million from the request, 1970 appropriations for "Rehabilitation services and facilities."

The largest increase is \$67 million for basic grants to the States for vocational rehabilitation services for a total of \$503 million. This, along with matching State funds, will rehabilitate some 288,000 persons for gainful employment; \$5 million has not been allowed to start a new program of services for migratory agricultural workers. The committee continues to feel that instead of starting a new Federal program, the vocational rehabilitation needs of the workers should be met through the regular programs in the States where they are living and working.

Programs for the aging were fully funded in the amount of the request of \$32 million, an increase of \$4,241,000 over 1970; \$15,200,000 was made available for State grants which include programs for senior citizen information centers: \$10 million is for the foster grandparents program and \$15.8 million is for research and training.

Juvenile delinquency prevention and control programs also received full funding by the committee. The \$15 million is the amount of the request and is a \$5-million increase over last year. This increase will be directed toward service-oriented programs for youth, with special emphasis on prevention service projects.

The bill included \$75,435,000, a reduction of \$6 million from the request and an increase of \$17,401,000 over the amount available in 1970 for research

and training. An increase of \$4 million for income maintenance experiments has not been allowed. Plans for the use of this money are very indefinite, and although the committee is sympathetic to experiments which may lead to improvements in the Nation's welfare system we have decided to increase the appropriation for this purpose at this time.

The committee has reduced by \$3 million a request for \$7 million for the social and rehabilitation activities overseas. We feel that there is not much likelihood that studies of social problems in countries where we have U.S.-owned foreign currencies will produce results which are useful and applicable here. The appropriation does, however, increase by \$2 million the funds granted in 1970.

For salaries and expenses the bill includes \$35,067,000, a reduction of \$2,372,000 from the request, and an increase of \$2,344,500 over 1970 funds. The bill allows 65 of the 100 positions requested and approximately two-thirds of the requested increase for contractual services to improve State and Federal management of medicated and welfare programs.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The next request is simply a mathematical computation of the amounts that will be required under the Social Security Act. For payments to social security trust funds the bill allows \$2,599,886,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$585,322,000 over last year.

Ninety-four million people will be covered by social security this year. That is nine out of 10 jobs. Ninety percent of people over age 65 receive social security while the face value of survivors insurance alone under social security is \$1.13 trillion.

In 1965 the social security system was paying benefits at an annual rate of \$17 billion. In June 1970 the program, including medicare, will be paying benefits at an annual rate of \$38 billion—120 percent increase in 5 years. Medicare payments constitute over \$7 billion of that total.

In 1970, 4.4 million aged will receive reimbursed health services paid for by the hospital insurance program, and 9.3 million will receive reimbursed physician and other services covered by the voluntary medical program.

For special benefits for disabled coal miners, the budget estimate considered by the committee included no funds for benefit payments under the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. The President has indicated that he will submit a request for 1971 when a more precise estimate of requirements can be made.

So that beneficiary payments will not be interrupted, the committee has made available an indefinite amount to be charged against subsequent appropriation for this purpose. The 1971 request is for \$2,759,886,000.

Payments to social security trust funds include \$997,461,000—the amount of the budget request—and an increase of nearly \$65 million over 1970. This appropriation does not involve any expenditures from the general funds of the Treasury.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

Under the special institutions portion of our bill, the American Printing House for the Blind received an amount of \$81,000 over the budget request which will provide educational materials for 1,200 blind children in private, non-profit institutions. The total amount of the bill is \$1,557,000.

The National Technical Institute for the Deaf appropriation includes \$19,744,000—the amount of the request—and an increase of \$16,893,000 over last year. The institute is operated by the Rochester Institute of Technology and can accommodate a total of 750 deaf students. Enrollment this year is expected to reach 315.

The \$2,432,000 was allotted for the Model Secondary School for the Deaf. This is an increase of \$1,654,000 over 1970. Fiscal year 1971 will be the first full year of operation of the pilot program of the school which is located on the campus of Gallaudet College. An enrollment of 120 students is expected.

Gallaudet College funds this year were reduced by \$280,000. The bill includes \$6,870,000. The amount allowed will provide for upgrading of faculty salaries and for a number of improvements in the college's instructional program.

The committee has not approved an increase of \$279,000 to offset reductions in revenue from non-Federal sources. A large portion of the loss in income arises from a decision to reduce the tuition charge from \$500 to \$357.

Howard University received full funding in the amount of \$36,185,000—but a reduction of \$25,209,000 below 1970. The appropriation includes an increase of \$2,891,000 for operating costs of the university and an increase of \$1,310,000 for the operation of Freedmen's Hospital.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

An increase in funds for the Office of Civil Rights will provide 144 new positions bringing the total staff of the Office to 545. This year's appropriation includes \$7,927,000 in appropriated funds and authorization to transfer \$947,000 from the social security trust funds for a total of \$8,874,000.

In the Office of Child Development the bill includes a reduction of \$5,917,000 from the budget request of \$5,538,000 and an increase of \$4,010,000 over last year. This is a new appropriation, funding certain activities formerly carried on in the Children's Bureau. The Office also administers Headstart.

Departmental management funds include \$35,100,000—a reduction of \$1,970,000 from the request, and an increase of \$3,964,000 over 1970 appropriations. The bill also allows 180 of the 361 additional positions requested.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The economic opportunity program request was reduced by \$34 million which represents, nevertheless, an increase of over \$98 million above 1970 appropriations. The total funds granted is \$2,046,200,000.

Of the total budget request, 58.4 percent is for the support of programs delegated to the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture. Of the funds appropriated,

41.6 percent is for the support of programs administered directly by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The committee incorporated into the bill the language requested by the President, and strongly advocated by the OEO Director, which sets aside certain mandatory funding provisions of the economic opportunity amendments although it is my understanding the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), objected to this language and will offer an amendment to the bill at the appropriate time.

THE 110-PERCENT LIMITATION AMENDMENT

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to devote the balance of my time to a discussion of the amendment I propose to offer to the bill at the appropriate time. The text of the amendment is as follows:

None of the funds contained in this title may be used for payments to any State for fiscal year 1971 for services, staff training, and administrative expenses under titles I, IV (part A), X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act which, in the aggregate, exceed 110 percent of the aggregate amount estimated for these purposes for such State for fiscal year 1970.

This language is precisely the same as that found in the section which our subcommittee deleted from the bill except for the following words:

Except where the Secretary determines that such a limitation would impair in a significant way the effective operation of the program involved.

This wording obviously makes the amendment subject to a point of order and under the rules of the House my amendment must be drawn in such a fashion as to be strictly a limitation on an appropriation bill, which this is.

My amendment would limit payments to the States for social services, staff training, and administrative expenditures under public assistance to 110 percent of the aggregate amount estimated for these purposes for such States for the fiscal year 1970.

Without this provision in this bill, we will have to face up to approximately a \$300 million supplemental appropriation.

Unfortunately, at the time of our hearings the last information available to us on public assistance costs were for the November estimates from the States. On the basis of those figures, the Department estimated that inclusion of the 110-percent limitation on social services, administration, and training would result in a savings of \$45 million.

Throughout the year the States' estimates changed and based on the May estimate, the amount of savings had increased to \$300 million.

It is difficult to analyze precisely why the estimates of cost have risen.

The November State estimates predicted a 10-percent increase in welfare caseloads for 1971 and a 16-percent increase to cover services, administration, and training. The May estimates indicate that the States expect caseloads to increase by 14 percent and they have proposed a 44-percent increase in services, administration, and training.

This 44-percent increase consists of a 54-percent increase in social services and a 27-percent increase in administration.

The 54-percent increase in services is not only precipitous, it is undefined as to its substance, and is questionable on two scores: First, whether or not States which claim they will double their social services program in 1971 have the serious intent to do so, and second, whether they have the capability, if indeed they are serious, to accomplish their objectives.

For instance, Pennsylvania proposed to increase Federal services dollars per AFDC recipient from \$37 in 1970 to \$152 per recipient in 1971. California would go from \$110 to \$168 per recipient. Not only do these predictions seem unrealistic, they also indicate the substantial fallacy in the assertion that the principal burden of the limitation will fall on small States just getting started.

In summary, the estimates are probably inflated—at least partially for purposes of demonstrating that the limitation would be extremely burdensome. It is probably, true, however, that the final savings will be closer to the \$300 million figure than to the \$45 million figure in the President's budget. The principal point, however, is that, to the degree that the May estimates are accurate, they reflect a program increase in relation to recipients which is now justifiable in today's fiscal situation.

Our committee report indicates that the limitation would "discriminate unfairly against those States which have been slow in developing their programs but are not ready to expand them."

In fact, the majority of the States affected by the limitation and the vast preponderance of the savings are associated with large States which have had programs for a number of years.

One of the principal goals of the new welfare legislation that passed the House was to equalize the level of services among the States. If we permit costs to rise indiscriminately, this will increase the disparity between the States.

Another point which we probably should have recognized long ago is that open-ended appropriations are only justifiable in relation to benefit payments. Conceptually, there is practically no case to be made for applying an open-ended concept to either services or administration.

Now, finally, Mr. Chairman, my amendment would permit a 10-percent increase in funding.

In a restrictive fiscal climate, there is no reason to permit administrative resources to expand by more than 10 percent a year. This would be inequitable in comparison with other governmental programs at the Federal, State, or local level.

The Social Security Administration, for example, does not receive an annual expansion in its administrative resources commensurate with its workload increases.

By far the biggest increase in recipient workload in public assistance is in large States which already have sizable welfare staffs. Like, SSA, they are better able to absorb workload increases.

That, Mr. Chairman, concludes my presentation of the 1971 Labor and HEW

appropriation bill. Essentially, it is a good bill and I would urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman yielding, and also appreciate the statement that he has made and that of the chairman of this distinguished subcommittee.

I would like to discuss just a little bit further the remarks that the gentleman in the well from Illinois has just made about medical manpower, and its adjunctive requirements for paramedical personnel.

Do I understand from the remarks of both the chairman and the ranking minority member on the committee that due consideration and allocation has been made for the so-called State teaching hospitals in order that we can increase the output of critically short categories of medically trained personnel in States, particularly that because of usury laws or others, are not allowed to borrow on the market to meet a guaranteed loan appropriately?

Mr. MICHEL. In our opinion we have gone over all of the testimony very carefully. We have \$401 million in this bill, as I recall, for health manpower. A \$50 million increase over 1970. Our committee added \$18.7 million over the budget increase of \$31 million for manpower training, bringing the 1971 amount for this purpose to \$401 million. So that in the aggregate is \$50 million more than we spent for health manpower in the year 1970.

I think this is a very significant increase, and one earmarked to do surely the job particularly that the gentleman makes reference to.

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SCHADEBERG).

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman for the cooperation he has given me with regard to hospitals, and ordinarily I would start my remarks by asking am I right by assuming—but I would prefer rather to start with a direct question: Is there enough money in this appropriation bill to take care of those hospitals that have started construction under Hill-Burton funds, but have not had it fully funded?

Mr. MICHEL. I believe the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), pretty adequately answered that question, which was propounded earlier by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN), as I recall. But I should tell the gentleman, as I am sure he well knows, that last year appropriated for Hill-Burton grants \$172.2 million in outright grants. The budget came to us this year at \$50 million for grants and \$30 million for direct loans, and \$5 million for interest subsidies. The subcommittee

and the full Committee on Appropriations backed that figure up to \$172.2 million again for outright grants which surely, in my estimation, ought to provide more than enough since it is the same allocation they had the previous year, because the amount is the same.

Then the States can themselves allocate within their own resources so that it would seem to me that those hospitals underway would surely be going ahead pretty much on schedule.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Was this amount expended last year?

Mr. MICHEL. This was the same amount as carried for direct grants last year as is in the bill this year for grants. Over and above that we provide \$5 million for interest subsidies, and that gives us \$166 million of additional construction over the \$172 million in grants.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. If there were not enough in the fund for each specific hospital, would it be the prerogative of the State to use some of the guaranteed loans to which they are entitled for the same purpose?

Mr. MICHEL. No question about it. As a matter of fact, one of the very fine things about the new amendments to the act is the fact that for the first time we can now combine grants with a guaranteed loan, and under that kind of a provision we should be able to build many additional hospitals around the country.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

THE INDIVIDUAL'S STAKE IN THE CONTROL OF FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the scarcity of Members on the floor does not indicate a lackadaisical attitude on the part of the House toward high taxes, big Government spending and Government programs generally.

I would rather hope that the scarcity of Members on the floor would indicate that the Members have great confidence in the Committee on Appropriations and are willing to approve the bill as drafted by the committee without amendment. I hope that that will be the result.

Mr. Chairman, as we begin consideration of one of the biggest spending bills of the session, it is fitting that we speak about spending. The President and his fiscal advisers spoke about spending over the weekend, provoking in the Washington Sunday Star a massive headline entitled, "Nixon Berates Hill on Spending."

The President should speak about spending because he has a great responsibility in this field. Practically all Federal money is spent under his direction and the direction of top people in the executive branch.

WASTE IN GOVERNMENT

No President, Democrat or Republican, seems to do a sufficient job in promoting efficiency and controlling spending. Always, it seems to get out of hand. Congress, the General Accounting Office, the executive branch, and the press uncover in every administration innumerable in-

stances of gross waste of dollars in miscalculations which lead to shocking cost overruns.

There are many types of waste. Do you remember the story about the submarine *Guitarro* which, as a result of carelessness, sank at the dock while under construction last year at a cost to the taxpayers of \$30 million?

To call the roll on Government waste in defense and nondefense areas would consume far more time than is allotted to me. I think my point is clear. There is waste and mismanagement in Government, and neither Congress nor the Executive have succeeded in controlling it.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SPENDING

The executive branch administers the Government, appoints the executives, hires the employees, makes the contracts, and spends most of the money.

Congress appropriates the money and is not blameless with respect to all waste and mismanagement, but the major responsibility in the field of actual spending and the administration of programs is with the administration in power.

It is not inappropriate for Congress—in seeking to do the best possible job—to call upon the administration to try harder to do a better job in the field of spending the money which Congress makes available. In that spirit I call upon the administration for a more vigorous effort in this direction.

The President has a difficult job—an almost impossible job. He is doing his best and I want to help him as much as possible. It is easy to see that an administration which is spending at a rate in excess of \$200 billion a year is confronted with problems of overwhelming complexity and difficulty.

I think it is fair to say that all Presidents try, in a measure, to blame Congress with what goes wrong, and all Congresses try, in a measure, to blame the President.

The present scenario is not untypical but let me say that what we need is not so much fixing the blame as fixing the country.

Yes, the headline said, "Nixon Berates Hill on Spending." In fairness it must be said that the President is compelled to try to keep the Government spending from getting completely out of hand.

NEED TO HOLD THE LINE

Let me say that I am not unsympathetic to the President's request that we seek to hold the line on spending. The Appropriations Committee has done its best to hold the line—not always successfully. It has at times been overridden by the House and by the other body and overwhelmed by its own enthusiasm for favored programs. The joint Senate-House Committee on the Reduction of Federal Expenditures, which I head, has made available the facts of the precarious fiscal situation. I would call attention to the most recent report of the committee in the July 16 RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Congress trying to hold the line on Government spending and I am not in favor of exceeding the President's budget for spending except in very extraordinary

circumstances. I am in favor of making reductions wherever we reasonably can.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY ROLE

As a Democrat of some experience in fiscal matters, I wish to say that the Democratic Party must do its best to hold the line on Federal spending and do the best possible job of balancing national priorities. I am not talking politics, I am talking commonsense and without a great deal of commonsense and self-restraint we are going to fall in this great hour of national need and let inflation and fiscal uncertainty defeat the hopes and dreams of the poor and destroy the economic base of the general prosperity which we have enjoyed for so many years in this country.

If Congress and the administration want more revenues to spend for improving the environment and other attractive and necessary programs, let us raise the needed revenue. But if we do not have the money we must restrain ourselves.

As a Democrat, I am not anxious to project the image that as a Democrat I want to outspend the Republicans. I am not interested in outspending anybody. I am interested in preserving the economic strength and integrity of this country, thereby retaining the means to promote the welfare of the rich and poor alike. It is in this area that the administration and the Congress could, if the hand of restraint is not applied, jeopardize the Nation's best interests. Of course, I realize that a big country has big needs and requires big spending.

The President says that we are exceeding his budget and spending beyond our means and we are exceeding the President's budget and we are spending beyond our means. This is not to say that I hold a brief for the economic policies of the administration. I am willing to join my Democratic brethren in saying that a better job should be done by the administration in the handling of our fiscal problems, but I am not willing to say that we ought to dismiss the matter of our precarious fiscal situation with a mere brushoff statement about politics.

In matters of foreign policy and in matters involving the economic integrity and stability of the country, Democrats and Republicans should join together—the administration and the Congress should join together—in an effort to meet our situation in the best possible manner.

That is not only good business, it is good politics, in my judgment, for both Democrats and Republicans.

Politics must not be permitted to obscure the precarious fiscal situation which confronts this country.

REDUCTIONS SHOULD PRECEDE INCREASES

There are those who say they favor staying within the overall budget of the President but who want vast increases for the social programs over the budgeted amounts and who seem to take the position that they will increase the funds for the social programs and nullify the inflationary impact on the budget by reducing by billions of dollars funds in the budget for defense and for space.

Very well. When and if those reductions have been actually enacted into

law, it will be appropriate to apply available excess funds to high priority programs but not before. As of now, those reductions have not been made.

However, I should make it clear that many reductions in defense and space programs were made last year, and there is a reduced budget this year. The reductions last year aggregated some \$6 billion. We are now spending more for social programs than for defense. Previously, this had not been the case. For this fiscal year, 37 percent of the budget is for defense and 41 percent is for the so-called human resources programs.

A JOINT RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Chairman, holding the line on spending and practicing sufficient fiscal restraint is a joint responsibility of the President and the Congress. And neither the administration nor the Congress is doing a sufficient job. And neither is without substantial responsibility for our national budget course and our national budget results.

Let me cite some facts, beginning with the fiscal 1970 budget.

When this administration took office, it immediately launched a review of the fiscal 1970 budget of the previous administration, and announced the results in April of 1969. It first undertook to "correct" the budget of the previous administration, and then announced spending reductions of \$4 billion.

The revised administration budget showed a projected budget surplus of \$5.8 billion for fiscal 1970. But it still projected spending at \$192.9 billion—an \$8 billion increase over what was then foreseen for the previous fiscal year 1969. The administration—after the extensive review—still proposed spending \$8 billion above the previous year.

According to the administration's budget revisions of May 19—2 months ago—fiscal 1970 spending was about \$198 billion—some \$13 billion, plus, above fiscal 1969. There were many contributing factors—including miscalculations of requirements in certain items, such as interest, and so forth—but that was the result.

The budget surplus originally projected by the administration in April 1969 for fiscal year 1970 had also vanished—and turned into a deficit.

In the fiscal 1971 budget, submitted last February, the President projected a slim budget surplus for 1971 of \$1.3 billion.

But on a Federal funds basis; that is, leaving out the borrowings from the trust funds, the fiscal 1971 budget submitted in February was in the red by some \$7 billion. As a result of miscalculations of the revenue outlook, miscalculations of certain expenditure requirements, and other changes—by the administration and by Congress—on May 19 the President upped the Federal funds deficit projection to \$10 billion.

This is cause for alarm. I am further alarmed because it does not seem that enough people are alarmed about the situation.

POSSIBLE \$20 BILLION DEFICIT

I am even more alarmed about the possibility that the Federal funds deficit

in this current fiscal year 1971 could go as high as \$20 billion. That is a distinct possibility.

I would not be surprised if the deficit on the unified budget basis goes to \$10 billion and the deficit on the Federal funds basis goes to \$20 billion. This could well come from administration miscalculations of revenues, underestimates of spending for so-called uncontrollables such as interest, and so forth, and congressional add-ons. And we are responsible for congressional add-ons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen from Texas has expired.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to my chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in the May 19 budget revisions, the administration has already conceded some miscalculations on revenues and underestimates of uncontrollables. The Joint Taxation Committee staff has recently cast some doubt—to the extent of about \$3 billion—on the validity of the administration's revenue projections. And in revenue forecasting, experience teaches that it is always best to assume the low side rather than the high side. Congress seems pointed toward further aggravation of an already aggravated situation.

As of July 9, the House, by its actions on both spending and revenue measures, had increased the projected unified budget deficit by about \$2.9 billion—reflecting such actions as a \$1.5 billion social security increase, a delay in the family assistance proposal, and other mandatory spending authorizations, totaling \$2.8 billion in all, and a net increase of about \$100 million in spending related to the various appropriation bills.

As of July 9, the Senate, on both spending and revenue measures, has increased the projected deficit for fiscal 1971 by a net of about \$2.3 billion. This net increase in the projected deficit reflects Senate actions on various mandatory spending authorizations similar to but not corresponding exactly to those reported for the House, totaling \$1.2 billion in all, and increased spending related to appropriation bills totaling \$1.3 billion, offset by nonbudgeted revenue increases voted by the Senate but not yet acted upon by the House. This word of explanation is needed in order to put House-Senate actions in proper focus: The Senate has not yet acted on the social security increase or the family assistance proposal, and has acted on only six of the fiscal 1971 appropriation bills in contrast to the 12 passed by the House.

In addition to the actions taken to date, still awaiting action are about \$4.4 billion of the administration's requests for legislative proposals that are counted in the budget as offsets to spending and new revenue proposals—both of which were counted in arriving at the deficit projected by the administration. Involved are such proposals as a new tax on leaded gasoline, accelerated collection of estate and gift taxes, certain user charges, and some spending offset proposals.

THE PENDING BILL

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pound the table and say with emphasis that we have a chance to exercise restraint in our consideration of the bill before us. As

the bill stands now, it exceeds the budget estimates by \$92 million. We exceeded the budget by \$453 million in the companion education appropriation bill.

It is indicated that amendments will be offered later today or tomorrow to further increase the bill in excess of \$300 million. At a time when we do not have the money in hand or in sight, I would plead with Members not to join in further aggravating our already serious fiscal difficulties by adding more fuel to the inflationary pressures and further downgrading the consumer dollar.

THE INDIVIDUAL'S STAKE IN THE CONTROL OF FEDERAL SPENDING

We all remember our responsibility to the voters back home, to the taxpayers. We remember that. We will have that matter called to our attention come November.

When we go home prior to November to meet our people, I would hope that husbands and wives would not point at Members of Congress and say, "Where is the man—where is he?—the man who helped cheapen my dollar and made it almost impossible for me to pay my grocery bill and feed my children?"

People have been talking here on the floor about doing something for the poor and the meek and the lowly—and we must. With that thought in mind, let us not shrink the value of the housewives' dollar at the grocery store and elsewhere.

Let us preserve the financial integrity of this country, for only through that procedure can we make it possible for this country to go forward. I plead with the Congress to support the committee on the bill which is before us and vote down the amendments and help take care of the poor who need some support as their dollar shrinks and their needs increase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished gentleman from Texas 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, who granted us a rule for the consideration of this bill, for which I wish to offer thanks.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for yielding to me.

My main purpose is to extend the congratulations and felicitations of this humble Member to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for this very timely speech that he has made here today calling the attention of the membership to the deplorable situation in which we find ourselves fiscally.

Of course, the gentleman knows and every Member of this House realizes that regardless of who the President of these United States may be, he cannot spend a dollar that this Congress does not authorize and appropriate. So, as the gentleman has so well pointed out, it is a joint responsibility of the Executive and of the Congress.

Of course, as bad as this continued deficit spending is, the most important thing is the thing that the gentleman

called to our attention at the last and emphasized; namely, the depreciation of the currency of this country, with the resultant devastating influence of inflation.

So I want to congratulate the gentleman, and I certainly hope, regardless of party politics, because, after all, if one party goes down the drain as a result of our fiscal irresponsibility, then both parties go down and so does this glorious young Republic of ours—regardless of party politics. I hope that we vote these amendments down. I hope that this membership will heed the advice and remarks of the man who is responsible, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for bringing these appropriation bills to the floor.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his very generous remarks.

Yes, particularly the poor. The rich can stand it, but particularly the poor must have their dollar protected by someone. The pre-World War II dollar is now worth only 35 cents. It has lost 65 cents. The dollar lost 6 cents last year. That makes it hard on the housewife and the poor little children. I think we ought to think about them in more ways than one. If we overspend and overspend and overspend, the rich will make out, but the poor will suffer. Only by maintaining a strong country can we move toward a better situation for all our people.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER).

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join in the remarks which have been made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and to congratulate and commend the chairman upon his statement.

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee's recommendations before the House today call for a total of \$18.8 billion in fiscal year 1971 for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity and other related agencies. This represents an increase of \$2.3 billion over last year's appropriation, and it is \$92.9 million above the President's budget requests for this year.

In addition to these funds permanent authorization exists for the trust funds for social security, railroad retirement, and unemployment compensation totaling \$53.8 billion, an increase of \$4.9 billion over fiscal 1970. Thus, the total amount included under these departments and agencies for the health and welfare of our citizens is \$72.6 billion.

This is a tremendous amount of money, and the committee has taken its responsibility seriously. For more than 14 weeks, Government and private witnesses produced nearly 7,400 pages of testimony.

I commend the chairman, the ranking member, and all of my colleagues of the subcommittee for their unselfish contribution in working out this bill and in doing so with complete agreement.

From these hearings, the committee presents the following recommendations:

For the Department of Labor \$1,208,368,000. This is an increase of \$118.3 mil-

lion over last year's appropriation, but a decrease of \$8.2 million below the budget request.

For the Health and Welfare portions of HEW, \$15,486,915,000. This is an increase of \$2.1 billion over last year's appropriation and \$134 million over the budget request.

For the Office of Economic Opportunity and other related agencies, \$2,129,380,000. Ninety-six percent of this is for OEO. The total represents an increase of \$85 million over the fiscal 1970 appropriation, but a decrease of \$33 million below the budget request.

There are hundreds of projects and programs funded in this bill, far too many to discuss at this time. These range from open heart surgery research to solid waste management; from veterinary medicine to population control; and from child care centers to job training programs. I will mention only a few which have received special attention this year.

Within the Department of Labor, the committee has been impressed by the early results of the job opportunities in the business sector program. This program encourages the private sector to become more involved in terms of interest and input in on-the-job training projects. Only by mobilizing these private resources can the Federal Government hope to upgrade the skills and job opportunities of thousands of workers who have been especially hard hit by the slowdown in the economy. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$77.4 million for this program.

Also regarding the slowdown in our economy, I might point out that the bill includes an authorization to transfer \$717.7 million from the Employment Security Administration account to the unemployment trust fund, an increase of \$51.9 million over 1970. It would be my hope that Congress would soon complete action on the employment security amendments of 1970 which will extend the time limit and expand the coverage of unemployment insurance. In many local areas the effects of the national slowdown are causing severe hardships for families whose regular benefit periods have expired. Much of this slowdown is due to changing national priorities, and the Federal Government has responsibility to share the burden of continued benefits with the States.

The bill includes \$163 million for the environmental health service. About two-thirds of this amount is to be used for air pollution control. According to information furnished the committee at my request earlier this year, the total Federal pollution control activities obligations for fiscal 1971 will cost about \$2 billion.

This represents a 60-percent increase over fiscal 1970 and a 123-percent increase over fiscal 1969. The committee has recommended a net increase of almost 10 percent for the air pollution activities in this bill.

For mental health activities under the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, the bill includes \$368.5 million. This is an increase of \$21.9 million above the President's request and \$15

million above last year's appropriation. Most of the increase over the President's budget is found in the committee's proposed addition of \$20 million for staffing grants for new community mental health centers.

It is estimated that \$20 million will be available from past appropriations for the construction of additional community centers. In view of these new centers, it made no sense to the committee to provide no money for additional staffing grants. We trust that this increase of \$20 million will be sufficient.

The committee has recommended \$181.5 million for medical facilities construction, an increase of \$92.2 million above the request and \$5.2 million above last year. This is the popular and successful Hill-Burton program. Included in this figure is \$5 million for interest subsidies which will support \$166 million worth of construction and modernization loans. With this subsidy, the total for construction of hospitals and other medical care facilities is \$338 million. With a backlog of an estimated \$11 billion in needed construction and modernization projects in our hospitals, this is certainly the minimum amount needed at this time.

The recommendation for the National Institutes of Health is \$1.6 billion. This is an increase of \$212 million over 1970 and \$92.7 million above the President's request for 1971. The committee added \$38.5 million to continue the research activities of each Institute at the 1970 level, thus halting any further deterioration in research support. This deterioration has resulted in a reduction in the number of NIH research grants from \$12,000 in 1967 to \$9,800 in 1970.

Of the remaining NIH increase, \$25 million is for the National Cancer Institute. The total recommended for cancer research is \$227.4 million, which is an increase of \$46.7 million over the 1970 amount. In addition to this, private sources of cancer research and treatment funds, such as the American Cancer Society and the Damon Runyon Fund and others, supply \$100 to \$150 million annually. This increase more than makes up for the reduction made by the Bureau of the Budget in the original request presented by the Institute.

It is sobering to note that about one in four persons will get cancer and two-thirds of those afflicted will die with the disease. Cancer will kill approximately 375,000 Americans this year. However, the committee heard repeated testimony that any crash program in cancer research would have to be phased in over a period of time rather than attempting a large expansion in 1 year. As Dr. Marston, the Director of NIH, testified: "A 6- to 12-year program can, therefore, be readily visualized as the time required for development, testing, and evaluation of a vaccine for use against a single form of human cancer. The same process might be repeated in developing and testing vaccines in other types of cancer," of which there are at least 100.

Thus, the committee is well aware that this is a long-term effort. However, the time to start that buildup is now, and the recommended increase reflects our con-

stituents' demands that cancer research receive highest priority in our Nation's health expenditures.

Similarly, the committee recommends an increase of \$17.4 million over last year for the National Heart and Lung Institute. Heart disease is the largest cause of death in this country, killing over 1 million of our citizens last year.

For the health manpower activities of NIH the committee recommends \$260.9 million, an increase of \$18.7 million over the budget, and \$48.2 million over last year. In recommending this increase, the committee is following the advice of Dr. Egeberg, the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs.

Dr. Egeberg testified:

In my professional judgment an increase of funds, should the committee determine to so recommend, could most effectively be employed in the area of health manpower development.

The increase over 1970 for health manpower is about evenly split between institutional support and student assistance. It is the committee's feeling that the student assistance programs should be restored to approximately the same level that existed before last year's cut-back. At the same time, it is clear that our medical science colleges are in desperate need of financial support if they are to be expected to produce the health manpower necessary now and in the future. As Dr. Egeberg pointed out:

For every student who enters medical school in this country there is at least one other person who has the necessary qualifications, but for whom there simply is no space.

The Federal Government is now the source of 52 percent of all medical school expenditures. Yet the need for additional doctors, dentists, nurses, and allied health manpower grows worse each year. The committee was told that if we added up all the private resources plus the Federal support going into health manpower training at the present time, we never would catch up with the need for additional personnel. Several of our medical schools are in a state of virtual collapse because of financial shortages. There simply seems to be no alternative to additional Federal support.

This bill also includes \$9.5 billion for the Social and Rehabilitation Service and \$2.6 billion for the Social Security Administration. Most of these funds are in the uncontrollable category.

Mr. Chairman, there is not time to discuss the rest of the items in this bill. None of these items is unimportant, as each deals with a certain aspect of the health and economic and social welfare of our citizens. The needs appear limitless; the means limited. It is easy to call for priorities; it is difficult to establish them, as higher priority for one program must bring lower priority for another.

Overall, this is a good bill, and I support the committee's recommendations.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, several times today this bill has been re-

ferred to as a \$19 billion or \$20 billion bill.

I would like to point out that the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will really be \$65 billion this year under the unified budget. One really cannot get an accurate picture or a balanced picture unless one looks at the unified budget which includes the trust funds.

Also, we have heard a lot lately from

some people, as if they have invented it, of the shifting of priorities. Actually, we have been shifting priorities for years. We have a higher percentage of the budget this year going into human resources than we have for defense appropriations and the principal bill for human resources is this bill appropriating money for HEW. I am going to place certain tables in the RECORD which I think will really provide a better bal-

anced picture of this comparison of human needs with the defense budget, and also the increase in the HEW and human resources budget over the years since 1954 when the Department was formed.

I secured these tables from the Bureau of the Budget and from Government sources, so that they would be accurate. I think it would be worthwhile for Members to study these tables which I set forth at this point:

BUDGETS ON NATIONAL DEFENSE AND ON HUMAN RESOURCES AS A PERCENTAGE OF OUTLAYS

Fiscal year	Defense unified budget	Human resources unified budget	Fiscal year	Defense unified budget	Human resources unified budget
1957	55.7	23.2	1965	41.9	29.9
1958	53.7	26.2	1966	42.2	31.0
1959	50.6	26.3	1967	44.3	32.0
1960	49.8	27.6	1968	45.0	32.1
1961	48.4	29.7	1969	44.0	34.4
1962	47.8	28.7	1970 estimated	40.1	37.0
1963	46.9	29.2	1971 estimated	36.7	40.8
1964	45.2	28.9			

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—HISTORY OF APPROPRIATIONS

Fiscal year:	Federal funds	Trust funds	Adjustments	Total	Fiscal year:	Federal funds	Trust funds	Adjustments	Total
1954	\$1,897,654,000	\$5,080,994,000		\$6,978,648,000	1965	\$6,896,843,000	\$17,684,035,000		\$24,580,878,000
1955	3,430,712,000	11,742,641,000		15,173,353,000	1966	10,139,059,000	20,077,021,000		30,216,080,000
1956	3,856,824,000	13,003,000,000		16,859,824,000	1967	12,624,152,000	30,077,055,000	-\$1,061,439,000	41,639,768,000
1957	4,515,096,000	13,086,790,000		17,601,886,000	1968	14,469,343,000	31,696,738,000	-1,477,860,000	44,688,221,000
1958	5,135,838,000	14,988,916,000		20,124,754,000	1969	15,619,076,000	38,307,896,000	-2,689,905,000	51,237,067,000
1959	5,444,499,000	17,255,195,000		22,699,694,000	1970	16,890,689,000	43,307,363,000	-2,561,345,000	57,636,707,000
					1971	19,704,273,000	48,279,399,000	-3,180,270,000	64,803,402,000

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor-HEW Appropriations, once again I want to pay my respects to my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL). Under their leadership, our subcommittee has worked diligently in bringing this bill to the floor.

The legislation before us today—H.R. 18515—carries funds totaling approximately \$18.8 billion to cover all activities of the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare—with the exception of the Office of Education which was covered in a separate bill—and various related agencies. This bill represents the bipartisan decisions of the members of our subcommittee after some 3 months of intensive hearings. As the seven volumes containing over 7,000 pages of printed hearings indicate, the subcommittee conducted a very thorough investigation and review of the budget requests and individual views brought before us. Representatives from the executive agencies, as well as those outside of the Federal Government, made excellent presentations. I am sure all of us are aware not only of the growing needs in the field of manpower, health, and welfare, but also the necessity to place these needs in a realistic framework of priorities in view of current budgetary limitations.

It has been pointed out that this is the largest of the appropriation bills excluding defense. However, when we take into consideration the money carried in other bills, the 1971 Federal expenditures for health, education, welfare, and services to individual Ameri-

cans will exceed defense expenditures for the first time since World War II—and I think that is significant.

Naturally, in an appropriation bill of this size—and dealing with matters which are related so closely and directly to people—there are bound to be honest differences of opinion regarding specific amounts. I certainly have great sympathy with many of those who testified—particularly in regard to appropriations for health care and research. The needs are great and more funds could be effectively utilized in some of these programs if available, but we must remember that our resources are not unlimited—and we have a responsibility to do our best to allocate these limited funds wisely and where they will prove to be most effective.

I believe no one would question that we have better medical care in this country than anywhere in the world. However, we know there is a critical shortage of trained medical personnel—hospital costs are high and still rising—and there are many diseases for which there is still no cure.

In this regard I would like to point out some of the specific areas which have been of particular concern to me and many others. Hundreds of people throughout the Nation and in my own congressional district have written to me to urge increased funds for cancer research, and I am pleased that our committee provided an additional \$25 million over the President's budget recommendation for the National Cancer Institute for fiscal 1971. The bill, as reported, provides a total of \$227.3 million for cancer research—\$46 million above the amount appropriated last year. As I have pointed out previously, I am generally not one to exceed the President's budget because I do recognize the urgent

need for sound fiscal management in Government if we are ever to control inflation and reduce taxes, but I do feel that a greater national effort is needed in our war on cancer, both in treatment and prevention technology and, in my judgment, the majority of Americans are willing to pay the cost of an accelerated attack on this dreaded disease.

Another area in which we increased appropriations was for the National Heart and Lung Institute where we provided \$178.4 million—\$6.7 million above the President's budget and \$18 million above the amount appropriated last year. In our report last year, the committee noted the rising incidence of chronic respiratory disease and suggested that tem. I am pleased that the Institute is, the Heart Institute give greater emphasis to these disorders which inevitably involve and affect the cardiovascular system, broadening the scope of research on these problems and that, to give visible evidence of this new commitment, the name of the Institute has been changed to the National Heart and Lung Institute.

Much concern has been expressed, also, about the continuation of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program. I have long felt that this is one of the most successful Federal-State programs in existence, but the goal of increasing hospital beds is even more critical today than it was when the program was instituted. Therefore, our committee gave this matter top priority by recommending appropriations that will provide construction totaling \$338.2 million. This consists of \$172.2 million in direct grants and \$5 million to subsidize interest payments on \$166 million worth of loans.

In a continuing effort to meet the shortages of personnel in the health field, our committee included \$260.9 million for the health manpower program—

\$18.7 million above the budget request and \$48.2 million over the amount appropriated for 1970. Included in this total was \$2.7 million for formula grants for schools of veterinary medicine. The goal is to provide more doctors, dentists, nurses, and other health personnel to overcome the existing shortages and meet the increasing needs.

Another subject which the committee gave special consideration was mental health. The budget for staffing grants for community mental health centers was \$60.1 million, but testimony revealed that this amount would staff only those centers that received grants prior to 1970. Therefore, we included \$20 million additional to staff new centers that will be ready to go into operation in 1971. In my opinion, the community mental health centers program has saved many dollars to say nothing in human suffering by reducing the number of patients who are confined to mental hospitals.

It is obvious that I have mentioned only a small percentage of the items in this bill. But I feel it is important that our taxpaying citizens know that much is being accomplished in these important fields.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, H.R. 18515, the bill before the House, is a good compromise, in that we have made every attempt to establish priorities among those programs which have proven their worthiness for the health and welfare of our people. We have recommended a net increase of \$92.9 million over the budget estimates—mostly for the National Institutes of Health and for medical facilities construction, as I have pointed out. However, this increase should have very little effect on the total expenditure estimate for 1971 since it is mostly for grants that will increase obligations in 1971 but will not have a major impact on expenditures until 1972 or later.

Our committee's task in establishing priorities was not easy under the very difficult fiscal situation which continues to face our Nation today—and I am hopeful that the House will approve our recommendations.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I was quoted on the wire service by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford) as being one of the spenders on the appropriations committee along with my colleague (Mr. YATES). I am very proud of the fact that I have been placed in that category if it means that I am one of the people who believes that we should reorder our priorities in this country and put the emphasis on our domestic programs which have been sorely neglected because of the Vietnam war.

Very few talk about the economic impact of that war. There are many of us here who have been talking about resetting national priorities by cutting back military manpower, eliminating obsolete weapon systems and a few other

substantial budget claimants. We have been talking about some of the very things that have been discussed by Chairman MAHON. We call for a shift in emphasis to the urgent needs of our cities.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make it perfectly clear that this is a constitutional democracy. Charles Shultz, former budget director, reminds us that the U.S. budget is not the document of an executive whose decisions are law, nor is the President a prime minister, whose party must support him or bring down the Government. This is not a parliamentary democracy. This is a constitutional democracy. The budget is, rather, a set of proposals sent to Congress for action on appropriation and tax measures. If only I had the time I could show that in the Charles Shultz paper on "Setting National Priorities—The 1971 Budget," we were presented with a contrived budget by the President. The Shultz paper shows how a potential surplus became a potential deficit.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I heard the Secretary of the Treasury suggest to committee members that the fiscal policies in this country were all that have been described here by our distinguished chairman, but significantly the Secretary of the Treasury said that we might have to go to selective wage-price controls. What happened? The next day the President contradicted him and told him to shut up. And the battle rages on.

The power is in the Executive to control and redirect this economy, not only in terms of monetary and fiscal controls, but in terms of economic policies and the allocation of resources for their most efficient use. As long as I have my warrant in the House of Representatives, I will be coming to the well to tell my colleagues that the people of the Seventh California District and other districts throughout the country believe that our program and spending priorities should be redirected to the cities. The major problems that this country is facing are internal, and if we neglect domestic problems too long, we do so at our own peril.

I will develop these thoughts in a more formal paper which I shall present later. But I want to call your attention to the fact that Mr. Shultz, in analyzing the 1971 budget, points out very clearly that the dollars allocated for education and medical manpower and facilities are inadequate.

They must be increased. It is for this reason I have led fights to increase education, medical manpower, and urban renewal funds.

I suggest to my colleagues that the President is not facing those domestic difficulties with the greatest candor when his minority leader strikes out at members of the other party, labeling us "spenders." It seems to me that anybody on the Republican side who voted for the education appropriation bill this year with its necessary \$400 million increase, can with pride classify himself as a spender.

But I have studied the rollcall. We were all together—Democrats and Republicans, and thank goodness. I believe one of the reasons we were all together is because some of us who are now being accused of being "spenders" were around here last year to do some of the work on this education bill. It is our deep personal belief that these are the important and urgent national priorities.

The President formed the Commission on Student Unrest. I suggest we take a look at some of the implications of what the findings may be. I think one of the things they will find is that for peace on the campus we should get out of Vietnam. If we do not, we will have not only campus problems but our budget cannot effectively be transformed to attack our pressing domestic problems.

We are trying to say two things: We have to set about our business of re-ordering our priorities, and we must fund these new directions. It is for this reason, as a Member of the most representative Legislature in the world that I come before you and make this case. In fact, it is our obligation and responsibility to do this.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say one thing in levity. To my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan, I want to express very deep regret that he did not make that statement a little sooner. It might have helped me out in the great Seventh District of California.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if I had known a statement of this sort by me concerning the gentleman's amendment could have been helpful to him in the Democratic primary, I would have said it sooner and louder and repeated it many times, because the gentleman knows I think he is a first-class Member of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. Chairman, on the bill at the appropriate time, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts is going to propose a package amendment. This package amendment has all the characteristics of the education bill. It fully funds vital programs that were left underfunded but I am not going into that now. It will be my task at the appropriate time when the bill is being read to explain a certain section of the package in relation to construction of medical facilities, as indeed I did before our full Appropriations Committee.

Let me tell the Members a little bit about what the problem is all about in the time I have left.

Our distinguished chairman was telling us about the uncontrollables in our budget. When we take the \$200.8 billion and add it all up, there are \$180 billion in uncontrollable items. The distinguished Member from Illinois made reference to the uncontrollable characteristics in the budget.

We all know what they are—interest on the public debt, social security, and so forth. How do we get interest on the public debt up to the level it is? It is because something is wrong with the whole fiscal policy. Prices have gone up. There is rigidity in the system. There are sticky prices and sacred cows being protected in that budget. Some are uncontrollable.

For example, it is not only the interest on the public debt, but take the Commodity Credit Corporation, which is a highly controversial and political issue, but, nevertheless, uncontrollable. We do not know what that bill is going to be from year to year. The point is that someone's ox is always being gored, but decision must be made.

Now we come to the famous uncontrollable medicare and medicaid. What about them? There are enormous problems being created here. There was a \$200 million estimate as our first year costs, instead they have gone up over \$2 billion. Why? Because of lack of medical manpower and lack of medical facilities, and lack of paramedical services, and all the categories we are discussing in this bill. If we do not fund existing medical programs, we are going to compound our ills. It will get worse.

A week ago I read in the paper that the Blue Cross plan is going to pot. Why? Because of the incredible rising costs of medical care: \$100-a-day hospital beds; uninsurable groups. The high cost of medical care demands that something be done to control these costs. To attack the problems we need more medical manpower and facilities. This is what the emergency health amendment is about.

I urge an aye vote on the Boland amendment when we vote tomorrow.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the committee whether my time may be allotted to the gentleman from California?

Mr. FLOOD. Not at this time, Mr. YATES.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, let me say I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) on his very excellent statement. I regret that his talents and his ability will not be available to the Appropriations Committee in the 92d Congress. But I am confident that his absence from this body will be temporary. He has contributed much in the years he has been here, in the very field about which we are talking now. He has been and is a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee. No one has worked any harder than he has in the time he has served on the committee.

Coming to this well after hearing some of the speeches that have been made here this afternoon in this Committee of the Whole, one would think one would come with some trepidation. That was a powerful speech by the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations (Mr.

MAHON). There was a magnificent dissertation on the bill and explanation of the bill by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

But, as the gentleman from California has said, there is the matter of priorities with which this Congress must deal. There is a matter of priorities with which this Committee of the Whole must deal.

So, powerful as the speech of the gentleman from Texas has been, I believe we have to face the fact that we must meet these priorities in the field of public health. This is one area in which the Congress ought to be deeply concerned.

Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, he has done excellent work on this bill and all the bills he has ever handled as well as on other appropriation subcommittees on which he has served and is now serving.

He has, I believe, won the respect and admiration and esteem of all the Members of Congress for the way he has pulled himself up from a very serious illness to the good physical condition in which he is today. I admire him for his spirit and his determination.

May I also say, Mr. Chairman, when one leaves the theater one has to walk into the street of reality. That is what we are trying to do with the package amendment that will be offered tomorrow.

When this bill was considered in the full committee I stated, and I repeat now, that this Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. FLOOD's Subcommittee for Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, has one of the toughest and I believe the most difficult tasks of all the appropriation subcommittees. There is more interest, more pressure, more testimony relating to this bill than to any other budget with which the Congress deals.

I suppose that this is so because it touches more people and more programs relating to people than any other budget the Congress considers. I imagine that there are few people in this Nation who are not affected in some way by what this bill seeks to accomplish.

The amendment I will offer and have titled, the "health emergency amendment", seeks to establish some priorities in the field of health. The health emergency amendment is not named for purposes of rhetoric. It is so named to reflect the condition of this Nation's health system.

This amendment seeks to do something about the crisis in health. This is a cry that we have been hearing much about—doing something about—but not near enough.

People are getting nowhere near the quality of health care they have a right to expect.

These are not my words. They are the words of former secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert E. Finch.

Crisis in health is not merely a slogan—it is not just another empty shibboleth.

It is, today, a striking reality. Without exception, everyone concerned with, and responsible for, the health of our Nation—from President Nixon to distin-

guished experts in the health professions, to ordinary citizens—has expressed deep concern about this plight.

There are other members of the committee who will discuss various aspects of this package amendment. They will expand on specific amendments in the package.

Let me detail briefly what the package amendment does. The emergency health amendment contains the following increases:

Medical manpower institutional support and student loans	\$138,954,000
Health educational facilities construction	100,000,000
Hill-Burton direct grant program	80,000,000
Community mental health centers, staffing grants	20,000,000
National Heart and Lung Institute	15,000,000
Pilot dental care projects for needy children	6,000,000
Grants to medical school libraries	500,000
Total	360,454,000

Mr. Chairman, so that the Members will have some knowledge of the programs that the package amendment affects, let me elaborate briefly on them.

First. Institutional support of health schools. Formula grants and special project grants are awarded to schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, nursing, public health, and the allied health professions. The purpose of these grants is to increase the output of health professionals, rescue schools in financial difficulties, and improve the quality of instruction.

The legislative authority for these programs authorizes a total of \$255,500,000 for fiscal year 1971. The administration requested only \$147,966,000, and the committee increased this request by just \$2,700,000.

The health emergency amendment would fund these programs of institutional support to the full amounts authorized, resulting in an increase of \$104,834,000.

Second. Loans for health professions students. The programs of direct loans to students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine, and nursing provide these students with much-needed funds for their professional education.

Fifty-six million dollars is authorized for these loans in fiscal year 1971. The administration requested only \$21,610,000 a sharp reduction from the previous year. The committee increased the request by \$16,000,000, still far short of the amount authorized and needed.

The health emergency amendment would fully fund these loans programs by increasing the appropriation by \$18,390,000.

Third. Traineeships for health professions students. Traineeships are provided to selected students of public health, nursing, and the allied health professions.

Thirty-eight million dollars is authorized for these traineeships in fiscal year

1971. The administration requested only \$22,270,000, and the committee made no change in this request.

The health emergency amendment would fully fund these health traineeship programs by increasing the appropriation by \$15,730,000.

Fourth. Construction of health education facilities. Matching grants are made to the schools of the health professions for construction of new teaching facilities and for renovation of existing facilities. At the beginning of the current fiscal year, approximately half a billion dollars worth of construction grant applications had been approved by HEW, but were unfunded for lack of money.

A total of \$260 million is authorized for these construction grants. The administration requested only \$126,100,000, and the committee made no change in this request.

The health emergency amendment would increase the request by \$100 million.

Fifth. National Heart and Lung Institute. The major source of funds for research into the causes and treatment of heart disease is the National Heart and Lung Institute of the National Institutes of Health. Research on heart disease—still the major killer disease—deserves more financial support than provided for in the committee's bill.

The National Heart and Lung Institute has an open-ended authorization. The administration requested \$171,747,000 and the committee raised this request by only \$6,732,000.

The health emergency amendment would increase this request by an additional \$15 million.

Sixth. Special dental care projects. Section 510 of the Social Security Act authorizes a program of pilot dental care projects for needy children which is aimed at finding ways to control dental disease. The administration requested, and the committee approved, a totally inadequate appropriation of just \$180,000 for this program.

The health emergency amendment would increase this request by \$6 million.

Seventh. Hospital construction grants. The program of grants for hospital and medical facilities construction and modernization, commonly known as the Hill-Burton program, is designed to provide assistance in meeting the great need for more hospitals and other health care facilities.

The administration requested only \$89,321,000 for the Hill-Burton program. The committee raised this request to \$181,521,000 by increasing the amount for construction grants and eliminating the amount requested for direct loans.

The health emergency amendment would increase the request for construction grants by another \$80 million, which would produce a total amount for grants which is less than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1969.

Eighth. Community mental health centers staffing. Community mental health centers are designed to reduce the number of patients in mental hospitals by emphasizing outpatient care in the local community as a more effective method of treatment. The greatest need of the cen-

ters is money to pay staff during the early years of a center's existence.

The administration did not request an appropriation adequate to continue staffing grants for those centers currently in operation. Only \$60,100,000 was requested for this purpose. The committee increased the request by \$20,000,000 but admitted in its report that even this amount would probably not be adequate to keep existing centers operating.

The health emergency amendment would insure that these centers continue to function by adding another \$20,000,000 for staffing grants.

Ninth. Medical libraries assistance. The National Library of Medicine administers a program of assistance to medical libraries throughout the country.

The administration requested only \$5,792,000 for this program in fiscal year 1971. The committee did not change this request, despite an authorization of more than \$12,000,000 contained in the Medical Libraries Assistance Extension Act of 1970 for nonconstruction assistance.

The health emergency amendment would increase this request by \$500,000.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I will introduce is intended to meet the minimum needs of nine HEW health programs. These health programs will be listed when we get back into the House. I will list all of the health programs and list the amount of money requested by the administration and the amount of money provided by the Subcommittee on Labor-HEW and the amount requested in this amendment.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope when we reach that part of the bill tomorrow where this amendment will be offered, the members of this committee will recognize the fact that there is a crisis in health and that the Members on both sides of the aisle will support the effort to meet that crisis.

Much has been printed and said about the "gap in the health needs of the Nation." Let us close this gap. Let us close ranks on both sides of the aisle and march down that aisle with the knowledge and the satisfaction that we measured up to our responsibility to provide the manpower and the programs that will bring happier and healthier tomorrows for the people of this great land.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it is time to talk about doubletalk, doubletalk from some of those on the Republican side.

We heard today from the minority leader that certain Democrats, including me, were guilty of budget busting and he warned against voting for the Boland amendments to increase funds for various health programs in the HEW appropriations bill. Apparently he forgot the release put out by the National Republican Congressional Committee on July 15, 1970, only a few days ago, which said:

THE MEDICO GAP

Dr. Roger O. Egeberg is preparing a request for the Nixon Administration for \$150 million to be applied toward closing the

doctor gap in America, Scripps-Howard has reported. The newspaper chain conducted a survey recently across the Nation which revealed a serious shortage of medical care available in many parts of the country.

The survey shows a need for a crash program to increase the number of health workers, with emphasis on doctors. The survey disclosed that physicians are over-concentrated in suburbia, with scarcity in the ghettos and rural areas. Many of the Nation's medical colleges are on the verge of bankruptcy. Medical education has become so costly that lower income groups are being foreclosed from training for careers in medical fields.

Dr. Egeberg is Assistant Secretary for Health at HEW. The \$150 million he reportedly wants would boost financial grants to medical, dental nursing and other health-related schools. It would increase the amounts and numbers of Federal scholarships and loans to medical, dental and nursing trainees. The U.S. needs 50,000 more doctors, 150,000 more nurses, 10,000 more dentists and thousands of health-care specialists. There are now 325,000 doctors, 100,000 more dentists and thousands of health-care specialists. There are now 325,000 doctors, 100,000 dentists, 700,000 nurses and 3 million other health-care workers, according to Scripps-Howard.

The 109 medical schools in operation graduated 9,000 doctors last year. Dr. Egeberg wants to double this yearly output to 18,000. "If the Government doesn't help the medical schools and medical students soon, we'll have a doctor shortage for the next 20 years," he warns.

Surprisingly, the U.S. is eighth per capita in the number of doctors, with Austria, Australia, Denmark, Israel, Italy, Russia and West Germany ahead. Health officials say that "maldistribution" is the main problem, with large areas suffering a gap in health care, and others having more than an adequate number of doctors. Dr. Egeberg also wants changes in the 13-year program now required to educate and train a doctor. The total cost of the present program runs nearly \$50,000 over the long years of schooling, internship, military service, medical residency and specialized medicine.

Dr. Walter C. Bornemeler, president of the American Medical Association, says the Government should provide "full scholarships and maintenance" for Negro, minority and poor white students who want to become doctors. He also advocates ghetto clinics financed by the Government, under private operation.

The doctor gap was created under the Democrats. The Nixon Administration wants a program to close it up.

Mr. YATES. How, Mr. Chairman? How does the Nixon administration propose to close the gap? With words? Words will not do it without dollars to back them up; and, even the minority leader knows that if the Congress stays within the President's budget as he says he wants to do, neither the doctor gap nor the hospital gap will be closed.

The Nixon administration and the minority leader cannot have it both ways. They cannot cling to the budget's admittedly inadequate figures and still call for closing the health gap.

We will find out tomorrow which side they choose when the votes are taken on the bill and on the Boland amendment.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to add my support to the emergency health amendment. The \$360 million which the amendment would provide may seem like a great deal of money, but it is really a modest invest-

ment when matched against a medical bill now hovering at around \$70 billion a year, which the American people are paying.

The consequences of our failure to adopt this amendment would be grievous indeed. Some of our most esteemed programs, for training sorely needed health care personnel, for supporting medical and dental schools and for assisting hospital construction, will suffer needlessly.

I for one cannot understand the logic in refusing to fund, in full, these essential and basically noncontroversial programs. Take traineeships and loans for students of the health professions. Everybody agrees we have a critical shortage of qualified health manpower; here's our opportunity to do something to rectify the shortage. Mr. BOLAND's amendment would simply raise the appropriations for the two programs to the authorized level of \$94 million, surely a sound move in these difficult times.

Other programs which the amendment would help are equally meritorious. Our medical schools are in trouble, and the amendment would respond to this problem by adding \$104.8 million to the \$150.7 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee for institutional support of these schools. Again, the ultimate purpose of these grants is to increase the output of health professionals by rescuing the schools from financial distress and improving the caliber of the instruction they offer.

The House has just expressed its own staunch support for the Hill-Burton Act for aiding hospital construction, by decisively overriding a Presidential veto of legislation extending this popular program. The emergency health amendment offers a logical sequel to the override action, by adding \$80 million to bring the Hill-Burton funding in this bill to \$261.5 million—still less than the amount we appropriated for fiscal 1969.

I should like to include at this point a letter sent last night by 10 members of the Commerce Committee to all House Democrats, as part of the effort to rally support for the emergency health amendment:

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 21, 1970.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which is responsible for authorizing legislation in the field of health, we are vitally concerned about full funding for our health manpower programs.

It is our understanding that the Appropriations Committee has recommended more funds for student loans than the Administration requested, but no additional funds for the schools of the health professions and nursing, except \$2.7 million to continue aid to schools of veterinary medicine.

The emergency in funding for our health manpower schools is grave, and is worsening every day. We should act now to meet this crisis.

An "Emergency Health Amendment" will be offered by Congressman Edward Boland to the Labor-HEW Appropriations bill, scheduled to come to the floor today. The amendment calls for greater funds for health manpower programs, as well as increases for Hill-Burton grants, Community Mental Health

Centers, and the National Institutes of Health. We support that amendment, and hope you will also.

Sincerely,

Samuel N. Friedel, John E. Moss, Lionel Van Deerlin, Fred B. Rooney, John M. Murphy, Brock Adams, Richard L. Ottinger, W. S. "Bill" Stuckey, Robert O. Tiernan, Richardson Preyer.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it known my full support of the emergency health amendment which would provide \$350.6 million to help meet our Nation's grave health crisis. This appropriation would specifically aid medical schools and will be very helpful in the attempt to bridge our deficiency of 52,000 doctors in the country.

Time and again, we have failed the medical schools and their dedicated faculties. We have demanded of them herculean tasks and given them only minimal support. We have demanded of them increases in their enrollments, aid to disadvantaged people in rural and urban areas, and higher quality health care and services. Moreover, we have demanded of them all this but turned a deaf ear to their cries for financial assistance.

Mr. Chairman, we have only approximately three active medical doctors for every 2,000 people, while the Soviet Union has five doctors per same number of people.

Our Nation deserves better care than this. But the only way to achieve a more realistic ratio and every improving care is to enable the medical schools to train more doctors. For this, they need our help. That is why Congress must give its full support to this important legislation.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971 would appropriate \$18.82 billion. While the amount is \$2.32 billion over last year's level, increases in uncontrollable programs such as grants to States and trust funds account for \$1.7 billion of the higher figure.

In the area of health care the bill is woefully inadequate. Fortunately, the committee saw fit to increase the requests by the administration for health programs such as Hill-Burton construction, the National Institutes of Health, and mental health programs. However, even with the committee increases, the legislation falls far short for providing the much-needed funds to respond to the Nation's health crisis.

Therefore, I support the "emergency health amendments" adding \$360.5 million for medical construction, health training programs, the National Heart and Lung Institute, the special children's dental program, medical student loans, and community mental health centers. I urge all our colleagues to support this worthwhile amendment. Overwhelming support by the House for adequate health funds would demonstrate a concern for the welfare of our citizens—a concern which takes priority over wasteful and unnecessary spending for programs like the SST and NASA.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

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

H.R. 18515

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, 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, namely:

**TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
ACTIVITIES**

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry into effect the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2571-2620), \$744,494,000 to remain available until June 30, 1972.

Mr. FLOOD. 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. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18515) 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 18515 and to include extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

**POSTPONEMENT OF WHEAT
REFERENDUM**

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1148 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 1148

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (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. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto

to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California, Mr. SISK, is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1148 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of 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.

Under the present law, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to hold a marketing quota referendum no later than August 1, 1970.

In view of the fact that new farm legislation to replace the expiring Food and Agriculture Act is expected to be reported at an early date, it is felt that a postponement of the referendum is desirable. If the referendum were to be held and then new farm legislation enacted, there would be a waste of time, effort, and money.

The purpose of S. 3978 is to authorize the Secretary to postpone the conducting of a national referendum on the 1971 wheat program. He could conduct the referendum not later than the earlier of two dates: 30 days after adjournment sine die of the second session of the Congress; or October 15, 1970. Thus he would be free to set a date earlier than October 15 if he felt that no new legislation were possible and that such action were needed in order to give wheat farmers greater certainty in planning for their 1971 crop.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 1148 in order that the bill may be considered. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statement just made by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK), concerning this rule, and this bill, but I hasten to point out that I am not too happy with the action of the committee so far as setting the date of October 15, 1970, or 30 days after the adjournment sine die of the second session of the 91st Congress, for the holding of this referendum. As was pointed out to the Committee on Rules, in the winter wheat areas they will be sowing their wheat long before October 15. In Ohio we usually sow our wheat some time around September 20 or September 25. This referendum could be held as late as October 15, when some of this wheat or most of the wheat in Ohio and in many other wheat areas would be in the ground, and these farmers would be forced then to tear up their fields.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to the House that I read on the wire today that the House Committee on Agriculture has tentatively agreed on a farm bill, and they hope to agree tomorrow. That would do away with the necessity for this wheat referendum, and my reservation about the date would no longer apply.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I support the rule, and I support the bill with the

hope that the Committee on Agriculture will follow through tomorrow and report out a farm bill.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 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, be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 3978

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 336 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision hereof the referendum with respect to the national marketing quota for wheat for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1971, may be conducted not later than the earlier of the following: (1) thirty days after adjournment sine die of the second session of the Ninety-first Congress; or (2) October 15, 1970."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the House Committee on Agriculture today did reach a tentative agreement on a general farm bill and also on a provision which would establish a limitation on individual payments.

The Washington Post in reporting this event this morning was in error, however, in describing the limitation as a limitation at \$55,000 per farm. As I understand the agreement, it would be at \$55,000 per crop, and dealing with the three major crops in the bill—feed grains, wheat, and cotton, and if that in fact is the case the limitation in reality is not \$55,000 per farm but at least \$165,000 per farm.

I do not view that as a responsible limitation on payments which this bill sets and if a responsible limitation on payments is not accepted when the general farm bill is before the House, I think the prospects for enactment of a general farm bill this year may indeed be rather dim. If this should not occur, then there would be a delay in the wheat referendum that we are voting on today, and which I oppose. It would be a grave injustice to the wheat farmers.

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

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. How does this statement that the gentleman just made relate to the limitation recently passed in the Senate of \$20,000 per farm?

Mr. FINDLEY. I would say to the

gentleman that the limitation provided in the Senate action on the appropriation bill for agriculture is at a proper and responsible level, which is \$20,000 per farm and at the proper time, if I am recognized for that purpose, I will seek to amend the limitation provided in the general farm bill to bring it down to the \$20,000 level.

Mr. YATES. How does it pertain to the present bill now under consideration? Is it related and does it relate in any way to the present bill—that is, the \$20,000 limitation?

Mr. FINDLEY. No, it is not. It is not in the bill at the present time, but I hope it will be before it is enacted.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, the House Agriculture Committee this morning acted to insure prompt action on new farm legislation. This action has a direct influence on House consideration of S. 3978, a resolution passed June 19 by the Senate postponing the wheat referendum scheduled for July 27–31 until October 15 or 30 days after adjournment, whichever comes first.

A referendum of wheat farmers forcing a choice between two mediocre farm programs would create unnecessary friction and division in rural America. In addition, the USDA has estimated the cost of conducting a referendum at \$2 million. This money should be applied to improve farm income and save the family farm operation rather than conduct a divisive farm vote.

I urge favorable consideration of S. 3978 to give the USDA the authority to delay the wheat referendum. A referendum will likely not be necessary since new farm legislation should be enacted during this session of Congress. We do not need an unnecessary expenditure of \$2 million and a controversial and unnecessary vote in rural America during these most divisive times.

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.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ANY ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DULY PASSED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until noon Wednesday, July 22, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JIM G. LUCAS, GREAT REPORTER, DIES IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma lost one of its finest native sons and the Nation lost one of its greatest newsmen last night.

Jim G. Lucas, a smalltown boy who won immortal fame as a Marine combat correspondent in World War II, and who went on to become one of the world's most respected war correspondents as a reporter for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, died last night at the veterans hospital here in Washington, D.C.

Jim Lucas was a newsman who covered war as the GI saw it and the GI fought it. From the beaches of Tarawa to the jungles of Korea and the rice paddies of Vietnam, he worked alongside America's fighting men and told their story with fidelity, bravery, and integrity.

From his starting days as a reporter for the Muskogee Daily Phoenix, Jim Lucas was a man who believed in going where the action was.

As a reporter for the Tulsa Tribune, he became one of Oklahoma's best known newsmen. In later years, with Scripps-Howard, he was the acknowledged successor to Ernie Pyle and one of America's most honored reporters.

In today's edition of the Washington Daily News there appears an editorial under the title of "Jim G. Lucas," part of which reads as follows:

Jim Lucas was a great reporter with a rare gift for chronicling the miseries and joys, heroism and humdrum of the life of the American soldier on the front lines in three wars.

Thousands upon thousands of ex-GI's will long remember him from the clips of his stories they have pasted in their scrapbooks.

American servicemen all over the world, who knew him as a friend, will join in mourning this brave Oklahoman.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in my remarks the full text of the editorial:

JIM G. LUCAS

One of many amazing things about Scripps-Howard War Correspondent Jim G. Lucas was that a lifetime of witnessing and writing about the tragedy of wars left him without a trace of inner hardness or cynicism.

He was, until the end, what one speaker said of him years ago in bestowing upon him some particular medal: "A truly modest man—an old Marine with a soft heart."

And he could, and did, write with the best of the journalists of any era.

He undoubtedly saw more combat than any newspaperman in U.S. history. He seemed to be always at the front—until age and a long, losing bout with cancer caused him to return from Vietnam three years ago for the last time. When, for example, Gen. Omar Bradley at a Washington banquet in 1953 awarded Jim in glowing terms the VFW's Gold Medal for conveying the feel of the battlefield in his stories, Jim was on the frontlines in Korea. When he was awarded the 1954 Pulitzer Prize for his human interest stories from Korea, he already was in Hanoi covering still another war. (He was in Hanoi when Ho Chi Minh's troops took over North Vietnam.)

Still, 25 years of frontline reporting in three major wars never shook his belief in the worth of the individual, the value of life, or the love of country.

He never married. He loved young people and there are countless stories of his help to the young, particularly young newspaper-

men on their first assignment to a war zone. He could, and did, oratorically wave his country's flag at the slightest provocation.

Jim Lucas was a great reporter with a rare gift for chronicling the miseries and joys, heroism and humdrum of the life of the American soldier on the frontlines in three wars.

Thousands upon thousands of ex-GI's will long remember him from the clips of his stories they have pasted in their scrapbooks.

Scores of young newspapermen in the future, we are sure, will be studying his work and seeking to emulate it—just as has been true in the case of Jim's predecessor, Ernie Pyle.

For those of us in Scripps-Howard, it has been an exceptionally rare privilege to have worked with Jim Lucas.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in what he had said about our late friend Jim Lucas, who was one of the most outstanding constituents of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. Speaker, Jim Lucas knew where the news was, went and got it regardless of how dangerous or how tough the undertaking, and I doubt that many reporters have covered the war in Vietnam as closely, as thoroughly and over as long a period of time as did Jim Lucas.

He was truly on instinctive and great natural reporter. America has lost one of its finest newsmen.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his comments.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I guess I knew Jim Lucas about as well as any Member in the Capitol. He was a marine at heart. He covered the battlefronts as a marine GI would cover it. He was loved by everyone who wore the uniform. He was intense in his patriotism and he was as intense in his reporting the truth to the American people, regardless of how they took it. He was an honorable reporter, a great American and a great credit to his profession.

Mr. Speaker, now that Jim Lucas has gone, a great American, a great American journalist has left this scene and he will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON) for what he has said about the late Jim Lucas and I wholeheartedly join in the sentiments which he has spoken so well. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for his kind remarks.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma.

(Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague in paying tribute to Jim Lucas. He was not only a great reporter but he was a great fellow and certainly was a dear friend of mine.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an editorial entitled "Jim Lucas Dies Here":

FAMED WAR REPORTER: JIM LUCAS DIES HERE

Jim G. Lucas, Pulitzer Prize-winning war correspondent for the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, died early today of abdominal cancer in the Veterans Hospital here. He was 56.

Mr. Lucas began his war reporting career as a Marine combat correspondent in the Pacific islands campaigns of World War II.

For the next quarter century, in dispatches datelined around the globe, his accounts of the heroism and agony and tedium of war gained him recognition as America's best known war reporter since Ernie Pyle, also of Scripps-Howard Newspapers and one-time managing editor of The Washington Daily News.

A versatile writer who covered many other types of stories, Mr. Lucas died three days before publication of his latest book, a biography of Vice President Spiro T. Agnew.

But the assignment he most desired was that which brought him to the frontlines, and to the side of those he respected above all others, American GIs. Mr. Lucas possibly saw more actual combat and more of the maimed and dead of war than any other newspaperman in U.S. history.

His period of front-line reporting spanned 25 years, including World War II in the Pacific, and the wars in Korea and Vietnam.

Many in his profession believed him to be the greatest since Ernie Pyle in his ability to write with compassion and understanding about the American soldier, sailor or marine in battle. He was twice the recipient of the Ernie Pyle Award for writing in the Ernie Pyle tradition, the only newspaperman to be so honored.

Only once was he wounded and that lightly by a piece of shrapnel over the eye near Da Nang in Vietnam in 1964.

He believed that the "fantastic luck" which had carried him safely through so many battles and firefights would stand by him in his bout with cancer which began with a major intestinal operation a year ago. But such was not to be.

SCOOP IN PACIFIC

Mr. Lucas first acquired journalistic fame at the bloody and epic Battle of Tarawa in the Pacific in late 1943. His story, written as a Marine combat correspondent, was the first out and for three days was the only word the outside world had. It was on Tarawa that he received a battlefield promotion from master sergeant to second lieutenant and a Bronze Star. His story produced for him the National Headliners Award for the best combat reporting of 1943. He was listed as dead for a brief time on Tarawa. The dead Marine turned out to be another combat correspondent who was wearing Jim's shirt.

In all, he made eight D-day landings with the Marines in the Pacific in World War II. Battles in which he participated included Guadalcanal and Iwo Jima.

After VJ Day, many newspaper organizations bid for his services. He joined the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance in Washington and became that bureau's military correspondent.

He covered the first atomic bomb test at Bikini and in 1947 went with the late Adm. Richard E. Byrd to the South Pole.

He went to the front lines at the start of the Korean War and spent 26 of that conflict's 36 months in Korea, being present at the end of the fighting. His reporting from Korea (which included making 17 B17 bomber runs over North Korea) won him

the Pulitzer Prize in 1954, as well as his first Ernie Pyle award and a flock of other honors—including the George Polk Memorial Award, the Veterans of Foreign Wars' Omar Bradley Gold Medal and the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association's "Not for Self But for Country" award.

After the Korean Armistice, he went to then French Indochina to cover the French war with the Viet Minh, and was based for 18 months in Hanoi. He was in Hanoi when Ho Chi Minh's forces marched in to take over the city.

After the Indochina armistice, he went to Goa to report on hostilities between the Portuguese and Indians. He went to Lebanon when President Eisenhower sent in the Marines and Army paratroops in 1958 and liked to remember that episode as "the only war I ever covered from an air-conditioned hotel room and dressed for dinner every night."

In 1959 he spent several months in Vietnam and in January, 1964—before the big American buildup—stationed himself at Can Tho, in the Mekong Delta of South Vietnam, for the first of several tours that were to constitute coverage of his last war.

WENT ON PATROLS

When U.S. Marines poured into Da Nang, Mr. Lucas shifted the base of his operations there and continued the type of reporting which won for him his second Ernie Pyle award. Even though then past 50, he continued to go on patrols and stay up all night when events demanded, as when the Reds overran the A Shau Valley.

He returned to the United States in the summer of 1967, hopeful of returning to Vietnam despite the fact he was 53 "and youngsters could do my job better." But health never permitted a return. A book of his Vietnam columns, "Dateline: Vietnam," was published in the summer of 1966 and sold well.

Early this spring he took vacation time to write a biography of Vice President Spiro T. Agnew. It is being published by Universal Publishing Co. of New York and was reviewed in this newspaper last Friday.

Mr. Lucas was born June 22, 1914, in Checotah, Okla. His father died when he was young and he was forced because of lack of finances to cut short his education at the University of Missouri. His first newspaper job was with the Muskogee, Okla. Daily Phoenix. After a stint as a reporter for the Tulsa Tribune, he enlisted in the Marines in 1942.

NEVER MARRIED

He never married, but once (after World War II) was engaged to a Wave lieutenant. The story around his home office was that the romance went on the rocks because the weekend he was to visit her parents in upstate New York an emergency assignment came up. The fiancée is supposed to have said: "It's the office or me." Mr. Lucas took the assignment.

His apartment in an Alexandria highrise was literally filled with awards, scrolls and testimonials. One picture shows one of the highlights of his life: President Lyndon Johnson in September, 1966, introducing him to 100 Congressmen LBJ had called in for Mr. Lucas to brief on Vietnam. It was the only time President Johnson asked a newsman to give such a briefing. Mr. Lucas was given a standing ovation at the close of his remarks.

He was an excellent public speaker and made scores of addresses throughout the country over the years before groups of all kinds.

He is survived by a sister, Mrs. Mary Moore of Bowie, a brother, J. Bob Lucas, state capital reporter in Oklahoma City for the Tulsa Tribune, a niece, Mrs. Beth Marshall of Torrance, Calif., and a nephew, Peter W. Hudson of Silver Spring.

Funeral arrangements are not yet complete.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the life and service of Jim Lucas.

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

There was no objection.

LET US PUT THE "TIGER CAGES" AT CON SON PRISON IN PROPER PERSPECTIVE

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the current furor in this body over the "discovery" of the so-called tiger cages at Con Son prison is somewhat out of focus, but nevertheless necessary.

First, let me say that atrocities of any kind, whether performed by ally or enemy, must be condemned. And surely if the Con Son prison conditions are as bad as the reports of two of our colleagues and others suggest, I condemn the situation loudly and vehemently, and demand that immediate action be taken to correct the injustice.

And let me also add an "I told you so," to my statement made at the time this body approved the sending of an investigating committee to South Vietnam.

In voting for the resolution, I had cautioned that it was imperative that the group take ample time to gather facts and information prior to their departure in order to make their journey more meaningful and productive. Obviously, the gentlemen from California (Mr. HAWKINS) and Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) had a good supply of information on the "tiger cages" and successfully sought them out.

However, let us not confuse the Con Son prison situation with that of the POW camps in North Vietnam. If I may, I would like to put the whole matter in perspective.

First, the South Vietnamese maintain separate prison camps for POW's, which are operated according to the Geneva accords and are open to inspection by international bodies such as the Red Cross. North Vietnam—which has signed the Geneva accords—has repeatedly refused to let the International Red Cross inspect their prisoner-of-war camps.

Second, the South Vietnamese Government has not exactly been hiding the Con Son prison. If an Associated Press wire service report dated July 15 can be believed, the International Red Cross has inspected the prison three times in the last year and a half, and in a "sharply worded" report declared the conditions unsatisfactory and made recommendations for improvement.

Third, in my investigations of stockades on U.S. military bases, I have found many appalling conditions that are just as despicable as those at Con Son prison. Likewise, the American press—particularly columnist Jack Anderson—has revealed horrifying conditions in many of our State penitentiaries.

However, none of this is meant to excuse the existence of the Con Son tiger cages. It is meant only to put it into perspective. I would welcome an investigation of the situation, but I wonder whether it is wise for the Congress to request such an investigation by the executive branch at this time.

I rather feel, Mr. Speaker, that we should await the results of investigations being conducted by the executive branch of the Saigon government and also by our counterparts in the Vietnamese Congress. The International Red Cross has also promised to make another investigation later this year.

Further, let us see if President Thieu carries out his promise, reported last week, to destroy the tiger cages.

Hopefully, reports of all investigations will be made public and will reflect the positive action of the Saigon government to rid Con Son of any inhuman conditions. If, however, they reveal that no action has been taken, then it would be advisable for the U.S. government to reconsider its AID policies which help finance some of the prison programs in South Vietnam.

In the meantime, I think our investigative efforts would be well spent on U.S. military and civilian prisons here at home.

Let us remember that when the Communist threat in South Vietnam escalated the United States manifested its "only we can do it right" attitude and took over the war. That has been proven unsuccessful. This time let us let the Saigon government correct its own prison deficiencies with our help if it is asked for.

It is a bit presumptuous of this body to expect a democracy of less than a decade to exhibit model penal institutions when this democracy of almost two centuries stands shamefaced on the issue of penal reform.

NO-KNOCK: A PROVISION BY ANY OTHER NAME

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

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I, along with other concerned Americans, deplore the passage by the House of the District of Columbia crime bill with its no-knock provision. There was a suggestion this very morning by Attorney General John Mitchell that the name "no-knock" be changed. Mr. Speaker, if the substance of this clause remains unchanged, then it will continue to pose a grave and direct threat to the freedoms of the American people. It also will open the door to further incursions in the future.

The citizens of the District of Columbia must be guaranteed security in their homes. They should not be subject to intrusion of any sort without, at least, the courtesy of a knock on the door.

The fourth amendment to the Constitution protects "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures." The Founding Fathers adopted this amendment be-

cause they remembered how the British troops had abused the rights of the American colonists. They remembered how the English troops had entered colonial homes without warning—armed with guns rather than with writs. They remembered how the troops had seized the personal belongings of colonists and often took the colonists themselves into custody. The fourth amendment was adopted so that such practices would not continue.

Yet the present no-knock provision of the District of Columbia crime bill directly contradicts the fourth amendment. It permits the government to do exactly what the fourth amendment was designed to prohibit. It makes the American people, and in particular the residents of the District of Columbia, vulnerable to abuse by the police.

Of course, we must also consider the safety of our Nation's police forces. Our law officers would be placed in grave peril were they to break into homes without announcing that they were law officers. I know I would shoot someone who forced his way into my house without announcing that he was a law officer. I am sure many of my fellow Americans would do likewise.

I recognize that the increasing crime rates in our cities are one of the major domestic problems confronting this Nation. I am a strong advocate of reducing this crime rate so that our citizens will not live in any fear or danger. Yet I recognize too that the rights of the individual have been the cornerstone of liberty in this country. These rights are finite, and serious inroads into their exercise are not easily recaptured. The crime rate in this country is high and must be reduced, but not at the expense of individual liberties.

We, the leaders of this Nation, must act to insure that these freedoms do not die. It is for this reason that I opposed the no-knock provision of the District of Columbia crime bill when it was voted on by this House. This provision by any other name will pose a dangerous threat to American liberties. I hope that the Senate will oppose the no-knock provision of this bill so that we may preserve those freedoms the Founding Fathers intended us to enjoy.

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the House Committee on Agriculture instructed the chairman and the ranking minority member to introduce a general farm bill, which bill has been introduced and will be available as soon as it can be printed, which we hope will be tomorrow.

So you may have some idea of what is in this bill, we have prepared a very brief summary of the provisions of the bill. I ask unanimous consent to insert this in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the principal provisions of this bill are as follows:

PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE "AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1970"—H.R. 18546

This bill is made up of eight titles which contain the following major provisions (*unless otherwise noted, all provisions will be in effect for the next three years*):

TITLE I—PAYMENT LIMITATIONS

(To be included in bill as a committee amendment.)

TITLE II—DAIRY

1. Extends and amends the authority for the Dairymen's Class I Base Plan in federal milk market order areas. It specifically guarantees competitive access to Class I Base markets by established producers outside the market order area. Appeal procedures under present law remain unchanged.

2. Suspends the operation of the mandatory butterfat price support program for farm-separated cream and permits the Secretary to set lower support prices on butter.

3. Extends the Secretary's authority to donate dairy products owned by CCC to the Armed Services and Veterans Hospitals.

4. Extends the Secretary's authority to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who through no fault of their own have their milk contaminated by and condemned because of the presence of pesticides and residues.

TITLE III—WOOL

1. Extends the National Wool Act of 1954, as amended, through December 31, 1973.

2. Continues the present incentive price of 72 cents per pound for shorn wool and 80.2 cents per pound for mohair for each year of the extension.

TITLE IV—WHEAT

1. Suspends both the marketing quota program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

2. Provides domestic marketing certificates to farmers participating in the set-aside program in an amount equal to U.S. food consumption (about 530 million bushels annually).

3. Sets the face value of these domestic certificates at the difference between the wheat parity price (currently \$2.82 per bushel) and the average price received by farmers during the first five months of the wheat marketing year (which starts on July 1).

4. Provides for a "preliminary" payment to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. This payment would be the amount estimated by the Secretary to be 75 percent of the value of the domestic certificate. The balance of the payment (if any) would be paid in December. If the Secretary's estimate were too high, no refunds by farmers would be required.

5. Continues the cost of certificates to wheat processors at 75 cents per bushel.

6. Authorizes the Secretary to set non-recourse loans to participating farmers from zero to 100 percent of the parity price for wheat.

7. Establishes a "set aside" program under which wheat farmers, in order to be eligible for loans, certificates, and payments under the program, must set aside or divert from the production of wheat and other crops an acreage determined by the Secretary.

8. Authorizes payments to participating farmers for any additional set-aside acreage and for permitting public recreational access.

TITLE V—FEED GRAINS

1. Establishes a voluntary feed grain (i.e. corn, grain sorghum, and barley) program for 1971, 1972, and 1973.

2. Provides that price support payments to participating farmers on one-half of their feed grain base will be the difference between

not less than \$1.35 per bushel (for corn) and the average market price for the first five months of the marketing year (which starts on October 1 on corn and grain sorghum and July 1 on barley). In no event, however, would these payments be less than 32 cents per bushel for corn (with corresponding rates on grain sorghum and barley).

3. Authorizes the Secretary to set non-recourse loans at zero to 90 percent of feed grain parity prices.

4. Authorizes additional set-aside and public recreational access payments.

5. Establishes a "set-aside" program under which participating farmers would be required to set aside or divert feed grain or other cropland in order to become eligible for feed grain loans and payments.

6. Provides for a "preliminary" payment of 32 cents per bushel on corn to participating farmers as soon as possible after July 1. If the difference between the average market price and \$1.35 were more than 32 cents during the first five months of the marketing year, an additional payment would be made. In no event would refunds by farmers be required.

TITLE VI—COTTON

1. Provides a guaranteed support of 35 cents per pound (middling one inch basis) on the estimated production from 11.5 million acres for the 1971 crop and an equivalent amount for the 1972 and 1973 crops.

2. Makes assistance available to participating cotton farmers through loans and payments. The loan would be 90 percent of the estimated average world price. The payment would be the difference between 35 cents and the average market price for the first five months following the beginning of the marketing year (which begins August 1), but in no event less than 15 cents per pound. No refunds by farmers would be required in the event market prices were greater than 20 cents per pound.

3. Authorizes payments to participating farmers on acreage made available to the public for recreational purposes.

4. Provides for a set-aside of cropland (not to exceed 33⅓ percent of the cotton allotment) as a condition of eligibility for benefits under the program.

5. Establishes a voluntary program under which marketing quotas, penalties, and acreage restrictions would be suspended for three years.

6. Requires participating farmers to plant cotton to receive payments, with two exceptions: (a) if unable to do so because of natural disaster or other condition beyond producers' control; (b) if not less than 90 percent of allotment is planted.

7. Allows the sale of cotton allotments within a State, permits the lease of allotments within a State, and provides for the release and reapportionment of allotments during the 3-year life of this legislation.

TITLE VII—PUBLIC LAW 480

1. Extends without change the provisions of P.L. 480 (the "Food for Peace" program) which authorizes donations and long-term dollar credit and foreign currency sales of U.S. farm commodities to underdeveloped nations. Under the Act most foreign currency sales are scheduled to end by December 31, 1971.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS

1. Continues the "Cropland Conversion" and "Greenspan" (long-term land retirement programs) at an authorized appropriation level of \$10 million annually for each program.

2. Continues the current exemption from marketing quotas for boiled peanuts.

3. Permits farmers or other land owners who do not desire to hold an allotment on any crop under a government program to voluntarily relinquish it. (This would be a permanent provision.)

4. Establishes an indemnity program to reimburse beekeepers for losses caused by pesticide residues.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill. We were instructed to introduce it by a vote of 25 to 7 in the committee. It has the endorsement of the administration. It has the support of the overwhelming majority of the members on both sides of the committee, and it will render a real service to agriculture and to consumers. I hope the membership will give it every consideration.

PLACE THE BLAME WHERE IT BELONGS

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

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, in strictly a partisan political approach, the Democrats have served notice that they will make inflation, Vietnam, and domestic disorder key campaign issues this year.

If they do not—we should.

Because it was the Democrats who controlled this Government during the first 8 years of the 1960's when the runaway deficit spending spiral was set in motion, when the American manpower commitment in Southeast Asia escalated from 793 to 550,000, and when riots, disorder, and rampant crime reached an all-time record high.

President Nixon did not start inflation—he was loaded down with it when he took the oath of office. The runaway spiral was set in motion by the "new economics" political doctrine of the 1960's which promised lower taxes and inaugurated a Federal spending spree that sank the Government into a \$59 billion hole—culminating in the record-staggering \$25 billion deficit in 1968 alone. The new administration initiated sound, responsible economic policies that gave us a fiscal year 1969 surplus of \$3 billion, reduced the annual increase in Federal spending by better than 50 percent, and curbed the causes of zooming prices.

President Nixon did not start the war—he inherited it. Since that inheritance, he has completely changed the direction through his Vietnamization program from an American responsibility to a South Vietnamese responsibility. There has already been an overall reduction of 125,000 Americans who were committed in Southeast Asia, and there will be 150,000 less by spring of next year, meaning that one-half of the boys committed to the war in 8 years of the two previous administrations will have been brought home in the first 2 years of the present administration.

President Nixon did not start riots, disorder, and rampant crime in America—it was at an alltime high when he took office. But since taking office, he has established an effective, capable Department of Justice that is letting the hopheads, thieves, crooks, and criminals understand that crime does not pay like it once did—and as a result of President Nixon's appointments, for the first time in 13 years, the Supreme Court is be-

coming independent of the activist, liberal coalition which has ruled it.

The Democrat-controlled Congress continues to drag its feet on needed anti-crime legislation, attempts to tie the President's hands and cut off supplies to our troops in Southeast Asia, and, blocks proposed Government efficiencies and works against the Republican administration's hard fight to hold down spending and curb the inflationary clutch that is despoiling the paychecks and the savings of American wage earners.

Let us pin the tail on the donkey, and place the blame where it belongs.

It is, indeed, a powerful campaign issue.

PFAFFTOWN, N.C., JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, dedication to excellence is the hallmark of any successful venture, whether in professional or personal items.

The size of an enterprise can enhance the appearance of its success, but size alone is no measure of true greatness or achievement.

It is my pleasure to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues an example of the dedication to excellence about which I have spoken.

It was recently announced that the Pfafftown, N.C., Junior Chamber of Commerce has been named the No. 1 Jaycee organization in the Nation for 1970.

This is a great honor in itself, but the prize is all the more deserved and should be all the more cherished when one considers that it was the work of only 59 men—59 men in competition with organizations many times larger—that earned the highest award bestowed by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce at its recent convention in St. Louis.

It is fitting at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the names of these 59 men should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as deserving recipients of this outstanding designation, but more, as symbols of dedication, of faith, of ambition, of excellence.

The Pfafftown Jaycees are Archie Anderson, Richard Austin, Thornton Berroth, Winfield Berroth, Ray Bottoms, John Burton, Ralph Burton, Stephen Callaway, Billy Carter, Jerry Carter, William Case, Norman Cash, James Cass, Jimmy Cline, Max Covington, Tommie Dalton, Stephen Elam, Robert Ely, Philip Fleming, Terry Harrell, Edwin Henson, James Hewett, Jerry Johnson, Roger Jones, Roger Jordan, Thomas Jordan, Thomas Logan, Robert Lukach, Arnold Marshall, Kenneth McKaughn, Charles McMillan, Billy Mendenhall, Stephen Miller, William Mueller, Fredrick Mulcox, Joseph Ottaviani, Kenneth Parker, Douglas Parrish, Jack Patterson, Cecil Peeler, David Poindexter, Dr. Barry Ramsey, Celtus Robertson, Stuart Rollins, James R. Scales, Jack

Stewart, Aaron Veach, James Wagoner, Dale Watson, Jesse Watson, Paul Watson, Jimmy Westmoreland, Jack White, Johnny Williams, Ronald Williams, Alan Willis, Donald Wooten, Michael Vehorn, and Michael Yates.

Without objection, I include the following newspaper account of their achievement, and a subsequent editorial, published in the Suburbanite-Weekly News, of Winston-Salem, N.C., in the RECORD:

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Suburbanite Weekly News, May 14, 1970]

Pfafftown Jaycees last weekend won the top Jaycee award in the nation at the annual national convention in St. Louis.

It was the second time in the past four years the chapter has been Number One in the United States.

It won the state title this year, as it did in 1967.

Competing against some 3,500 chapters in 50 states, the Pfafftown chapter, which has only 60 members, also won the Clarence Howard Award for the best overall chapter in its division in the nation. Divisions are based on population of towns and cities in which chapters operate.

Ron Williams, who was president of the Pfafftown chapter during the year for which the awards were made, attended the convention in St. Louis, along with his wife, Sue.

"It was one of the biggest thrills of my life," said Williams, an energetic 34-year-old employee of R. J. Reynolds Industries.

"Jim Ollis, our state president, was so happy about our winning that he hugged my neck while I was on the way to get the award. I missed a step coming from one stage level to the other and fell."

Ollis had just been elected a national vice president of Jaycees.

Pfafftown Jaycees now will enter international competition and will submit the entry as soon as final instructions are forwarded from the national office. Greensboro Jaycees once won the international award.

In fact, Pfafftown and Greensboro Jaycees have monopolized the state award for the past five years, Greensboro winning it three times and Pfafftown the other two.

The national awards were made for the excellence of the overall performance in each of eleven project activity areas.

The Pfafftown chapter placed first nationally in recreation and sports, chapter management, publications, and was in community health and safety.

The chapter received a plaque in recognition of its showing in these categories.

Two other North Carolina chapters took first place awards in their population divisions. They were Greensboro and Forest City, which won Howard Awards in their respective divisions to give the state three of the six division awards.

"I said a year ago when I took office my wife and I had an impossible dream—that Pfafftown Jaycees would be chosen the number one Jaycee chapter in the United States on this 50th anniversary of the national organization. Thanks to the members of our chapter and their wives, and to North Carolina Jaycees, this dream has come true," Williams said.

"I also want to thank the citizens and business men of the community, who in large measure made it possible for us to enjoy such tremendous success in our undertakings," Williams said. "I would rather we were number one with them than number one in the nation."

The Pfafftown chapter was chartered in March, 1965, with only 30 members. That year, it won the state and national Milestone Awards for the best first-year chapter in North Carolina.

The following year, it was declared the number one chapter in the state and nation and consistently has ranked among top chapters in North Carolina.

The thing which makes the Pfafftown accomplishments uniquely significant is the small size of the chapter and the community in which it operates. Greensboro, for example, has more than 500 members and almost unlimited resources as sponsor of the Greater Greensboro Open Golf Tournament.

In state competition this year, Pfafftown Jaycees won first place in seven out of 11 categories in which they competed, plus two second place finishes and the "project of the year" award in the state and division.

The chapter was judged at the national level in the same categories as at the state level.

The chapter last year raised and disbursed for charitable purposes more than \$69,000—more than \$1,000 per member. The members put in more than 15,000 manhours in community work, which if performed by an individual working 24 hours a day would amount to more than 1.8 years of continuous work.

Its award-winning project of the year was the Guardsmen's Assistance Fund. The drive, conducted in October, raised more than \$41,000 in about 15 days following a gas explosion at the local National Guard armory on Link Road. Four Guardsmen were killed and a dozen others injured.

The first \$10,000 of the fund went to pay travel expenses of immediate families of the victims, who were taken to Houston, Texas, for treatment at the Army Burn Center and later were visited by their dependents.

The remainder of the money—more than \$30,000—was put in trust for the education of children of the men who died in the explosion.

In addition to Williams, other officers of the chapter during the project year included Roger Jones, internal vice president; Jim Westmoreland, external vice president; Don Wooten, treasurer; Jack Patterson, secretary; directors Fred Mulcox, Dr. Barry Ramsey, Ralph Burton, Jerry Johnson and Mike Yates. Jim Cass was the club's representative on the state board of directors and Norman Cass was chairman of the project of the year.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Suburbanite Weekly News, May 14, 1970]

A SALUTE TO YOUNG MEN

Unique honor was bestowed during the weekend upon Pfafftown Jaycees, who for the second time in four years were declared the best chapter in North Carolina. That, even for such a gigantic and renowned organization as Greensboro Jaycees, who have won the top honor the other two years, is a rather significant accomplishment. But for a chapter like Pfafftown's—which is in only its fifth year—the success is phenomenal.

Moreover, during its second year, when the chapter won the state award, it also was declared the number one chapter in the United States. On this the 50th anniversary of Jaycees, the chapter presumably stands an excellent chance of once more capturing the national title.

This, mind you, in a suburban community and a chapter with only 59 members. How can such accomplishment and honor befall so tiny a chapter, when there are others in the state with memberships of more than 500?

Involvement is the answer. During their five-year history, Pfafftown Jaycees have responded to community needs and have solved community problems by the simple expediency of recognizing and analyzing the problems, determining how they should be solved, and individually and collectively doing something about it.

We suggest that this nation and these wonderful communities of Forsyth County can,

by the same strategy, solve the difficulties that beset us. Our problems are here, so to await solution from our national capital, or from Raleigh, is folly. Problems are best solved by the people which they concern. If we, as clubs and churches and societies and individuals will rationalize, we can by individual and collective effort obliterate some of our economic and social sores which are now festering and which left unsolved, may develop into malignancies.

Pfafftown Jaycees is a great organization because of the dedication, devotion, ability, and energy of its 59 members. This nation is great because of the basic attributes of each of its some 200 million individual citizens. If one dared determine what is wrong in this country, he would first assess his own shortcomings as a citizen, multiply the results by 200 million, and he'd be pretty close to the answer.

So there is something more than signal honor in the accomplishments of Pfafftown Jaycees, who, incidentally, won the state "project of the year" award, plus seven first place awards in the 11 categories in which they were judged. This chapter, like all Jaycee chapters, is made up of young men 21 to 35 years of age. Its membership is well distributed within that age group. Certainly, from these 59 young men will come much of the community's leadership. And from the succeeding generation will come other dedicated young men who may hang another dozen plaques on the clubhouse wall.

Leadership, tenacity, singleness of purpose (though perhaps 59 divergent ideas about how the job might be done), energy, involvement, and dedication to duty are the attributes which enabled Pfafftown Jaycees to bring to themselves and to their community another unique distinction. The same can be achieved by every civic club, by every social order, by every fraternity, by every church, by every community, by every city, by every state, by this nation if we will, as individuals, but set our goals as high and devote ourselves as diligently to saving the wounds of our society and of mankind.

REPORT OF SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON MYLAI INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, just last week the special subcommittee on the Mylai investigation made its report. Once again, it proved to be very newsworthy and was carried by the wire services across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to have served on this committee because I feel we have performed a very valuable function.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but be concerned that the American people will view the United States as "the bad guy" in this instance, but it was one instance, it was news because it was unique, because it was different. A tragedy of this nature is not the policy of this country, and it has not been our policy in the past. Yet it seems that the news media and the public in general are either unaware or unconcerned about the atrocities committed by the North Vietnamese regularly.

Just prior to the Mylai incident, in a place called Hue, over 4,000 South Vietnamese were systematically slaughtered, many of them buried in mass graves, their hands tied behind them. Whole families were eradicated. The fact that

over 4,000 human beings were slaughtered, was not even deemed particularly newsworthy by the media around the world.

In 1 month, in a South Vietnam village, the Vietcong went in with flamethrowers and burned to death every man, woman, and child in that village, over 200. Bodies were stacked like cordwood. These things did not get play in the press, and they did not hit the conscience of the public for some strange reason. I am tired of the Americans always being picked as the heavy-handed boy in Vietnam when it is the practice of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to commit these atrocities with premeditated regularity. At this time I would like to include an editorial from the Sunday, June 28, 1970, issue of the Birmingham News. I urge my colleagues to read the editorial opinion of James E. Jacobson. It will be well worth the few minutes it takes.

THE LESSON OF HUE

Uncounted columns of words have been written and uncounted feet of television film have been devoted to the alleged massacre of Vietnamese villagers at My Lai.

But one is hard to find a mention of the grisly story of Hue, where the bodies of more than 6,000 victims of Communist "liberation" have been recovered from mass graves.

The story of Hue is recounted in detail in a study written some months ago by Douglas Pike, a career official of the U.S. Information Agency and the author of books which have established him as perhaps this country's top expert on the Viet Cong.

Even more chilling than the story of what happened at Hue when the city was captured by the North Vietnamese in the 1968 Tet offensive is Pike's conclusion that as many as three million people might suffer a similar fate if the Communists are permitted to win a decisive victory in South Vietnam.

Those in this country who have urged a U.S. pull-out have tried to dismiss the suggestion that a bloodbath would follow a Communist victory as propaganda by the "hawks" to keep us in the war.

Hue is uncomfortable proof that the fears have a basis in reality. Maybe that's why it's so studiously ignored.

When the Communists took the city, Pike wrote, they began a systematic liquidation of those considered unfriendly. They were rounded up and machine-gunned—the more fortunate ones. Some were tortured and buried alive.

After the elimination of individuals whose names were on their death list, the Viet Cong assassination squads which surfaced after the North Vietnamese took the city began to move against "social negatives"—that is, those who were deemed potentially dangerous not because of who they were, individually, but because of the places they held in the community.

"... Killing in some instances was done by family unit," Pike wrote. "In one well documented case during this period, a squad with a death order entered the home of a prominent community leader and shot him, his wife, his married son and daughter-in-law, his young unmarried daughter, a male and female servant and their baby. The family cat was strangled; the family fish scooped out of the fishbowl and tossed on the floor. When the Communists left, no life remained in the house. A 'social unit' had been eliminated."

Multiply that by the times it would happen in every town and village and hamlet in South Vietnam if the Communists prevail.

But Americans might never know about it, and thus their consciences need not bother them—or so some seem to think.

One of the Communists' first acts, Pike said, would be to clear all foreigners, especially the Western reporters, out of South Vietnam: "A curtain of ignorance would descend. Then would begin a night of long knives . . . But little of this would be known abroad. The Communists in Vietnam would create a silence."

"The world would call it peace."

The Communists *won't* prevail, if they must depend upon a military victory to do so. But in South Vietnam and in Cambodia their capacity for waging big unit war has been drastically reduced. This, Pike predicts, will motivate them to turn more to the strategy of terror, with an eye on the impact they can have on wavering public opinion in America, in the hope that the American people will lose their stomach for going on.

Vietnamization *can* succeed, giving the people of South Vietnam a fighting chance to survive the Communists' attempt to impose their rule, and thus to escape the fate of the 6,000 at Hue. Then, perhaps, peace can be achieved.

Are Americans really prepared to live with the other kind of "peace" which Hue forebodes?

Douglas Pike wrote:

"Apparently (the massacre at Hue) made no impact on the world's mind or conscience. For there was no agonized outcry. No demonstrations at North Vietnamese embassies around the world. Lord Russell did not send his 'war crimes tribunal' to Hue to take evidence and indict. In a tone beyond bitterness, the people there will tell you that the world does not know what happened in Hue, or if it does, does not care."

We believe some do care.

AGRICULTURAL PAYMENT LIMITS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural payments limitation issue is an emotional one. It is a many-headed monster that few really understand. And, I am convinced, that no one realizes all the adverse effects of a low level limitation such as the \$20,000 limitation the Senate added to the Agriculture appropriation earlier this month.

I do not feel, Mr. Speaker, that a limitation like this should be added to an appropriations measure. If Congress is going to change the payments program; it should be done in conjunction with the farm program legislation. Only at that time will the Congress have sufficient foundation on which to render a truly judicious decision.

Behind the move to limit payments to a low level is the old complaint that farmers should not be paid for not growing crops. There is something about paying for nonproductivity that offends. But is this what we are really doing? Let us look for a moment at what we would be doing if we instituted a low level limitation.

Most importantly, we would have removed the incentive under the current farm program for a farmer to enlarge his operation or to seek greater efficiency. It would clearly jeopardize a man who has improved his operation over the years.

In addition, the low level limitation will cripple the commercial producer, the one that produces the majority of our production. It is said that the limi-

tation can be established at a very low level before more than 80 to 90 percent of our producers are affected. However, the production that comes from the top 10 to 20 percent of our growers is substantial and without it we will see a disruption of our markets. The Lubbock Avalanche-Journal editorialized on July 13, 1970, that—

Many persons regret, on a number of grounds, that U.S. farms have been growing larger. Nevertheless, that is no reason to penalize their owners and operators with ill-advised legislation which, by itself, is unlikely to benefit small farmers to any great extent.

The primary cause for the growth of these large farms has been modernization and mechanization in other phases of our economy. This has also been the primary cause for the low prices Americans today pay for most farm products. By placing a \$20,000 limitation on payments, we will be saying to the majority of farmers in our Nation, in terms of production, that they cannot enlarge, that they should not become more efficient and the result will be chaos. If, indeed, we remove the payments or cut them to a meaningless level, we will force the large and most effective producers out of the program and into other crops, thereby causing total havoc in other areas.

Unless, we in Congress take a long look at the farm program in its entirety, we will see the demise of our ability to produce so well at such relatively low cost by the addition of this amendment. The appropriate time for considering payment limitations is when a new legislative bill comes before the Congress.

GI HOME LOANS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which will rectify an injustice to certain veterans residing in my district. This injustice was not the result of direct action by the Federal Government, but due to certain circumstances which have combined to prevent these veterans from taking advantage of benefits which the Government intended them to have.

I am speaking of the GI home loan authority for World War II veterans. Certain provisions of Public Law 90-77 extended until July 25, 1970, the period of eligibility of World War II veterans for such loans. However, because of circumstances existing within the State of Maryland and the Fifth District of Maryland for the past year or more, eligible veterans have been virtually prohibited from purchasing homes of their choice with the assistance of such loans.

The Members are aware, I am sure, that in those States having usury laws, the present interest rate, which has been in effect for more than a year now, has had a drastic effect upon the housing and mortgage market.

In 1969 after the last two major increases in the interest rate, the State of Maryland remained bound by a State usury limit of 8 percent as well as a

limitation on the number of points which could be charged. That low usury ceiling led to the withdrawal of private investment funds from the Maryland mortgage market and finally the withdrawal of the Federal National Mortgage Association resulting in a "no loan" situation.

Many real estate agents stopped sales completely. Others were forced to close down their business offices. Returning veterans from Vietnam were unable to take advantage of the benefits which Congress had given them under the VA mortgage provisions because lenders would not finance homes in Maryland.

After approximately 9 months of inaction and literal stagnation of the market in Maryland the State legislature passed remedial legislation.

No sooner had the housing and mortgage market begun to revitalize than on May 20, 1970, the Maryland Department of Health ordered a moratorium on building construction in five areas in the Maryland suburbs including much of Prince Georges County in my district.

This moratorium was the result of serious deficiencies in the system utilized to handle sewage treatment for the suburban Maryland area. The Interior Department thereafter quashed plans to expand the Blue Plains Treatment Facility in the District of Columbia which handles much of the sewage from Prince Georges County.

The Federal Water Quality Control Administration agreed to an expansion of that facility to only 309 million gallons per day which is inadequate to meet the needs of the Maryland suburbs.

Suburban and State officials, along with the Interior Department, have agreed that Maryland must provide additional plants to take care of new growth in the county and to cover present sewage treatment requirements. This moratorium will continue to be in effect until the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission can provide assurances that the present overload situation has been alleviated, which may be another year away.

Just prior to this moratorium, similar bans were in effect in various parts of the area for periods of time. These are the circumstances which have combined to prevent World War II veterans from seeking loans under this authority in the last year or so.

Mr. Speaker, I have noted that during consideration of the legislation extending the period of eligibility of World War II veterans to July 25, 1970, Congress did not consider the cost of this program to be significant. If such is still the case, and in view of these factors which have prevented eligible veterans from participating during this period, I urge the subcommittee members to give consideration to further extending the period of eligibility for World War II veterans for 1 or more years in order that these veterans may be given full opportunity to take advantage of the benefits which Congress intended them to have when authorizing this program.

I have presented my views on this legislation to the Subcommittee on Housing of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and

am very hopeful that consideration will soon be given to extending the period of eligibility for these veterans for 1 more year, as is authorized in the bill I have introduced.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER. 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. A pound of butter costs an average Soviet worker 163 minutes of working time; a Japanese, 84 minutes; a Frenchman 70 minutes; and Argentinian, 61 minutes; and a West German, 57 minutes. An American worker has to expend only 16 minutes of working time to buy a pound of butter.

S. 30 AND CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1970, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 21890, I rose in this Chamber to call to the attention of the House erroneous and misleading analyses of S. 30, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1969, that had appeared in certain newspapers and even the usually unbiased Congressional Quarterly. On July 8, 1970, in the RECORD at page 23345, I had occasion to call to the attention of this body an article in the Congressional Quarterly which revealed as the source of that publication's erroneous news reports the biased and one-sided report on S. 30 by the Bar Association of the City of New York.

Today I rise to bring to the attention of this body a frank, fair, and unbiased presentation of the provisions of S. 30 which appears in the July 14 issue of Congressional Quarterly. The publication not only fairly analyzes the provisions of the bill but also calls attention to the confusion which has surrounded recent press reports concerning S. 30 and notes that some have confused this measure with the District of Columbia crime bill. Additionally, the last paragraph of the Quarterly's report on S. 30 points out that the fate of the measure now depends on two factors: First, the force and effectiveness of administration advocacy of the measure and, second, the reaction of Judiciary Committee Chairman CLELLER.

I would now also like to emphasize the first of the Quarterly's crucial factors, which it accurately alleges will determine the future of S. 30. In this context, I am disturbed by a report contained in the July 17 issue of the Wall Street Journal—page 1, column 5—that Mr. McClellan of Ohio, the senior Republican on the House Judiciary Committee now backs a lengthy rewrite of S. 30, which passed the Senate after a year's consideration by

a vote of 73 to 1. I certainly hope this report is erroneous. S. 30 is part of the President's anticrime program. In addition, the New York Times—July 17, 1970, page 12, column 8—now reports that the board of governors of the American Bar Association has approved in principle and recommended passage of the various titles of S. 30 with the exception, chiefly, of the provision of title I, which permit grand juries to criticize public officials. With ABA approval it does, indeed, seem that the tide is now changing in favor of passage of S. 30.

Mr. Speaker, because the recent analysis of S. 30 by the Congressional Quarterly of July 14 is one of the few fair hearings the measure has had in any publication, I include the article at this point in the RECORD:

ORGANIZED CRIME CONTROL BILL FACES BATTLE IN HOUSE

Endorsed by President Nixon and approved, with only one dissenting vote, by the Senate, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 (S. 30) could nevertheless die in the House.

More than a year after Mr. Nixon's endorsement on April 23, 1969, and months after Senate passage on Jan. 23, 1970, vigorous opposition to the measure has developed among alarmed Democrats—led by House Judiciary Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler (D N.Y.)—who label it "repressive" legislation. (*Fact sheet, Weekly Report* p. 1499; *House hearings*, p. 1632, 1582, 1438; *Senate passage*, p. 258; *Nixon message*, 1969, *Almanac* p. 43a; *Congress and the Nation* Vol. 1, p. 1674-5, 1700, 1706, 1745-7, 1752-3.)

Partisan reaction to S. 30—and to the District of Columbia crime bill with which it has been confused—has tended to obscure the complexity of its provisions and the balancing safeguards which they contain. The opposition—led by the American Civil Liberties Union and the committee on Federal legislation of the New York City Bar Association—dismisses the source of many of the bill's proposals—the final report (February 1967) of the President Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, headed by then-Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach. (1967 *Almanac* p. 873)

The renewed Federal concern about organized crime reflected in the Commission's comprehensive study of crime was a legacy of the Kennedy Administration. Robert F. Kennedy had come to the Department of Justice early in 1961, fresh from his experience as chief counsel for John L. McClellan's (D Ark.) subcommittee investigations of labor racketeering (1957-1960). A stepped-up Federal effort against organized crime became a priority program during his years as Attorney General.

An organized crime and racketeering section had been created in the Justice Department in 1954, but it was composed of only 17 attorneys in 1960. Under Kennedy the section was expanded to 63 attorneys by 1964, spending 1,364 man-days in court, in contrast to 61 man-days in 1960.

Despite the increased Federal effort, between 1960 and March 1969, of 5,000 known or suspected organized crime figures, only 257 were indicted.

In 1965, President Johnson created the President's Commission (Crime Commission), headed by Katzenbach and authorized it not only to study the causes of crime and to analyze the Federal failure to cope with organized crime—but also to suggest cures.

Published in February 1967, the Commission's final report contained more than 200

recommendations for action to reduce crime. Twenty-two of these recommendations were directed specifically toward dealing with organized crime.

S. 30: AN OVERVIEW

The Organized Crime Control Act, introduced Jan. 15, 1969, by McClellan, with Sam J. Ervin Jr. (D N.C.) and Roman L. Hruska (R Neb.), the ranking members of his Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, contained eight titles, six of which embodied Crime Commission recommendations. The Act as amended and approved by the Senate Jan. 23, 1970, contained ten substantive titles.

Evidence-Gathering. The Crime Commission reported that defects in the process of gathering legal evidence severely hampered the Federal effort to halt the growth of organized crime. The failure in that effort, it said, was not due primarily to a need for more men, more training, better facilities or better courts but to the need for revised laws.

Titles I-VI of S. 30 followed Commission recommendations to strengthen the legal means of obtaining usable evidence:

Special grand juries, with unusual autonomy and the power to file reports on conditions they find, would be created in certain areas. Confronted by a witness refusing to testify because his testimony might incriminate him, the grand jury could immunize him from use of his testimony against him and then order him to testify.

If he still refused to testify, he could be held in contempt and detained until he testified or until the grand jury term ended. If he did testify, the Attorney General could protect him and his family in special facilities to ensure his safety from reprisals. If he lied, he could be convicted of perjury under new rules of evidence.

To protect the testimony of a witness from loss through intimidation, death or murder, the testimony could be recorded in a statement potentially usable at trial, if the witness was no longer available.

Proof. Title VII would nullify a recent Supreme Court decision in order to limit challenges to evidence and to restrict to possible relevant material the Government records disclosed to a defendant.

Gambling. Professional gambling is the syndicate's "lifeline," the source of its greatest revenue. Title VIII, incorporating an Administration proposal, would bring any major illegal gambling operation within Federal jurisdiction.

Corrupted Businesses. Title IX would make it a crime to use income from organized crime or racketeering methods to acquire, operate or establish an otherwise legitimate commercial operation. Title IX authorized the use of criminal and civil sanctions—antitrust remedies—against such activities.

Special Sentences. Title X would authorize courts to impose increased sentences of up to 30 years upon adult special offenders, who are defined as habitual, professional, or organized crime figures and who pose a continuing danger to the community.

DOUBLE STANDARD

The major objection levelled at S. 30 as a whole argues that—although use of its provisions against organized crime is presented as justification for its passage—its changes in criminal laws and procedures are not limited to that use.

"Organized crime," the bill's advocates reply, is a functional concept like "street crime" or "white-collar crime" not susceptible to hard definition in legal terms. Besides, at the outset of an investigation, the involvement of organized crime in a matter is not always clear. To find such an involvement may be the purpose of the inquiry.

McClellan pointed out that this objection implies a double standard of constitutional

rights: one applicable to persons involved in organized crime and one applicable to the rest of the nation.

S 30, McClellan said, "must stand or fall on the constitutional question without regard to the degree to which it is limited to organized crime cases." If it violates the rights of those engaged in organized crime, then it should not be approved, he said. If it does not, then it does not violate the rights of persons not engaged in such crime.

SPECIAL GRAND JURIES

"As an instrument of discovery against organized crime, McClellan has said, 'the grand jury has no counterpart.'"

Title I, in line with recommendations of the Crime Commission, would reinforce and expand the investigatory powers of the grand jury. It would:

Establish special grand juries authorized to investigate offenses against Federal criminal laws in heavily populated areas and wherever the Attorney General determined a need.

Require the grand jury to meet at least once every 18 months; allow it to sit for as long as 36 months.

Expand the grand jury's autonomy by allowing it to select its own foreman and to appeal any dispute between the jury and the judge or prosecutor.

Allow the grand jury to file reports with the court concerning the noncriminal misconduct of a public official; vindicating the conduct of a public official; recommending legislative, executive or administrative action; or concerning organized crime conditions. (Twenty-two states now allow grand juries to make similar reports.)

Most of the criticism of Title I concerns the grand jury's power to file reports on the misconduct of a public official. The nonadversary nature of grand jury proceedings, critics say, makes it nearly impossible for an official to defend himself, and he has no chance to vindicate himself because there is no indictment and no trial.

McClellan, in a Senate speech June 9, explained that an official so criticized would—under S 30—have the right to appear before the grand jury, to present his witnesses and to file a rebuttal to the report, which becomes part of the report.

The court would study the report and rebuttal to ascertain that the report was supported by a preponderance of the evidence and that each person named was given a chance to testify. Only if both these requirements are met would the court release the report, with the rebuttal, for publication.

Publication would be further delayed, if the order of the court releasing the report were appealed. The report would be not published until there had been a final decision on its validity.

Comparing S 30's procedures with those under which the special grand jury in Chicago released a report May 15 concerning the shooting of Black Panthers by Chicago police, a Senate Subcommittee staff member said:

"The Chicago grand jury commented on both policemen, who are public officials, and the Black Panthers, who are private citizens.

"If you are dealing with . . . noncriminal misconduct, something that is censorable, but not a crime then the grand jury (under S 30) could indeed file a report . . . but included in the transcript would be the defense of the people commented on. They would have received a preliminary draft of the report and had 20 days plus postponements within which to prepare their own side of the story—and they could call witnesses. So while it wouldn't be a perfect adversary hearing, both sides would be in the transcript and only after the judge had reviewed both sides, could he then accept the report. And even after that, there would be an appellate review of his decision . . . and there would be no publication until it was

all over. So when it was filed finally, it would carry with it the answer of the public officials.

"Now, none of these protections was given to the police officers in Chicago. . . . If they testified at the grand jury it was without knowledge of the context in which they were testifying; they didn't see a preliminary copy of a report. They didn't have the right to call witnesses. . . . They didn't have a right of judicial review . . . or of appellate review." And, under S 30, nothing at all could be said in such a report about the conduct of private citizens.

Concerning the publication, in *The New York Times* June 26 of parts of the secret report (also called a presentment, a formal request for an indictment) of a Baltimore grand jury regarding the involvement of Members and employees of Congress in influencing the outcome of a construction firm's bid for work on a House garage, the staff member said:

"That kind of document can or cannot be published depending upon what the judge wants to do. . . . Insofar as that presentment included materials that did not really indicate criminal matters . . . such as misuse of a Congressman's office . . . that could have been the subject matter of a report (under S 30) and insofar as the Congressman failed to exercise administrative control over the use of his own name . . . (he) might be censorable.

"A report could be filed, but he would have an opportunity to come in and testify; he would have an opportunity to call in other people to testify; and the full panoply of protections would be applicable to the Congressman and his staff in protecting their own reputations.

"It wouldn't have gone from the grand jury to the judge to *The New York Times*; it wouldn't have been leaked. . . . Under S 30 an unauthorized publication of a report is contempt and is punishable. . . . At least the remedy is there, while there is (now) theoretically no remedy for leaking a presentment unless there is a specific order (forbidding disclosure). . . . The ground rules set under S 30 are very clear and unequivocal about what happens at various points, and the existing law in this area is, to put it mildly, less than clear." (*Weekly Report* p. 1707)

WITNESSES

Witnesses are essential to a prosecutor's case. Titles II-VI of S 30 revise criminal investigatory procedures to facilitate securing reliable testimony from live witnesses.

Immunity. The 5th Amendment guarantees that "no person shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." Witness after witness in organized crime investigations "take the 5th" and refuses to testify. To overcome this objection and compel testimony, Congress has enacted a multiplicity of witness-immunity laws.

Title II would replace all existing witness-immunity laws with one comprehensive law, ensuring all witnesses compelled to testify before congressional, judicial or administrative bodies that neither their testimony nor any evidence obtained by exploiting that testimony would be used against them. The Crime Commission recommended enactment of a general immunity law.

S 30 would provide "use-immunity," a narrower grant than the "transaction-immunity" authorized in most existing law.

"Transaction-immunity" protects the witness from prosecution for any offense mentioned in or related to his testimony, regardless of independent evidence against him. This is sometimes referred to as an "immunity bath." "Use-immunity" protects him from prosecution directly or using his testimony or anything directly or indirectly derived from it against him.

Originally, S 30 authorized immunity granted by grand juries and courts, oriented

to investigations of organized crime. But during Committee consideration of the bill, the National Commission on the Reform of Federal Criminal Laws, recommended enactment of one comprehensive Federal witness-immunity law. Title II was consequently expanded into a statute covering proceedings "before or ancillary to" a court, grand jury, Federal agency or congressional body.

Recalcitrant Witnesses. If an immunized witness still refused to testify, Title II provides, as under existing law, that the court could order him confined, in contempt of court, until he testifies or until the investigation ends.

The Crime Commission said that once a witness was immunized, he must testify or face jail for contempt. Title III would not change existing law, but would codify civil contempt procedures which have evolved in case-by-case decisions.

Bail normally is not available to persons held in civil contempt. Under S 30, however, if a person appealed a contempt order and the appeals judge found "a substantial possibility of reversal," bail would be allowed during the time that the appeal was pending. The appeal, states S 30, must be disposed of within 30 days.

Title III has been criticized as allowing a person held without bail for as long as three years. Yet a Senate subcommittee staff member points out that S 30 would allow bail in certain cases on appeal whereas now normally no bail is available to anyone held in civil contempt and existing law permits extended civil incarceration.

Perjury. To encourage a witness to give truthful testimony, the Crime Commission, as had the American Bar Association (ABA) in 1952, recommended that Congress abolish the two-witness and direct-evidence rules for perjury prosecutions. Title IV does just that.

The two-witness rule requires more than the sworn statement of one witness to prove a statement false. The direct-evidence rule requires clear noncircumstantial evidence that a statement is false.

Title IV defines perjury as a knowingly false statement made under oath and states that a witness can be charged with perjury if he makes contradictory statements under oath and does not correct them of his own volition.

Further, Title IV provides that a statement is false if it is proved, beyond a reasonable doubt, to be one of two manifestly contradictory statements which the same person made under oath. Proof need no longer be made by any particular number of witnesses or by any particular type of evidence.

Protection. Title V of S. 30 authorizes protection of witnesses; Title VI authorizes protection of evidence.

The Crime Commission recommended that the Federal Government set up residential facilities for the protection of witnesses from reprisals. Under Title V, the Attorney General could provide such security for witnesses, potential witnesses and their families.

When there is substantial risk that a witness might die, hide, flee, become ill, be killed, injured, kidnapped or bribed, Title VI would allow, upon court order, the recording of his testimony in a deposition, a sworn statement, which either side could take of its own witness. Taken under full guarantees of counsel and cross-examination, depositions preserve evidence in a form usable at trial if the evidence becomes otherwise unavailable.

USE OF EVIDENCE

The use of evidence, once obtained, frequently challenged by a defendant who claims that his constitutional rights were violated by the way in which it was obtained and who asserts that it should not be used against him.

Because of legal uncertainty and policy conflicts, evidence obtained by electronic

surveillance is particularly vulnerable to such challenge. The Supreme Court in March 1969 held that all Government records from a surveillance device must be disclosed to a defendant who claims that evidence against him is the result of that surveillance and who proves that his rights have been invaded. If the Government does not disclose its records, the case can be dismissed. (*Alderman v. U. S.* 1969 *Almanac* p. 145)

McClellan has said that this decision encouraged a defendant at any time unlawfully surveyed to challenge evidence in any case against him—however unrelated—since he knows that he can thus win disclosure of confidential files or, if disclosure would be too harmful to the Government, dismissal of the charges against him.

Several times since this decision wholesale turnover of wiretap logs to defendants has resulted in the publication of material irrelevant to the case, but harmful and embarrassing to uninvolved third persons.

Title VII would narrow the time span within which challenges could be made to evidence alleged to have been indirectly derived from an illegal wiretap and would allow a judge to screen Government records before turning them over to a defendant.

It provides that no challenge to evidence which is the indirect product of an unlawful act can be considered if that act occurred more than five years before the event to be proved.

Disclosure of surveillance records, it provides, will be limited to that part of such records which a judge finds "may be relevant" and "in the interest of justice."

Critics of S. 30 express alarm that Title VII dilutes a citizen's protections against illegal acts by law enforcement agents. The ABA Criminal Law Council has, however, approved the five-year limit. McClellan has stated that the five-year limit does not affect challenges to evidence directly produced by an unlawful Government act. The law would continue to bar the use, as evidence, of such direct product as the transcript of an illegal wiretap. It would limit challenges to evidence obtained by the exploitation of such an unlawful act—by the use of that transcript.

In arriving at the five-year time limit, a member of the Senate Subcommittee staff explained that Justice Department records were checked to ascertain how long a "lead" from such records might last. The answer was two or three years. "If a lead doesn't produce evidence within that time, it's not going to."

Explaining the need for such provision, he pointed out that—under existing law—as soon as a criminal realizes that he has inadvertently been "caught" on a surveillance device which cannot be disclosed, he has virtually "a license to kill." If brought to trial for any crime he can challenge the evidence against him as indirectly related to the undisclosed surveillance and—because the Government cannot disclose the fact of the surveillance or the records—the case against him must be dismissed.

Under Title VII, a judge would see—from the Government records—that the surveillance had no possible relevance to the pending case, and there would be no disclosure. If more than five years had elapsed between the time the defendant was recorded on the device and the time of the crime with which he was charged, no challenge to the evidence would even be considered.

S. 30 would decrease the likelihood of massive disclosures of surveillance records involving innocent third persons. By restricting the amount of material turned over to a defendant and by ensuring that all material turned over is of possible relevance to the charges against him, Title VII brings the defendant's self-interest to bear against publication of the material.

ILLEGAL GAMBLING

Gambling produces from \$7 billion to \$50 billion annually for the operations of orga-

nized crime. Title VIII would extend Federal jurisdiction over all major illicit gambling operations.

Title VIII contains most of the provisions of S. 2022, an Administration bill of which the President spoke in his April 23, 1969, message on organized crime:

"The purpose of this legislation is . . . to give the Attorney General broad latitude to assist local and state government in cracking down on illegal gambling, the well-spring of organized crime's financial reservoir."

Title VIII defines an illegal gambling business as one which violates a law, involves five or more persons, operates for more than 30 days or has a gross income of \$2,000 in a single day. It also declares it a crime for a law enforcement officer and a person involved in an illegal gambling business to plot to obstruct the enforcement of antigambling laws.

CORRUPTED BUSINESSES

Title IX, derived from S. 1861 introduced April 18, 1969, by McClellan, contains the most innovative of S. 30's provisions. (A companion House bill, HR 10312, introduced by Richard H. Poff (R. Va.) has rested untouched in the House Judiciary Committee since April 1969.) To cope with the infiltration of organized crime into legitimate business and labor, Title IX declares it a crime to use organized crime profits or methods to establish, acquire or operate any legitimate business.

Title IX provides both criminal sanctions—fines, prison sentences and criminal forfeitures—and civil sanctions developed in anti-trust cases to remove organized crime from legitimate organizations. Under this section, courts would be able to order crime syndicates to divest themselves of certain holdings, never to reenter a certain type of business and to dissolve infiltrated enterprises. The Attorney General would be able to initiate civil proceedings against persons suspected of this type of crime.

Organized crime, one Senate subcommittee staff member pointed out, is not used to operating against civil proceedings in which cooperation, between plaintiff and defendant, is the hallmark. And, in civil suits, if the defendant refuses to cooperate, the plaintiff wins his suit by default.

SPECIAL SENTENCES

The Crime Commission recommended that extended sentences be authorized for organized crime figures convicted of a felony. The ABA, American Law Institute, and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency have recommended similar measures. Title X authorizes sentences of up to 30 years for persons convicted of a felony—if they are found to be dangerous and found to be "habitual" offenders—convicted previously of two or more felonies, a "professional" criminal—whose felony was part of a lifelong pattern of conduct from which came a substantial part of his income, or an "organized crime figure"—whose felony was part of a conspiracy to engage in a pattern of criminal conduct.

A defendant would be found to fall into one of these categories only after a special presentencing hearing at which he has the right to counsel and cross-examination. After the decision, both the defendant and the Government would have the right to appeal.

The need for this title was pointed out by a Senate staff study for the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, which found that of all organized crime figures sentenced in Federal court from 1960 to 1969, two-thirds faced maximum jail terms of five years or less and fewer than one-fourth received a maximum sentence. The provision allowing the Government, as well as the defendant, to appeal a sentence, embodies another Crime Commission recommendation that there be some type of supervision over trial judges who, "because of corruption,

political considerations or lack of knowledge, tend to mete out light sentences in cases involving organized crime management personnel."

OUTLOOK

The fate of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970 is uncertain. Much depends upon the determination and the skill with which the Administration exerts its influence in favor of S. 30 and the reaction of House Judiciary Committee Chairman Emanuel Celler (D. N.Y.), within whose Committee S. 30 now rests. If the House Committee delays action on S. 30 too long past midyear, observers outside the Congress believe that the Senate might add S. 30 as an amendment to the bill (HR 17825) authorizing Federal law enforcement assistance funds, a measure dear to Celler's heart.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE STREETS— A LOCAL VIEW OF CRIME—THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

(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 problem of crime in our Nation's cities is one of great concern to everyone. Too many Americans have been confronted by the lawlessness existing in our country, especially in our Nation's Capital city. A need for effective law enforcement measures has long been voiced by the countless innocent people not wishing to be counted among those who have already been victimized by the frightening number of lawbreakers. It is indeed sad when residents and visitors in a city cannot enjoy the sights and beauties it has to offer in the evening as well as in the daytime. I speak with particular concern about our Nation's Capital. When brutal muggings, senseless murders, kidnappings, and other crimes of equal fright seem to be the most numerous "sights and beauties" a city has to offer, something is seriously wrong. When crime increases more than 600 percent in the last 10 years in the seat of our Nation's Government, a response is needed immediately for the present and for the future.

Last week, the controversial District of Columbia crime bill passed this House. Though this bill is not the immediate cure-all for all of the sicknesses of crime, it is without doubt a start in the right direction. This bill, since it has been introduced, has been subjected to some of the strongest talk about repression ever thrown at a bill of such importance and necessity. I recognize the fact that stricter law enforcement is not in itself the only solution. I am fully aware of the need for penal reform, court reorganizations, reforms in the juvenile code, better community relations, and other important factors to eradicate crime as well as preventing existing lawbreakers from doing any further harm. Many of these are, in fact, included in the District of Columbia crime bill. Too often denounced as "another fascist law-and-order bill," many provisions of the bill are completely overlooked. The District of Columbia crime bill is a single omnibus crime bill providing sound, comprehensive legislation. Our Nation's Capital needs a strong, sound, and progressive crime bill to bring order and tranquility to the city; our

Nation's Capital needs the District of Columbia crime bill.

The need for strong legislation is well-summarized by a brief, but concise editorial in the July 1970 edition of the *In-Towner*, a community newspaper from a section of Washington, D.C., where a member of my staff resides. With a community newspaper such as the *In-Towner*, the opinions of the editorial staff are much more clearly attuned to the readers' than are most large city newspapers for a simple reason: the editors of the small community paper are also members of that community. The opinions that are expressed in the newspaper are formed by events and circumstances often shared by both the editors and the readers—all of them belonging to the same community. The language of the editorial is simple enough to understand, but the thought behind it is something truly worth thinking about.

Among others I have been a severe critic of the shortcomings of much of the so-called national news media. In sharp contrast is much of the local media in my own district, which is particularly close to the people; weekly newspapers, small radio stations, and afternoon newspapers which flourish in this context. I am particularly pleased that in Washington, D.C., there is this same type of local press coming into existence.

I strongly recommend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE STREETS

It is no fun for an elderly couple, black or white, to have worked a lifetime, scrimping and saving, only to find that they cannot walk, sit, or even work in front of their own homes without fear of being robbed, raped or molested.

This is why much of the opposition to the crime bills before the Congress falls on deaf ears and no amount of charges of "racism" or "fascism" is going to allay these fears.

They want something done about it—and they want it now.

Well-intentioned liberals may philosophize, sociologize, and psychologize crime until the cows come home but a resident in the Inner City who is attacked is going to yell like hell for the Police.

Unless liberals can come up with a better formula than that which has been proposed, one that will work now and not in the dim future, then they would better serve the community by just keeping quiet.

MAIL REFLECTS STRONG OPPOSITION TO BAIL-OUT FOR PENN CENTRAL

(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, hundreds of people from all over the Nation have written me about the bankruptcy of the Penn Central Transportation Co. These letters have come from people with all types of backgrounds and from all political persuasions. It is obvious from these letters that an overwhelming majority of the American people were opposed to the idea of a Government bail-out of the Penn Central Transportation Co. My mail has reflected almost total opposition to the administration's plans

to grant this huge corporation hundreds of millions of dollars of loans guaranteed by taxpayers funds.

Mr. Speaker, a number of newspapers around the Nation have also editorialized in the same vein as these letter-writers.

I place in the RECORD a sampling of some of the letters from various points across the Nation. I also place in the RECORD editorials on the Penn Central case.

The material follows:

HOUSTON, TEX.,
June 24, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Although Mrs. Adams and I have never had the privilege to vote for you we have followed your service as well as our other Texas Representatives services in Washington. We appreciate the fine representation you have given us.

We want to thank you for your stand on the recent Penn railroad loan guarantee. Since they lost 80 million last year and more than 100 million the year before it is hard to see how a loan of 200 million could be very much help to them.

I do not know anything about railroading but if I was ever confronted with a problem of this kind I believe the first order of business would be to bring in some new blood for the management group.

Thanks for your past services. We know you will continue to look after our interests.

Sincerely,

FRANK C. ADAMS.

LA JOLLA, CALIF.,
June 2, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Million of citizens must share the appreciation I feel of your stand in behalf of the public in the case of Penn Central and your other efforts to protect all our citizens from the depredation of special interests.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH BANNING.

P.S.—Please do not trouble to acknowledge this.

N. & H. DISTRIBUTORS,
FRESNO, CALIF., June 11, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Re Credit guarantee for Penn Central Railroad by U.S. Government.

Please let me know how I can qualify for this wonderful and helpful program "Nixonomics" is ruining us. Please continue your enlightened and progressive fight to help us common people. We really need your help.

NEIL D. BALLWEBER.

WICKENBURG, ARIZ.,
June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Many thanks for your part in stopping the Penn Central steal. Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

L. S. BRAMKAMP.

ROCHESTER, N.H.,
June 24, 1970.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN: Thank goodness the U.S. has one representative who is thinking of the American taxpayer! How many more businesses are we going to subsidize?

I am certainly glad you had courage enough to say "no" to Penn Central. You let one company have the taxpayer's money then there will be a hundred others looking for a

handout! It's bad enough that we are letting the so-called welfare sit on his — without working! I am just a little housewife with a retired husband who is trying to make ends meet. I am willing and we have paid plenty of taxes to meet Government expenses but by God there is a limit!

Mrs. BENJ. BRIDEAU.

I am against putting huge profit making organizations like Penn-Central Railroad on welfare. I think poor people come first!

If Penn-Central is in the Defense Business, I am going into it myself!

Mrs. M. BROUDE.

KATONAH, N.Y.,
June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman House Banking Committee, House of Representative Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: As a taxpayer and a patron of the Penn Central Railroad, may I take a few minutes of your time to express certain thoughts I have regarding your investigation.

If the Penn Central merger has resulted in unprofitable operations, I suppose the blame should be put directly on management. Therefore, why is this type of management rewarded in the form of high salaries and extremely attractive pensions. I call your particular attention to Mr. Gorman's salary as announced in the papers of \$250,000.00 per annum. Also the pension allowances given to Mr. Stuart T. Saunders and Mr. Alfred Perlman have been reported as being up to \$150,000.00 per annum each.

If some sort of government assistance will either now or later be granted to the Penn Central, the cost of which must come from the taxpayers such as myself and many others, it would be my opinion that the managers and pensioners should forfeit some of the high salaries and pension funds which have been granted to them by Penn Central.

I suppose that you are taking steps in your investigation to probe into the salaries and expenses paid to previous management (now retired) and to the present management to see if such payments were excessive.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES S. BROWN.

ELIZABETHVILLE, PA.,
June 20, 1970.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Banking Committee, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: It was with interest indeed to learn thru the public press, of your concern, by taking exception to advance the Penn-Central \$200 million, thru the Defence Production Act, at a time of questionable financing.

With the present plight of the transportation industry by rail, that is traceable to gross mis-management, it would be unwise to advance taxpayer's credit as an assurance to pay for further failure.

The predictions made by these two huge corporations prior to consolidation, indicated, should the merger be approved by ICC, it would result in improved service and greatly enhance their financial status. Where have predictions materialized of rail consolidations, beginning with the Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore Lines, New Jersey, in 1933. Past performance should determine the merit, of advancing guaranteed credit at taxpayer's risk.

Instead, I should like to recommend in this manner, the Penn-Central should be confiscated by the United States Government, according to their own worth as quoted on the New York Stock Exchange at \$10.00 per share; strip all high authority of their fancy titles, starting with the Board of Directors, together with those serving in official posi-

July 21, 1970

tions down to division superintendents; allow the accounting department or auditor of disbursements to handle the financial situation, place operation of service for the public in charge of trainmasters, yardmasters, station agents, etc., dedicated career men whose primary aim is to adequately serve, at not exceeding \$25,000 per year, plus a limited expense account itemized.

This type of management would provide the desired supervision and operation to meet modern progress in-keeping with competition and public demand.

Based upon this brief analysis of a deteriorating industry, that has been fading into oblivion for thirty years, more or less, by reason of indifference to meet simple operating requirements, such as—maintain track conditions to eliminate numerous derailments, improve rolling equipment to comply with safety standards of good practice, on-time passenger schedules with clean coaches and sanitary conditions. Lengthy freight trains should be reduced to not exceeding 70 cars, by providing more frequent service to shippers. Until such times as the Penn-Central is placed in charge of more competent management, the loan should be denied, in its entirety.

Very truly yours,
W. STANLEY BUEHLER.

LOS GATOS, CALIF. 95030,
June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This note has for its purpose a compliment to you for your opposition to a government loan guarantee to lenders of the Penn Central Railroad.

These days when confidence in our government leaders is wearing so thin it is indeed refreshing to read of such courageous action as yours.

With the military now having the use of almost two-third of our national budget it is such action as yours gives us hope.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

JAMES S. CANTLEN.

LONG BEACH, CALIF.,
June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: It is indeed a pleasure to congratulate you on your recent stand relative to the Penn Central government guarantee of a loan.

It helps restore one's faith in our way of life to know there are men of your caliber in government at this critical time in our history.

Thank you for a job well done.
Sincerely,

DAVID A. CARDINALI.

NEW GARDENS, N.Y.,
June 22, 1970.

DEAR SIR: To read the Times and Wall St. Journal you were the only block between the Penn-Central-N.Y. Bankers—Washington friends of Penn-Central. Well, too bad for them and good for you.

Doesn't the average American have any friends in the Administration? Why does official Washington act so promptly to protect the Penn-Central and the Bankers investment but when it comes to bread and butter issues, important to the masses, well it seems like time is of no importance.

President Nixon gets on TV and asks for our support we give it. We ask for little enough in return we get the business.

Please keep after all the fat cat bankers. Why should the public have to pay to keep

the bankers solvent. The finders fees and high interest rates and the one hand at Penn-Central Board of Directors washing the other would seem to need a little investigation.

Thank you.

BRENDAN CARNEY.

RESEDA, CALIF.,
June 23, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You are to be highly commended for your successful fight to prevent the give-away of some two hundred million dollars of the taxpayers money to the Penn Central Railroad. This would have been only the beginning of a raid on the public treasury that would have made Boss Tweed's activities look like a church social.

Please continue to keep a watchful eye on these wolves as you have done in the past. You have the support, I am sure, of every alert and patriotic American. Yours in admiration.

Capt. R. C. MARBLE.

VERO BEACH, FLA.,
June 24, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Re: Penn Central \$7 Billion Switch? What could be sweeter for Penn Central stockholders than to be bailed out by the Government (taxpayers) loans? It's like children, if you start something like this, you have to do it for all of the others. How do we the taxpayers know that we won't end up owning a huge deficit railroad colossus and the stockholders owning some of the most profitable real estate in the United States? Evidence on the television shows a badly run railroad system. Where did the money come from to buy Florida and other real estate ventures?

Very truly yours,

ROBERT A. CARTER.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN.

DEAR SIR: God bless you and I hope every taxpayer in this country lets you know we have at least one man in Washington not afraid to stand up and be counted. Hope you don't turn around and vote \$750 million for all railroads including the Penn Central. Too bad we don't have more men like you in Washington. I shall pray for you always.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

MARY CASEY.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
June 21, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You are to be commended on your refusal to grant the taxpayers' money to the Penn Central Railroad. Why should the taxpayers make up losses for big business? Dear sir, if you do not take care of the little man in this country, who will. The Republicans will naturally favor the bankers and corporations. We appreciate your interest in the nation.

Sincerely,

JOHN DENT.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
June 21, 1970.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Congratulations on stopping the Penn Central loan.

PAUL DEARMAN, JR.

MOBILE, ALA.,
June 24, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I say to you, Thank You Sir. You renew my faith in elected officials when you go to bat for the forgotten man, the overabused American Taxpayer, in this Penn Central Case.

I've grown so tired of Bankers who make loans of a dubious and not to say very risky nature to certain people by the millions when they would not lend a thousand dollars to a better risk unless they could get sufficient collateral to cover the loan. When these Bankers made these loans I believe there were about (17) seventeen of them involved did they not have the earnings reports of this big RR? Certainly they didn't make these loans on the basis of the Real Estate and if they did they deserve the consequences of their action.

I think we've had enough of fiscal irresponsibility, I saw so much of that in the last depression and it looks like the same old tactics are being tried all over again. It's too bad that there are so few people left that are familiar with the last big depression, if there were, we would not be having this kind of thing happening all over again.

Another thing I consider discriminatory is the raising to a minimum of \$10,000.00 the purchase of Treasury Certificates. I was buying them on a three month basis to try to protect my small income when suddenly I was told that I could only buy in lots of ten thousand dollars. In other words little man put your money in the Bank at 4½% we'll buy the Treasury certificates, and collect the difference of three to four percent without getting off of our fat bottoms. Then there is all this humber about controlling prices and wages, I submit that prices are already controlled by all sorts of different methods to our detriment. In my State the price is fixed on Milk and Whiskey by the State. In the first case by a Milk Board, in the second by State owned Stores. In both cases competition has been eliminated so it doesn't take a genius to know what happens in a case of this kind.

We subsidize many food commodities, so we pay twice for the end product, we pay the producer and we pay the retailer. Bread for instance and many others. If I am not mistaken we've even subsidized Brazil for Coffee and then we pay an ungodly price for it at retail. We subsidize a certain section of our population with Food stamps and put them in a class of buying not consistent with their income so we pay for the privilege of having these people run up prices on certain commodities that otherwise might be cheaper.

We regulate wages thru minimum wage laws and then cry about the young teenagers who can't get summer work while out of school. This class of employee does not deserve the wages of a breadwinner nor are they worth it but they could be employed if it were not for the law.

So all of this crying over wage and price controls we've got it partly, why not 100%.

Sincerely,

J. C. DUFFY.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,
June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Through the years, though you represent Texas, I have always read about your activity and found you could not be swayed to vote against the people's interest, and means all the people of this nation.

The people in Texas have a good active representative in the Congress.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN DUHL.

BELLEVILLE, MICH.,
June 26, 1970.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Banking Chairman.

DEAR SIR: Please keep up your excellent work in the "Penn Central" probe. Why should the Federal Government "ball out" the big investors and banks. When I run short of operating capitol, no one helps me (and millions of others like me).

I have been following your activities for years and admire your "guts." Keep up your fine work—I wish you were from Michigan so I could support you.

Thank you,

SEYMOUR FENSTER.

HIGHLAND PARK, N.J.,
June 23, 1970.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance and Bank-
ing, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am quite concerned about the fate of passenger trains and of the Penn Central in particular. Over the years I have traveled N.Y. Central frequently and Pennsy a number of times.

Had a foreboding when the two lines merged as N.Y. Central train travel had long been made uncomfortable whereas the Pennsy ran trains on time and seemed to maintain equipment.

Morale among N.Y. Central employees had long been low, that of Pennsy seemed high.

Since the merger, it has appeared to me the whole blooming business has taken on the coloration of N.Y. Central. Each trip I take to mid-Ohio now gets worse. (Crestline, Ohio).

But I would find it out of the way to try to fly and unsuitable in bad weather.

I surely hope some way can be found to persuade Penn Central to be more responsible and conduct its transportation system in a manner to inspire confidence. One would almost think they have a "death wish" for both the passenger and freight business.

And what a responsibility railroads have when they go trundling dangerous cargoes through towns and cities with poorly maintained equipment and tracks!

Good luck in your plan to get the facts of Penn Central's conduct of business.

Sincerely,

MISS HELEN B. FERGUSON.

ROTAN, TEX.,
June 25, 1970.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for your service in the recent action in preventing the guarantee to the Transportation Department of a loan to the Penn Central Railroad.

I feel without your quick and determined action and almost single handed, our government would have started a never ending underwriting or guaranteeing of loans for sick and ailing corporations thruout the nation.

It is disgusting to read and hear so little business judgment being exercised by our representatives. Thanks to you for your good judgment guts enough to stand up and fight.

Thanking you, and hoping you may continue to help trim our budget, and get our nation back on a business basis.

Your very truly,

M. T. FILLINGIM.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
June 20, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Your action in denying the Penn-Central Railroad government assistance in meeting its financial obligations is most commendable.

Why was this conglomerate allowed to divest itself of very valuable holdings such as the Pennsylvania Station to "insiders" who have made fabulous fortunes out of the development of these assets? Was not it the responsibility of the SEC to step in when this was going on? Also it is difficult to understand why these assets were not pledged as security for the millions of dollars that Penn-Central and its predecessors borrowed. These assets should have secured these borrowings and they could now have been used to retire them.

The same thing happened to the Northwestern Railway here in Chicago. A holding company was formed to hold the very valuable urban assets such as Northwestern Station and then this company divested itself of the "rolling stock," "trackage" and other assets of not too much value. Just why the \$340,000,000 debts were passed off to the "operating company" is hard to understand.

Men like Ben Heineman, Perleman etc. have made billions out of these transactions and it is now time for the government to step in and repossess these assets for the railroads which are created to serve the people.

Again much praise is due to men like yourself and Senator Proxmire for your courage in opposing this.

Respectfully yours,

HOWARD FLEER.

JUNE 22, 1970.

Hooray Mr. Patman! It's time we balled out the little people instead of the big ones. If we lived in Texas we'd vote for you. (Democrats from Louisiana.)

PAULA GEORGE.
TERESA VINET.

DALLAS, TEX.,
June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: It probably isn't often that a Republican writes you to both commend you and tell you that you are both on the same side of the street, but that is what I'm doing in this letter.

I want to commend you for your firm action in resisting the poorly disguised effort of the Administration to save the Pennsylvania Railroad from reorganization, and assure you that you expressed my feelings in these actions. There is no justifiable reason why the Pennsylvania Railroad should be favored over others and given a long guarantee that it is in no way qualified to receive simply to either save the Administration from embarrassment or worse yet, perpetuate the disastrous management that has brought the railroad to this sorry state. If the corporation should be reorganized, let it be done and let them sell off some of their extremely valuable land or profitable subsidiary operations to meet their current obligations.

The Administration action if approved would mark a first step in the nationalization of the U.S. transportation system. If this were to come, it would mark the end of a great era and the beginning of a sad one. Again, Mr. Patman, let me thank you for your action which I believe clearly serves the public welfare.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT B. GILLESPIE.

ARLINGTON, VA.

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: I am writing to congratulate you on your stand in the matter of the Penn-Central RR. All too rarely do our Congressmen look first to the public interest as you did in this case.

I hope that you do not lessen your constant vigil in protecting the public interest against the various private interests and governmental interests which align themselves with these vested groups. You are our only hope in many instances to give the people an honest and responsive government.

Keep up your good efforts.

Yours truly,

HANK GOLDMAN.

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
June 24, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: You, more than anyone else, were effective in denying the Penn Central the recent loan and I take my hat off to you for your efforts.

I can understand and see some justification for subsidizing rail mass transit, but I shudder to think that the taxpayer could someday be expected to bail out enterprises suffering from bad management!

Many thanks again.

Respectfully,

G. H. GOODWIN.

SCARSDALE, N.Y.,
June 22, 1970.

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: Thank you, from a citizen, for helping put things in perspective regarding the Penn Central. The government cannot arbitrarily help a failing private enterprise, singled out for special help.

Only in wild dreams of power and importance are companies the size of Penn Central made. It is well known how Vanderbilt's wild dream of power and money put together the New York Central System. As much as businessmen try to justify these conglomerates that astound the imagination with their size by quoting statistics "proving" how profitable they will be, in reality it is just as much of a power play as running for President: these people want to be some sort of gods.

I am glad that CPC International stock is down over a hundred points since this monstrosity's inception, and that ITT is doing similarly. Vast combinations, whether or not in technical violation of the anti-trust laws as for restraint of trade, are still harmful to capitalism by their very size after a reasonable and almost discernible point.

I would like to take this opportunity to advocate support of Congressman William Ryan's proposal (I do not know whether it is a bill or an amendment) to take from the highway funds and use the money for mass transportation. I do not know to what extent your constituency is involved with commuter and long distance railroads but one cannot exaggerate their importance in metropolitan New York. Five million commute to New York City daily, and if they all came by car it would be, to say the least, bad. Today I had to go into New York and I took a train home during rush hour. Car after car filled with people, with fifty to a hundred getting off at even the most insignificant stops. Every two minutes for an hour and a half a train was scheduled to leave Grand Central for some point with a full load of passengers, each with the newspaper headlining the Penn Central's demise. Every fifteen to twenty minutes, a train would depart for the same destination again.

Not meaning to try your patience with a long letter, I have some concrete proposals of my own concerning commuter railroads and the Penn Central.

First, the Penn Central property should be taken over, owned and maintained by the government. Second, the Penn Central should be divided into not less than four nor

more than six private railroads. They must be able to exist and function profitably. Third, These companies may only handle freight, not passengers. They may rent the use of the tracks from the government. They may build new track, in accordance with State and Federal law, as long as the new track does not parallel or supplement the government-owned track.

Specifically, the Penn Central Company should be divorced from the Penn Central Transportation Company (the railroad). The new rail lines would be created out of the latter company. The former company would not be permitted to deal in railroads, but only its present real estate, and so on. The railroads created according to the second part of the plan would not be permitted to deal in real estate, banking, manufactures. The government would maintain passenger service on its lines, according to set standards. A new, temporary authority would be created to last one year only to administer this act.

The purpose of this act is to make yet another attempt to forestall government ownership of the railroads. Such ownership would run into difficulties I'd rather not see us face: government-owned railroads competing with trucks and air freight, a truly socialized industry in the U.S. (even electricity, gas and telephone are still private) and so on. This plan is designed to rid the railroads of the passenger service it wants to be rid of, but possibly not in a way much to the railroads' liking. Well, they can't have their cake and eat it too. The government should stop making a pretense of "aiding" passenger service, and run it. It should end dilapidated and run-down condition of so much rail property, and the dangers this imposes (look at the extraordinary amount of deaths and accidents since the Penn Central merger).

The object of the plan is to keep the railroads still competitive in the area of freight, to keep them still privately owned and run.

A corollary proposal would be to establish a permanent commission (or assign this role to an existing body) with these powers: It would enforce detailed minimum standards of rail passenger service as laid down by the Congress. After a procedure allowing a railroad to correct a violation, it could do the same to delinquent roads as for the Penn Central: take over the property (or the passenger property only), separate its subsidiary non-rail business, run the passenger service and rent the use of the tracks for freight. It could also remodel the company on a more profitable basis.

But can the federal government rent exclusively the use of a facility to one company? Why must it?

Since the railroads use each other's tracks now, the same lines could use the federal government's tracks under an agreement with the federal government. Also, the railroads are presently granted a degree of exclusiveness by the state legislatures. The same exclusiveness could persist. After all, the railroads are a utility.

That the legislatures presently grant charters to a railroad could be used in another way. These charters grant the railroads exclusive use of certain routes provided they maintain certain minimum standards of service. Thus, a railroad could be found by the new railroads commission mentioned above, or be brought to court by the new commission under state law, for not providing minimal standards of service, as set forth in their charters and this new federal law. In this way they could also be legally held to account for good service.

I await your comments on this letter. Please excuse the underlining.

Yours truly,

MICHAEL GOODMAN.

P.S.—Concerning the top paragraph of this page: Governor Rockefeller of New York has

announced that the state will take over soon the New Haven Railroad, that is, the portion lying in New York State.

SCARBOROUGH, N.Y.,

June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am not much at writing fan letters but I want to say hurray for you in your opposition to the Penn Central loan.

Sincerely,

WALTER HANLON.

DALLAS, TEX.,

June 26, 1970.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: I am writing to congratulate you and thank you for your recent stand against the \$200 million "gift" to Penn Central. Without guarantees to the government and for positive action by the company to help itself, this action would have been a down the rat-hole operation.

I also urge you to do everything possible to defeat the bill to give \$750 million to the railroads. They are no different from other businesses such as laundries, drug store, filling stations, etc., which should also receive loan guarantees if the railroads do. That would be impossible. It is of course argued that the railroads are federally regulated and therefore subject to special consideration. All utilities are also federally regulated, thus each utility would have a precedent on which to base a demand for a grant if this bill were to pass. Penn Central has said in the press that it would need at least another \$500 million, thus it is saying that it needs $\frac{2}{3}$ of the entire proposed grant to all railroads. This bill then is aimed almost exclusively at "bailing out" the Penn Central and is not designed for the general good of all people. Penn Central has filed bankruptcy to reorganize but has not sold any of its equipment, real estate, paper holdings, etc., to try to help itself. Therefore, why should the taxpayers' money be used to save the company when it won't help itself?

Thank you for your efforts through the years.

Sincerely,

LYNN B. HARDING.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.,

June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I have read in the press of your putting your foot down on this loan of some 200 million dollars to the Penn Central Railway and I glory in your spunk. I of course realize the importance of the railroads and I know we must have them, but after all they are private enterprises and if the Federal Government starts bailing out every private business failure, then we are in a hell of a fix.

I am enclosing an article from Time magazine of June 22 which perhaps you did not read. In reading this article it is easy to see why this railroad is in this present mess. With the Pennsy's "red" faction vying against the Central's "green faction" over business methods, etc., thus between them they have taken the railroad down the trail to bankruptcy.

I have marked a paragraph with red pencil that to me even seems ten times worse than loaning the Penn Central the 200 million. This paragraph relates that the Wall Street brokerage firms are now asking for a 1 billion dollar fund to prop and save the various brokerage firms, that through their own inefficient operations and failures are causing them to go broke. This One Billion dollars would be used to save them. To me this is the most God awful guts that I have ever

heard of and it is my sincere hope and wish that you and your Committee will stop this bit of damn foolishness. If they can't make it, then let them go broke like any other private enterprise. If I go out and buy a prospective oil lease I do not expect the Federal Government in Washington to put it up for me and to my way of thinking these brokerage houses are no different.

May I add Mr. Patman, that Wichita Falls is home. My family moved there in 1918 during the Burkburnett boom and it has been home ever since. Although I moved to Oklahoma a few years back for the simple reason that from my viewpoint I could do better as a small operator. I have a sister in Wichita Falls (Mrs. Bailey R. Collins) that is quite a Democrat worker and between she and Rhea Howard they think they run the Democratic Party, and they sure get in their licks in Wichita County.

Trusting that I have not bored you with my opinion and with the wish that God give you the strength to keep up the good fight, I am,

Yours most cordially,

E. C. HARLIN, Jr.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,

June 23, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, House Banking and Currency
Committee, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: You and I are well aware of the conduct as well as misconduct of this nation's Bankers. (merger Colonial National Bank and First Virginia Corporation).

The nation is indeed in your debt for the action you took this past weekend, which brought an end to perhaps one of the greatest frauds perpetrated on the American public (Defense Act and all its sins). The conduct of the Administration and the fraudulent abuse of the Constitution by the Department of Defense, was brought to a climax this past weekend when the Banks had the audacity to request the Government through the Defense Act, to save the Banks from their mismanagement of Public Funds. It is incomprehensible for the Bankers to conduct the Banking business in such an irresponsible manner as to make loans to such incompetent management as the Pennsylvania-Central Railroad has suffered these past 9 years.

You may recall the former chairman of the Pennsylvania Railroad is the same gentleman, who, as chairman of the N & W Railroad, sold an American flag carrier (Bull Line) to a couple of bankrupt foreigners. i.e. "Bull Line".

You are well aware that the small and independent businessman cannot afford to enjoy the folly of incompetence because the small businessman cannot qualify under the Defense Act to have his notes guaranteed at the Banks by the Defense Department.

It is with great pride that I nominate you, Wright Patman, as the Hero of the Hour.

God Bless You.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE A. HATZES, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: It is reassuring to note that you are a member of a group questioning the propriety of guaranteeing loans to the Penn Central Company. I submit the following:

1. The paramount interest of the Department of Defense is in the maintenance of an adequate physical plant of any component of the domestic infrastructure.

2. The diversion of revenues (interest and

dividends, sinking funds, bond and note maturities) to the maintenance of plant and equipment is what the DoD should support.

3. The Penn Central Company has many assets which could be pledged for new loans or guarantees.

4. The sum now reported as being sought—\$200 million—is substantial; however, the operating deficit is so vast as to make inevitable granting of much larger credits.

5. Many other companies are not far removed from insolvency. They would also seek guarantees.

It is possible that insolvency of Penn Central will have an effect on certain lending institutions, although it is improbable that this would have serious implications for any large, strong bank. Perhaps these should be considered.

Consideration should be given to a plan of de-merging the Penn Central into smaller, regional viable operating segments.

Respectfully yours,

SAMUEL HILL.

FORT WORTH, TEX.,
June 24, 1970.

SIR: Too bad about the banks! Always they want a "cinch" on repayment of any loans they make. Let the P.R.R. do like any small business has to do, get broke & take their medicine. After all, the past 15-20 yrs. has been the most prosperous anyone can remember. So Pennsy's plight has to be a result of poor to bad management.

I don't profess to have anything to say with respect to banks lending money to railroads or any other business, but as a small part of what Lincoln said, "Of the people, for the people, by the people," I do say, don't guarantee any bank loans with any part of people's tax money. After all, the government is the people. Where else does government get money? I say no to government guaranteed loans of this type.

Yours truly,

M. L. IVY.

CORONADO, CALIF.,
June 21, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I want to thank you for your courageous stand against Nixon's attempt to give \$200 million of public funds to Penn Central.

Please keep up the fight against giving public funds to private corporations.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely,

ANDREW L. JOHNSON.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
June 20, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Just a short note to commend you on your stand opposing the loan of \$200 million to the Penn Central R.R. As a business man, I and my many business friends are sick and tired of these give away programs. We would suggest that a company with assets of over \$6 billion dollars, dispose of some of these assets.

As you know the Penn Central owns several billion in real estate. Not long ago the company purchased huge tracts in Florida and also in Penna. (including Pittsburgh). An intensive investigation of these land buys in the past three years is scandalous.

Furthermore, the P.C. owns millions of dollars of real estate for which it has no use. As a matter of fact P.C. owns so much unimproved land, that no one office knows just what they do own. If the R.R. is so hard up . . . let them sell \$1 billion dollars of real estate and stick to railroading.

Yours sincerely,

S. LEE KANN.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: While I am not one of your constituents and not always one of your admirers, I wish to take this opportunity as an American to express my deep appreciation and admiration in your courageous stand in opposition to the Administration's efforts to force the American taxpayer to underwrite the mismanagement of the Penn-Central Corporation.

As a believer in the American system of free enterprise, I do not believe that the Federal Government has any right or obligation to rescue any private corporation or individual, however large or small, from bankruptcy. If we are to save the Penn Central, then why should not the Government also make good the losses of American investors who have lost over \$300 billion as a result of President Nixon's misguided and perhaps dishonest economic policies?

I have taken my share of investment losses in the last 18 months of Republican ineptitude. I believe, as I think any good American should believe, that these losses stem in large measure from my own shortcomings, and that it is up to me, and to me alone, to find steps that may lead to a satisfactory recovery. By the same token, I believe that it is up to the Penn Central Corporation to find its own way out of the mess created by its incompetent management. The same can be said, by the way, about Lockheed Aircraft and a host of other companies.

To be sure, some kind of Federal action will eventually be needed to correct the abuses of our dreadfully archaic transportation industry. I don't know the solution, but certainly it is not the stop-gap measure proposed by Mr. Nixon's henchmen to rescue the blue-blooded Republican Penn Central from financial ruin.

In the meantime, I wish to express my solidarity with your position in the Penn-Central case and my earnest hope that you will continue to be a tower of strength in opposing Federal attempts to use taxpayers' money to save this ill-starred private organization and others as well.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW J. KAUFFMAN.

JUNE 26, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I was pleased to read about your forthright stand in regard to the unhappy Penn Central affair.

I agree with you that the government has no business bailing out private corporations. Free enterprise should be free to make profits and also to lose money.

I am writing you because I usually disagree with many of the economical positions you have taken during your long and distinguished career in the Congress. I feel certain that your actions will go a long way to protecting the Federal Treasury from any further Penn Central type demands.

I am, Mr. Patman,

Most sincerely yours,

GUSTAVE E. KIDDE.

HOUSTON, TEX.,
June 24, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I wish to express my grati-

tude for your noble effort in blocking the \$200,000,000 loan to the Penn Central. Such action is refreshing in these times of "give-aways," and such action will be most welcome to all citizens who are interested in fiscal responsibility.

Recently heard your statement, during an interview on television in which you stated

that lowering the interest rates to a more realistic figure, would solve the inflation problem. To this, many millions of our citizens would concur.

In appreciation of your constant effort, I say thank you.

Sincerely,

HAROLD W. KILLEEN.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
June 23, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I was glad to hear your statement concerning the Penn Central Railroad situation. Although I am a stockholder I feel that this corporation has been mismanaged for a long time and I don't think the general public should be made to pay for it. I hope your investigation will dig into misuse of corporation money including some of the lucrative pension funds that the retiring executives have been setting up for themselves during the past several years. Those of us who run successful businesses don't expect something like that.

There should be an efficient high speed railroad system connecting Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, and with all of the Penn Central's propaganda that was put out at the time of the merger we still don't have an efficient transportation system. We certainly need one for economic reasons as well as for our national defense, and I sincerely hope that you will push for separation of the transportation portion of Penn Central and creating a public utility or authority. The air corridors over the East are already dangerously overcrowded because they are doing the job that the railroads should be doing.

The entire Penn Central holding company should be required to liquidate over a period of time (like 5 years). The real estate business for too long has been a convenient cover up for the mismanagement of the railroad.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM KLEINHOFF.

GREEN BAY, WIS.,
June 24, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The purpose of this letter is to request that you do everything in your power to prevent the Penn-Central Transportation Company from securing a government guaranteed loan to bail the Carrier out of its current financial morass.

It is my opinion a guaranteed loan to the Penn-Central, or any other railroad company, would be impudent for the following reasons:

1. A government guaranteed loan to assist the Penn-Central or any other railroad company would be an open invitation to railroad management to mis-manage their properties. On certain railroads in this country mis-management is a way of life and subsidization by the government in the form of a guaranteed loan would encourage rail management to this end.

2. Guaranteed loans from our government, I believe, would encourage holding companies, such as the Penn-Central Company, North West Industries, and others, who own railroad properties, to siphon off money into the holding company coffers rather than put a share of the earnings back into the property of the railroad to up grade, or even just maintain, right-of-way and rolling stock. Even today, without government subsidization, the nation's rail carriers have let their property and equipment fall into disrepair, witness the holocaust at Crescent City, Illinois which occurred on June 22, 1970. It is reported the derailment was caused by a wheel coming loose from a tank car truck; an investigation by the Department of Transportation will reveal the true cause.

On the same date as the Crescent City disaster a derailment occurred on the Galena Division of the Chicago and North Western Railway at Wheaton, Illinois which resulted in 25 cars going in the ditch. The derailment occurred just 10 miles out of the initial terminal of the train, Proviso, Illinois. The derailment occurred in a highly populated area; fortunately no fires were ignited and no one was injured.

The purpose of the foregoing is to demonstrate what is happening now; I shudder to think what will happen if railroad managements could count on "Uncle Sam" to pick up the results of their mis-management.

3. Government guaranteed loans, in my opinion, would be the first step in the nationalization of the railroads. If the railroad owners (stockholders, holding companies) wanted to get out of the railroad business all they would have to do is secure a loan from the government, pocket the profits from the operation of the railroad and then default on payment of the loan. Upon default the government, we tax payers, would have to foreclose and we would be left with a piece of railroad that couldn't be sold for scrap value.

I recognize that the railroads in this country are in dire financial straits. But granting loans guaranteed by the government is not the answer to the railroad industry financial problem; all a loan would do is increase the indebtedness. The answer to the rail industries financial plight is less government regulation. Let railroads compete with the air lines, the truckers and barge lines for traffic by letting the railroads set rates that are competitive. If this is done the rail carriers will attract business to make them financially healthy.

At this point, if you have read this far, I should tell you I am personally interested in the railroad industry. I hold seniority right on the Galena Division of the Chicago and North Western Railway as an engineer and fireman (helper). The financial health of our railroads is of great concern to me and all other citizens of this country who are employed by a railroad in any capacity. A financially healthy railroad is a railroad that enjoys safe operating conditions because the money is available to take care of and correct unsafe conditions; needless to say when unsafe conditions do not exist the railroad man and other people who live in the vicinity of a railroad benefit.

It is my opinion the Senate and House of Representatives should organize a thorough investigation of the Penn-Central and the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine just how this financial disaster occurred. Certainly the men who put together this gigantic merger knew, or should have known, what they were doing. The Penn-Central is in the category of private enterprise but it is also a semi-public utility and a large part of the nation's transportation "back bone". This whole affair should be looked into in detail if for no other purpose than discovering how it happened and to prevent, if possible, such a fiasco from happening again.

So please Congressman, do what you can to prevent any government loans to the railroad industry and do the whole country a good turn by exerting the influence of your office toward getting the railroad industry into a better financial posture through less regulation.

Yours truly,

ROY H. KOEPKE.

JUNE 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: I applaud your opposition to any loan whatsoever for the Penn-Central Railroad. This company has in the past 25 years done untold harm to the citi-

zens of New York State by denigrating the service steadily and without regard to the need for it. Commodore Vanderbilt's: "The public be damned" was a blessing compared to what they have done to the passengers who have finally learned to avoid their filthy, tardy, insolently-serviced trains. One cannot even get information about arrivals or departures from their surly employees: there are telephone lines but so ill manned that one cannot get through even during the hours they are supposed to be staffed. The company should stand or go bankrupt on its own demerits.

Respectfully,

DR. LAWRENCE A. KOHN.

P.S.—This needs no answer; none is expected.

MIAMI, FLA.,
June 21, 1970.

DEAR SIR: I strongly endorse your position concerning the guarantee of Penn Central's debts. I feel that the government has no authority or need to enter into such contracts. Poor management must suffer its own consequences and not be rescued by the Federal Government. Your stand on this issue is a step in the right direction.

Thank you.

J. FRANK L. DUE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
June 26, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Banking Committee,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It took a lot of courage to fight the move to give hundreds of millions to Penn Central. You bucked not only Penn Central but the Administration.

The people of this country don't realize what a great American you are, but a hell of us know you are doing a fine job. Keep up the good work!

RUBIN LEFKOWITZ.

ONTARIO, CALIF.,
June 20, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: This is my expression of gratitude to you for your stand against the Penn Central Co. in its attempt to get the government to guarantee a \$200,000,000 loan to its railroad.

It gives me increasing concern to note this administration's attitude against excessive welfare costs, but think nothing of giving out countless millions to favored corporations.

I also noted with alarm that the proposed loan guarantee to Penn Central was being handled by President Nixon's former law firm in which Attorney General Mitchell was also a member.

Also I note with disdain that Sec. of the Treasury, David Kennedy is linked into the Penn Central "deal" through the Continental National Bank and Trust, from which company Mr. Kennedy came to his post in Nixon's Cabinet. That bank had loaned the Penn Co. \$26.8 million. Apparently Mr. Kennedy's influence is expected to insure the Continental National Bank that the public purse is to be raided via the Penn Central Co. so that they will be repaid—by public expense—for a bad loan made while Mr. Kennedy was with the bank.

The unsavory deals by our public men and other violations of public trust must surely contribute to the disrespect for "the establishment" throughout the land. Therefore we have campus unrest, hippies, black panthers, etc.

I want to tell you I am gravely concerned about corruption in our democracy and hope there are enough men like you in the Con-

gress to protect us from the lack of integrity among our high governmental officials connected with corrupt practices.

I am a retired superintendent of schools and have been a business man as well as an active politician but I am seriously worried about things like the Penn Central deal.

Most seriously,

CONRAD LANGE.

WINNETKA, ILL.,
June 22, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: Congratulations on your decades of serving the public as watch-dog against large-scale boodling at public expense, and most recently on your stopping the Penn-Central federal guarantee.

Aren't all these half-way measures wasteful, and shouldn't we now go to the logical conclusion that other free countries in Western Europe reached long ago: outright government ownership and operation of the railroads?

My own feeling is that the ills of the post-office proceed not from the principle of government ownership and operation, but from the failure of public and congressional alertness in supervision.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. LLOYD, JR.

WESTCHESTER, PA.,
June 24, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is just a note of appreciation for your action in reviewing the Penn Central situation and for your forthright inquiry as I believe without your sense of inquisitiveness, the American people would have been supporting the stockholders of a corporation that has suffered poor management.

Even though some of my family own a few shares of the Penn Central, I feel that it would have been improper to make a "No-Strings-Attached" loan to bail management out of a predicament caused by their own short sightedness.

Thank you once again for representing that Silent Majority of Americans who almost were caught in a give-away program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. LORGUS.

THE PENN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE Co.,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 23, 1970.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I want to express my approval of your prompt action in stalling Penn Central's bid for a Government guaranteed bank loan.

There seems to be no valid reason why this or any other company should be "bailed out" of a situation resulting substantially from bad management.

Penn Central has tremendous assets which could be sold or pledged to handle their problems.

Yours truly,

GEORGE R. LOULAN.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, June 24, 1970]

THE PENN CENTRAL CASE

The bankruptcy of the Penn Central, and the scrambling within the administration to prevent it, have raised many questions.

For example: How much special treatment should be accorded railroads by this administration or any other? Is the plight of the Penn Central a result of poor management

or the consequence of outmoded federal regulations for a method of transportation which has trouble competing with airlines and trucks?

To answer just these two questions would be as difficult as finding a lost dime on Galveston Beach.

It does appear though, that the administration was about to follow a devious and unwise course when it planned to guarantee loans totaling \$200 million to the Penn Central through the Defense Department.

This guarantee was scrapped when Texas Rep. Wright Patman raised pertinent objections. The Texarkan congressman's points:

The bail-out arrangement was an unlawful use of the Defense Production Act which was designed for small contractors.

It would not be proper for the government to bail out large private companies.

There was a good chance that the proposed \$200 million loan guarantee would become a loss of that amount to the taxpayers. (Reportedly, Penn Central officials told Rep. Patman and others that the railroad would need at least \$500 million more to avoid bankruptcy.)

And, that the plan would set a precedent under which other companies would come to Washington asking for help. (Other sources have since said that some defense contractors were planning to take this step.)

The report from Washington is that the administration decided, after Rep. Patman's objection, that the political risk was too great to grant the guarantee. A sound decision, for the taxpayer who is lured by inflation, high taxes and questionable federal expenditures in many areas would not be overjoyed at the millions which would have to be committed to help a \$7 billion diversified corporation.

It has been noted, too, that Penn Central filed bankruptcy for its rail operations only and that its other businesses, which produce a profit overall, are not included in the bankruptcy petition. Individuals, who do not have the advantage of holding companies in divorcing unprofitable companies by the bankruptcy route, find it hard to understand why a holding company with billions in assets would not be forced to sell several companies to make up the deficit before it declared bankruptcy for one wholly-owned subsidiary.

Even on the Penn Central, which operates the largest railroad in the most populous area of the United States, passenger service has not been profitable. Yet, passenger service is needed. It is still the most economical way of moving large numbers of people.

Thus, it may be necessary for the federal government to subsidize railroads. But a concerted and coordinated effort to determine what is needed and how much it will cost the taxpayer should be made before a single railroad is given special consideration.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, June 26, 1970]

A DANGEROUS SITUATION

The most interesting spinoff question of the Penn Central bankruptcy is whether the downfall of the railroad colossus will trigger a chain reaction of financial disasters. Although the financial community in New York has known of Penn Central's plight for months, the general public did not, and the event came suddenly, at a time when fears of a liquidity crisis were already widespread.

The danger of a chain reaction of bankruptcies is quite real. Penn Central does three-quarters of its business with other railroads, and several of these were in exceedingly precarious financial shape before the news of the Penn Central failure was announced. And banks and other suppliers of the railroad will take a huge beating in the short

run, to say nothing of the anguish of stockholders.

The Nixon administration was wise to back away from the \$200 million rescue operation, which the Department of Defense was to have financed. The Defense Production Act of 1950, the legal instrument of the proposed rescue, was designed to help small and medium-sized war contractors, and only by a vastly strained interpretation of the act could it have been used as a salvage vehicle for Penn Central.

Rep. Wright Patman of Texas deserves commendation for pointing this out to the administration, and for blocking the action. By his opposition to the hastily conceived scheme, the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee may turn out to be the best friend the Nixon administration has in this election year.

To ordinary citizens of every political persuasion, squeezed by inflation, tight money and increasing difficulty in meeting personal obligations, the Defense Department guarantee of \$200 million in bank loans to Penn Central would have seemed a particularly rank and gamy act of political favoritism toward big business.

With Penn Central facing debt payments of \$75 million by June 30 and nearly \$600 million by Oct. 31, it is a virtual certainty that the taxpayers' loan dollars would have been money down the drain in any event.

The big railroad has an overall debt of \$2.6 billion. Its services are highly essential in moving passengers and freight over 40,000 miles of track in 16 of the most highly industrialized states of the nation. One-fifth of the nation's rail freight traffic moves on Penn Central tracks, and 70 per cent of the bankrupt's traffic moves on other lines.

In this perilous financial situation, no man, least of all any spokesman for Penn Central, can read the future. Even under the reorganization, the railroad will have to exercise great diligence to maintain the inflow of revenue over the critical period ahead. Meanwhile, the nation can only hope and pray that the danger of a resultant financial panic is exaggerated and that one will not materialize.

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, June 30, 1970]

PENN CENTRAL NOT EXACTLY POOR, SO WHY EXEMPT FROM ITS BILLS?

We don't mean to be hard-bitten about things, but let us face the realities: If you couldn't pay your bills and wanted to go on public welfare, the government would want to assure itself, before giving you a hand-out, that you weren't sitting on a gold mine somewhere, or otherwise possessed assets which you might be able to convert into cash to tide you over.

Maybe a mammoth corporation can't be compared to an ordinary citizen, but on the other hand why not?

Consider the Penn-Central Transportation Company. It's in such bad financial shape, two and a half years after its consolidation into one of the world's greatest corporations, that it can't pay current debts and couldn't even borrow at an astronomical interest rate of 11.5 per cent.

The company thereupon went, hat in hand, to the U.S. government, and the government, with exceptional alacrity, began taking steps to bail out the troubled corporation.

The Defense Department prepared to put the government's guarantee behind a \$200 million bank loan, and President Nixon, in his economic message, called for legislative action to provide for emergency assistance to railroads in financial difficulties.

But at that point a number of congressmen, including that indefatigable battler for the little man, Texas Democrat Rep. Wright Patman, began asking questions.

The Penn Central is not exactly in rags.

It happens to own about \$7 billion in assets—that is not a misprint, we said \$7 billion. It owns some of the most valuable real estate in the world.

Representative Patman, who is chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, demanded to know precisely what legal authorization the government has for guaranteeing the Penn Central borrowing and, failing to get answers to this and other questions, refused to withdraw his opposition.

Interestingly enough, foreseeing legal and other problems, the Penn Central suddenly last April decided to retain President Nixon's and Attorney General John N. Mitchell's former law firm of Mudge, Rose, Guthrie and Alexander.

That notwithstanding, the Nixon administration decided to backtrack, at least temporarily, on the government guarantees.

Penn Central officials expressed their dismay, and we can't say that we blame them. For being dismayed, that is. But not for the way they've run their railroad. And not for the way they're trying to duck out of their responsibilities.

They have now filed a bankruptcy petition which, they emphasize, "does not apply to the Pennsylvania Company, the parent Penn Central Company or to the many affiliated or subsidiary companies."

Why should they be exempt from financial obligations?

Would it be asking too much for the parent company or other members of the immediate family to sell—say—a half a billion dollars of property in order to protect the other six and a half billion?

You might have to sell a piece of your land, or get a second mortgage on your house, if you were in similar difficulties. Why shouldn't the Penn Central, which brought its own troubles on itself, do likewise?

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Journal, June 27, 1970]

BUSINESS ETHICS AND BANKRUPTCY

The legal sanctuary used by the Penn Central Co. to avoid paying debts and taxes of the railroad has been justified on the grounds that the nation's biggest transportation network must be kept running for the good of the economy. There is no dispute over this. But surely when the enormous assets of the sixth biggest corporation in the United States (\$7 billion) cannot be legally touched to cover the debts and operating costs of what once was the company's major enterprise, there is something wrong with the system and the law. Especially when, in the view of bankruptcy experts, the Penn Central can stay in its bankruptcy cocoon for as long as 20 years under the protection of the law and to the financial aggrandizement of a battery of lawyers who keep the arrangements going.

This is hard to swallow for other businessmen and individuals who suffer to avoid bankruptcy because of the legal and moral compulsion to pay off their creditors, including many who might otherwise founder. It should be disturbing, too, to any wage earner who finds the finance company repossessing his car for missing a few payments or to the middle-class wage earner who must liquidate his insurance to cover a hospital bill. He has no Park Avenue offices, no Miami Beach hotels, no oil pipelines and no Madison Square Garden interests to fall back on.

Despite its financial crisis, the Penn Central paid out \$43 million in dividends last year, awarded generous stock options and retirement annuities to its executives, including a \$140,000 a year pension to the recently ousted board chairman, and, according to Rep. Brock Adams, D-Wash., transferred some of the assets of the railroad operations into the holding company when

the railroad operations were going downhill. Those assets remain safe in the holding company. And it's all legal, too.

Penn Central, of course, like the bankrupt Jersey Central, can give a convincing argument that it has been forced by the government to carry on the deficit operations of its railroad company. If it were free of government interference, like other private firms, the Penn Central could have disposed of its commuter services and long distance trains. In no way should such deficit operations hamper its other profit making enterprises. All this sounds fair except when you begin examining the reasons why the Penn Central was able to accumulate its investments and form a conglomerate by originally borrowing on the reputation, credit and assets of the railroad. Furthermore, the railroad mismanagement suggests that the Penn Central Co. was devoting its money and energies into subsidiary investments that really had nothing to do with transportation, except that they benefitted by having access to rail service.

The cash crisis that the Penn Central was suddenly trapped in is partly due to this drive to acquire new firms, a situation that is afflicting other conglomerates that are in trouble. They have sunk their cash into property, buildings and firms that are almost totally unrelated to the parent company. This unprecedented move toward mass mergers in recent years has led to an economic derangement in the business world and centralization of economic power and decision making in the hands of about 100 large corporations.

The 700-page report of the Federal Trade Commission, issued last year, warns about the serious consequences of the conglomerates, which are a legal prop to skirt the anti-trust laws. The commission found that conglomerates do not enhance efficiency, lead to a system of reciprocal buying in closed markets, push out competition and run counter to many of the basic assumptions of a free market. Neither the consumer nor the employees of companies owned by conglomerates have much chance against these big cartels. They constitute a form of business socialism whose enormous power and legal protection removes them from public accountability and restraint. In this respect, they are a threat to the kind of democratic capitalism that is based on competition and the wide sharing of wealth and resources in this country.

Rep. Wright Patman, chairman of the Housing Banking Committee, has already quashed the Penn Central's request for a loan guarantee by the federal government. He has promised to lead a vigorous inquiry into the Penn Central and its connections with big banking interests. It can shed some new light on the dangerous growth of the conglomerates and, perhaps, on the dreadful record of the Interstate Commerce Commission in protecting railroads from competition in rates and in allowing labor practices to stymie improvements. But most of all, Rep. Patman, an earnest protector of the little guy, can start cutting the conglomerates down to size.

HIGHWAY SAFETY—IV: THE PROBLEM OF ALCOHOLISM

(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 my series of commentaries on highway safety, I have been trying to illustrate to my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD the serious situation that exists when Americans drink, not just socially but as a disease, and then drive. The

alcoholic driver is probably the greatest safety hazard on our highways today. We must find ways to control this hazard and help make driving safer for everyone.

As Guy Halverson points out in the following article in the Christian Science Monitor, much of the problem of drunken driving in the United States can be traced directly to "alcoholism." He notes the shocking statistic that alcoholism hits every fifth home in the country. With this in mind, it seems apparent, then, that one way to stop the problem of drunk driving is to deal seriously with the underlying problem of alcoholism.

A first step in dealing with alcoholism is to treat it as a disease. We must realize that alcoholism is not restricted to one social or economic class, but can and does strike people from all backgrounds. Only when we realize this fact can we give the people afflicted with this illness the treatment they need.

Guy Halverson makes an effective case for promoting more effective rehabilitation of alcoholics. I believe that our highways can be made much safer for all drivers if such a program is carried out. We must do something to reduce the tragic toll taken by alcoholics on our Nation's roads and highways.

The article follows:

ALCOHOLISM BEHIND THE WHEEL

(By Guy Halverson)

MILWAUKEE.—A confused and lonely 21-year-old Florida woman races alone through a stormy night on a motorbike. An alcoholic since her teen-age years, she is drunk. Rain and wind slash against her as she tightens her grip on the bike's handlebars. She looks up and in an instant of blurred recognition sees the glare of headlights from a vehicle racing directly at her. She is hurled across the highway and a human life is wasted.

The woman is one of about 70 million Americans who both drink and drive. Of these, millions are either problem drinkers or chronic alcoholics.

Clearly, alcoholism itself underlies much of the spiraling liquor-related accident toll on United States highways. And the toll won't be cut until Americans start to cure this deeper problem.

Efforts in this direction are producing results in some instances:

Here in Milwaukee, at another moment in time, a silver-haired business executive strides quickly toward a massive building. The renewal he feels inside shines as bright as the spring day. The man is a recovered alcoholic, and this day is his last at an outpatient clinic at the privately funded DePaul rehabilitation hospital.

FRAGMENTARY RESPONSE

But in general, response by government and the public to the alcohol problem is only fragmentary and all too often lethargic and ineffective.

The drunk driver, safety experts insist, reveals only one aspect of the blotch of alcoholism that strains so much of American society. Divorces, shattered families, frequent home and industrial accidents, and mounting crime all testify to it. Industry loses over \$2 billion annually to alcoholism in absenteeism and shoddy work.

"The central truth," says Sen. Harold E. Hughes (D) of Iowa, chairman of the special Senate subcommittee on alcoholism and narcotics, and himself a reformed alcoholic, "is that we must make up our minds to launch an all-out, adequately funded attack on the problem of alcoholism in America if we are

to make significant reductions in the deaths and maimings on our highways. . . ."

Most safety experts agree there must be a sharp about face in the permissive attitudes about liquor now sweeping the land:

The mass media, in particular, must stop glamorizing drunkenness by identifying it with good humor and sophistication.

The home, the church, the school must do a better job of acquainting young people with the dangers and risks of drinking.

Employers, work associates, and relatives must stop overprotecting alcoholics who desperately need attention—not the hidden isolation that is often a sure passport to self-destruction and tragedy for others.

Courts must be given greater flexibility in dealing with drinking drivers. The present system—which seeks to control driving behavior through reliance on legal sanctions alone—is a failure. Modern rehabilitation facilities and techniques are sorely needed in almost every major community in the nation.

The problem of alcoholism and liquor abuse seems almost overwhelming in its complexity and ubiquity. In one of the nation's largest metropolitan areas I walked into the office of the local sheriff to discuss highway safety and found him seated behind his desk with a highball in his hand. It was 2 p.m.

MOST NEGLECTED PROBLEM

In another city a local traffic safety council official could hardly keep his eyes open during our interview because of the drinks he has had during an afternoon meeting. He finally had to have a relative come and drive him home.

No matter where one goes—to the office of a police official, a safety expert, a highway engineer—the conversation inevitably swings around to a discussion of alcoholism. Yet, as John W. Gardner, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, has pointed out, alcoholism, the nation's No. 3 health problem, is also its most neglected. Alcoholism treatment lags far behind treatment for drug abuse, which touches a much smaller percentage of the population.

Alcohol is the most used—and widely abused—drug in society.

Health officials insist that alcoholism is a disease, not just a behavior problem as was assumed for so many years. Between 6 and 20 million people are believed to be chronic alcoholics or problem drinkers with a compulsive dependence on liquor. But there is also a staggering multiplier effect that adds a tangled new dimension to the problem. Every alcoholic, the experts say, directly affects up to three relatives. Thus, up to 60 million people in this country may be immediately touched by alcoholism. That would mean one out of every five homes.

For years the public stereotype of the problem drinker was that of the skid-row demented. But, says William M. Moore Jr., executive director of the National Council on Alcoholism, "only about 3 percent of all alcoholics are derelicts. Most are the type of people you might meet anywhere in society—wage earners, homeowners, housewives, professional people."

Take what happened one day here. The local office of Alcoholics Anonymous received a frantic call that a woman, plainly drunk, was about to slide behind the wheel. AA called the local sheriff who dispatched a car. The woman was pulled from her vehicle before she could drive it off. It was a bus for elementary school children.

MANY DIFFERENT TYPES

Studies of drinking drivers clearly indicate that many are chronic alcoholics or longtime problem drinkers. Indeed, most studies show the typical drinking driver involved in a fatal or near fatal accident to have a blood-level content far above levels associated with normal social drinking.

Yet, when one talks about the "drinking driver" one is really talking about many different types of drinkers:

1. The chronic alcoholic or problem drinker who is suspected of causing perhaps the largest chunk of all fatal accidents.

2. The social drinker, whose blood level usually registers less than most problem drinkers, but still accounts for an important share of highway mishaps.

3. The novice drinker or occasional drinker, whose inexperience with liquor is a contributing factor to some accidents.

4. The young drinker. Some studies suggest that the youthful drinker is causing an increasing number of highway accidents. Of the first 10 auto fatalities this year in Michigan, for example, all were under age 26, and liquor was a factor or suspected as a factor in nine of the cases.

How does one stop these people from mixing their drinks with driving?

In most courts throughout the U.S., judges are still heavily dependent on punitive legal sanctions—fines, license suspensions and revocations, or jail sentences. But because of the hardship on the offender, whose livelihood is often dependent on use of his vehicle (particularly in the Western states with their large distances), juries and courts are reluctant to impose stiff sentences. Moreover, prosecutors, acutely aware of public sentiment, carefully weed out thousands of marginal cases each year, even though they know the defendant is guilty of a road violation. Or they deliberately seek a lesser charge, such as "reckless driving," instead of "driving while intoxicated."

"HEALTH-LEGAL" APPROACH

The resulting "control system" is just not working. In Chicago several months back, a 28-year-old man was slapped with a \$20 fine and court costs for staggering drunk in front of a stream of cars at a busy intersection. The very next night he was again arrested—this time for drunk driving.

Last year some 300,000 drivers had their licenses suspended or revoked. Yet, it's believed that as many as 200,000 of them continued to drive illegally.

What's needed, say many jurists, is a multipronged attack on the drunk driver—a "health-legal" approach, as Lyle Filkins of the Highway Safety Research Institute of the University of Michigan has dubbed it. On the one hand, judges should be allowed to impose stiff sanctions for those drivers who respond to punishment—such as social drinkers, occasional drinkers, and young people. On the other hand, rehabilitation should be available for those drivers who need a change in drinking behavior more than driving behavior.

And that's the rub. Few jurists today have any place to send the problem drinker for rehabilitation.

In many cities I found businessmen and teen-agers, problem drinkers, and hard-core delinquents all thrown indiscriminately together into grim drunk tanks. In one Southwest city I found a middle-aged man lying face down on a concrete floor where he had tumbled from a bunk.

PROGRAMS JUST NOT ENOUGH

There are only about 200 facilities of varying types around the country to handle the problem drinker, including halfway houses and clinics. Only about six cities have major detoxification centers, including important installations at Washington, St. Louis, and Des Moines. Even more significantly, only about six cities have comprehensive treatment programs, including Minneapolis, Atlanta, and the private DePaul program here in Milwaukee.

The federal response has so far been spotty and piecemeal.

The main thrust to date, most experts feel, has come out of the National Center for the

Prevention and Control of Alcoholism in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Budgeted at around \$4 million annually, the program has dealt with the research, education, and treatment areas.

Rehabilitators maintain that the programs are just not enough. More money is spent each day on liquor purchases in the U.S., they say, than the entire federal government spends on alcoholism treatment in the course of an entire year.

A measure recently introduced into the Senate by Senator Hughes, along with Sens. Jacob K. Javits (R) of New York and Frank E. Moss (D) of Utah, would earmark a more realistic amount of \$435 million over a three-year period for a comprehensive alcoholism program, including grants for construction of facilities by state and local communities. It would set up a control agency located most likely in the National Institute of Mental Health (that section is being hammered out in committee as of this writing). The measure would require establishment of prevention and treatment programs for federal employees and armed forces personnel, and also provide that group health and disability policies for federal employees must include alcoholism.

The Hughes bill (S3835) in effect supersedes an earlier, less comprehensive bill introduced several years ago by Senators Javits and Moss. The newer Hughes-Javits-Moss bill has so far snapped up endorsement from close to 50 senators, including a spectrum as diverse as Sens. George Murphy (R) of California, Charles H. Percy (R) and Ralph Tyler Smith (R) of Illinois, and John J. Sparkman (D) of Alabama.

PROPOSERS OPTIMISTIC

Proponents of the Hughes-Javits-Moss bill are optimistic of passage during the next year. They note that the Hill-Burton hospital construction bill—enacted over a veto by President Nixon last month—contained a provision establishing new priorities for treatment of alcoholism within hospitals. In the past most hospitals have tended to shun the alcoholic. The Hill-Burton Law, rehabilitation enthusiasts assert, shows that a national consensus is building toward a broad-based federal rehabilitation program.

The new \$18 million program under way at the Office of Alcohol Countermeasures in the Department of Transportation is also geared in great part to an identification—and then control—of the problem drinker. Under the program, announced June 26, demonstration grants have been awarded to a number of communities around the nation: the state of Vermont; Marathon and Sheboygan Counties in Wisconsin; Nassau County in New York; Washtenaw County in Michigan; King County, Washington; the cities of Eugene and Portland, Ore.; Denver; Seattle; Albuquerque, N.M. and Charlotte, N.C. DOT officials hope the roster can be upped by an additional 20 localities next year.

The imaginative program—a small, but important first step in the control of the drinking driver—will test out some 50 or 60 countermeasures, including use of chemical agents that cause the drinker to react unfavorably when he imbibes alcohol, tying gas station operators into special traffic grids so they can check licenses numbers of motorists suspected of being intoxicated, and even special buzzer devices on the cars of drinking drivers that may be activated due to erratic driving conditions.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

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

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 40th anniversary of the Veterans'

Administration. On July 21, 1931, President Herbert Hoover signed an executive order creating the Administration as a new agency of the Federal Government. Prior to that time, the various benefits established for veterans had been under diverse bureaus which had grown from previous governmental activities.

Today, 4.5 million veterans and dependents receive direct financial aid through the VA, and the number of hospitals totals 166.

This anniversary comes following by 1 day the passage in the House of legislation to increase the availability of guaranteed home loan financing for veterans and to increase the income of the national service life insurance fund. Our unanimous vote on this bill yesterday will go a long way toward helping our Nation's sagging homebuilding industry, and at the same time greatly aid the veteran. 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, and the bill passed yesterday will provide a needed boost.

However, our job is not completed. The conditions in some of our VA hospitals are deplorable, and today, this 40th anniversary of the Veterans' Administration is a good time to reflect on our responsibility and to dedicate ourselves to pioneering new paths to serve in civilian walks of life those who served the Nation in its time of need.

OBJECTIVITY FROM THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE EMBASSY

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, my office periodically receives the "Vietnam Bulletin" a publication of the South Vietnamese Embassy here in Washington. Normally, the contents of this publication range from trivia through hogwash to propaganda.

But, to my amazement, on picking up the most recent issue, I found a sophisticated and objective military analysis of the Cambodian incursion. Among other things, the analysis cautioned against committing the South Vietnamese forces to more than short-term thrusts into Cambodia, lest they overextend themselves and allow the other side to increase its strength in South Vietnam, and thus entrap the Vietnamese army.

The name of the author of the article is not listed. This is unfortunate; it might have been interesting to trace the course of his career as he works his way toward the Con Son tiger cages.

Under unanimous consent, I insert two sections of the article, entitled "Current Strategy" and "Trapper's Trap" in the RECORD at this point.

CURRENT STRATEGY

The Communists naturally know what they are good at. Their current Cambodian strategy appears to be one of two prongs they really know how to exploit. It is the view of this column that they seek at present to

asphyxiate the Lon Nol administration economically and politically while drawing the South Vietnamese Army deeper and deeper into Cambodia, where the role for other allied forces would be minimal and where they think they have a better chance of defeating their enemy, especially if the latter should be foolish enough to take over the territorial defense of an extensive part of the neighboring country.

For students of Vo Nguyen Giap's strategy and tactics, the current military developments in Cambodia present little or any novelty. The top Communist military commander in Indochina had done something similar in past campaigns. By throwing whatever troops he had at his disposal in 1953 against townships in the Thai country and Laos, he succeeded in holding tens of thousands of French troops in enormous traps, thereby reducing to nil the newly acquired mobility of General Henri Navarre's troops. Dien-bien-phu was to be only the final blow to an overextended French expeditionary corps.

The men from Hanoi, once again, apparently think they can induce South Vietnamese generals into committing the mistake made by Navarre. If Saigon should take over the leading role in the defense of Cambodia, its armies will risk being trapped or bogged down. The Communists will then return to the pacified areas of South Viet-Nam the way they reentered the Red River Delta in 1953-54 and mount a scenario reminiscent of what they did 16 years ago to reduce the French government to suing for peace.

TRAPPER'S TRAP

South Vietnamese leaders, it must be said to their credit, fully realize the dangers of getting too deeply involved in neighboring Cambodia. The dozens of military pushes into Cambodia, for all the publicity they receive abroad, are essentially short-term campaigns designed to consolidate political and military achievements on this side of the border. Even such assaults as those against Takeo and Kompong Speu and possibly such other attacks as the Vietnamese may be called upon to mount against Communist units deep inside the Cambodian hinterland are not necessarily deviations from the general strategy of Saigon.

Indeed, so long as Saigon uses its troops as strike forces with no territorial duties, they simply cannot be trapped or bogged down. And if the new Cambodian administration should be able to live through the next few difficult months, a new alliance will certainly emerge from the new conditions in Southern Indochina, possibly resulting in the creation of an immense politico-military trap for the Communist trapper himself.

CAMPAIGN STRATEGY IN SOUTH VIETNAM—MANIPULATE THE BALLOT BOX

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, all of us who run for public office are faced with a number of basic decisions we must make regarding the conduct of our campaigns. Should we emphasize newspaper, radio, or television advertising? Should we attack our opponent or ignore him? Should we concentrate on economic issues, the war, or the environment?

In one of the world's other great democracies, the Republic of South Vietnam for which 50,000 Americans have given their lives, those who run for office must also make decisions on the best way to campaign. The tactics employed

by the incumbents are of particular interest to the student of electoral politics.

In 1967 the Thieu-Ky government's campaign strategy consisted primarily of disqualifying every other candidate who had a chance of winning. But now it seems from a recent New York Times article that the government realizes true democracy involves allowing the opposition to run for office.

So the Government's current electioneering places heavy emphasis on ballot-box stuffing, combined with the use of soldiers to advise the peasants on which candidate to choose. In the province discussed in the article, however, these tactics proved insufficient. But the military-appointed province chief rose nobly to the occasion—he simply threw out the vote totals and substituted his own figures.

The object of the exercise was, the province chief said, to prevent the Buddhists from gaining a majority in the provincial council, since they were "pro-neutralist, and a victory on a national scale might provoke enraged army officers into a coup."

Since the population of South Vietnam is 85 percent Buddhist, this might be said to create something of a problem. But we can be confident that General Thieu who is, we are told, one of the world's four or five best politicians, will continue to display the resourcefulness he has demonstrated in past crises.

I include the article entitled "Vote-Rigging Dismays a Vietnam Province," from the New York Times of July 15, 1970, in the RECORD at this point:

VOTE-RIGGING DISMAYS A VIETNAM PROVINCE

(By Takashi Okal)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, July 14—A case of flagrant vote-rigging has discouraged officials and reinforced the cynicism of villagers in a small province along South Vietnam's coastline.

The province cannot be identified because the officials, the candidates and the villagers who told of the incident fear reprisals from the province chief, a military officer on active duty, appointed, like all his colleagues, directly by Saigon.

On June 28, South Vietnam held elections for provincial and municipal councils. The elections were hailed in Government statements as another step in the official policy of decentralization, giving local bodies progressively larger responsibilities. News media considered the elections a useful test of voter sentiment before the more important elections this year and next year for the Senate, the lower house, and the presidency. American observers felt that by bringing out the vote, especially in rural areas, Saigon could demonstrate its control over the countryside in the face of Communist intimidation and disruption.

A 75-PERCENT TURNOUT REPORTED

Nation wide, many American observers considered the elections a success. Out of 6,113,286 eligible, 75.9 per cent voted, according to official statistics. The voting seemed to be reasonably honest, American and other observers said. Communist efforts to disrupt the process were judged, on the whole, to have failed. But in the Province of A—girdled by mountains and looking out in the blue South China Sea, June 28 and its aftermath were bitterly disillusioning, not only for many voters but also for officials forced to change vote totals.

Information on the vote-changing was provided by local leaders of the Vietnam

Quoc Dan Dang one of South Vietnam's oldest political parties, by villagers who voted, by candidates and by certain officials.

As a result of the vote-rigging, these informants said, two of four Buddhists elected to the seven-man provincial council lost their seats to two candidates favored by the province chief.

Since one of these two candidates is a Roman Catholic, and since Catholics hold three other seats on the council, the vote-rigging transformed a Buddhist majority into a Catholic majority. Several Catholic priests and laymen are deeply disturbed over the change, which they fear could lead to a new upsurge of political enmity between Buddhists and Catholics.

Informants said that the day before the election, the province chief called in his civil and military assistants and told them that it was essential to keep Buddhists from a majority in the provincial council. The Buddhists, the province chief reportedly said, were proneutralist, and a victory on a national scale might provoke enraged army officers into a coup. To avoid this, the province chief reportedly said, the officials must see to it that the Buddhists were denied a majority.

The province chief reportedly then told his assistants, who were in charge of the province's 51 polling stations, to increase totals for acceptable candidates by 10 per cent by stuffing the ballot box from time to time, for example during the noon hour when few people come to the polls.

Under South Vietnam's voting system, for each candidate there is a slip of paper bearing the candidate's symbol—a lotus, for example, or a candle, a buffalo or an elephant. Since A—Province had 29 candidates, a voter received 29 slips of paper and an envelope. Inside a curtained booth, he chose seven slips, put them into the envelope, and dropped the envelope into the ballot box. The other slips were discarded.

To many voters, the names of the individual candidates were meaningless. Many voters did not bother to attend campaign meetings, and many of those that did complained that all candidates promised the same things.

"Candidates, are like birds without feathers," one village voter said. "We, the voters, give a candidate his feathers—each vote being another feather. When he has enough feathers, off he flies—and we never see him again."

A number of voters, especially older people and housewives, simply ask election officials to pick candidates for them—which the officials are happy to do. As one district chief, a colonel, commented: "You journalists make things so complicated. Elections are really quite simple. You can't expect most voters to know who is good and who is bad. Either they don't bother to come and vote, or else they choose their candidates at random. Far better to let us choose the candidates for them."

The province in question is not atypical in South Vietnam and the tampering was generally discreet and, so officials who participated said, confined to 10 per cent of the total vote. Votes were not taken away from any candidate; they were added to those the province chief favored.

Each candidate is permitted to send an observer to watch the voting. In one hamlet, fairly early in the day, an observer, a woman teacher 19 years old, noticed an official slipping something under the table. She challenged the official, and found an envelope of seven slips. The official had evidently been waiting to slip the envelope into the ballot box.

REPORT ON INCIDENT

The teacher demanded that the official in charge of the polling station make a written report on what has happened. This was done.

At the end of the day, the count began, in the presence of the observers. The work was finished about 8:30 P.M. and the officials left, after the hamlet chief and the observers had signed the written report, which included both the totals and an account of the day, including the stuffed envelope.

Back at province headquarters, as officials from the various polling stations began to add their totals, they found that four out of the seven candidates elected were Buddhists, and that two candidates particularly favored by the province chief were trailing so badly that a 10 per cent shift of votes would be insufficient to elect them.

The province chief insisted that two of the four Buddhist candidates be eliminated, to accommodate his two candidates. The president of the election commission, a youthful judge from a neighboring province adamantly opposed this, in the presence of other officials present. The judge said that it was better to declare the whole election invalid than to try to eliminate two elected candidates.

Finally, the account went, the province chief won out. Officials who had been in charge of four or five key polling stations were ordered to go wake up the hamlet chiefs and get them to sign new reports.

NEW FORMS SIGNED

One hamlet chief reluctantly admitted that this had, in fact, happened to him. He had been routed out of bed at 5 o'clock in the morning, during the curfew, when no villagers are supposed to be about except soldiers on patrol. He was told there had been several mistakes of form in the report he had signed and he was asked to sign a new report. Trained through long years to do as he was told, he said, he signed "four or five new official forms." The forms were blank he said.

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the so-called generation gap has resulted chiefly from a communications breakdown between the youth of America and their elders. It is for this reason that the commencement address, delivered by President Charles E. Perry of the Florida International University, to the graduating class of Broward Junior College on April 30, 1970, is particularly relevant.

President Perry has gained a valuable insight into this question by simultaneously having the responsibilities of a college president and being a member of the "younger generation" in age. I recommend this speech to both young and old as a clear, enlightened, and honest appraisal of this misunderstood problem:

TELL IT LIKE IT IS

(By Charles E. Perry)

President Adams, members of the faculty, distinguished guest, ladies and gentlemen of the Broward Junior College Class of 1970.

I am not going to deliver the typical commencement speech tonight; the kind of speech which applauds you, the members of the graduating class, for the splendid job you have done in getting this far in your academic career; or the kind which discusses how you have overcome hardships and made sacrifices; or how you are going to go on to bigger and greater accomplishments—even though all of these things are true.

I am also not going to give you the traditional commencement address which points out how you will be the leaders of tomorrow,

and that overnight you will become a highly paid corporation executive, a successful professional, a top government official, or even a college president.

And I am not going to tell you that life is pleasant and bright, and that once you have the A.A. or A.S. degree in your hand, the world and a high paying job are yours for the asking.

In addition, I am not going to use this special occasion in your life for an oratorical workout to show you how "cool" I am with words. Motherhood, apple pie, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and even Babe Ruth will be pushed aside this evening, although they all had their place in traditional commencement speeches.

No, I am not going to talk about these things tonight, because I am going to tell it like it is.

Tell it like it is. This has become a notable phrase in our modern-day language, signifying honesty and candor, but often used to the point of being meaningless. Yet, I wonder, if we had been willing to tell it like it is a long time ago, and had come to grips with the real priorities in our national life, would we not now be so deeply enmeshed in the problems confronting us today?

In fact, if we dare be so bold to tell it like it is, it could result in some unprecedented soul-searching among young Americans who find themselves inheriting a world they did not make, but in which they must live.

Telling it like it is may be very frightening to many older Americans. They see not only questioning and dissent, they see rejection, they see rebellion and, ultimately, they see the possibility of revolution. And it frightens them.

But it also frightens many young Americans because they don't understand why the "over 30" generation is not more concerned about the problems facing this nation of ours. And in a nation that is united by allegiance and by a shared heritage, it is not a hopeful symptom for the future when the old fear the young, when the suburbs fear the cities, when Americans of one color distrust Americans of another color and when votes are cast not thoughtfully, but in fear or in anger.

Accelerating change in this nation is producing a great many new problems and aggravating old ones, leaving nothing untouched, aside from your own personal concerns about just plain living, the changes related to the precarious balance of nations between war and peace—particularly in Southeast Asia, inflation and the high cost of living, the need for more and better jobs, the pollution of our environment, the increasing alienation of our people (young and old alike), the problems of racial injustice, and the darkening shadows of national poverty—face all of us today.

You can say that you did not cause these things—and you will be right. Most of you are not old enough to have to take that kind of blame, but, young as you are, you are now allowed to be full participants in this society of ours. This didn't used to be so. I guess I, myself, am a good example of the new era.

At the age of 32, I was selected to be the first president of the new state university to serve Dade and Broward counties. It is a great honor—and an even greater responsibility. But my point is that it would have been unthinkable to have given someone of my youth this responsibility and authority a few short years ago.

Like all the things we deal with, this change in attitude has two sides to it. It means greater opportunity and a far more significant status in society for people of your age and my age. But it also means the imposition of much greater responsibility at a very early state of adult life.

I don't mean just income or job responsibility. I mean the responsibilities of citizen-

ship. The responsibility for making the kind of choices every adult constantly faces in a free society. When leaders were in their 40's and 50's and 60's, young people in their 20's were considered to be babes in arms. They were not expected to be very responsible in terms of citizenship—and they weren't usually given much of an opportunity to show they could be responsible citizens.

But now that has changed—and I think it has changed for the better. There is no reason whatever—and really there never was—why people of your age and my age could not take and handle this kind of responsibility. We have shown we could in one continuing situation throughout history—and that is in war. Now we have both the opportunity and the obligation to show we can do as much in peace . . . if that condition ever comes to this "war-weary" nation of ours.

What does what I've said so far really mean? How does it affect you and the things you do?

First of all, it means you have to understand the kind of world you are living in. It is no good just being "against" the world or the conditions in it. It has never been very different. It has never been kind or friendly or very peaceful. And this world has only made the bits and pieces of progress we call freedom at the expense of enormous human effort.

That human effort was made not by chance—but by choice. It was exerted by people just like you and me who lived with the belief and the conviction that things could be made better and that they could, in some small way, help achieve that condition. You have the same opportunity; that is, if you choose to take it.

I don't mean being concerned or being dedicated on a short-term basis. That's easy. The tough thing is to be concerned and dedicated all the time, even when your own personal and family demands are increasing or when there is a great desire to say, "the hell with it, let someone else worry about it for awhile."

My friends, there is no someone else. There is only you. No one will pick up the torch you put down. It will just go out and there will be that much less light and that much less fire and that much less effort to make of this world. A slightly better and somewhat more liveable place than it is today.

There are so very many ways of turning your back on the problems of your world. You can become involved in study. You can be concerned only about your own job. You can get immersed in the details of living. You can do all this and still complain, but who will "take up the battle?" Who will be concerned enough to do something about prejudice, about quality education, about justice and equal opportunity, about drug abuse, about inflation, about pollution, on our streets? *You can*, or you can just about the ghetto, about war and about crime give up.

You can take the position that nothing any of us can do will make the slightest bit of difference. And so you will no longer try. You will say you are a good and a fine person—but since the bad and the evil ones outnumber you, you are resigning from the team.

There is really no end to the excuses and, in time, you will see them all used. But I hope you will not yield. I hope you will not use them. I want you to stay just as concerned and just as dedicated as most of you are now. I want you to keep on questioning, to keep on being dissatisfied.

There are solutions to all the problems we face: but it's going to take an enormous and a sustained effort to find them. It's going to take some pretty blind faith and lot of brainpower. And it's going to take a "deep down gut belief" that things in America don't have to be the way they are.

We need to examine our nation's institution—the government, the educational system, the business establishment and so on—but we need much, much more to examine our personal priorities. Institutions are impersonal. They do nothing on their own, much as we may like to think they cause the evils that beset us. It is people who activate institutions. And it is people—people like you and me—who can change them, who can make them responsive.

All of us are aware of what has happened on American campuses since 1960. In the past decade, students have achieved greater personal freedom than in the prior half century. The doctrine of *in loco parentis*, for example, is almost gone. Parental rules governing campus activities are fast disappearing. And this is a result of the fact that students no longer want to be treated like children. They want to be treated like adults, and with that they must be willing to take on certain responsibilities. And in most cases, students have been very capable in assuming this new burden.

The 1960's also included much needed reforms in American higher education and I hope more will come, one of the changes that will greatly assist the learning experience is centered around the concept of giving students a major role in all university programs—from curriculum planning, to governance, to evaluation of programs and professors.

In addition, students are now turning their attention to problems off the campus, their concern about the "real world" will have a tremendous positive effect on the future programs of the nation's colleges and universities. The days when the institutions of higher education can divorce themselves from the problems of our society are over.

For example, last Wednesday, Earth Day, I spoke to an audience in Miami on the role of the urban university in the fight to improve our urban environment. Many activities were held to draw attention to how we are mistreating our environment, and Earth Day turned out to be fairly successful in that regard. But more needs to be done and one day's effort is certainly not going to be enough. Every day is really Earth Day, and I urge you to continue to be concerned about "Planet Earth."

But I hope that your concern for the environment is not based upon the fact that it's "in vogue" to talk about ecology these days. In fact, there are people making speeches now on this subject that did not even know the definition of ecology six months ago.

And I hope that you will not take the easy way out by blaming business and industry for all the problems of pollution and our environment. They have been the "scapegoat" for many attacks, but we must all share the responsibility for these vast problems and we must all work together—education, business, government and private citizens—to solve these complex problems facing our nation.

In addition, I hope that you will not forget that it was the black man that first started to "talk about" the problems of the environment. He was the first to complain about the stench of the ghetto, the lack of clean air and water, and the almost unbearable sanitary conditions that he lived in. But the black man's voice was not heard . . . or if heard, it was not listened to with much sincerity or desire to do something about it.

So, let's not "cop-out" by using the now fashionable jargon of ecology and forget some of the basic problems still facing Americans of all colors . . . whether those are problems related to education, to housing, to transportation, to better and more jobs, and so on.

There are lots of ways to help solve these problems—lots of ways to become involved

in the many problems of society and most all of them will show results. Ladies and gentleman of the class of 1970, working to change our nation is a tough job, but by being involved together—businessman, teacher, government worker and citizen—it can be done!

One of the major ways to get involved is to be concerned about government and politics. A lot of people in this nation act as if politics is something "dirty." But in a free society, the political process is government, and the way to affect government or to make government responsive to the needs of society is to become involved in politics.

There will probably be on the ballot in November a constitutional amendment to give 18-year olds the right to vote in Florida. *I'm all for it.* But where 18-year olds have been given the right to vote, not too many of them use it. In fact, I'm disappointed to tell you that the percentage of voters under 30 who have used their right to vote is far below those voters over 30. That is not just non-involvement, that is a total refusal to use the most precious right that you and I have in this free nation of ours.

The day you have the privilege of voting, register to vote. Pick a party, or, if you don't like parties, pick a candidate. And then go to work for him. Every candidate needs all the help he or she can get, and none can get elected without it. If you want to be involved and see change, get out and work for it!

And when the election is over, don't forget about the people you elected. Keep a check on what they do, and what they don't do. And let them hear from you. No one in America—absolutely no one—has a more sensitive feedback mechanism than an elected officeholder. The problem is that they seldom hear from anyone except paid lobbyists, extremists on the far right or the far left, or from other officeholders. If they hear from you, they'll react. It's all part of the input every officeholder is constantly using, and it affects their votes in city councils, state legislatures, or the congress, and their vote in those governmental bodies affect your lives in many, many ways.

And your involvement will affect the future of Florida. You know, Florida is a wonderful place to live, to work, and to raise a family. It's a state that's among the big 10 of the 50. And it's the fastest growing of the big 10. How Florida grows and how it develops will decide how you and your children and their children will live. It will mean the difference between swimming in clean water or staying out of polluted water. It will mean good schools and good roads and good law enforcement, or bad schools, bad roads, and bad law enforcement. It will mean good jobs, or bad jobs, and possibly no jobs.

These are the kinds of choices you will be making—and, remember, if you do nothing, that is a choice too. *Negative, but still a choice.*

Tonight is a significant landmark in your lives. You will often look back to it as marking a dividing line in the time of your life. I hope you will also look back on it as marking a dividing line in the *tone* of your life. I want the tone of your life to reflect your involvement and dedication. Will you be a lifter or a leaner? A creator or a conformist? A driver or a drifter? These choices are yours, but, remember, the old biblical phrase: "As a man thinks . . . so he is."

In closing, let me say that it is not nearly as difficult for me to tell it like it is, as it will be for you to get involved and to stay involved tomorrow, the next day, and all the days that follow. Whether you agree or disagree, are for or against, is not half as important as being involved and taking a stand. This state and this nation are not finished. They are still being shaped and moulded. Don't let anyone—and don't let yourself—through non-involvement—deprive you of

the right . . . not just the chance, *but the right* to place your imprint on the America that you will leave to a new generation.

MERCURY CONTAMINATION—ADMINISTRATION'S ACTION—PAPER OR REAL

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine on May 4, 1970, reported:

Last week Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel ordered Federal investigation of all discharges into the Great Lakes' U.S. waters . . . As for mercury, Hickel will stop all lake-side discharges if Governors of the affected states ask him to do so.

Time indicated the action was taken because the suspected ultimate poison methyl mercury constituted a clear threat to human health. Two months later, mercury residues have been found in fish and water in 20 or more States. As a result, last week, it was reported in the press, Secretary Hickel had now sent telegrams to the Governors of the effected States urging them to take strong action against plants which dump mercury into waterways. He further stated that if the Governors did not take action and that if the industrial plants did not stop dumping mercury that he would take action by asking the Justice Department to file suit. The drastic step proposed by Secretary Hickel amounts to public notice that he will not necessarily wait for the Governors to ask him to act before he carries out the water contamination responsibilities of his office which do not require him to ask prior permission of the Governors.

However, the Justice Department a few days prior to Mr. Hickel's statement indicated that it would file suit if requested by the Federal Water Quality Administration, of the Department of Interior, but that it would not file suits under the 1899 Refuse Act against pollution of navigable waters with refuse. Justice contends that it would use the 1899 act against "accidental and infrequent" pollution, however, the Federal Water Quality Administration must handle the mercury situation, because it is purposeful, continuing, and certainly frequent. A day to day dumping by an industrial plant is to be ignored under the strong 1899 Refuse Act by the Justice Department's guidelines to its attorney.

The actions of the Departments of Interior and Justice appear to be too late, too little, and paper thin and considerably less than their mandated responsibilities. We do not need new laws. We need responsible leadership. The mercury contamination problem warrants congressional hearing and I shall seek such a hearing.

UNJUSTIFIED CRITICISM OF PRESIDENT NIXON

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the unjustified criticism of President Nixon by an official of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored

People has drawn an appropriate response from a Negro leader in Michigan, Ulysses W. Boykin. Mr. Boykin's comments were carried by the Michigan Chronicle in its July 18, 1970, edition. I include this news item at this point in the RECORD:

UNJUSTIFIED CRITICISM OF PRESIDENT NIXON

Uly Boykin, president of Urban Community Consultants Inc., black Detroit-based management consulting, research and economic development firm, last week blasted back at black leaders who maintain President Nixon is insensitive to needs and problems of minorities. Quoth Uly: "These critics are blind to the good the President has done. Such (unfounded) criticism is destroying public confidence in the executive branch of the government because of mistakes in policy committed by Democratic presidents who preceded him (Nixon) . . . What does Mr. Nixon have to do to convince my fellow blacks that they have never had a better friend in the White House. He has appointed more blacks to responsible positions, he has made more funds available to black minority business ventures, and he has made good on every promise—a record no other president can match."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KEE of West Virginia (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the 21st of July, on account of official business.

To Mr. ADAMS of Washington, for July 23 to July 27, 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. SCHMITZ), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. BUSH, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, today, for 10 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MAHON to revise and extend remarks to be made today and to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa to include extraneous matter in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. YATES and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COHELAN and to include extraneous matter during his remarks in the Committee of the Whole on H.R. 18515.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHMITZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KYL.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. BEALL of Maryland.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.

Mr. SNYDER.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. MINSHALL in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in two instances.

Mr. COLLINS in five instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. FOREMAN.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WHALEN.

Mr. PELL.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RIVERS.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. HANNA in five instances.

Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. KYROS.

Mr. MARSH.

Mr. DIGGS in three instances.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey.

Mr. ROBINO in three instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table, and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2104. An act for the relief of Milton Kyhos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 417. An act 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;

S. 778. An act to amend the 1964 amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act;

S. 885. An act to authorize the preparation of a roll of persons whose ancestors were members of the Confederate Tribes of Weas, Plankashaws, Peorias, and Kaskaskias, merged under the Treaty of May 30, 1854 (10 Stat. 1082), and to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission Dockets numbered 314, amended, 314-E and 65, and for other purposes; and

S. 3685. An act to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly

(at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 22, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speakers' table and referred as follows:

2226. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report on disbursements to small business investment companies during June 1970, pursuant to section 301 of title III of Public Law 91-151; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2227. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2228. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for financing the economic development of Indians and Indian organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2229. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2230. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate the importation, manufacture, distribution, storage, and possession of explosives, blasting agents, and detonators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2231. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated April 17, 1969, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Six Runs River, N.C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted August 16, 1950. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvement has been approved for accomplishment by the Chief of Engineers under the provisions of Section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

2232. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 24, 1969, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted April 11, 1946, and in response to an item in section 11 of the Flood Control Act approved July 24, 1946. No authorization by Congress is recommended as the desired improvements essentially have been provided under other authorizations; to the Committee on Public Works.

2233. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated November 18, 1969, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on the Inland Route, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted February 24, 1960; to the Committee on Public Works.

2234. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the first annual report on services to families receiving aid to families with dependent children, pursuant to section 402(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee Ways and Means.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2235. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on potential savings by centralized control of overseas air passenger transportation; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 15560. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, Rodenticide Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 135-135k), to prohibit the importation of certain agricultural commodities to which economic poisons have been applied, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 17619 (Rept. No. 91-1321). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POAGE (for himself and Mr. BELCHER):

H.R. 18546. A bill to establish improved programs for the benefit of producers and consumers of dairy products, wool, wheat, feed grains, cotton, and other commodities, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 18547. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the apprehension, restraint, removal, and delivery of certain persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 18548. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to subject certain nationals or citizens of the United States to the jurisdiction of the U.S. district courts for their crimes committed outside the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 18549. A bill to amend sections 902(b) and 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the 50-percent requirement to 10 percent between first and second levels and to include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 10-percent test is met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 18550. A bill to amend the act of June 10, 1938, relating to the participation of the United States in the International Criminal Police Organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 18551. A bill to provide for the establishment of the George Washington Memorial Institute for the Social Sciences; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 18552. A bill to amend section 13 of title 17, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 18553. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to extend by 1 year the period in which guarantee and insurance entitlement may be used by World War II veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 18554. A bill to amend section 8 of the act approved March 4, 1913, (37 Stat. 974), as amended, to standardize procedures for the testing of utility meters; to add a penalty provision in order to enable certification under section 5(a) of the Natural Gas Pipeline Safety Act of 1968, and to authorize cooperative action with State and Federal regulatory bodies on matters of joint interest; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. MAY (for herself, Mr. McCURE, and Mr. HANSEN of Idaho):

H.R. 18555. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to permit sharing the cost of agriculture-related pollution prevention and abatement measures; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OBEY:

H.R. 18556. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for class actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 18557. A bill to authorize the President to restore and maintain the military balance in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 18558. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide refunds in the case of certain uses of tread rubber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 18559. A bill to establish a Department of Education and Manpower; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 18560. A bill to amend section 8c(6) (I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit projects for paid advertising under marketing orders applicable to lettuce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 18561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the continuation of the investment tax credit for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 18562. A bill to reorganize the government of the District of Columbia by the establishment of a Board of Governors to replace the Commissioner of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 18563. A bill to deem service with the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico as service with an executive agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. BETTS):

H.R. 18564. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on olives packed in certain airtight containers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 18565. 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. FALLON (for himself, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. KEE,

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. FISHER, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr.

FOREMAN, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 18566. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the duties on stainless steel sheets and on articles made from such sheets, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 18567. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance financed in whole for low-income groups, through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits, and to provide a system of peer review of utilization, charges and quality of medical service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (for himself (by request) and Mr. DAWSON, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. FRASER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. KYROS, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. SPRINGER, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. WINN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. HALL, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. HORTON):

H.R. 18568. A bill to provide support for the health manpower needs in the medical and dental educational programs for private nonprofit medical and dental schools in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 18569. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure that U.S. requirements for low-cost energy will be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. McCURE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. WOLD, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. ASPINALL, and Mr. HALEY):

H.R. 18570. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 18571. A bill to provide for financing the economic development of Indians and Indian organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 18572. A bill to amend certain laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. AYRES, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BOW, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MACGREGOR, Mr. MCCLODY, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. POFF, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. WIGGINS):

H.R. 18573. A bill to regulate the importation, manufacture, distribution, storage, and possession of explosives, blasting agents and detonators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.J. Res. 1318. 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. DENNEY:

H.J. Res. 1319. 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. GROVER:

H.J. Res. 1320. 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. SYMINGTON:

H. Con. Res. 690. Concurrent resolution relating to treatment and exchange of military and civilian prisoners in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Res. 1152. Resolution providing for printing additional copies of House Report 91-1319; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Res. 1153. Resolution urging withdrawal

of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

H. Res. 1154. Resolution urging withdrawal of Russian personnel from the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H.R. 18574. A bill for the relief of Miss Maria Fedelia Martinez Hernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 18575. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Balzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 18576. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Crescencia Lyra Serna and her minor children, Maria Minde Fe Serna, Sally Garoza Serna, Gonzalo Garoza Serna, and James

Garoza Serna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

428. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Pyramid Lake natural resources, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

550. Mr. PHILBIN presented a petition of the Newton, Mass., Board of Aldermen, calling for a reaffirmed U.S. commitment to a lasting peace between the Arab States and Israel arrived at by direct negotiation and by recognition by the Arab States of sovereignty of the State of Israel, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

YOU DARE NOT FAIL—ADDRESS

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 21, 1970

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, one of Kentucky's outstanding citizens in the field of industrial development is also one of our State's most devoted friends of education. He is Mr. Rexford S. Blazer, chairman of the board of Ashland Oil, Inc. In a recent commencement address entitled "You Dare Not Fail—You Must Succeed," delivered at Union College, Barbourville, Ky., Mr. Blazer voiced some challenging statements about some of the assumptions many people have made in connection with the present generation of college students. Mr. Blazer, who points out that Socrates and Cato and other ancients were dealing with the youth problem long ago, discusses some of what he calls the divisive myths and slogans such as the generation gap and the establishment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Blazer's address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU DARE NOT FAIL—YOU MUST SUCCEED

(By Rexford S. Blazer)

It has been more than thirteen years since I enjoyed the privilege of visiting this campus on Senior Day to talk with high school students who had been invited to be the guests of Union College on that occasion. At that time I emphasized my feeling that the Commonwealth of Kentucky has many reasons to be proud of Union College; its scholastic standards are notable and many of its graduates have become leaders in Kentucky and throughout the nation.

And I mentioned that even though such occasions as Senior Day and Commencement are primarily for the purpose of honoring students, it is often true that the members of the older generation benefit most from such occasions. For us, there is the very real pleasure and inspiration derived from association with attractive, ambitious young men and

women at the threshold of a future bright with promise.

There is, of course, the temptation of an older person to lecture the young. This consideration imposes a duty upon me not to be impossibly boring and long-winded—for I realize that brevity is almost always a virtue. When I was last here I told the story of an uncle who took his six-year-old nephew to church. After the service, uncle said, "And how did you like it, Johnny?" To which his nephew replied, "I liked the music but the commercial was too long." So I'll try to keep the commercial within reasonable balance.

Nevertheless my position on this Sunday afternoon affords me a rare opportunity to congratulate you, your parents and your instructors on this moment of high accomplishment in which each of you has played an important part.

It is good to be invited back to Union College and to see the physical evidence of the great progress which has occurred here during the intervening years. Were this a less formal occasion, I would prefer that we found a comfortable, quiet place and simply sat down and talked. Each of us might profit and our exchange of ideas would be stimulating—at least to me. At heart, I am still a student myself and experience has continued to teach me that what I don't know far exceeds what I think I know.

Within the hour you graduating seniors will make the transition from students to alumni—and the beginning of a new journey toward horizons not yet visible. I wish only that I could make the trip with you and that we could return thirty years hence to ask where we had been, what we had learned, and what had been accomplished.

Although my wish will not be granted, ancient tradition requires that today I issue the charge and endeavor to point a course. I well remember my grandfather's words when I was preparing to leave the University of Illinois in 1928 to hitchhike several hundred miles, first to Kentucky and then to Cleveland, in search of a job. "Many people will offer you advice," he said. "The art is choosing your counselors wisely."

For today I have been chosen as your counselor. Whether this was a wise choice will be for you to judge. One thing is certain: I am honored by the opportunity you have given me.

As a Kentuckian and a senior officer of Kentucky's largest home-based industrial firm, I have strong personal feeling of our Kentucky colleges and universities which are doing such an outstanding job under condi-

tions which are often trying, worrisome and discouraging. I am a serious worker in behalf of my alma mater, the University of Illinois, and of Mrs. Blazer's alma mater, the University of Kentucky; and with great satisfaction I serve as Regent of The University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee. Mrs. Blazer is a Trustee of the University of Kentucky—only the second woman to ever serve in that capacity—and she served for four years as Vice Chairman of the Governor's Commission on Higher Education in Kentucky. Additionally, she has given leadership and has worked hard in Kentucky and at the national level to bring Educational Television into our homes. So education is of profound interest to our family. Events occurring in recent weeks on college and university campuses across the nation have brought real sadness to our hearts and are to us a matter of deep personal concern.

Commencement addresses at colleges and universities in recent years have become repetitive in theme: Speaker after speaker, from government and education and business, has dwelt on the theme of law and order. Their conclusions have also been practically identical: "Freedom perishes unless law and order prevail." All responsible political segments agree on this thesis—they know that freedom is not free! These are, of course, fundamental truths for any organized society, but it is a mistake to oversimplify. The last resort, as Justice Holmes once observed, for the preservation of social order is the policeman's club. But it must be the last resort. Riots and civil disorder will rarely occur where the citizens are in basic accord on fundamental values. But a democratic society is in danger when there is profound disagreement on its underlying assumptions—what might be called its constitutional axioms. Thus, the effort of responsible citizens must be toward accord on the deep issues arrived at through persuasion and reasoned discussion, not through force and violence.

It's essential also in order to preserve our freedoms that we resist the efforts of forces designed to divide us—and having divided us, to exploit us and, eventually, to conquer us. One of the most diabolic of all the techniques of discord is the repeated insistence on "The Generation Gap." Frankly, I don't know where the Generation Gap occurs. Is it after high school? After college? After age 30? Or is the trick of this illusion that it automatically compels the listener—any listener—to identify himself as either young or old, committing him to take sides in a