

before the Senate it has no status and that it is the property of anyone in the Senate to call it up if he wishes to do so—the implication was made, on and off the floor, that the Senator from Colorado had somehow done something underhanded in trying to give the Senate a chance to vote on this very, very important amendment—an amendment that has been very divisive in the life of our country.

I now ask the Presiding Officer whether he will inquire of the Parliamentarian if the substance of what I have just said concerning the status of an amendment at the desk is true or untrue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Cook). The Parliamentarian assures the Chair that the remarks of the senior Senator from Colorado are correct: that once an amendment is presented to a bill and it is printed, to lie on the table, it is the prerogative of any Member of the Senate to call that amendment up; and the senior Senator from Colorado is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have the floor, but I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is that the usual procedure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not sure that that is a proper question to be directed to the Parliamentarian.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say that I do not think that is the proper procedure, that the rest of the Senators usually recognize the priority which the introducer of the amendment usually has; and I am sure the Senator from Colorado would agree with that thesis.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would agree with the distinguished Senator from Montana that it is not the usual procedure. But a lot of things are unusual in the U.S. Senate; and I say, frankly, that I resent having the imputation that the Senator from Colorado somehow did something

underhanded. That is the reason I asked for the reaffirmation, as to the status of any amendment at the desk, regardless of who introduces it.

Now, having said that, Mr. President, I do not know who was on the floor at that time, because I absolutely could not be here. But, I was told that I was being attacked on the Senate floor. The Senator from Rhode Island was in a very bitter and critical debate over some items in that bill. The distinguished majority leader knows what the items were. I was supporting him. One of the items, incidentally, was one in which the majority leader was greatly interested.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ALLOTT. It was impossible to leave the conference at that time. I did come to the floor. I only wish that I had a fine friend on the other side of the aisle who was present at that time who would have thought that it was wrong to say that the actions of the Senator from Colorado were crude, cynical, and political. Perhaps he had not read the dictionary recently. In that case, of course, he might not have realized the whole implication of what the words mean when they are looked up in the dictionary.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma very much for yielding to me.

Mr. BELLMON. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I hope that this colloquy on the floor of the Senate this afternoon will prove to be beneficial in future relationships among all Members.

I would point out again—this is reiteration—that we get by, not so much on the basis of our rules and regulations but on the basis of the unwritten rules and the unwritten regulations—the custom, the precedents, which have grown up and which have been tried and tested and found to be true, not only over the decades but over the years as well—and, pretty soon, it will be over the centuries.

It disturbs me when anything of this nature develops because there are no people I value more than my 99 colleagues in this body, regardless of

whether they are Democrats or Republicans. As majority leader, I know that it would be impossible for the Senate to function if the minority leader and I were not to get a certain amount of cooperation, understanding, and flexibility. That has been forthcoming. We think it keeps the Senate from becoming an anarchic institution, which it could easily become because of the tremendous powers inherent in the position of any one Senator—the newest or the oldest.

So now that this is out of the way, I want to assure my colleagues that I will be on the lookout for any future infractions and will not hesitate to publicize them; but may I say that I do not expect there will be any more infractions of this kind. Hopefully, out of this conversation and colloquy will come a better understanding of the Senate and a stronger institution as a result.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, July 24, 1970, at 11 a.m.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 23, 1970:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John G. Hurd, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

The nominations beginning Helmut Sonnenfeldt, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, and ending La Rue H. Velott, to be a consular officer of the United States of America, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 11, 1970.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, July 23, 1970

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

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

*Restore unto me the joy of Thy salvation; and uphold me with Thy free spirit.—Psalms 51:12.*

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, make Thy presence known to us throughout the hours of this day. Fill our minds with wisdom, our hearts with love, and our spirits with the desire to walk humbly in the way of Thy commandments.

We are glad that we are American citizens and that we live in this blessed land of liberty. Let no violence, no prejudice, no discord dim our vision of a free people living together harmoniously, working for peace in our world.

Bless our President, our Speaker, our Members of Congress, and all who work

under the dome of this Capitol. Bless every individual citizen that the sacred rights of a free people may be ours forever.

In the name of Him who keeps men free we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17619) entitled "An act making

appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 14, 25, 26, 33, 34, 38, 42, 53, 56, and 60 to the foregoing bill.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14705, EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1970

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14705) to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 5, 1970.)

Mr. MILLS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement at this point in view of the fact that there will be an explanation offered.

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

There was no objection.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. 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. 230]

Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Maillard
Ashley	Erlenborn	Murphy, N.Y.
Baring	Farbstein	Ottinger
Blatnik	Feighan	Patman
Brasco	Fish	Pollock
Bray	Gallagher	Powell
Brook	Gibbons	Price, Tex.
Brooks	Gilbert	Pryor, Ark.
Burke, Fla.	Gray	Quillen
Burton, Utah	Green, Pa.	Rarick
Byrne, Pa.	Hanna	Reid, N.Y.
Caffery	Hawkins	Rhodes
Celler	Hébert	Rogers, Colo.
Chisholm	Hogan	Roudebush
Clark	Hosmer	Ryan
Clay	Ichord	Scheuer
Conyers	King	Sikes
Cramer	Kirwan	Stokes
Cunningham	Koch	Stratton
Daddario	Kyros	Tunney
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Weicker
Dawson	Lukens	Wildnall
Dent	Macdonald,	Wilson, Bob
Diggs	Mass.	Wyatt
Dorn	MacGregor	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the present continuing resolution expires at the end of this month. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on any day next week to consider a joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1971.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 14705, EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1970

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) is recognized.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there were a number of points of difference between the House and the Senate versions of H.R. 14705. However, most of the differences were largely technical. Many of them were necessary in order to take care of problems arising merely from the passage of time since the House acted on the bill last year.

There were, however, several matters in conference which I believe deserve some explanation.

The first two of these relate to the broadening of the coverage under the unemployment compensation program, that is concerning the coverage of small firms and farmworkers under the unemployment compensation program.

The last two concern matters unrelated to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the coverage of small firms, the Senate deleted the provision of the House bill which amended the definition of the term "employer." Under present law an employer is defined as a person or firm that employs four or more workers in 20 weeks in any calendar year. The provision of the House bill changed the definition to include persons or firms that employ one or more workers during the 20 weeks in the calendar year, or pay wages of \$800 or more in a calendar quarter. The Senate deleted this provision from the bill, retaining the present test of four or more employees in 20 weeks.

The House provision was adopted by the conference report, with an amendment increasing the alternate tax from \$800 to \$1,500 a year. So in this instance the House prevailed on the basis very largely of the language of the House bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to farmworkers who are presently excluded from mandatory coverage under the Federal law, the Senate adopted an amendment extending coverage to persons, other than certain aliens, who work for employers who employ eight or more farmworkers in 26 weeks in a calendar year. The Senate receded on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) intends to offer a motion at the proper time to send the conference report back to the conference committee with instructions to include in the bill the language of the Senate amendment relating to the coverage of farmworkers.

Let me say at this point that the House members of your conference committee took a strong position on this issue in view of the fact that there was no provision covering agricultural labor in the version of the bill as it passed the House and because of the experience which the House members in the conference committee had gained in working upon this issue during executive sessions of the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Ways and

Means spent many, many hours attempting to agree upon a provision extending employment coverage to farmworkers. Because of the many problems the committee encountered it was unsuccessful in its attempt to adopt a workable provision.

Mr. Speaker, the peculiar nature of the agricultural labor force, which is made up of many migrant and sporadic workers, is the principal cause of most of the difficulties that the committee encountered. Serious objections relating to costs and administration presented themselves due to the makeup of the farm labor force.

Recognizing the many problems that have to be dealt with in order to extend unemployment compensation coverage to farmworkers, the conferees modified another section of the bill to provide that in conducting the research program authorized under the legislation, first attention—now, bear this in mind—first attention be given to coverage of agricultural labor under the unemployment compensation program.

Mr. Speaker, I believe—and I am referring to this requirement for a study—that this is the most prudent course of action that could be taken on this issue at the present time. Although the issue of coverage of farm employment under the unemployment compensation system has been discussed for many years, the problems relating to it have never been adequately dealt with. Even the limited data we have obtained, based on the experiences gained in those few States that have covered agricultural workers under their programs, has not been analyzed as I think it should be. I therefore feel that we should have the benefit of a concentrated study of the issue before we take legislative action to require the States to cover farm workers.

I am sure that we will learn a great deal from such a study, and that on the basis of the knowledge we gain from it we will be able to draft legislation specifically designed to cover such employment under the system in a manner that will take into account the unique nature of farm employment.

Mr. Speaker, let me interpose at this point to point out that under the Senate provision, first of all, in order for a farmer to qualify for coverage it is necessary for him to have at least eight employees working for him in each of not less than 26 weeks in that year. But those are not the only employees who would be covered when once this trigger is released. All of his employees would be covered—not just those eight—but all of them would be covered.

We had no real problem in the committee—we had no real problem in the conference—about covering those employees of the larger farm operations who are permanently or almost permanently employed by the same farm employer, but we had a great deal of difficulty in the coverage of the other sporadic employees who would come under the program as a result of a particular employer being covered.

Now, about half of your farm laborers

are employed in the State of California, and in that State the department of employment has made a study for a State legislative committee, and it is one of the very few that have been made. They point out in the study that short-term and intermittent workers play a major role in the production of California's crops and that even among the farmworkers who are firmly attached to the labor force there is chronic unemployment.

Under the California unemployment tax the farm employers are not paying fully for the benefits received by unemployed farmworkers because the tax rates do not go up as high as the benefit cost rates for such workers. Now, that means, then, that the other employers within the State under the provisions of the Senate amendment would have to pick up the tab for a substantial portion of the cost of covering these farm employees. I feel that this is highly unfair to the other employers in the State.

From information given to us by the Department of Labor in connection with our executive sessions, the benefit cost rate to provide benefits for unemployed farmworkers in California was estimated to be 9.5 percent, while the benefit cost rate for all industries in California was 2.4 percent, and bear in mind there is a top tax rate in that State of 3.7 percent permissible under the law. It would clearly appear from this that the benefit outgo in that State for farm coverage would amount to approximately \$40 million per year, whereas agricultural employers, even at the maximum permissible tax rate, would contribute only \$20 million toward that cost. Thus, other California employers would have to pick up the tab for the difference.

That is just an instance of one of the many problems that exist in this whole area where we think it is much better for us before we finally legislate to have far more information than we presently have. And that we will have, in our opinion, as a result of the study that the conference report directs shall be made.

Mr. Speaker, there is one amendment that we rejected in the conference that I am afraid—if we go back to conference—we well might have to take in order to have a bill at all.

That has to do with the amendment that was offered, which is not germane to this subject matter, but on which the Senators were most insistent in the conference. That would require the Secretary of the Treasury to issue a special type of savings bond paying—mandatorily paying—6 percent interest.

The Senate in this instance receded. But, if we go back, I am concerned very much about what might happen in conference on this amendment.

Now why am I opposed to the amendment? In the first place, the amendment will drain out of savings accounts which are largely held by your savings and loan institutions many of the deposits in those institutions because none of them that I know anything about have a rate of interest over an extended period of time of 6 percent for the duration of these savings bonds that we have in this amendment.

I think many, many people will go to the extent of taking money they have from their savings out of the savings and loan industry and deposit that money in these bonds at higher interest rates and thereby further reduce the amount of money that is in the savings and loan institutions that can be used for housing.

From what members of the Committee on Banking and Currency tell me, that industry is already in enough of a depression without adding to it by the acceptance of this type of amendment.

The second of the unrelated provisions added by the Senate amends the Securities Act of 1933 and the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide that industrial development bonds the interest on which is excluded from gross income under section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are to be exempted securities. The House receded with an amendment to exclude from the coverage of the Senate amendment bonds substantially all portions of which are to be used to provide residential real property for family units or for the acquisition or development of land sites for an industrial park, unless such bonds would qualify under section 103(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to exemption for certain small issues. The conferees did not intend to require registration of any security which is exempt from registration under existing law. Thus, the amendment will not change the exempt status under section 3(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 or section 3(a)(12) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 of bonds or other obligations issued by housing or mortgage finance agencies of States or local governments where the programs of these agencies are administered by the agency or by the State or local government.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize, if I may, the fact that the conference report we are voting upon today represents the culmination of many months of work on the part of both Houses of Congress and particularly on the part of the Committee on Ways and Means. The legislation contained in this bill was fashioned during many months of work on the part of our committee over a period which started 5 years ago. The committee first took up this legislation in 1965 when it held several weeks of hearings on what was the administration's proposal at that time. The committee went into executive session early in 1966 and rewrote that legislation, producing its own bill—H.R. 15119—which was adopted by the House and later passed by the Senate. That legislation unfortunately died in conference over the problem of Federal standards. The Senate conferees were adamant in their position that the provisions relating to Federal standards that the Senate had adopted should remain in the bill. The legislation we are now acting upon is basically the same as the 1966 bill. I might point out that the 1966 bill passed this House by a vote of 374 to 10 and the present bill passed the House on November 13, 1969, by a vote of 337 to 8.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation contained in the conference report enjoys broad support throughout the Nation. If the conference report is not adopted, it

would be a great loss to everyone concerned. The reforms contained in the bill relating to unemployment compensation coverage, the extended benefit program, judicial review, and the bill's other provisions are desired by labor, business, and the State agencies that have responsibility for administering the unemployment compensation program. I, therefore, urge my colleagues in the strongest terms possible not to jeopardize this legislation but to vote against any motion that may be made to send the conference report back to the conference committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think the conference report should be adopted. I do not think it should be returned because there is always the danger that you cannot come back with a conference report that would be satisfactory to all of us because this matter has been before the Congress now for 5 years.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman on this report.

While I have sympathy for those who do not have unemployment compensation, I have been advised that there are 62,000 workers in the State of Michigan who have exhausted their benefits and this bill is needed at once.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is referring to the extended benefit provision of the bill, which we worked out?

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. It will be of tremendous help in the event we have an increase in the amount of unemployment in the years to come.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like my distinguished chairman to tell me about the new provision added to the bill to eliminate the taxation of industrial bonds.

Mr. MILLS. It does not do that at all. That was done heretofore up to the extent of \$1 million with one alternative and \$5 million with another alternative when a city votes bonds for industrial purposes.

What this amendment does has nothing to do with taxation. It merely says when such an issue is made by a city for this specific purpose, this is not included within the requirement of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The Commission tried to find a way under the existing law to eliminate these bonds from this prolonged and tedious requirement for approval.

But, it could not do so. They said, if the Congress wanted that done, then the Congress would have to legislate. The Senate was most insistent upon this provision. You know the feeling of the House conferees about adding matters that are not related to the bill passed by the House. This is not related to it. The Senate had receded on the bond issue. The Senate was most insistent on this particular provision being included

and it has nothing to do with taxation on those bonds, I will say to my friend.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. Can the gentleman tell me if there is any Treasury loss under this new provision?

Mr. MILLS. Not at all. It has nothing to do with taxation. It merely states the fact that these particular bonds are to be registered within the commission under the Securities and Exchange Commission Act. It has nothing to do with taxation whatever. That was taken care of earlier.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas has consumed 14 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has indicated, it is my intention when the previous question has been agreed to on the conference report to move to recommit the bill to conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to agree to the Senate amendment which would provide unemployment insurance coverage of employers of farm labor who employ eight or more workers during each of 26 or more weeks a year. It has been suggested by the chairman that a good deal of the hesitancy of the membership of the Ways and Means Committee and others who entertain doubts about this proposal was occasioned by their fear that the cost of the proposal would be excessive, and there was testimony before the committee to the effect, and I quote that testimony:

If Unemployment Insurance were extended to nonseasonal farmers, costs could run from 10 to 15 percent of taxable payrolls.

That allegation was based on an experience in North Dakota. I think it is worthwhile to examine some information about that experience that was not available when this question was before the committee.

The North Dakota experience, on which this dire prophecy has been based, involved 121 farmers, that is all, and the 121 farmers altogether employed 148 workers. Not a single one of those 121 North Dakota farmers whose experience serves as the basis for this charge of excessive cost—not a single one of them would be covered by the proposal that I will make today. They were small farmers who would not be covered under this proposal. In fact, costs do not run anywhere near that high in States where we have more experience.

In Hawaii, the only State in which there is full coverage of farm workers under unemployment compensation insurance, you cannot say with exactitude what the cost has been for all of them, but among the portion of them which have chosen to be self-insured, the cost has been very low—less than 2 percent of taxable payroll.

In California, where a large number of big growers have elected coverage, the cost has been 4.5 percent of taxable pay-

roll. And a California study just a few years ago suggests that if all California farmers were covered, large and small, the cost would be less than 10 percent.

But even if we accepted this prophecy of high cost, is that a good reason to deny coverage? If the costs were going to be high, why would they be high? They would be high because unemployment is a frequent occurrence among those workers. They would be high for the same reason they are high for the construction industry: Because their workers are more apt to be unemployed. Are we going to adopt the philosophy that the only workers who ought to be covered by unemployment insurance are those who are unlikely to need such protection?

It has been suggested also that a study will be conducted to see the best way of going about this. The Department of Labor in a letter signed by the former Assistant Secretary for Manpower, Arnold Weber, who has gone over to the White House staff with the former Secretary, Mr. Shultz, has indicated in response to a question about the need for further study:

The Department felt that there was sufficient data available from earlier studies and experience to demonstrate the feasibility of coverage of large farms. And Secretary of Labor Shultz so advised the Senate Committee on Finance in his testimony on February 5, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the unemployment insurance system was enacted into law in 1935. Thirty-five years ago the farm workers were excluded from coverage. I would think that 35 years, Mr. Speaker, is a long enough time to study the problem. Perhaps what we ought to do now is to provide just a little bit of coverage, and maybe that is the way we can learn more and the proposal I make provides very little coverage indeed. Less than 2 percent of all farms in America would be affected by this proposal.

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

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

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

Could the gentleman tell us how many employees and how many farms would be affected by this? I am impressed that the gentleman is talking about farms of only very considerable size.

Mr. O'HARA. The Department of Labor has advised us that 276,000 farmworkers would be benefited by this proposal. I cannot from memory give the gentleman the number of farms, but it would be less than 2 percent of all farms.

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

Mr. O'HARA. Finally, it has been suggested, Mr. Speaker, that adoption of this change—what I am proposing is to ask the managers on the part of the House to go back to the Senate conferees and take just one more provision from their bill—would somehow endanger the entire bill. Mr. Speaker, if I thought there was the slightest danger that this proposal would endanger the passage of this bill, I would not be in the well of the House at this minute.

As the gentleman from Michigan

has pointed out, unemployment is today a very serious problem. According to the Governor of Michigan, there are 62,000 Michigan workers who are about to exhaust their unemployment benefits who need the passage of this legislation. I can assure the Members that I feel that need just as deeply as any Member of this House, and I would not make a proposal which would endanger the passage of this bill. Indeed this proposal does not do so. The Senate could hardly object to the House conferees saying we want to take one more provision of your bill that we did not take before. That could hardly endanger this proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the time has long since passed when we ought to show some indication of concern about the systematic exclusion of farmworkers from the laws that we have enacted to protect other workers in this country.

Even though the farmworker is more apt to be disabled on his job than almost any other worker, he is covered by workmen's compensation in only five States.

Even though the farmworker receives the lowest wages of any industrial worker, only some of them are covered by Federal minimum wage laws and those who are covered are covered at a rate 30 cents lower than other workers.

Even though the farmworker is engaged in hard physical labor, the child labor laws which apply to every other industry do not apply to agriculture.

Even though the farmworker is part of the economically weakest group in America, he has no legally protected right to organize and bargain collectively for himself, and a farmworker can be fired or blacklisted for union sympathies.

Even though the farmworker is more apt to be out of work than any other worker in America, he is covered by unemployment compensation only in Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

This is a modest proposal we are making here today. It is unfortunately a water-down version of the Nixon administration proposal of last year. It would cover all too few farmworkers, less than half of the total.

But it would be a beginning, Mr. Speaker, a beginning that is long overdue.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES).

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for a long time now the unemployment compensation laws of this country have been in need of revision and change. We tried to move in that direction in 1966, when we passed a bill in this House. At that time the Senate also passed a bill, but no agreement could be reached in conference, so the much needed changes went by the board.

We began the effort again last year, recognizing that some very important changes should be made in the program. Now we have reached an agreement on legislation. It passed the House by an overwhelmingly large margin—337 to 8. The Senate also passed legislation, and we went to conference on the differences.

We have worked out the differences. We come here now with a good confer-

ence report and ask this House to accept it and not endanger enactment of these needed improvements by further conflicts or controversies.

It is all well enough to say, "This is a matter that has been agreed to as a Senate amendment." But let us understand there were other changes which were made in conference, which all become opened up, if the motion to recommit with instructions is agreed to. This will not go back to conference with the conferees limited only to this area. Let us remember that.

All the differences that were ironed out—and I believe they were ironed out, so far as the House position is concerned, in a most satisfactory way—will be open again. I believe that the need for the changes we are making in this bill are so great that we should not jeopardize its enactment into law.

One of the most important changes, in addition to increasing coverage for 4.7 million workers, involved in this legislation is the provision for automatic extended unemployment compensation benefits. The chairman and I have been working for years to try to get this program written into the basic law of this Nation. This will finally have been done if we adopt this conference report today. Let us not jeopardize this goal by sending the report back to conference.

I speak to you as one who tried in the committee to make a start in the area of covering farm workers. There is no question but that this is a most serious problem. I was hopeful we could make a start and experiment with at least covering employees who are comparable to the industrial employees already covered. However, we could not arrive at a satisfactory method for doing so. I tried again in conference to arrive at a reasonable method of covering this type of farm employee.

At the conference we were unable to reach an agreement on this issue. Let me emphasize that the Senate provision for covering farm employees has many problems. Yet if you adopt this amendment to recommit, you instruct us to take verbatim the amendment that the Senate adopted. Yet the Senate amendment is not a satisfactory basis for taking this first step toward coverage of farm employees—a step that I want to take as soon as we can. As I said, I do not see any difference between a large farm operation that has eight or 10 full-time employees throughout the year, and a nonfarm business establishment with the same number of employees. Let us remember, though, that the Senate bill is much broader than that. It covers the full-time employees, but in addition, taxes the employer on a lot of employees he may have on a temporary basis that will never qualify for benefits.

I think the gentleman from Michigan should recognize the difference between the question of requiring an employer to pay a payroll tax on an employee, and the question of whether that employee is going to qualify for a benefit. In agriculture, we have a large number of individuals who work but a very short time during the year—not only a short time for any one employer but in any

employment. It is estimated that in 1968 some 70 percent of farm workers worked less than 75 days during the course of the year. They were students and others who may simply have helped out at harvest time. Additionally, 44 percent worked less than 25 days a year, and averaged about 10 days a worker during the year. You can say that you are going to cover them, but all you are doing is imposing a payroll tax on an employer for an employee who is never going to be eligible for benefits. Let us recognize that many of the employees who would be covered would never receive any benefits. Now, that is a good way to promise something and not deliver it. I believe we have to do something better than that. We cannot work out those problems today.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is appropriate to place an additional tax on an already overburdened agriculture unless we are providing a meaningful solution to the problem. I do not think that the Senate bill does that. I hope that the studies and data that will soon be available—some of them under the terms of this bill—will provide a basis for covering agricultural employees with a continuity of employment.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out another problem. The administrative problems are most difficult in covering agricultural employment, particularly with reference to the interstate movement of many workers. Our attention has been directed to the experience of the State of Hawaii. However, the State of Hawaii does not have the problem of workers moving from State to State, which involves determining which employers and what State funds will be charged for benefits, and which State law will govern the amount and duration of benefits. Those are problems that have to be worked out if this Congress is going to take sound action and exert sound judgment in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I speak to you as one who feels most sincerely that we have to make an effort to solve this problem, but I do have to say I think what happened—

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the chairman of the committee for this additional time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I think the debate this afternoon on the motion is a good thing. It points out the interest in this subject. In my opinion it gives momentum to an effort to cover our farmworkers on a sound basis. Certainly, many of them need our help and assistance. They are in a sad plight. As one who wants to do that, let me say that it would be a mistake to place this entire bill in jeopardy by sending it back to conference to accept a provision, written into the bill by the Senate, that is not in my judgment a satisfactory solution.

Mr. Speaker, if we had latitude and time, perhaps, we could work something out, but that is not what is being given us. The action recommended by the conferees requiring the Labor Department

to give priority attention to studying the problems of extending coverage to agricultural workers is the course we should now pursue.

There are other studies being made, also. Ohio State University and the University of Connecticut are making studies in cooperation with the Department of Labor on the problem of covering the farmworker under unemployment compensation.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just suggest to the gentleman, if I might, that I think the problems are not quite that difficult. The States decide, of course, who is covered and who is not covered, and we would not want to try to cover anyone who is not employed.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Not if we say agricultural workers have to be covered. They have to cover agricultural workers if we require it, just as they are going to have to cover the workers in an establishment with one or more employees in 20 weeks. The States can go further than this; but they must at least meet the requirements of Federal law.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman will yield further, we do not propose to change the work test, that is, the individual worker's test, and in California he has to have earned \$750 during the base period.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And that is why they would not get any benefits. The Senate amendment would tax the employer, but it would not do anything for this poor worker whom you and I both want to do something for.

But I do not think it is a good argument to say just because a tax is going to have to be paid on his wages that he is going to receive benefits, because he still has all the other tests to comply with.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman will yield further, I just think that of course we would not want to cover the housewife who goes out to a farm to work for a few days, or a schoolboy who goes out to work on a farm for a few days; that is not the broad coverage we are after.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. But why tax the employer, then? Why tax the employer on that person for that person's services? Why put that burden on agriculture?

Let me yield to the chairman, if I may.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further for just one moment, so that I can make just one concluding statement concerning this—and I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman on this matter, but I think if the problems were as difficult as the gentleman has described them to be here he would not have supported this proposal the way he has.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I never did support the Senate proposal. I tried in conference to develop a workable basis for achieving coverage. I opposed the Senate language and the amendment that the gentleman now wants us to be directed to accept. I opposed that. But

I did try in conference to see if we could not work out some compromise.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman did support the administration proposals, did he not?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No, I did not. No, I did not. I thought there were problems involved with the proposal, but I thought we might possibly find a proposal we could agree on. I think at one time we did come fairly close to a provision that the administration generally agreed with, and I thought it was pretty much in keeping with what I could agree to.

But if you are talking about the Senate version and about the conference, I did not support the amendment as adopted by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to attest to the fact that I remember distinctly that the gentleman from Wisconsin offered certain amendments to the administration's proposal for the inclusion of farmworkers. The gentleman did not vote to support the administration's proposal just as it was presented to us. The gentleman and I both voted for amendments to that proposal, trying to work something out.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. MILLS. Something that would cover these people who are involved here, but not all of the other people whom the gentleman from Michigan himself says he is not trying to cover, but are covered, as far as the tax is concerned.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is the important part.

Mr. MILLS. That is why we tried to emphasize why we needed some study of the language as to just how we should do this. I think that people who are fully employed and employed for this length of time should be covered, frankly, by these larger operations. I do not think that, because they are covered for these people, that now they shall be automatically taxed for everybody else who works, even if they work one day a year.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman could tell us specifically the differences in the Senate version and the version which the Committee on Ways and Means voted down, and a version which admittedly was different from the administration's, but more restrictive?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I must confess to the gentleman I would not trust my recollection now to state the differences between them. As far as I was concerned I was trying to produce something that was workable, not some-

thing that was necessarily part of the administration proposal.

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CORMAN. As I understand it, the Federal law defines "employer" and we leave it to the State law to define the length of time an employee must be employed to be a beneficiary.

I do not recall that in the Committee on Ways and Means we had legislated as to a definition of "employee." Our effort was as to the "employer" admittedly. The motion nearly carried.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will remember, we were trying to develop a formula covering employers, based on the number of employees they had for a specific time. The actual tax liability of covered employees would have been further limited by exempting wages during a quarter that fell below a specified minimum. A higher proportion of employees on whom a tax was paid would, therefore, have a chance to qualify for benefits if unemployed. Under the Senate amendment, if an employer has eight employees for 20 weeks and then they have at some point 100 more persons for 2 weeks, he would be taxed on those 100 employees who are never going to get any benefit.

Let me just conclude by saying that I think it would be an error now to jeopardize all of the work that has been involved for at least 3 years by sending this back to conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, representing a district which would probably be affected to a greater extent than almost any district in America, I rise to support the motion which will be made by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

As one who represents a very large agricultural area, and a substantial part of the largest agricultural producing State in America, I recognize that there are problems in this situation.

My particular area is under considerable attack at the present time and has been for several years in connection with farm labor. We have had peddled across this country a great deal of misinformation about the way we handle our farm labor and the wages we pay.

I may say very frankly that I, for one, vigorously opposed the boycott which has been levelled, and I think most unfairly, against a group of innocent California producers. Yet, on the other hand, for all too long I think we have swept under the rug the problem of farm workers, the people who furnish the labor to make it possible for us to be the best-fed Nation in the world.

This is a subject that I have discussed at great length for a period of a number of years with the farmers who have to pay those taxes we are talking about here this morning.

Unfortunately, the decision made by the Committee on Ways and Means at

the time that this matter was under consideration was predicated upon very poor information.

I am not being critical of the gentleman from Arkansas nor of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) because I appreciate the efforts they have both made. They have both talked to me about this and I have discussed this with other members of the Committee on Ways and Means. I appreciate the efforts that have been made.

Unfortunately, their decision was finally predicated upon, and decided upon, bad information pertaining to the State of North Dakota.

Over a period of 16 years, this is the first time I have appeared before the finance committee of the other body. I did on this occasion.

I am not sure that I had any particular influence but I do appreciate the fact that they did insert the Mondale amendment which frankly is far more restrictive as to coverage than that proposed by the Nixon administration.

So it seems to me today that after some 35 years, as has been recited by the gentleman from Michigan, there has been a lot of study in this area, a lot of thought given, and there has been experience. We have had experience in California. Frankly, the experience in California in connection with those farmers who have elected to be covered has been such as to show a far lower cost than that pertaining to the processing industries themselves. At present in my State all the processing areas are covered, the food processing plants, the packing plants, and yet, if you are familiar with them, they operate a few months in the year and they are closed down the balance of the year. Yet those people are covered.

We have shown from experience in California a lower cost for those farmers who have elected to be covered and for farmers who would fall under the provisions of this proposed amendment than the construction industry has in connection with unemployment insurance.

There are a lot of facts, there has been a lot of study given, and I just feel that it is unfair to say in connection with the farmworkers, "Well, we have got to continue to look at it, we have got to continue to study it, we have got to sweep it under the rug."

Let me say in conclusion that we are faced with a situation nationally in which we are simply going to have to recognize that these people are human beings. They are Americans. They are entitled to consideration.

We in California, of course, are faced with a serious situation today, and we have been faced with it for the last several years. I realize other areas of the country have escaped, but your time is coming. These people are entitled to some consideration. Our farmworkers are going union very rapidly. I think they have a right to bargain collectively. As the gentleman from Michigan has indicated, in most cases we have exempted them from various other laws. Now it seems to me that this tiny step should be taken, and the time has come to take

it. I just feel that the excuses that have been offered are excuses that we should no longer have to live with, and that this experience should be gone through with this very narrow coverage of less than 2 percent of the large farms in America.

As I have said, my district is covered on a per capita basis by more of these farms than any other district in America and, therefore, I urge the adoption of the O'Hara motion in order that we might move ahead to correct some of the injustices of the past.

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

Mr. SISK. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. McFALL. I wish to commend my colleague from California for his statement and for his diligent work on this issue and to say that I join him on this amendment. Our districts have the same characteristic. We are contiguous. We share the same problems, and I believe we need this unemployment insurance coverage for farmworkers.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

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

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

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today I plead with my colleagues to recommit the conference report on H.R. 14705, the unemployment compensation bill, with instructions to accept the amendment covering a token number, approximately 22 percent of farmworkers. This is a modest proposal and I use the word "plead" advisedly. I would happily deliver these remarks on my knees if that would make them more persuasive and would not offend the decorum of this august place. For I tell you there is not a single action this House could take today that would do more to alleviate human suffering in our land and to erase an ancient injustice. And there is not one argument against this action that will stand up under close scrutiny. But our action today will be scrutinized—and judged—by those who are familiar with the terrible hazards that are part and parcel of the daily lives of our farm working families, by those who are wondering whether such barnacle-encrusted institutions as this can comprehend and treat the illnesses of our society, by that sea of young people to whom we recently extended the vote. But rather than appeal to the political instincts, I would direct this plea to that which is highest and best in each of us—to our concern for our fellow men.

Perhaps my colleagues read in the Washington Post this week the story of the infant migrant child with pus draining from its ear, sucking from a bottle of sour milk. Born of migrant farmworkers, in total innocence, in the very beginning of its life, it was condemned to death or to a life of misery and incalculable hardship. In weighing the question before us, it would be well if my colleagues would keep this image in mind, the picture of the dying migrant child. In a very real sense, our society is respon-

sible, we are responsible. The child's fate is a consequence of our neglect and abuse. The migrants are the most neglected and abused group in our society, and the most impoverished.

The question now is whether to extend unemployment compensation insurance to some 275,000 farmworkers on 2 percent of the Nation's farms, whether to extend to them the same protection enjoyed by more than three-quarters of the workers in the United States.

At this moment the attention of the Nation is being focused on the plight of our migrant farmworkers, so I will not belabor you here with more descriptions of the hardships and hazards of their lives. I will use the time to answer the objections that have been raised against this measure.

First, the cost. The objection is that it would be too expensive to administer. There is no evidence the cost would be out of line with other industries where coverage is taken for granted. But that question aside, a nation that pays out \$3.2 billion annually in farm supports cannot in good conscience deny this minimum benefit to its farmworkers. In California's Central Valley last year, seven major farm corporations received an aggregate of \$14 million in farm supports. The Washington Post story referred to above pointed out that the Federal Government spent \$419,000 on migrant health services in two counties in Texas during fiscal 1967. During that same period, in the same area, the Government spent \$3,564,000 on eradication of disease in animals. In fiscal 1969, the disparity was even greater—\$564,677 for migrant health and \$5,502,000 to control animal diseases. Such shameful comparisons are plentiful. Since only 2 percent of the Nation's farms would be affected, hardship to the farmer is hardly a valid objection. The third and final objection—that the mobility of the migrant would make it difficult if not impossible for State and Federal agencies to administer the program—is equally invalid but deserves to be answered in some detail.

The popular conception of the migrant farmworker is that he is continuously on the road. That is not the case. Most migrant families travel only 4 or 5 months of the year. The remaining 7 or 8 months they maintain a permanent or semipermanent residence in their home State. Furthermore, 67 percent of all man-days of agricultural employment are attributed to regular and year-round farmworkers. Many of those who do not work full time on large commercial farms find employment in nonfarm jobs near their homes to complete their year-round employment. The migrant farm family, then, is mobile but not rootless. It seeks as much stability as its perilous occupation will allow. By extending unemployment insurance to this group the Government would enhance its stability. The long range benefits both to the farm working families and to society as a whole are obvious. By increasing their stability we would enable their children to have the same continuity in education that the children of other workers enjoy—a continuity that is essential to

scholastic success and eventual upward mobility.

Mechanization is further disrupting the migrant way of life, forcing families out of the migrant stream and into urban ghettos where, if they cannot compete successfully for the limited number of unskilled jobs available, they must go on welfare to survive. For many this marks the beginning of family demoralization and distintegration, with all of the attendant social evils of "generational dependency" and delinquency. From a social point of view, from a government point of view, from a human point of view, this is a far more expensive course than the one proposed. We can help break that pattern by extending to these farmworkers unemployment insurance. It will give them the stability all people need to better their circumstances. It will help them to become full-fledged members of a permanent community.

No occupation is more hazardous than that of the farmworker, who must often take his wife and sons and daughters into the fields to eke out enough income to survive the full year. In 1967 there were 2,700 fatal accidents and 230,000 disabling injuries in agriculture. The percentage increase in fatalities and disabling injuries in farmwork led all other industries during the past 10 years. In California, a major agricultural State, the occupational disease rate among farmworkers in 1967 was more than 50 percent higher than the next leading industry and three times higher than the average of all other industries.

But neither statistics nor rational arguments will prevail against closed minds and hearts, so once again I appeal to the humanity of my colleagues. The cost of our failure to act will quite literally be paid in human lives. The cost of our approving this action will be small compared to the benefits to farmworkers and to the larger society.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative from the only State which extends unemployment compensation to agricultural workers on a mandatory basis, I rise in support of the motion to recommit to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) with instructions to accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal is a modest one, less extensive, in fact, than what the administration itself has proposed. Only farm employers with eight or more workers each, employed for 26 or more weeks would fall under the coverage. The so-called family farm will not be included.

The major objection to this proposal is not that farmworkers do not deserve to be covered, for the virtues of farm workers have been extolled unanimously by Members of this body. It is not that the program would be difficult to administer, for the administration itself has proposed an even more extensive program. The objection is that the cost will be too high.

Let us, then, look at Hawaii's experience. Hawaii's experience shows that the cost to the farm employer has been less—I repeat—has been less than to

the nonfarm employer. In 1964, for example, it was 1 percent to the farm employer on the basis of percentage of the payroll, as compared to 1.6 percent to the nonfarm employer.

In 1965 and 1966 the figures were 1 percent for farm employment and 1.3 percent for nonfarm employment. In 1967 and 1968, for farm employment 1.1 percent of payroll, and for nonfarm employment 1.6 percent. So the experience of the only State, which for 11 years now has had mandatory unemployment compensation for agricultural workers, shows that the cost is far less in the agricultural industry than in nonagricultural industry. This, I believe, ought to dispel all fears on the part of Members who feel that this program would be too costly to be borne by farm employers.

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

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much ado made here over the fact that once the employer is covered, he is going to have to pay for employees who do not reach the coverage stage themselves, but is not the same thing true with the industrial employers today who are covered? Once they reach the coverage, they pay for all their people based on their payroll and not on how often people work. Is that not true in industry too?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman is correct. In that connection, I might point out that the law presently covers building and road construction workers, and the cost is as high as 10 percent of the total payroll, including seasonal workers. Certainly no one would suggest that coverage of these construction workers should be discontinued because of the high cost.

Even with 15,463 seasonal workers in the pineapple industry in Hawaii, the cost to the employer has been as low as 1.1 percent. This low cost experience in Hawaii's 11-year history of unemployment compensation for agricultural workers would seem to indicate that the cost of extending coverage to agricultural workers as proposed in the Senate amendment would be far less than in the construction industry. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, the agricultural worker should be granted equal consideration.

Acceptance of the Senate amendment would be a prudent but important first step toward giving equal treatment, long overdue to the agricultural worker who forms the backbone of our Nation's economy.

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

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

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

I have refreshed my memory on what was said by the gentleman from Wisconsin. There is a difference in the Senate version from that which we voted on in the committee, there was a substantial support in that committee for covering employers who employed eight employees for 26 weeks. Second, we did restrict the

people covered to those who earned at least \$750 per quarter. There would be almost no hardship to anybody with or without that limitation. Certainly it is a badly needed improvement in the field of farm labor. If we are going to be able to solve our farm labor problems in an orderly fashion, we are going to have to extend the same kind of protection to them that we do to the industrial workers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a yes vote on the O'Hara motion.

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we passed this bill, as has been said heretofore, through this House by a large majority. It was passed by the Senate and, among other things, an amendment was put in it, that was ill-conceived, which covers farmers. Certainly everybody recognizes that there are many farm laborers who, under the right kinds of conditions and after appropriate legislation has been enacted, are entitled to the same coverage as some employees of other industries. But this motion that shall be made will adopt a hodge-podge amendment put in by the Senate that will not do what its proponents think it will do and will work a tremendous hardship on the farming industry.

Mr. Speaker, we went to conference. We agreed unanimously, both the Senate and the House, on a conference report that extends coverage under our unemployment compensation system to practically 5 million more people.

In our report we ordered that the Department of Labor make an expeditious and extensive study of the proper way to cover farm labor, so that it will not be a tremendous impediment to our farmers and so that it will do something to help those farm laborers who work for long times and then are laid off from work.

I am sure that they will come forth with a sound program, and perhaps one we can live with.

In addition to that, in Connecticut a university is making a study of the same situation. Ohio University is making a study of the same situation.

I beg the Members not to go off half cocked and adopt something that all of us are going to be sorry was adopted.

Certainly, to put the farmers under unemployment compensation would cost a tremendous sum of money, close to 10 percent of payroll. I do not know anything about the situation in Hawaii. Perhaps there is plenty of work there for the farmers the year round. But that is not the testimony before us by all the State agencies. The Interstate Conference, which represents all the administrators of employment security, meets, and they adopt recommendations that Congress should enact and that the States should enact. They testified before our committee and they said that of all the propositions that were before that conference the one which was most certainly adopted was to not put farmworkers under compensation at this time until a further study was made and a sound method had been developed for putting them under it.

What would be done if we put the big farmers under it? Right off the reel, there will be a big scramble such as is going on today for farm labor. Nearly all of our farm labor has moved to industry as it is. What will happen is that there would be four or five big farmers in a little community, perhaps under it, and all the rest of the farmers, the little ones like me, would be out from under it. The little ones will have the toughest problem in the world of getting any part of that farm labor to work for us, because the other boys are going to have unemployment compensation. They are going to flock to the places where, after they work for a series of farmers for 13 weeks—and farming is the most seasonal of all occupations—they can then draw unemployment compensation for 26 weeks.

I want to reiterate again that once a farmer gets under this, under the Senate amendment, every child and every woman that he employs even for 1 day or 1 week, outside of the eight who qualified him, he is certainly going to have to pay for, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) correctly stated. He will pay a tax on them, but they cannot draw anything unless they work for him and other farmers long enough to qualify, say, for example, for 13 weeks.

The point was made that this is the same as it is in other industries. Certainly it is. But the farming industry is a very seasonal industry, whereas an industrial-type industry is not. People usually do not shut down plants during the course of a year.

But in respect to harvesting, the wheat harvest, the grape harvest, the tobacco harvest or whatever harvest one might have, it is necessary to call in a lot of extra help. They must have them at that time. They may not need them throughout the year, and they do not need them. But they will have to pay a tax on them just the same, and the workers will get no benefit.

Or, if they are able to work for a total of 13 weeks, which would probably take them through that harvest season, then what would happen? They would immediately be out of work and they would draw unemployment compensation for 26 weeks. Then they could rest for 13 weeks more, and that year would be gone. Then probably they can get another job during the harvest season to cover 13 weeks, and you go through the same rigmarole. There are a great many complications, but after we get the information we need it can be worked out. The time is not right now, until we get the benefit of these studies. If you put them under it now, it will just create chaos. The farmers cannot afford to pay the 10 percent. So what are you going to do? You will make tremendous deficit employers out of them, and you will take every little merchant and every manufacturer and everybody else now under unemployment paying taxes and you will have to go back to the States and precipitately raise those rates of unemployment tax on people who are not creating the problem in order to pay for those seasonal workers who as soon

as the harvest is over are out of work. Moreover, any State that wants to do it today can do so. They can put farmers under it. But that is different from forcing them under it. The Interstate Conference action shows that none of them wanted it. It has been tried and found wanting and will not work. I say to you it would be a mistake to do it and to run the risk of delaying this conference report when many States today are practically out of unemployment compensation. We do have a triggering device for extended benefits in here that will be badly needed, if it is not needed now, in many instances.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am voting today to recommit H.R. 14705, the unemployment compensation conference report, with instructions to extend coverage to farmworkers.

The unemployment insurance coverage which was proposed to the Congress on July 8, 1969, would affect more farm employers and farmworkers in California than in any other State. Nearly half of the workers who would be covered are employed in California.

Thus I think that it should be of substantial interest to the House that farm employers in California are increasingly in favor of Federal unemployment insurance coverage of farmworkers.

There are a number of reasons for the increasing support for unemployment insurance coverage on the part of California farm employers. An important factor is their concern that they may be placed at an interstate competitive cost disadvantage in selling their produce, if California passes a farm coverage law or if they elect to cover their workers.

Thus, in a statement submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee on behalf of approximately 12,000 citrus and avocado producers in Arizona and California, the executive vice president of the Agriculture Producers Labor Committee stated:

One argument in favor of extending farm coverage on a national basis is that California's cotton, meat, poultry, cheese, wine, citrus, tomatoes, vegetables and melons must be marketed in competition with the same products from other states; that national coverage will eliminate an element of unfair competition between the states in the marketing of these products.

Also, many California employers have found that unemployment insurance is a highly worthwhile part of their labor-management relations. Hence, some 765 farm employers have voluntarily elected to cover their 18,000 workers. They have found that unemployment insurance stabilizes their labor force and results in reduced costs of recruitment and turnover. In other words, their experience has been similar to that of nonagricultural employers. And, these employers have found that the cost of unemployment insurance coverage for their workers has been moderate. In 1968 the benefit cost rate was only 4.5 percent of taxable wages. They have found that they are better able to compete with nonagricultural employers in attracting workers.

Coverage under unemployment insur-

ance would properly place the cost of fluctuations in farm employment on the unemployment insurance program which was designed for that very purpose. Unfortunately, much of the cost of farm unemployment is now met under the welfare program. I know that the House is deeply bothered by the rapidly rising costs of that program.

A change to farmworker coverage under the unemployment insurance program would place covered farmworkers in a more equitable position vis-a-vis the great majority of other workers, in that entitlement to income during spells of unemployment would be an earned right under an insurance program, rather than a welfare grant based on need.

I urge that H.R. 14705 be amended to provide for coverage of agricultural workers, at least to the extent recommended by the President.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, my State of California provides more benefits for the farmworker, permanent and migrant, than any other State. Working conditions, living conditions, housing, and wages are better in California than most every other State. Even so all of these factors could be improved—and should be.

There should be a system of unemployment compensation for farmworkers—all farmworkers.

I have introduced legislation to provide benefits for farmworkers throughout the United States comparable to the benefits provided in California.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA) has made an emotional appeal for unemployment compensation for farmworkers. In the past his recommendations in the farm labor field have prejudiced the farmworker and agriculture in general.

This problem is urgent. Legislation is necessary. But facts are more persuasive than emotional oratory.

California has studied this problem seriously for some time and has not yet devised a satisfactory system. Before we pass a Federal law on this subject, we should know a lot more about the facts.

I therefore oppose any parliamentary motion which on the face appears to benefit farmworkers, but which in fact is ill considered, inadequately studied, and not ready for deliberation by the House.

The chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) have made persuasive arguments for considering the subject of unemployment compensation for farmworkers at a later time to avoid jeopardizing this important bill which is so necessary to so many unemployed workers.

For those who really want to help the unadvantaged farmworker, they can advocate and vote for many other well-known working benefits—minimum wage, disability insurance, better hours and working conditions—which are wholly inadequate in most States.

The proposal for nationwide unemployment compensation for farmworkers

is not ready for passage today. It requires more experience and study—but I hope it will come soon.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker. I have here in my hand a resolution by the Associated Farmers of California, Inc. It says, in part:

Whereas, farm labor in California falls into two general categories: the permanent worker and the seasonal or migratory worker, and

Whereas, the former does not need unemployment insurance and the seasonal worker's motivation would be lost with unemployment insurance,

Now therefore be it resolved that the Associated Farmers of California, Inc. will vigorously oppose in principle any legislation designed to include farm workers under any program of Unemployment Insurance.

I have heard untenable arguments before, but I must say this one wins the mink-lined bathtub.

The farmers say permanent agricultural workers do not need unemployment compensation because their jobs are permanent. Clerks and engineers and civil servants and a lot of other people have "permanent" jobs too, but sometimes they turn out to be not all that permanent. That is what unemployment compensation is for. If we were to follow the Associated Farmers' reasoning, we would have to cancel the entire compensation program for everybody.

The second reason given, that seasonal workers would lose their motivation, is just as ridiculous. The payments will be better than nothing, but they will be small indeed. And they will not continue for more than half a year.

If anyone feels that farmworkers are naturally lazy, that they will work less if unemployment money is available to them—I suggest you try this kind of work for awhile. It is the most grueling, back-breaking work I know of. Whatever else one may say about farmworkers, they are not lazy.

Before I go any further, I do not want to appear to be attacking farmers in general. The Associated Farmers are only one group. Others are more humane and enlightened. The California Farm Bureau in Yolo County, for example, favors a national compulsory unemployment insurance program.

Mr. Speaker, this is something the country needs, and it is a disgrace we did not have it a long time ago. I commend President Nixon and the Labor Department for their stand.

The treatment of farm laborers in this country is something none of us can regard with anything but shame. If there is anyone who was not aware of the inhuman conditions under which farm laborers live and work, Senator MONDALE's current hearings should be eye openers.

We all know there is only one reason why farm laborers get the short end time after time: they are not powerful politically. We have kept them uneducated, poor, disorganized, and beat down, and there has not been much they could do to press their case. They cannot throw cocktail parties or contribute to campaigns. Most of them cannot even

vote. This is going to change, and as far as I am concerned, the sooner the better. But right now, we have to give them this unemployment insurance. It will not solve their problems. But it will help. They need it and, as a matter of justice, there is no defensible reason for denying it to them.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

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

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MR. O'HARA

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. O'HARA. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'HARA moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 14705 to the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to agree to Senate Amendment No. 9 extending unemployment compensation to agricultural labor employed by persons who employ eight or more workers during each of 26 or more weeks.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 170, nays 219, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

YEAS—170

Adams	Culver	Gonzalez
Addabbo	Daniels, N.J.	Green, Pa.
Anderson, Calif.	de la Garza	Gude
Annunzio	Delaney	Halpern
Ashley	Dent	Hamilton
Barrett	Diggs	Hanley
Bell, Calif.	Dingell	Hansen, Idaho
Bennett	Donohue	Hansen, Wash.
Biaggi	Dulski	Harrington
Bingham	Dwyer	Hathaway
Blatnik	Eckhardt	Hawkins
Boland	Edmondson	Hays
Bolling	Edwards, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.
Brademas	Ellberg	Heckler, Mass.
Brasco	Evans, Colo.	Helstoski
Brooks	Farbstein	Hicks
Brown, Calif.	Fascell	Holifield
Burton, Calif.	Feighan	Horton
Burton	Flood	Howard
Byrne, Pa.	Foley	Hungate
Carey	Ford	Jacobs
Celler	William D.	Johnson, Calif.
Clark	Fraser	Karth
Clay	Friedel	Kastenmeier
Cohelan	Fulton, Pa.	Kluczynski
Conte	Fulton, Tenn.	Koch
Conyers	Garmatz	Kyros
Corman	Gaydos	Leggett
	Gibbons	Long, Md.
		Lowenstein

Lujan	Olsen	Scheuer
McCarthy	O'Neill, Mass.	Sisk
McFall	Patten	Smith, Iowa
Macdonald, Mass.	Pelly	Staggers
Madden	Pepper	Stanton
Mathias	Pettis	Stokes
Matsunaga	Philbin	Sullivan
Meeds	Pike	Symington
Melcher	Podell	Thompson, N.J.
Meskill	Price, Ill.	Tierman
Mikva	Pucinski	Tunney
Miller, Calif.	Quile	Udall
Minish	Rallsback	Van Deerin
Mink	Randall	Vanik
Mollohan	Rees	Vigorito
Monagan	Reid, N.Y.	Waldie
Moorhead	Reifel	Watkins
Morgan	Reuss	Whalen
Morse	Riegler	Wilson,
Mosher	Robison	Charles H.
Moss	Rodino	Wolf
Murphy, Ill.	Roe	Wright
Nedzi	Rooney, N.Y.	Wyatt
Nix	Rooney, Pa.	Wydler
Obey	Rosenthal	Yates
O'Hara	Roybal	Yatron
O'Konski	Ruppe	Zablocki
	St Germain	Zwach

NAYS—219

Abbt	Flowers	Nelsen
Abernethy	Flynt	Nichols
Adair	Ford, Gerald R.	O'Neal, Ga.
Albert	Foreman	Passman
Alexander	Fountain	Patman
Anderson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	Perkins
Andrews, Ala.	Frey	Pirnie
Andrews, N. Dak.	Fuqua	Poage
Arends	Gallifanakis	Poff
Ashbrook	Gettys	Preyer, N.C.
Aspinall	Goldwater	Price, Tex.
Ayres	Goodling	Pryor, Ark.
Beall, Md.	Green, Oreg.	Purcell
Belcher	Griffin	Quillen
Berry	Griffiths	Reid, Ill.
Betts	Gross	Rivers
Bevill	Grover	Roberts
Blackburn	Gubser	Rogers, Fla.
Blanton	Hagan	Rostenkowski
Boggs	Haley	Roth
Bow	Hall	Rousselot
Bray	Hammer-	Ruth
Brinkley	schmidt	Sandman
Broomfield	Harsha	Satterfield
Brotzman	Harvey	Saylor
Brown, Mich.	Hastings	Schadeberg
Brown, Ohio	Hébert	Scherle
Broyhill, N.C.	Henderson	Schmitz
Broyhill, Va.	Hogan	Schneebell
Buchanan	Hull	Schwengel
Burke, Mass.	Hunt	Scott
Burleson, Tex.	Hutchinson	Sebelius
Burlison, Mo.	Jarman	Shively
Bush	Johnson, Pa.	Shriver
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonas	Sikes
Cabell	Jones, Ala.	Skubitz
Camp	Jones, N.C.	Slack
Carter	Kazen	Smith, Calif.
Casey	Kee	Smith, N.Y.
Cederberg	Keith	Snyder
Chamberlain	Kleppe	Springer
Chappell	Kuykendall	Stafford
Clancy	Kyl	Steed
Clausen	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.
Clausen, Don H.	Landrum	Steiger, Wis.
Clawson, Del.	Langen	Stevens
Cleveland	Latta	Stubblefield
Collier	Lennon	Taft
Collins	Lloyd	Talcott
Colmer	McClory	Taylor
Conable	McCloskey	Teague, Calif.
Corbett	McClure	Teague, Tex.
Coughlin	McCulloch	Thompson, Ga.
Cowger	McDade	Thomson, Wis.
Crane	McDonald,	Ullman
Daniel, Va.	Mich.	Vander Jagt
Davis, Wis.	McEwen	Waggonner
Dellenback	McKneally	Wampler
Denney	McMillan	Watson
Dennis	Mahon	Watts
Derwinski	Mann	Whalley
Devine	Marsh	White
Dickinson	Martin	Whitehurst
Downing	May	Whitten
Duncan	Mayne	Widnall
Edwards, Ala.	Michel	Wiggins
Eriksen	Miller, Ohio	Williams
Esch	Mills	Winn
Eshleman	Minshall	Wold
Evins, Tenn.	Mize	Wyle
Fallon	Mizell	Wyman
Findley	Montgomery	Young
Fish	Morton	Zion
Fisher	Myers	
	Natcher	

NOT VOTING—42

Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, La.	Ottinger
Baring	Gallagher	Pickle
Brook	Gilbert	Pollock
Burke, Fla.	Gray	Powell
Burton, Utah	Hanna	Rarick
Caffery	Hosmer	Rhodes
Chisholm	Ichord	Rogers, Colo.
Cramer	Jones, Tenn.	Roudebush
Daddario	King	Ryan
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	Stratton
Dawson	Long, La.	Stuckey
Dorn	Lukens	Weicker
Dowdy	MacGregor	Wilson, Bob
	Maillard	
	Murphy, N.Y.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hanna for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Ryan for, with Mr. Rarick against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Pickle against.

Mr. Murphy of New York for, with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Dorn against.

Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Jones of Tennessee against.

Mr. Gray for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. King against.

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Rhodes against.

Mr. Ottinger for, with Mr. Bob Wilson against.

Mrs. Chisholm for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Burke of Florida against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Maillard.

Mr. Weicker with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Caffery.

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were open.

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 388, nays 3, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

YEAS—388

Abbt	Beall, Md.	Broomfield
Abernethy	Belcher	Brotzman
Adair	Bell, Calif.	Brown, Calif.
Adams	Bennett	Brown, Mich.
Addabbo	Berry	Brown, Ohio
Albert	Betts	Broyhill, N.C.
Alexander	Bevill	Broyhill, Va.
Anderson, Calif.	Biaggi	Buchanan
Anderson, Ill.	Bieber	Burke, Mass.
Anderson, Tenn.	Bingham	Burleson, Tex.
Andrews, Ala.	Blackburn	Burlison, Mo.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Blanton	Burton, Calif.
Annunzio	Blatnik	Buton
Arends	Boggs	Byrne, Pa.
Ashbrook	Boland	Byrnes, Wis.
Ashley	Bolling	Cabell
Aspinall	Bow	Carey
Ayres	Brademas	Carter
Barrett	Brasco	Casey
	Bray	Cederberg
	Brinkley	Celler
	Brooks	

July 23, 1970

Chamberlain  
Chappell  
Chisholm  
Clancy  
Clark  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del  
Clay  
Cleveland  
Cobelan  
Collier  
Collins  
Colmer  
Conable  
Conte  
Conyers  
Corbett  
Corman  
Coughlin  
Cowger  
Crane  
Culver  
Daniel, Va.  
Daniels, N.J.  
Davis, Wis.  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dellenback  
Denney  
Dennis  
Dent  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Downing  
Dulski  
Duncan  
Dwyer  
Eckhardt  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Ala.  
Edwards, Calif.  
Ellberg  
Erlenborn  
Esch  
Eshleman  
Evans, Colo.  
Evins, Tenn.  
Fallon  
Farbstein  
Fasell  
Feighan  
Findley  
Fish  
Fisher  
Flood  
Flowers  
Flynt  
Foley  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Ford,  
William D.  
Foreman  
Fountain  
Fraser  
Frelinghuysen  
Frey  
Friedel  
Fulton, Pa.  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Fuqua  
Gallifanakis  
Garmatz  
Gaydos  
Gettys  
Glaimo  
Gibbons  
Gilbert  
Goldwater  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Griffin  
Griffiths  
Gross  
Grover  
Gubser  
Gude  
Hagan  
Haley  
Hall  
Halpern  
Hamilton  
Hammer-  
schmidt  
Hanley  
Hansen, Idaho  
Hansen, Wash.  
Harrington

Harsha  
Harvey  
Hastings  
Hathaway  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hébert  
Hechler, W. Va.  
Heckler, Mass.  
Helstoski  
Henderson  
Hicks  
Hogan  
Hollifield  
Horton  
Howard  
Hull  
Hungate  
Hunt  
Hutchinson  
Jacobs  
Jarman  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jonas  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, N.C.  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Kazen  
Kee  
Keith  
Kleppe  
Kluczynski  
Koch  
Kuykendall  
Kyl  
Kyros  
Landgrebe  
Landrum  
Langen  
Latta  
Leggett  
Lennon  
Long, Md.  
Lowenstein  
Lujan  
McCarthy  
McClory  
McCloskey  
McCulloch  
McDade  
McDonald,  
Mich.  
McEwen  
McFall  
McKneally  
McMillan  
Macdonald,  
Mass.  
Madden  
Mahon  
Mann  
Marsh  
Martin  
Mathias  
Matsunaga  
May  
Mayne  
Meeds  
Melcher  
Meskill  
Michel  
Mikva  
Miller, Calif.  
Miller, Ohio  
Mills  
Minish  
Mink  
Minshall  
Mize  
Mizell  
Mellohan  
Monagan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morse  
Morton  
Mosher  
Moss  
Murphy, Ill.  
Myers  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nelsen  
Nichols  
Nix  
Obey  
O'Konski  
Olsen  
O'Neal, Ga.  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Passman

Patman  
Patten  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pettis  
Philbin  
Pike  
Pirnie  
Poage  
Podell  
Poff  
Preyer, N.C.  
Price, Ill.  
Price, Tex.  
Pryor, Ark.  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Quile  
Quillen  
Rallsback  
Randall  
Rees  
Reid, Ill.  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reifel  
Reuss  
Riegler  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robison  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Rousselot  
Roybal  
Ruppe  
Ruth  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Satterfield  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Scherle  
Schueer  
Schneebeil  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Sebellus  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Snyder  
Springer  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Stanton  
Steed  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stephens  
Stokes  
Stubblefield  
Stuckey  
Sullivan  
Taft  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Tiernan  
Tunney  
Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Waggonner  
Waldie  
Wampler  
Watkins  
Watson  
Watts  
Whalen  
Whalley  
White  
Whitehurst  
Whitten  
Widnall

Wiggins  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Winn  
Wold

Wolf  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wyder  
Wyllie  
Wyman  
Yates

Yatron  
Young  
Zablocki  
Zion  
Zwack

H. Res. 1158  
*Resolved*, That John G. Schmitz of California be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.  
The resolution was agreed to.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 further 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.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 18515, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 2 on page 12 of the bill and there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.  
Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.  
Mr. Chairman, our bill is \$167,632,000 over the budget, for these programs itemized in the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

To summarily increase this bill for just these items by another \$360 million—or 47 percent—makes a mockery of the deliberations of our subcommittee.  
Figures in the gentleman's amendment would appear to bring each of these items up to the full authorizing level, but we have heard the arguments of these full-funding enthusiasts before.

There is always the temptation when this bill comes to the floor for Members to be the champions of a variety of very special causes. And there are some of us who can and have been awarded some very beautifully worded citations and handsomely engraved plaques for our efforts. But I am reminded of what our good friend JOHN BYRNES, the ranking member of the tax-writing Ways and Means Committee said just the other evening. He could not recall any instance when a member of his committee or this House was given any kind of special award for raising the taxes to provide all these goodies we are going to bestow upon the people.

Now a large part of the money in the gentleman's amendment is for aid to medical schools, but there is an enormous

NAYS—3  
Camp McClure Schmitz  
ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1  
O'Hara

NOT VOTING—39  
Baring Gallagher Murphy, N.Y.  
Brock Gray Ottinger  
Burke, Fla. Hanna Pickle  
Burton, Utah Hosmer Pollock  
Caffery Ichord Powell  
Cramer Jones, Tenn. Rarick  
Cunningham King Rhodes  
Daddario Kirwan Rogers, Colo.  
Davis, Ga. Lloyd Roubidoux  
Dawson Long, La. Ryan  
Dorn Lukens Stratton  
Dowdy MacGregor Symington  
Edwards, La. Mailliard Weicker

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Until further notice:  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.  
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Burton of Utah.  
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hosmer.  
Mr. Gray with Mr. King.  
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Cramer.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Lloyd.  
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Burke of Florida.  
Mr. Rarick with Mr. MacGregor.  
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Rhodes.  
Mr. Ryan with Mr. Weicker.  
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Roubidoux.  
Mr. Hanna with Mr. Mailliard.  
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Pollock.  
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Dowdy.  
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Baring.  
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Symington.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DADDARIO). If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just adopted.

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

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

amount of money in this bill which will ultimately go to medical schools.

There is \$150.6 million for institutional support. A significant increase over the \$128.9 million appropriated last year.

There is \$91.9 million for student assistance, another increase over the \$68 million available for 1970.

There is \$126.1 million for construction of teaching facilities.

For the health manpower training program of the NIH, the budget proposed fiscal 1971 appropriations of \$382 million, an increase of \$31 million over the 1970 funding level. Our committee added another \$18.7 million for manpower training, bringing the 1971 amount for this purpose to \$401 million—\$50 million more than the comparable 1970 figure.

This is not the training of scientists for research work, but the training of professional and paraprofessional personnel who will work directly in patient care.

More than half of the total increase—\$26 million—is in the area of student assistance. Under the student loan programs, for example, we will provide loan funds for 19,250 health professions students and 22,300 nursing students. In both instances, the number of students who may be assisted exceeds the budget request by more than 8,500.

But that is not all, Mr. Chairman. Let me continue. There is \$1,107,048,000 in this bill for the National Institutes of Health.

That is \$72.5 million over the budget and \$131 million over 1970. Now a very large share of that research and training money goes to medical schools.

I wonder how many of you actually realize that the Federal Government now provides over 50 percent of the annual operating expenses of the Nation's medical schools.

Let me turn to some of the other specifics of this amendment. It would add money for student loans, but our committee has already added \$16 million over the budget request for medical and nursing student loans.

The amendment would increase funds for traineeships, but we are already providing for \$22 million plus.

The gentleman would add money for the National Heart and Lung Institute, but we have already added \$6.7 million over the budget, and this is \$17.4 million over the 1970 level.

The amendment would add money for a special children's dental program, but there is already money in this bill to get this program started.

As for the additional amount for medical libraries, we have \$19.8 million in this bill for medical libraries which is double the figure carried in the bill just 5 years ago. So that should give clear indication that our subcommittee has been more than generous over the years on this item.

The amendment would add money for staffing community mental health centers, but our committee has already added \$20 million over the budget giving us a total of more than \$80 million, an increase over last year of \$32.5 million.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the add-on for Hill-Burton funds, there seems to be a widespread misconception that Hill-Burton grants are the only form of Federal assistance available for the construction and modernization of hospitals and other medical facilities. This is simply not true.

HEW estimates that approximately \$300 million per year is being paid for depreciation reimbursement to hospitals and other facilities through the Medicare and Medicaid programs. These payments relate directly to capital financing.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development administers a program of guaranteed loans—without an overall authorization ceiling—for the construction of nonprofit hospitals.

In enacting, over the President's veto, the Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970, the Congress authorized loan guarantees with interest subsidies for the construction and modernization of nonprofit health facilities.

This Hill-Burton appropriation for fiscal 1971 must be considered against this backdrop.

The newly authorized loan guarantee-interest subsidy program is especially important. Beginning in 1971, the Federal Government, through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, will guarantee loans made to private nonprofit organizations for the construction or modernization of health facilities at a total amount of loans guaranteed of \$500 million per year. This \$500 million will be allocated among the States in accordance with their population, financial need, and respective need for construction and modernization of facilities. The Federal interest subsidy is established by law at 3 percent per annum.

Under the bill as reported by our committee, \$500 million would be allocated among the States in fiscal 1971.

As in the older Hill-Burton grant program, however, the State Hill-Burton agencies will not approve firm commitments against the entire State allocation during the first year in which it is available. This is comparable to the situation in the construction grant program, where grant funds are allocated to the States in the fiscal year in which they are appropriated, but the majority of these funds are not actually committed at the State level until the following fiscal year. Of the \$500 million loan guarantee program, the administration estimates that firm commitments approximating \$166 million will be made by June 30, 1971. The remainder of the \$500 million is available by law through June 30, 1973.

To summarize, then, our Appropriations Committee has approved: Hill-Burton construction grants amounting to \$172.2 million; and, a \$500 million loan guarantee allocation for fiscal 1971, of which \$166 million is expected to be committed with the \$5 million provided for interest subsidy.

I would urge Members to support your committee and vote down this \$360 million add-on.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. I agree that what the gentleman is suggesting should be done in the interest subsidy program and also in the FHA guarantee for hospitals program. But, the fact of the matter is that these are hopeful desires and, in fact, we have no proof that they are going to work effectively, particularly in these days of high interest rates. For example, in the case of the FHA hospital program, the fact of the matter is, and the testimony developed in our appropriations committee this year, shows that this program has been very slow in getting off the ground and as of today there are a total of six insurance commitments, that add up to a total of \$42 million.

I know that the gentleman knows there are hospitals in this Nation which could each alone use \$42 million for expansion. So this FHA program, although it sounds good and although the purposes are meritorious, are really not making much of an impact on the \$11 billion shortage.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman well knows if there is a choice between grants and loans, everyone is going to take the grant.

We are just embarking here on a new approach.

You say it is long in coming. And I say let us get on with it as provided in the new enabling legislation. There have been some delays, but I submit it is a good program and we ought to move forward with it and give it a chance to operate.

Mr. GIAIMO. In effect, what we are doing in these programs is to compel them to go out and borrow money at anywhere from 9 to 10 percent, which based upon the millions of dollars involved, means that the hospitals will be paying literally millions of dollars in interest each year when in fact under a direct grant program the Government could get the money cheaper.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

IN THE OVERALL BEST INTEREST OF THE  
INDIVIDUAL CITIZEN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to approach the pending problem from the broad basis of the Nation's welfare, encompassing the 50 States and the more than 200 million American citizens.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) spoke of the difficulty of securing loans. Loans are difficult to secure—in significant measure—because overspending by Government has contributed to inflation, tight money, and high interest rates. What is proposed in the pending amendment will, in my opinion, serve to aggravate the already serious situation.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Twenty-three days ago—on June 30—the national debt was \$373 billion. In the

last 4 years—from June 1966 to June 1970—it has gone up by \$53 billion. No wonder you cannot get loans for programs. The national debt is now crowding \$400 billion. Earlier this year, we voted a \$395 billion ceiling.

#### BUYING POWER OF THE DOLLAR

The buying power of the dollar lost 6 percent last year, calendar year 1969. That is for all of us, including widows, orphans, the rich and the poor—everybody. In the last 3 years, calendar years 1967–1969, the dollar lost 13 percent of its buying power. The buying power of the dollar of the rich and the poor is fading each month, and there are those who would seemingly seek to erode it further.

#### RECENT BUDGET DEFICITS—APPALLING

Budget deficits in recent years have been appalling. Omitting the trust funds such as those for social security and highways—because they are collected for and pledged only to trust fund purposes—the deficit in Federal funds in the fiscal year 1967 was \$9,869 million. In fiscal 1968, it was \$28,379 million. In fiscal 1969, it was \$5,490 million. In fiscal 1970, concluded just 23 days ago, the latest official executive branch estimate—issued May 19—is \$11 billion. It may well be higher when the final tally is made.

For the current fiscal year 1971, \$10 billion is the tentative estimate of the executive branch as of last May 19.

For the 5 years, 1967–1971, the Federal funds deficit on this basis is over \$64,700 million. And it could very well prove to be \$10 billion more than that when the fiscal year is closed out.

There is a distinct possibility that the Federal funds deficit for the current fiscal year 1971 could go as high as \$20 billion.

The budget for fiscal year 1972, which will come to Congress next January, could, according to official administration spokesmen, reflect a "massive deficit."

#### OVERSPENDING—A DISSERVICE TO THE NATION'S BEST INTERESTS

What has all of this to do with the pending amendment and the bill before us? It has a lot to do with it. It has a whale of a lot to do with it.

Sponsors of the amendment assert that they are supporting the poor and the helpless. They say the question is, "Do we favor money considerations or do we favor human values?" I plead that we favor human values above all other considerations, and act in the best interests of the 200 million Americans who rely upon us for leadership.

The inflation to which governmental overspending has contributed mightily and is still contributing tends to destroy the poor. The rich can, and in a measure are, protecting themselves. We vote Federal workers pay raises to help discount inflation. Well-organized union workers can, in part, take care of themselves. But the poor people in the ghetto, the poor people in the rural areas, the people on pensions, the poor migrants, and the great middle-class generally—what about them? Who will take care of them? Will we continue to make their

grocery dollar buy less and less for them and their children? Will we?

That is what we are doing as of now. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(On request of Mr. FLOOD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I shall not use the 5 minutes.

#### THE INDIVIDUAL'S STAKE

What about the stock market? The latest figures I have seen show that one out of every six Americans owns stock of some kind. Why have people lost billions in the stock market? Why have your neighbors lost so much? Why are stocks so low? Many people believe that it is largely because of fiscal uncertainty, inflation, overspending by the Government—not sufficiently heeded by those who are unwilling to lay the hand of restraint upon the appropriation of Federal funds.

If we do not preserve the economic stability of our country, the people who will be hurt most are the underprivileged, the undereducated, the poor and the sick, and the great middle class generally.

An enlightened vote for the poor and the needy and the Nation's welfare is against the \$362,000,000 add-on to this \$18 billion bill.

I do not see why any Member of this House could not satisfactorily explain his action in the interest of the American people to his constituents, by voting against this proposed add-on to a bill which is already \$92 million above the budget requests.

I repeat what has been said in effect by others: I favor restraint not because I wish to save money but because I wish to save people.

As we approach the vote on the amendment, I hope we will keep in mind not just the people who send telegrams—because they have been asked to—and not just certain problems which are difficult to deal with, but as we cast our votes today, let us think of all the people and the Nation next month and next year and 10 years from now.

We must lay the hand of restraint upon our actions lest we falter and fail in the Nation's great hour.

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

I believe there is little I can add to the excellent presentation of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) and the fine address that was made yesterday by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) as well as his remarks of today.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that this bill already provides increases for programs that the gentleman from Massachusetts proposes to further increase. We used to hear so much discussion about how more funds went for defense than for human resources, but today—in the Nixon budget for 1971—human resources are receiving more support than defense. Priorities

have been changed, but this isn't the only problem.

Mr. Chairman, the people of America are faced with a real fiscal crisis. We must stop inflation—and every effort is being made by this administration to stop it. No one, I am certain, doubts that inflation also contributes very substantially to the financial problems that face our hospitals, mental health centers, and medical schools. This inflation is the result of 10 years of deficit spending.

If we can stop these deficits, so that interest rates decline, then hospitals will be able to obtain necessary funds through the combination interest subsidized loan and grant programs that are provided in this bill.

There is contained in this bill \$172 million for grants, and \$5 million for interest subsidies that generate another \$166 million in construction loans. This is \$348 million available for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton program.

I urge my colleagues to support the committee, which has done such a commendable job. There are volumes of testimony that was heard by this subcommittee that clearly support this bill. This is a record that took hours and hours, day after day, to hear and the recommendations that resulted merit our respect and approval.

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

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. The figures cited by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and by my distinguished chairman are frightening. This country is bankrupt. The interest on the national debt, just the interest alone, is \$20.8 billion.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate the gentleman calling our attention to the amount of the interest—\$20.8 billion. Let us reduce this to an amount everyone can understand. We do not always appreciate the magnitude of billions of dollars. But every time the second hand goes around on that clock—every minute—we are spending almost \$40,000 for interest on the national debt.

Those who are concerned about human resources should consider what \$40,000 every minute would do in housing, hospitals, or whatever else might be important.

It is because of the spending we have done, because of the great debt we have built up that \$40,000 every minute is being lost.

I urge my colleagues to support the committee and defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 30 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GIAIMO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that purpose.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 45 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let me point out that not one single member of the authorizing committee of this House on either side of the aisle has been permitted to utter one word during the debate upon this legislation. There are some of us who are informed and are interested. To cut us off, after the members of the Appropriations Committee have been permitted to extend their time, without objection, for at least an additional 5 minutes, is in my judgment improper.

I therefore object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California objects.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end at half past 3 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 3:30 p.m.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROSENTHAL) there were—ayes 51, noes 26.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred twenty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I hope this discussion is not coming out of the time of the gentleman from Connecticut.

The CHAIRMAN. I am afraid it is. The gentleman yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Connecticut not be taken from that 1 hour.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to object and, in fact, I strongly favor the action taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but we have consumed an extra 5 minutes through parliamentary maneuvering. I think it would be a good idea to add 5 minutes to the time limitation and make it 3:35.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Connecticut will be recognized for 5 minutes.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that I only yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request and did not realize that all of this would come out of my time.

Mr. YATES. The time had not been announced.

Mr. GIAIMO. I refuse to yield further on my time.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, there was a unanimous-consent request made.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

Mr. MOSS. And, I reserved the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked if there was an objection and there was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I registered an objection and I reserved the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's objection came too late.

Mr. MOSS. I reserved the right to object and the gentleman to the left of me and the gentleman in front of me heard me reserve the right to object.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman ruled on the matter.

Mr. MOSS. It is not a matter of the Chair ruling. I was on my feet and I reserved the right to object very specifically.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman wants to be fair.

Will the gentleman state his objection?

Mr. MOSS. I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the right to object to what?

Mr. MOSS. To the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the gentleman now in the well be permitted to proceed for the 5 minutes, notwithstanding the fact that his time had, in fact, expired because he had yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the time had been consumed in parliamentary maneuvering.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman insists that he was seeking to reserve the right to object, the Chair will again put the request.

Mr. MOSS. I do so insist, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. MOSS. Reserving the right to object—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has already reserved the right to object.

Mr. MOSS. That is correct. Then you should ask the gentleman to address himself to his reservation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman from California made the reservation.

Mr. MOSS. I want to state my point, if the Chair will permit it.

The CHAIRMAN. Reservations to ob-

ject are entertained only in the prerogatives of the Chair. The Chair does not recognize the gentleman from California, Mr. Moss, any further unless he objects.

Mr. MOSS. Of course, the gentleman is not going to object to a request to accommodate the Chair and he thanks the Chair for the courtesy accorded him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thanks the gentleman from California.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Has the Chair announced the names of the Members who were standing?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GIAIMO. The gentleman from Connecticut, with all due apologies, refuses to yield further.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred and twenty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the emergency health amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) because I believe that we are facing an emergency in health, health services, and health delivery in the United States.

There is no question—I repeat—there is no question that sufficient amounts of money are not available for our health services. The great subcommittee, chaired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) has recognized this fact and has added moneys to the budget requests of the administration. We are not progressing and going forward in our health efforts. We are going backwards.

Reference was made earlier to the fact that we have increased the programs involved in this appropriation—forgetting for the moment the fact that last year, in the parliamentary involvement with education and those other items in the Labor-HEW bill; many of these programs were inadvertently cut down in conference. Therefore, in effect, what we are doing by restoring and by increasing moneys that the administration asks for is merely standing in the same position rather than progressing and going forward. And make no mistake about it—there is a health crisis in the United States. It is here now.

We talk of \$172 million for Hill-Burton hospital construction. Is that a lot of money? That is a drop in the bucket, I submit. In my own city of New Haven there is one hospital which today and for the last year has been seeking \$30 million; that is one hospital in one city alone, and here we have \$172 million for the entire country.

Talk about the loan guarantee programs of FHA, talk about the interest subsidy programs of 3 percent, but they

will not work in today's highly inflationary money markets. In effect, what you are saying to those health institutions is that they are going to have to spend \$2 and \$3 and \$4 million a year; not for health services, not for paramedical personnel, not for beds and buildings, but for interest to banks, insurance companies and other people whose business is the lending of money. Is this going to provide health services to the American people? It is not.

Now, we are told—and I am reminded of the famous line from history, which I will paraphrase, "Oh, economy, how many sins are committed in thy name?"—that we must be economical. We are told that we understand there is a need for more money, but we have to save money. Why do we not hear these same arguments made for limiting the spending of untold billions of dollars for a very questionable defense system like the ABM? Why are not the same arguments made when we are asked to spend billions in farm subsidies, and in other subsidies in this Nation? Right in this bill there is a very questionable appropriation, \$2 billion for the OEO. I say to my colleagues, \$2 billion for one of the most disgraceful and questionable programs that we have ever enacted into law in this Congress. And yet we are told that we cannot come up with \$300 million more in moneys for the greatest priority need of the American people—to improve the quality of American life, the one priority which supersedes housing, the one which supersedes education, and the one which supersedes job opportunities—health care, adequate health care and better health care for the American people.

This is what we are trying to do with this amendment. This is what we are suggesting. This is why we must adopt the Boland amendment.

Last night I was with a group of doctors from the county medical association in my own State of Connecticut, and they told me about the research projects which have had to be curtailed this year, after 5 and 6 and 7 years of work, because of the fact that NIH and the other Federal agencies have literally run out of funding money to continue these projects.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that wisdom demands that we recognize this need as a top priority, and accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been limited to 3:30 o'clock. The Chair has noted the names of Members who were standing at the time the limitation of time was called.

REFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY  
MR. ROSENTHAL

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the preferential motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the Chair did not announce the time that each Member is going to be recognized for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will an-

nounce the time after the preferential motion.

The Clerk will report the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROSENTHAL of New York moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his preferential motion.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the situation we face now is a classic example of what is wrong with this House.

I suggest, with all humility, and I feel it is presumptuous of me to make this kind of remark to senior Members of the House, but I can only say that I want to share my disgust with everyone who is present on the floor. Many of us have waited for 2 days to speak on this amendment. Many of us have worked for many months, and I, particularly in the field of medical education, on matters we consider of great importance to this Nation. For the last 2 days, Members of the House, and I really find no fault with it, chose to leave the floor at 4:30 o'clock in the afternoon for reasons best known to themselves. Now, when those of us who have equal constitutional rights to speak in this body are allotted a minute of time on a bill of this importance, I think we ought to show our displeasure with this procedure and what we should do is to fold our tent for the week and go home. Maybe over the weekend we can reflect on what we have done. We can reflect on the integrity of the House of Representatives.

How can anyone who shares responsibility in this House move at this time to close off debate when more than 20 Members were standing and asking to speak. Each of them are allotted a minute. It is an absolute disgrace—it is the ultimate abuse of arbitrary power.

None of us can hold our hand up to take our oath of office next time around, if we are lucky enough to be elected, if we engage in this process.

So I would suggest that the wisest and calmest and coolest thing we can do, and so far as I am concerned I want to do it, is to close down for the week. Maybe when we come back on Monday we can, all of us, have a fair amount of time to discuss amendments that we have thought about for weeks, if not for months.

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

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) rise?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion and yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the preferential motion because I support the

amendments that are now pending before this committee. I support them as a member of the committee that has given equal attention to that given by the subcommittee on appropriations to the consideration of each of these items.

For 14 years, I have served as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has authorized these programs and which has placed the ceilings above which appropriations may not go. We did not act idly. We did not act in ignorance of the needs of this Nation, nor did we act irresponsibly. We are not bleeding hearts nor are we knights in shining armor with amendments hanging on our lances as pendants, as we have been characterized.

I think perhaps the words used by our late beloved colleague, John Fogarty, just 4 years ago, in this Chamber, when he quoted from John Webster, should be requoted:

Gold that buys health can never be ill spent.

It was true then, it is true now, and there is not one man on this floor, on appropriations or otherwise, who will tell me that we are supplying in this program adequate assistance to manpower training, to the construction of medical educational facilities, because they cannot support such a statement. We are not providing. There is a desperate need in this Nation, and as we have been running rapidly in recent years, we have slipped continuously behind. We are not keeping pace with the need. It is a critical need.

Remember, that every person who is ill is a drain on the economy of this country. It is time that we deal with these problems, that we assign them the priorities they must have.

This Nation has the wealth if we use it wisely. We have heard about the boondoggles in defense, SST, and many others. Let us look at a bunch of the weapon systems where we have had tremendous overruns, overruns which would wrap up the entirety of cost of this program. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has spoken about inflation and the stock markets. I happen to chair the Commerce and Finance Subcommittee. I know something about the commodity and security markets of this Nation. Let one tell you that whether you use Government loans, whether you use municipal bonds, whether you use mortgage debt, you are going to be competing in the money market. It is the pressure to construct the infrastructure that puts the pressure on the inflationary factors in our economy. We cannot step back in these fields of health. We must build, and we are going to have just as much, if not a greater inflationary impact—if we go the route of municipal bonds, and with the very high cost of mortgages—10 and 11 percent in my State of California in some areas—or if you go to Government-guaranteed loans, loans which some financial institution must make, I think we ought to look at all the facts. The unmet needs are the

measure of our successes and our failures.

The fact that we can say we are doing more than last year or more than 5 years ago does not prove that we are doing an adequate job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROSENTHAL) there were—ayes 6, noes 72.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SANDMAN).

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I share the feelings of the gentleman from New York. I have been waiting for a whole day to say something on this subject, because I think I have something to add—something to add in the sense that I am not opposed to this because it adds \$360 million to an already-high appropriation. I am opposed to it because it cannot possibly do what the sponsors of the amendment want it to do. If you add a billion dollars in this amendment to train more doctors, it would not produce a single doctor more in the coming year or the year after that. I know what I am talking about because I come from a State that has over 7 million people and we produced only 70 doctors last year. That is all we produced, mainly because those in charge of the State university establishment there would rather build monuments to themselves than try to train doctors in greatly needed numbers. A change in the system of training medical professional people is sorely needed throughout the country.

The popular course would be to vote for the amendment. The responsible course is to oppose it. This is not an issue as to who is more humane or who cares more about sick people, because I am absolutely convinced that every Member of this House wants to do everything that he can to assure adequate dental and medical care for all Americans.

The gentleman from Massachusetts presented a most articulate, heart-rending plea and I agree with all that he has to say in regard to our national shortcomings for medical, dental and institutional care and I am just as interested as he in correcting those deficiencies. However, those deficiencies cannot be corrected overnight even if every American dollar in the Treasury was appropriated for that purpose today. A real reason exists as to why we do not have enough doctors, dentists, nurses and medical technicians.

A plea was made for more scholarship and loan money and I favor more scholarship and loan money, but if we appropriated a billion dollars for more scholarships and student loans for medical schools it would not produce a single doctor more for the simple reason that every medical school in the country, according to the best information available

to me has its September classes filled now and tens of thousands of students throughout the country who wanted to go to medical school have no school to go to.

Let us place the blame exactly where it belongs and in this case I am only going to talk about my own State where we did not even have a State medical school until 1963. Where in 1969 a State of more than 7 million people graduated only 70 doctors and 80 dentists. How did that happen? I can tell you how it happened. It happened because the State turned down a thousand bed hospital-medical school complex in Jersey City that it could have had for \$1 and instead chose to build an entire new complex at a cost of more than \$100 million. This meant that for 5 long years, while the new complex was under construction—and, Mr. Chairman, that takes us up to the present time—one of the largest States in the Union in population produced practically no doctors.

It has been argued that we need 150,000 more registered nurses in the country and I think that is a low figure. It is a known fact today that if we had no practical nurses, half the hospitals in the Nation would close. We were told 6 years ago in New Jersey that we needed 10,000 more registered nurses and 6 years ago in New Jersey we tried to do something about it. Would you believe, there were fewer nursing schools in New Jersey then than there were 20 years before that date. In 1969 New Jersey had hundreds of R.N. trainee vacancies in hospitals and nursing schools that were not filled. There were 1,000 young women more could have been trained in New Jersey in 1969 under existing programs than were trained. This deficiency was not caused by a lack of money or a lack of facilities—it was caused by a lack of applicants. In these days of prosperity our young women are seeking more glamorous positions and are not as interested in the nursing field as they used to be. This condition, I am told, exists nationwide. So, if we are going to do something here we have to do something to make girls more interested in nursing.

This amendment has a very nice name. It no doubt will be well received by the press, especially the more liberal segments and those of us who oppose it no doubt will be branded as being against the proposition of keeping Americans healthy. I can prove that all the loans provided for in this amendment and all the scholarships provided for in this bill will not produce one more professional in medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, and nursing because with the exception of the field of nursing we already have more applicants than we can take care of.

Addressing ourselves now to the capital construction needs provided for in the amendment and at the outset let me say I would vote for many times the amount requested if it could be prudently handled and build the facilities that are needed or if they could even obligate that much money in fiscal year 1971 un-

der contract—which I know is impossible and so does every Member of this House. This is one of those amendments that is popular, has a nice name, and just as pure as motherhood itself. To oppose it is not politically smart. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania said that his committee, who listened to hundreds of witnesses during months of hearings, provided all the capital funds than can be used in fiscal year 1971. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his committee would have approved many times the amount sought by this amendment if the objectives sought by the sponsors of the amendment could be accomplished with more money. For these reasons I have chosen the responsible course of action. I will support the committee bill and oppose the Boland amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that very few were in the Chamber the day before yesterday when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee spoke of the precarious fiscal situation. He posed the issue correctly. It is not as simplistically suggested—a question of according a higher priority to human needs than financial consideration.

Was it Carlyle who spoke of economics as dismal science? This debate has spawned a familiar argument. If you are talking about a program—sufficiently worthwhile when measured in terms of its goals and objectives—forget about the threat of inflation; ignore economic considerations.

The results would be dismal indeed if we followed that prescription. We simply do not need the stimulative effect of a \$20 billion deficit in the context of the present situation when many of us feel we are at a turning point.

The majority whip is critical and says we rely too much on monetary policy. That is not so. It is precisely because we see the necessity of a proper mix and we do not want to impose too great a burden on monetary policy, that we are counseling fiscal restraint now.

It is not that we are less mindful of human needs, or oblivious to the crisis we are approaching in the delivery of health care services.

We need new programs—better programs—but those on this side of the aisle live in a very unreal world where they counsel an add-on above the budget of more than a third of a billion dollars. If we commit now in 1970, resources that we simply do not have, we are going to undercut the very effort we would like to make as soon as possible, hopefully in fiscal 1972, to come up with programs to make basic improvements in our present system of delivering health-care services.

It would be nice if we could wall off, or seal off, inflation in some kind of watertight compartment and say, you can't affect this section of the economy. That simply isn't possible.

Let me give you some concrete exam-

ples of what it has done since 1965 in this very area of health care:

Listen to these figures from the Journal of the American Hospital Association on the average expense per patient day between 1965 and 1970.

The information contained below was secured from Miss Dorothy Rice and Miss Mary McGee of the Division of Health Insurance Studies of the Social Security Administration. They secured this information from hospitals, the Journal of the American Hospital Association—AHA—and the AHA testimony at the October 28, 1969, hearing of the House Ways and Means Committee.

In 1965, the "average expense per patient day" in an American hospital was \$44.48. The estimated cost for 1970 is \$74.24.

The table below gives the "average expense per patient day" between 1965 and 1970:

1965	-----	\$44.48
1966	-----	48.15
1967	-----	54.08
1968	-----	61.38
1969 (estimate)	-----	67.59
1970 (estimate)	-----	74.24

Now hospitals are for the most part nonprofit corporations. They are not out to gouge the public. Their rates are rather the result of general inflation of the increased costs of labor and material, but mostly of personnel costs.

Now listen to these figures on recent hospital construction costs—\$57 per square foot.

I believe it is critically necessary that we exercise the kind of fiscal restraint that the President called for last weekend. If we ignore his admonition, the average American is going to get even less in the way of health care.

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, we heard a few moments ago from the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who spoke about the human values involved in the Boland amendment. I would like to speak about the monetary and financial values, because I think they are important, too.

I am concerned about inflation. I am concerned about the effectiveness of the billions of dollars we spend every year for remedial programs under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to help our kids learn in school, to help the young people learn a trade, learn skills so that they can become employable, because we all want to get them off the welfare rolls and onto the job rolls and the tax rolls.

Experience teaches us that under title I of the ESEA we have to spend enormous amounts of money on health care, in giving our young children from deprived families the medical and dental care they have shamefully lacked, so they can learn in school before we begin the attempt to educate those kids. And in the Job Corps and other elements of the poverty program we are forced to spend a very great percentage of anti-

poverty funds on health care before we can help these young men and women develop their talents and learn a trade.

If we really mean business in our efforts to educate properly all American kids, if we really mean business in our antipoverty efforts to help our young people become economically productive by acquiring the technical skills necessary to hold down a good job, then their health needs must become our first order of business. Unless we provide the health services and facilities to provide a healthy mind in a healthy body—mens sana in corpore sano—we are literally wasting in a futile effort much of the billions of dollars we are spending annually on our remedial education job training and employment programs. We are dooming these programs and these people to substantial and continuing failure.

Such a waste of taxpayers' dollars would be an unthinkable burden on the taxpaying public, and an unjustifiable addition to inflationary pressures. Let's provide for America's health needs, if for no other reason, for the reason of simple economics—we simply cannot afford the luxury of doing otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I will not take the time to cover the individual medical and health appropriations contained in title II of this bill as these were clearly described yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY). Neither will I take the time to cover the increases which have been made in various items of title II which will improve medical and health care in this country as these increases were clearly described yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, Mr. NEIL SMITH.

I do want to ask the Members of this House to take a clear look at what the adoption of this amendment really means, and I do want to refute some of the totally erroneous statements made on the floor of this House yesterday.

Title II of this appropriation bill, which is the title providing for appropriations for HEW, is \$2,119,302,000 above the fiscal year 1970 appropriation and is \$134,100,000 more than the sum provided for in the budget for fiscal year 1971. To add an additional \$360,450,000 to the expenditures under title II of this bill would be the ultimate in fiscal irresponsibility.

It is very thoughtful of the sponsors of this amendment to label their amendment as the "emergency health amendment." This is a very catchy phrase, but it is not truly descriptive of the situation in this country today. The fact is that medical and health services are better in this country than ever before. In some cases, medical schools are not accepting all of the students that they could really accommodate and the overwhelming majority of applicants for admission to medical colleges are able to pay their own tuition. In addition, thousands of medical clinics have been established by

the medical profession and communities throughout this country where medical attention is available on a prompt and reasonable basis.

I do not believe the figures we heard yesterday about the projected personnel shortages which will exist in future years in the medical and health fields, as these figures were projected by those who have a special interest in these fields. Only several years ago, we were receiving from HEW officials dire predictions about the great shortage of teachers that would exist in the future. This shortage has never developed. Today, in many sections of this country, elementary school teachers, and even secondary school teachers, are having difficulty in obtaining positions.

The fact is that the appropriations contained in this bill will adequately meet the health needs of our country when it is properly supplemented as it should be by State and local money. A comment was made on the floor of the House yesterday to the effect that local governments have reached their maximum capacity to tax. Such a statement is totally unsound because the Federal, State, and local governments receive their tax money from the same sources, the American taxpayer, whether that taxpayer be an individual or a company or a corporation. A more proper statement would be that the American taxpayers have reached a limit of taxation regardless of whether the taxation comes from the Federal, State, or local government.

Further, it is possible for community interests or medical interests, or such interests working together, to build profit-making hospitals and operate these hospitals more efficiently and at a lower cost than non-profit-making hospitals. An example of this occurred in my own congressional district.

A group of doctors got together and each put up a certain sum of money and they built a 50-bed profit-making hospital. Their operation was so successful that they have now expanded to a 200-bed hospital. This hospital pays corporate taxes, local real estate taxes, and all of the other taxes which any corporation pays. At the same time, their costs are actually lower than many nonprofit hospitals in the same area. Also, nonprofit hospitals in my congressional district have been enlarged with only some assistance from the Federal Government. This shows what can be done without soaking the taxpayer.

Also, hospital costs have been dramatically increased but this is largely due to poor administration of hospitals and will not be corrected by appropriating more Federal tax dollars.

Continued deficit spending, as represented by this amendment can only lead to continuing inflation. We have just started to get inflation under control and down from the 6- to 8-percent annual inflation increase we have been suffering, and more deficit spending will accelerate inflation. This inflation did not start with the Nixon administration. We have been suffering from inflation

during successive, prior administrations, to continue the course we are now on in deficit spending will ultimately result in the U.S. dollar being worth little more than the paper on which it is printed.

What do the sponsors of this amendment think will be the plight of the American people when this occurs? If they do not know, I will tell them. Continuing devaluing the American dollar can only destroy our economy, increase unemployment to an all-time high, and make it impossible for our people to obtain proper medical treatment and other necessities of life which they must have. In last night's news media, a respected columnist made the statement:

Inflation continues around the world but all eyes are on the United States. For if its economy can become adjusted, the effect should be felt in many countries abroad.

Continued Federal deficit spending is the one thing which will prevent our economy from becoming adjusted, and make no mistake about it.

At one time, the full faith and credit of the Federal Government of the United States meant something. It meant that our Government could float bonds for a term of 25 years at interest rates of 4¼ percent and less. The full faith and credit of the Federal Government of the United States today—due to continued deficit spending on the part of successive, prior administrations—means so little that our Treasury Department is being forced to sell bonds and other Federal obligations on terms of 3 years or less and at an interest rate of 7½ percent. The deficit spending policies forced on our Federal Government by the Congress is the reason for high interest rates.

While it is fashionable on the part of some Members of this House to blame the "big bankers" for high interest rates, this is just a fallacy. The big banks today are unable to lend money even to their preferred customers when the collateral proposed to be posted for such loans is 110 percent of the amount of the loan.

It is the fact that our Government is borrowing money to refinance over \$110 billion of maturing Federal obligations and borrowing billions of dollars of new money, all of this at 7½ percent interest, to pay for deficit spending that is causing tight money and high interest rates. In fact, just this week, Federal agencies like the Federal National Mortgage Association, Fannie Mae, borrowed money on the open capital market at a rate of 7.95 percent and is lending this money out in mortgages at 9.2 percent interest rate and charging 4.85 points. This means that when a developer of Housing for moderate-income families borrows \$1 million from Fannie Mae, he actually receives \$951,500 and pays 9.2 percent interest on the entire million dollars.

It is these conditions, developed by deficit spending which is denying money for housing, pollution control, the redevelopment of our cities, and all of the other programs which are so important to our people.

We heard here yesterday that Presi-

dent Roosevelt helped to get us out of the 1929 depression through the policy of pump-priming, of course, this was at a time when the full faith and credit of our Federal Government meant something and we could easily borrow money. If we have another depression or severe recession, we will not be able to apply the pump-priming process because there will not be any money to borrow and we are already in debt for a sum of money exceeding \$374 billion.

Also, who will be hurt the most by the deficit spending represented by this amendment. The people who are being hurt the most are those who can least afford it. We have learned from brutal experience that Mr. Average American Workingman must pay the overwhelming bulk of the taxes and in just 2 years, the annual interest rate on the money we owe will exceed \$30 billion as a continuing, increasing item in each annual budget. Deficit spending is actually robbing the great bulk of our taxpayers of money they need to provide for their families.

I urge the Members of this House who have any concern about our economy, sound fiscal programs, and concern about our overall social programs to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MEEDS).

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

THE NATION IS FACING A MASSIVE HEALTH CRISIS

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the emergency health amendment to the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill for 1971, which in my view constitutes a minimum response to obvious needs. The Nation is facing a massive health crisis which could well lead to a total breakdown of our health delivery system. Obviously we cannot permit this to happen. We must do something, and we must do it now.

On June 22 President Nixon chose to veto a 3-year extension of the Hill-Burton program despite the fact that there is a \$16 billion backlog in health facility construction and that there is a need for 250,000 more hospital beds, 893 public health centers, 872 diagnostic and treatment centers, and 388 rehabilitation facilities. In addition, 460,000 hospital beds must be modernized.

In view of the enormous need for additional health facilities and for modernization of existing facilities, I was pleased that the Congress was able to override the President's veto. The problem now facing us, Mr. Chairman, is one of providing the necessary funding not only for the Hill-Burton program but for the various Federal programs which help train the necessary personnel for existing health facilities and for those to be built in the years ahead.

This is no easy task. It takes many, many years to produce good doctors and dentists. And yet we currently need 50,000 more doctors, 18,000 more dentists, 150,000 more nurses, and over 260,000 more allied health personnel. As our popula-

tion grows and as we reduce the backlog in health facilities, the need for staffing will become more acute. Indeed, the situation will probably deteriorate before it begins to improve.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, the average American must continue to put up with less than adequate medical attention. In fact, in certain areas of the country and among some segments of our population medical and dental care is just not available.

One would think that with the unquestioned need for more health personnel, the number of students being assisted under the student loan program would be increasing. Unfortunately, however, this is not the case. During 1969, 36 percent of students in the health professions received loans. During 1970 the figure was 19 percent. And in 1971 it is estimated that only 13 percent of the students will receive such loans.

Rather than decreasing Federal funds for the student loan program, we need to dramatically increase such assistance. In addition we need to increase funds for scholarships and for work-study programs. How else are we going to encourage the poor and the black to consider careers in the health fields?

As we all know, the inventory of figures which I, and many of my colleagues, have employed in support of the emergency health amendment is only a mathematical representation of our crisis in health care. All too often we limit our discussion to the bricks and mortar issues, but the shortages and the inadequate Federal support are felt in much more human terms. Savings are wiped out; visits to the doctor are avoided; and humans suffer and die for want of prompt medical attention.

Restraining Federal spending is a worthy cause, Mr. Chairman, but is there a higher priority than human health or life itself?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. THOMSON).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin yielded his time to Mr. SHRIVER.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER).

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to repeat what has previously been said in this debate but some items need reemphasis.

It has been repeatedly stated that our bill is way above the budget. It needs to be restated—so Members of the House will be able to vote responsibly on the pending amendment which would add \$360 million to the subcommittee bill.

First, I emphasize that our bill represents an increase of \$2.3 billion over last year's appropriation.

Second, our bill is \$92.9 million above the President's budget.

Now it is proposed to add \$360 million which would bring the total of the bill to over \$450 million over the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that our Appropriation Subcommittee and the full Appropriation Committee have done a good job with this bill and with all of

the hundreds of items included in the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We have made needed increases. We have exceeded the President's budget. We have acted responsibly.

Chairman MAHON called our attention during general debate to the absolute need of holding the line on spending and practicing fiscal restraint.

He called our attention to the fact that as of May 19, the Federal funds deficit projection is up to \$10 billion.

He called our attention that the Federal funds deficit in this current fiscal year could go as high as \$20 billion.

Our committee spent weeks and weeks of time—seven large books of testimony, 7,400 pages of hearings, with scores of private and public witnesses.

Who would know better than those of us charged with the responsibility as to where to make increases—the priorities of allocations of funds and this budget as it relates to all other appropriation bills—both Republican and Democrat.

We are unanimous in our support for the committee bill and in opposition to the Boland amendment.

We urge you to sustain our position.

One-half of that requested as an increase is for construction—bricks and mortar—\$100 million for health, education facilities and \$80 million for Hill-Burton. This \$180 million of increase probably would not be used. This—our committee has found from long, past experience—has been the practice when fiscal restraint is needed.

All of us are aware of the appeal of adding money for buildings and manpower for health care.

The members of our subcommittee have complete information of the needs of better delivery of health care.

As our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa yesterday so well stated, before we go into a crash program to increase numbers of doctors and medical personnel, the system needs change.

I want to direct my colleagues' attention to the testimony presented by Dr. Egeberg on pages 19 through 25 of part 2 of the hearings, available at the committee tables. No one is attempting to deny the serious shortage of doctors in our country today. The point that is being missed, and which is very well stated by Dr. Egeberg, is that we have not found the most effective way to alleviate this shortage. In simple terms, merely pouring more money into a system which has proved ineffective will do more harm than good. By adding more money, we will be telling our citizens that we are attacking this shortage, when in fact we are not.

Until medical schools and our entire medical system is reoriented toward meeting modern priorities and alleviating geographical and professional shortages, more money will merely extend a stagnant situation. Why should these schools change their curriculum and requirements if they receive increasing amounts for the status quo? There is enough money already in this bill for medical school emergencies, that is, to

keep them open. I assure you that if individual emergencies arise which cannot be handled from this appropriation, this subcommittee stands ready to consider supplemental requests.

The committee has been asked by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) what is sacred about the budget request figures, and I agree with his answer that they should not be sacred. The committee recognized this; we recommended increases in certain areas and decreases in others. That is our responsibility. That is why we had 14 weeks of hearings. At the same time, what is so sacred about the figure of \$360 million, which would be added to the committee's increase? On what hearings is this figure based? Where are the already effective systems of health manpower training which are not working because of a lack of this \$360 million?

This is not a political question. This is not a regional question. This is an opportunity for the House to act responsibly and wisely. This is an opportunity to look further and deeper into a problem than to just take the easy road of throwing money at it and feeling self-satisfied.

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

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boland amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the emergency health amendments we now consider may be the most important legislation before Congress this year. This importance reflects both the substance of the programs—medical care—and the form of the dispute with the administration: Shall Congress have a role in setting national medical policy?

These amendments interpose a judgment, backed by the Nation's medical experts, that we must now reverse a disastrous trend of temporizing and economizing which has brought us to this situation:

In the 1970-71 school year, medical schools across the country will be accepting or rejecting students on the basis of their ability to pay. This situation has never before developed in the history of American medical education.

A prominent medical school in New York City has removed from its 1970 catalog a statement it has contained for 50 years. That statement assured students that no one would have to leave the school of medicine solely for reasons of inability to pay the tuition.

In the fiscal year 1970 Federal program for loans to medical students, only 35.8 percent of the money requested by students was available to lend them.

Let me remind my colleagues that we are not talking about grants or scholarships. We speak of loans to students who must find, after college, between \$20,000 and \$25,000 for medical school tuition. If we do not greatly increase the funds proposed by the administration, and even increase the amount recommended by the committee, the situation will be immeasurably worse next year.

Last year, we were told by the admin-

istration that another Federal program, the guaranteed student loan program, would take up the slack created by underfunding of the medical student loan program. This has not happened in the past year and it will not happen next year.

Why? Medical students report from across the country that bankers are reluctant to grant loans to students in general in a period of tight money. They are also unwilling to give money to poorer students, to those from rural areas—remote from the banking centers—and to students whose families have not had bank accounts. In short, bankers treat these student loans like any other loans. In a competitive money market, students lose out.

Mr. Chairman, we are in desperate need of remaking our entire medical care system. We must also reconstruct the means of financing medical education and of selecting medical students. Ultimately, we should develop a system which would provide free medical school tuition in return for several years of public service by young doctors.

Until we make those basic changes, however, we cannot let our medical manpower gap increase. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that we will need by 1975 40,000 more doctors than our present production plus immigration of foreign doctors will produce. These 40,000 doctors will not be produced either magically or painlessly.

We will start producing more doctors today if we pass these expensive but vital amendments which our country needs so desperately.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MOSS yielded his time to Mr. BOLAND.)

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

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the emergency health amendment. I would especially like to address my remarks to the three phases of the amendment which will provide increases in funding for the dental care projects for needy children, the community mental health centers, and the traineeships for students in health professions.

The dental care pilot projects for needy children authorized under section 510 of title V of the Social Security Act are a small item in terms of cash investment but highly significant in terms of long-term yield. These projects have a double purpose: to give care that is desperately needed by American children and to permit experimentation in methods of delivery in order to discover the most efficient, economical alternatives that are available.

There are literally millions of children in this Nation—in inner cities, in rural areas, and elsewhere—who are receiving no dental care whatever. Nearly half the children in the Nation under the age of 15 have never seen a dentist; we read in yesterday's paper of the terrible depri-

vation suffered, in this regard, by children of migrant workers.

We need to remedy this situation and we need to discover the best ways of doing it. Section 510 is explicitly designed to accomplish both purposes. It was approved by the Ways and Means Committee and this House 3 years ago; it has sat on the books ever since; it has never been implemented. The House Appropriations Committee, last year, issued a clear call for implementation of these projects, but still nothing was done.

What are we talking about in terms of implementation? Six million dollars in the first year. Contrast that, if you will, with the fact that more than \$110 million dental care dollars, on the Federal level, are annually paid out under medicare. Much of that money is spent to repair damage that need not have occurred and would not have occurred if programs like section 510 would be vigorously pursued. It is purely and simply a heedless waste of money. We have approved section 510; we have strongly suggested it be implemented.

It is now time, in my opinion, that we insist that the waste of money stop and that the proper agencies in the executive branch be explicitly directed to get moving on section 510, title V and thus begin a more rational and more economical approach to public expenditures for dental care.

In the mental health field, previous appropriations have allowed mental health centers across the Nation to begin working toward their goal of providing more efficient out-patient care. Without additional funding, their initial progress will be lost and the centers will not be able to continue in operation.

In the 22d Congressional District which I represent, Federal aid from the community mental health program has enabled the San Fernando Valley Child Guidance Center to increase its patient visits per year from 3,000 to 20,000 in a 5-year period. The same facility has been able to increase its hours of concentration to the supporting community from 3,500 hours to 18,000 hours in the same 5-year period.

In addition, staffing grants received under this program have contributed immeasurably to training some 17 psychiatrists, 15 social workers, 12 mental health nurses, and five psychiatric residents at the child guidance clinic—personnel which are the key to the success of the entire program.

A third area which is in desperate need of funds is the program which provides traineeships to selected students of public health, nursing, and the allied health professions.

As the needs for health manpower continue to rise, additional emphasis must be focused on the value of enlarging our allied health program. This is a program which has demonstrated great potential for extending the availability of health services and has indicated potential for providing a substantial return on the money required to implement it.

Casa Loma College, which is also in my district, has recently entered 86 stu-

dents into its fall program for allied health training. If even one student completes the program, he will earn enough in his lifetime to more than pay for the entire grant received by the college. If eight students complete the program, they will pay enough income tax to repay the Government for the entire grant.

Congress cannot ignore its responsibility for the continuation of these programs. Positive action taken now will go a long way in increasing our nationwide supply of health care and aid in delaying future increases in the cost of medical services. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment to assure top quality medical care for all Americans.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CORMAN yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. BOLAND.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. O'HARA).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA yielded his time to Mr. BOLAND.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIVERS was allowed to speak out of order.)

#### REVIEW OF THE DRAFT LAW

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to publicly commend the Special Armed Services Subcommittee which recently completed its investigation and submitted its report to the committee and the general public on the Mylai affair.

The report requires no commentary from me since it speaks for itself. Every member of the subcommittee and its staff by virtue of this candid report have once again earned the continued respect of every Member of Congress, and indeed the American public.

The chairman of the special subcommittee was Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT. I am, therefore, happy to announce that upon the conclusion of his special investigation into the Mylai affair, I requested that he convene his Special Subcommittee on the Draft to begin a review of the entire draft law, including its administration, regulation, and judicial interpretation.

Mr. HÉBERT's subcommittee is now meeting on this subject and I am confident will, upon completion of its review, provide the full Committee on Armed Services with meaningful recommendations for possible future action in this area.

It has been truthfully said that when you want difficult problems solved, you assign them to a busy man. I think what I have just said indicates the type of man EDDIE HÉBERT is. I would like to commend him, in particular, for the special dedication he always gives to any of the myriad of problems that are submitted to him as a subcommittee chairman.

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I commend the able chairman of the subcom-

mittee—the gentleman from Pennsylvania—for the bill he brings to the House floor. But the question is not what we have done, but what needs to be done for health research and medical care for the people of this country.

In 1968 over \$53 billion was spent by public authorities and private individuals for health care. More research and more medical care would have reduced that expenditure.

In 1967 the workers of the United States lost over \$3 billion in wages which would not have been lost if there had been adequate health research and adequate provisions for medical care for these workers.

In 1967 the people who lived, who otherwise would have died but for the research we have had in the past, contributed \$1.7 billion in Federal income and excise taxes.

Mr. Chairman, not to speak of what it means to save human life and health in terms of dollars saved, it is economy for this country to spend much more on health research and medical care for our people than we are spending or prepared to spend. This amendment, though itself not adequate for the Nation's needs, will make this bill more meaningful to the people of our country and I hope it will be adopted.

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

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the emergency health amendment introduced by our distinguished colleague, EDWARD BOLAND of Massachusetts. Our colleague, on the floor in debating this amendment, has cited the extraordinary need for these additional moneys which would be used primarily to fund vital health services.

The simple statistic on infant mortality in this country, and this country stands 13th in the world, should shock the conscience of every legislator sitting in this Chamber. With all our technological advances permitting us to be the first to land on the moon, we are not the first in terms of health care. As was pointed out by other of our colleagues, our male population has a shorter life expectancy than that of males in 17 other countries. The poor in this country, and I refer now to those who are not on welfare, are the least assisted medically. In my own State of New York the person who is not on welfare and over the age of 21 and under the age of 65 is not eligible for medicare. And it is that large group of people that I have just described that have been the least assisted by this Congress over the years. The medical schools are suffering and are not able to provide us with a growing physician population to meet the needs of the growing population at large. And many medical schools are in critical financial condition. We have no hesitation in spending billions on military cost overruns and yet we hesitate to provide bare minimums for the health of our population.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in economy but not economy at the expense of

health. There are many areas in the Federal budget and in particular the military, space, farm, and highway budgets that could be trimmed to have many times the cost of this amendment and I therefore urge its adoption.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. KOCH yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. BOLAND.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to increase expenditures for health care ought to pass.

Dr. Kenneth M. Endicott, Director of the Bureau of Health Professions Education and Manpower Training, put it convincingly when he testified before the subcommittee 3 months ago. Dr. Endicott said:

For, as reported by the President and many national health organizations, there is indeed a health crisis. There is a massive shortage of physicians, dentists, nurses, and all types of allied health personnel. Unless very substantial investments to expand training capacity are made now, these serious shortages will persist into the late 1970's and 1980's.

There is no mistaking the extent of this health crisis, and no question about the substantial investments required to deal with it. We must apply our resources to the best of our authorized abilities. To do less would be foolish and shortsighted.

Yesterday a question was raised on the floor as to who is qualified to judge what ought to be spent on health care. That is a legitimate question, but it does not take a genius to see that our medical and dental schools are in serious trouble and that in their present condition simply cannot produce the quantity and quality of doctors and dentists the country demonstrably needs. I am disturbed because some people have discussed this in terms of being just an urban problem, but it is not. I come from a rural district and small community after small community in that district is without a single doctor and even the most populous county in my district has less than half the Nation's average in the number of doctors per hundred thousand population and that national average is terribly inadequate and it results, at least in part, in the shocking health statistics which define the status of our country's health.

In infant mortality this country stands 13th in the world. If we had the same rate of infant mortality as they have in Sweden, 50,000 fewer American babies would have died last year. American males have a shorter life expectancy than males in 17 other countries. Forty-five percent of the population suffers from some chronic disease and the poor have four times the incidence of those diseases as the rest of the Nation. By 1975 the number of visits to doctors in this country will increase by 25 percent. The number of doctors will increase only 9 percent, and yet the medical schools are dying.

The Association of American Medical Colleges reports that 61 out of 107 med-

ical schools in the Nation have been awarded special projects grants on the basis of some condition of financial distress.

Without these emergency transfusions, some schools certainly would have gone under. And half of the 61 were in such critical financial condition that they were in danger of losing accreditation.

Two dental schools, one in Missouri and one in Louisiana, have closed their doors permanently, and six others are reported in danger of doing so. The total operating deficit of the Nation's 53 remaining dental schools is estimated at about \$45 million.

Mr. Chairman, our medical schools are straining to increase their enrollments. They will be admitting 30 percent more students this fall than they did in 1963. And they are strained to the breaking point.

At present there are \$600 million worth of approved but unfunded applications for the construction of medical and dental teaching facilities. Unless we make a substantial effort to reduce this backlog of expansion projects, we shall be unable to increase our output of health professionals.

And there is another fact to consider. Whether we are for it, or against it, we had better face the fact that some kind of national health insurance program will be facing us within the next 5 or 6 years. The Nation's health care system is inadequate to handle its present burden. Can you imagine how woefully inadequate it will be to meet the needs of that kind of a program even if we budget every dollar that is authorized? We need dramatic action and we need it now. Five years from now we will wish we had adopted these amendments and gone even beyond them.

There seems to be an assumption on the part of some that supporters of this amendment do not care about the Federal budget. The record shows, however, that many of us have tried continually to cut programs that can wait: The SST, the ABM, the space budget, and some parts of foreign aid. I do not apologize for the fact that this amendment asks for an additional \$360 million. That is a small fraction of the cost overrun for the C-5A. The moon, superspeed travel, and certain aspects of the foreign aid program can wait, but heart disease, cancer and other diseases do not occur conveniently on a fiscal year basis. They happen every day. If the richest Nation in the world cannot afford to become the healthiest Nation in the world, I do not know who can.

Two weeks ago we overrode the veto of the Hill-Burton authorization bill. All we are asking is that you today put some meaning into that action by voting for the money to finance that override.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. BOLAND.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GERALD R. FORD and Mr. MICHEL yielded their time to Mrs. REID of Illinois.)

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment which would increase appropriations by \$360.4 million. As I have pointed out previously along with the other members of my subcommittee we gave all of the items included in the amendment very careful and considerate attention and in almost every instance we have increased the amounts over the President's budget request and provided more money than was available in the 1970 fiscal year. For all health programs, H.R. 18515 will provide a total of \$208 million over the budget request and \$313 million over the amount available in 1970.

After hearing the testimony and discussing the items in executive session, a majority of our committee felt that the funds we recommended for most of these programs—with the exception of the Hill-Burton program—were all that could be used effectively in this fiscal year. In the case of Hill-Burton hospital construction and modernization, testimony has shown that modernization needs alone could exceed \$11 billion. Obviously, it is impossible to provide all of this in a direct-grant program. Therefore, the administration has recommended a new approach of financing by providing interest subsidies. In order to get into this program gradually, our committee added \$122.2 million to the direct-grant program while providing \$5 million for interest subsidies.

I believe that most of us will agree that all of these health programs have very worthy goals and it would be wonderful if we could proceed to build and modernize all the needed medical facilities and schools at once—as well as provide the needed scholarships and student aid. But, I would remind you once again that in deciding our priorities, significant and overriding points must be weighed. Providing health services is one of the Nation's largest domestic businesses and, even more so than other businesses, it has been hit hard by the effect of inflation. Thus, the importance of curbing inflation must be understood by anyone who sees the dollar spent on such services being continually eroded by inflated costs. We must, therefore, continue to do everything possible to win the battle against inflation and in doing so, we have a responsibility to appropriate funds in ways that will provide the most effective results. In my opinion, we should keep this in mind and, accordingly, vote against this amendment.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Is it in order for me to move that the Committee do now rise?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a privileged motion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. YATES and Mr. FLOOD.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 8, noes 93.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all the Members of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union are happy that we are coming to the end of this debate on this particular amendment. We have had a rather full debate on the amendment over the past few days.

Mr. Chairman, I was struck by the arguments that were advanced here a moment ago by the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) and by the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAMMO).

The gentleman from California (Mr. Moss) has served for some 14 years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That committee is interested in this legislation and in this amendment because it has over the past years passed some of the finest health legislation in the history of the Congress. I look with pride on the other side of the aisle upon the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SPRINGER) who has been one of those who has been a leader in some of the great landmark health legislation that has been passed out of this committee and passed by the Congress.

I repeat, I was struck by the arguments of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAMMO). Simply stated, his arguments were that we ought to reorder our priorities, and that is what we are doing with this amendment, precisely what we are doing with this amendment. The gentleman indicated, I think with good reason, where money could be taken from other programs—other programs—not from those programs that deal with the health of the people of this Nation.

So, Mr. Chairman, as we come to the close of the debate on this amendment, let me quote from the RECORD of the 88th Congress, the second session, the words are those of our late, beloved, and remarkably able colleague, John E. Fogarty—a giant, as any Member who is serving here today knows, who served with him, can tell you—a giant in the field of Government participation in health.

He pointed out, with some degree of modesty, that he had been intimately involved in the development of the HEW programs over the years. He said, and I quote:

Time and again, and more often than should have been necessary, I have seen the Congress stepping in—because Congress could not do otherwise—to assure the funds to seize present opportunities—as identified by our science leaders to meet the most urgent of these health needs. Largely because the Congress has had the foresight and good sense to take bold action, these health-related programs have flourished. Their effectiveness and high reputation throughout the world are unequalled in the science area.

All of us—each day—count increasing benefits from these programs. I reiterate my con-

viction that what has been wrought in this postwar effort, in medical research, will emerge as the most significant federal action of our era.

Mr. Chairman, the action we take today is indeed bold action with which to meet the crisis in health that pervades this land. But this great body has taken this kind of action before. It can with reason and with conviction do so again today by voting for the amendment now before this committee.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wonder if the gentleman is aware that this administration has done a remarkable job already in the reallocation of our resources?

As an example, I will cite the fact that while the Department of Defense budget was 45 percent of the overall Government spending in the last year of the Johnson administration, that it is now 37 percent in this year in the Nixon budget.

Mr. BOLAND. In response to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I believe we can say that the fault lies not alone with the Nixon administration, but with past administrations. We are here today to make our own judgments of what ought to be done in this field. I say that this is the way to do it, and I would hope that the gentleman from Massachusetts would support our efforts in this area.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would also point out, because I am sure that my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts is aware of it, that the Government spending on human resources in the last year of the Johnson administration was 32 percent of the total budget, while it will be 41 percent of the Nixon budget in this Congress this year.

Mr. BOLAND. The contention of those who support this amendment is that we are not spending what we ought to be spending in the health area. There is a crisis in health, and this has been the cry not alone of our President, but the cry of the former Secretary Robert E. Finch, and the cry of the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Dr. Robert Egeberg.

There is a crisis in health, and this is the way to meet it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, just about 1 year ago on July 10, 1969, President Nixon walked into the Rose Garden and before the assembled press said this:

I realized when the administration came in, in January, that we had a major problem with regard to health care, that the problem was primarily one of enough doctors, the quality of the doctors, enough hospital beds to take care of the massively increasing demands in this field.

The report that I have received from Secretary Finch and Dr. Egeberg indicates that the problem is much greater than I had realized. We face a massive crisis in this area and unless action is taken, both administratively and legislatively, to meet that crisis within the next 2 to 3 years, we will have a breakdown in our medical care system which

could have consequences affecting millions of people throughout this country.

I don't think I am overstating the case.

That is what the President said a year ago. "I don't think I am overstating the case." And then, amazingly, Mr. Chairman, he filed a budget that severely underfinanced the health care program, as for example, the Hill-Burton program which was reduced by more than two-thirds of what was appropriated last year. Recommending appropriations which are clearly insufficient is hardly mounting a massive attack on the massive crisis the President spoke about. It is somewhat like throwing a rope 30 feet long to a man who is drowning 50 feet away.

Mr. Chairman, in this year, 1970, medical care is still not available for the people of our country and the committee's increases in the bill were timid for the most part. Timid and less than meaningful. The Boland amendment will take the long step needed to stop the accelerating deterioration of our medical care system.

This country has the brains and the resources to provide the best medical care of any country in the world and we are not doing it. The gap between what we know and what we do is so great that thousands of people die needlessly every year. There is no greater priority than the health of our people and the budget must take that into consideration. The budget must not decide what the needs of the Nation are. The needs of the Nation must govern the budget, and if Federal dollars are to be limited in their allocation, certainly the care of the people of our Nation must come highest in our consideration. I believe there must be an aye vote on the Boland amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in these historic Halls many good men have gone down with the ship. I see here another case.

This bill, with the Boland amendment, would sink this House and would destroy many brave men.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the health emergency amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

The need for increased appropriations for health is a matter of clear record before both our legislative and appropriate committees.

The package amendment now pending would increase the health appropriation in this bill by \$360,454,000.

It covers added institutional support of health schools, loans and traineeships for health profession students, construction of health education facilities, increased funding for the National Heart and Lung Institute.

Also, initial funding for special dental projects, increased funding for hospital construction grants, increased funding for staffing of community mental health centers, and a small increase in the funding for medical libraries.

#### AID FOR PROFESSIONS

Included in these collective requests are funds for the health professions. I

would call particular attention to the need for providing assistance in connection with the nursing staffs of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

I am a member of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which has been investigating the hospital staffing situation.

As a result of on-the-spot investigation by myself, as well as hearings before our subcommittee, it is clear that the ratio of nurses to patients in VA hospitals is dangerously low.

The evidence before our committee is that the employee ratio per patient in VA hospitals is running about 1.5 as contrasted with the ratio in civilian hospitals of at least 2.7.

#### VA BELOW CIVILIAN MINIMUM

During our subcommittee hearings, a witness from a VA hospital in California pointed out that the State minimum licensing criteria for civilian hospitals is a ratio of 2.5. On this basis, the witness said that if the VA hospital was not a Federal institution it would not be licensed to operate in that State.

It is essential that the Federal Government increase its share of assistance for students in the health provisions. This can be done through loans and traineeships. We also must have additional health education facilities.

Without the facilities and the assistance for students the prospect is that the shortage of doctors, nurses, dentists, and other health professionals is going to increase to a point of peril to our Nation's health.

While I recognize the need for a control on Federal spending, I do not believe that we can justify the meager appropriations which we have been providing in the past for health manpower.

Mr. Chairman, I support vigorously the pending health emergency amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, during my first term in office, I have served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which developed the authorization language for the Health Manpower Act of 1968.

The United States is faced with a critical shortage of health manpower. More than 50,000 additional physicians are needed now. In 1967, we needed 800,000 registered nurses—yet in 1969, the nursing manpower supply was only 700,000. The demand for health professionals is increasing faster than the supply, especially since we, the Congress, recently passed a hospital construction bill to provide more needed hospital beds.

To meet this need, a program of direct loans to students of the health professions was established by us in 1965. Grants are made to the schools of the health professions who then loan the money to the students most in need. Students of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine are eligible. A similar program exists for nursing students.

Despite the students' demonstrated need for and dependence on these loan funds, the administration is requesting only \$9,610,000 for nursing students, with a markup to \$15,610,000 by the full Ap-

propriations Committee. This figure falls far below the amounts authorized by us under the Health Manpower Act of 1968—\$21,000,000—and far below the fiscal year 1971 funds requested by schools of nursing—\$27,900,929.

In my own State of North Carolina, the Duke University School of Nursing currently states:

We receive 175-200 applications for undergraduate study of which we can presently enroll a maximum of 85. Of 303 students in the school, 102 receive financial assistance and the need for aid keeps increasing.

Mr. Chairman, with facts and figures before us, I fully support the Health Emergency Amendment of 1970, and I urge you to do the same.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the wire services quoted the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD) as citing Mr. YATES of Illinois and Mr. COHELAN of California as the two biggest "spenders" of the House Appropriations Committee.

It is now quite clear that this impulsive attack was an expression of disapproval of the attempts that are being made today to provide adequate health facilities and medical manpower, along with my past efforts in behalf of decent housing for the American people, quality education, and, in general, adequately funding those programs which are designed to improve the quality of life in our cities through those programs which are in desperate need of Federal support.

Such scatter-gun attacks by the administration on big spending will not hide the real issues. An examination of the budget for fiscal year 1971 will make clear that the administration's budget requests for our most important domestic programs were deficient—falling far below the minimal amount necessary for schools, health facilities and manpower, and urban housing.

It is also painfully clear that the administration has made no effort to submit revenue measures designed to alleviate these alleged imbalances and adequately fund our necessary domestic programs. No request for the extension of the surcharge came from the administration. This lack of meaningful revenue measures on the part of the administration was done with the complete knowledge of the budget formulation that the termination of the surtax would remove \$10.8 billion from Federal revenues. Also it must be remembered that the President's own economic plan, inadequate though it may be, called for a "cooling off" of the economy. This meant that there would be a reduction in new construction, production, and employment. Thus by the President's own plan it was predictable that tax revenues would fall sharply from last year's figures.

The point is that the administration knew that it would be a budget with a deficit when they formulated it. The administration chose not to ask for the needed revenues which would have helped to offset these financial imbalances. The administration did choose to control—"slash" is a better word—the controllable programs to improve the quality of life in the United States.

I must also note that there has been no discussion by the administration of

the two spending categories that have substantially increased the budget outlays over the past few years. The first is in the uncontrollable items such as social security, retirement, medicare, and public assistance.

The estimated increase in uncontrollables from 1970 to 1971 alone is \$9.8 billion. I do not specifically object to these expenditures, but merely point out their magnitude in order to gain some perspective on the spending question.

The second category is defense spending. Here we see substantial increases. For example, authorizations for strategic nuclear forces from 1968 to 1971 grew from \$16.6 billion to \$18 billion. Authorizations for general purpose forces, not including Vietnam, costs grew from \$37.5 billion in 1968 to \$43.3 billion in 1971. This is a total increase of \$7.2 billion, and may I add that it was the Congress that led the way last year in cutting the Department of Defense budget.

Let us look to the comparative figures. On one side we have a growth of \$7.2 billion in military spending; yet not one word of caution comes from the White House. Quite the opposite. The administration continually presses forward with programs of dubious value. The ABM is but one example.

On the other side, Congress has been treated to a continual barrage of criticism from the administration for increases over budget requests. But these so-called tremendous increases total a mere \$1.884 billion. I want to emphasize that the total increase in educational appropriations and the total suggested increases in health and housing totals less than \$2 billion.

I do not want to leave the impression that we have adequately funded these domestic programs. This \$1.884 billion increase is only a drop in the bucket compared to the needs in these crucial areas of education, health, and housing. But the real problem is inadequate revenue schemes.

It is instructive to note the magnitude of the total budgetary picture when discussing the questioned congressional action. The budget as submitted foresaw expenditures of \$202.2 billion, including cost estimates for a 10-percent social security increase and a \$5.2 billion decrease in defense expenditures. On the other side, with the surtax for example, we would have expected revenues of \$210.8 billion—leaving a surplus of \$8.6 billion.

Why then do we have a deficit? The administration attempts to blame expected deficits on additional expenditures which we see are minimal in relation to the total budgetary picture—\$2 billion in a \$202.2 billion budget. The answer is clear. The President has refused to suggest or continue adequate revenue producing measures which would have allowed for the increased domestic expenses.

The administration continues to blame the Congress for its own dereliction in the revenue area. Had the surtax been continued the \$1.5 billion extra in expenditures resulting from a necessary 15 percent rather than 10 percent increase in social security, as well as the \$1.884 billion in additional domestic ex-

penses, could easily have been absorbed in the surplus budget.

Looking at this table, each of us can ask what were the new revenue measures suggested by the administration.

[In billions of dollars]

User transportation charges.....	0.7
Excise rate extension.....	.6
Increase in social security.....	.2
Retirement fund (for new increases)....	.1
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>1.6</b>

Thus, faced with predictable revenue shortfalls—shortfalls built into the Nixon economic plans—the administration did almost nothing to raise new revenues. It became painfully apparent as the revenues from personal income taxes would become offset by increases in unemployment insurance, as corporate taxes fall short of projections because of accelerating recession. It is obvious even to the most casual observer that the highly touted \$1.3 billion surplus was just an effort in wish fulfillment and public relations.

According to my information, the Ways and Means Committee has not received official administration proposals for excise tax speedups or an official administration bill for a tax on leaded gasoline. By administration figures, these proposals would add \$3 billion to revenues.

The full picture is clearly seen in the following chart:

#### THE 1971 BUDGET PROBLEM AND HOW IT WAS HANDLED

##### THE POTENTIAL SURPLUS

Revenues, if calculated for fiscal 1971 at 1969 tax rates (that is, not allowing for the expiration of the tax surcharge), would have been \$210.8 billion.

Expenditures, if calculated for fiscal 1971 only on the basis of a 10 percent social security benefit increase, a \$5.2 billion military spending cut, and largely uncontrollable increases in civilian spending (including a federal pay raise on July 1, 1970), would have been \$202.2 billion.

Hence there would have been a potential surplus for program expansion, for tax cuts, or for fiscal policy purposes of \$8.6 billion.

##### HOW THE POTENTIAL SURPLUS BECAME A POTENTIAL DEFICIT

The expiration of the income tax surcharge will result in an estimated revenue loss of \$10.8 billion.

The extra 5 percent increase in social security benefits will cost an estimated \$1.5 billion.

The total loss of available funds from both these effects will thus be \$12.3 billion.

A loss of \$12.3 billion in available funds would transform the \$8.6 billion potential surplus into a potential deficit of \$3.7 billion.

##### THE BASIC PROBLEM FORMULATED

Even after a \$5.2 billion cut in military spending and without any allowance for program expansion, the budget was threatened with a \$3.7 billion deficit. Hence the basic problem became that of turning the deficit into a modest surplus and finding budgetary room for some program expansion to meet urgent needs.

##### HOW THE ADMINISTRATION HANDLED THE PROBLEM

Six ways were found to reduce expenditures by a total of \$7.5 billion.

They were: program reductions, \$1.1 billion; postponement of the federal pay raise for six months, \$1.2 billion; a reduction in the postal deficit, \$0.9 billion; an additional

net sale of government mortgages and loans, \$2.7 billion; sale of stockpile assets and the Alaska Railroad, \$0.8 billion; and transfer of cash royalties from the continental shelf oil escrow account to the Treasury, \$0.8 billion.

Three ways were found to increase revenues by a total of \$2.1 billion. They were: accelerated tax collections, \$1.2 billion; an increase in the social security tax wage base, \$0.2 billion; and new user charges, \$0.7 billion.

The net effect was to increase available funds by a total of \$9.6 billion.

The \$9.6 billion increase was used in two ways:

The \$3.7 billion potential deficit was converted into a \$1.3 billion surplus; this required \$5.0 billion.

Existing programs were expanded and new programs were proposed; this required \$4.6 billion.

Earlier in this statement and in my remarks made on the floor of the House July 21, I discussed the uncontrollables in the budget. Medicare payments, as one example, increased from the estimated \$200 million to \$2 billion yearly. This escalatory trend in uncontrollables is not clearly understood by the administration or by the Congress for that matter. One method used by the administration to balance the rise in uncontrollables was an attempted decrease in controllable items. This is an obvious albeit deadly solution for it results in what I call "paralleling" the spending. As budgetary social welfare uncontrollables rose, the administration attempted to cut social welfare controllables. Obviously Congress will not stand for this approach to spending. The domestic programs are acutely underfunded now, and it makes no sense to cut them further because the domestic uncontrollables have expanded beyond expectation. This expansion should be viewed as an indication of the need for more funds and more rational planning. It should not be viewed as an excuse to penalize those whose need is well evidenced.

The administration appears to view the budget as a series of compartments, for example, education, health, military spending, and so forth. Reallocations are made within compartments on a "robbing Peter to pay Paul" basis. This approach is neither fair nor logical. In the short term we must look at the full budget to determine where cuts and additions can be made.

Granted this is difficult as appropriations are considered in the same compartmentalized basis, department by department, agency by agency. They are then voted on a piecemeal basis as they come out of committee. This tends to make for interdepartmental juggling rather than providing a view of the entire structure.

In his budget message, the President did make reference to a macroeconomic approach. He said:

The President's ability to control budget decisions is limited by long-range impact of past decisions as to the nature and dimensions of resource allocation. Budget control can be improved by projecting available resources and potential claims on them. Such projections require assumptions about the future course of economic, legislative, international, and other events and are necessarily rough and arbitrary. Nevertheless, they should be undertaken to present a tentative indication of our future fiscal environment.

This is sound. It expresses general problems in this area.

The President must follow his own dictum, however, for the Congress is and should be willing to gut the essential programs to cut deficits resulting from inattention to new revenue sources and poor administration planning.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to increase appropriations for health programs under H.R. 18515.

This amendment would provide an additional \$104.8 million for institutional support of our medical schools, \$100 million for medical training facilities construction, \$80 million for Hill-Burton medical facilities construction, \$20 million for community mental health staffing, \$18.4 million for student loans, \$15.7 million for traineeships, and \$15 million for the National Heart and Lung Institute, among other things.

It greatly disturbs me when I see public officials from the Chief Executive on down opposing increased funding for the many projects aimed at improving the faltering health services delivery system in this country and increasing research in various health fields.

I am fully aware of the need to control excessive Government spending which feeds inflation, but the Budget Director's slashes should never be permitted to jeopardize the health and well-being of the people of our Nation.

Daily, the testimony concerning the tremendous need for health services among migrant workers pours in. The Hill-Burton program would help build medical facilities in many rural areas to meet the needs of these poor Americans. But the present administration and its supporters in this body would deny the necessary funds for such construction.

And over and over the statisticians point to heart disease and cancer as among the leading causes of death for Americans. Increased funding for the National Heart and Lung Institute would mean that a real cure to these terrible diseases might come about sooner. But the present administration and its supporters in this body would rather buy an SST than the answer to two of our most serious health problems.

And urgent reports are reaching this body of the imminent possibility of many of our leading medical schools closing due to lack of sufficient funds to maintain their operations. This amendment would provide those greatly needed funds and thus protect these important institutions from ruin. But the present administration and its supporters in this body would rather invest in palaces for dictators with misguided foreign aid funds than in the future of our greatly needed medical doctors and nurses.

And all too frequently we hear of growing drug abuse, youth frustration and increasing mental health problems. More mental health centers are needed to meet the growing demands in this area. This amendment would provide the funds necessary to insure adequate staffing to at least keep existing centers open. But this administration and its supporters in this body would rather supply unwanted

and unneeded jets to Taiwan than aid the many suffering mental patients in this country.

What economy is it, I ask, if the patient dies while the doctors quibble over who will pay the bill? Can we afford to count pennies when the health of so many of our citizens, young and old, rich and poor alike is the risk of the ante? What dollar value can one place on the life of a heart attack victim that is lost because researchers lacked the money to cure his disease? Or what is the value of a child's life, lost because no doctors or medical facilities were available to her due to the parsimony of a few politicians?

Mr. Chairman, this measure is properly entitled the emergency health amendment. Our medical schools, hospitals, and medical research institutes are in a crisis. Many Americans can hardly afford to pay for medical services because of the ever-increasing costs. And many more cannot even obtain such services due to a lack of facilities in their area.

I sincerely hope that a majority of my colleagues here today will see the wisdom in providing for at least adequate funding for these programs so vitally necessary to the health of every citizen. I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment and prompt final passage of H.R. 18515.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in support of the emergency health amendment, offered by Mr. BOLAND, to add \$360 million to help meet our Nation's grave health crisis.

I flew to Albany, N.Y., this morning to carry out a longstanding commitment to address the Albany Rotary Club on current issues in the Congress. I had planned to return to Washington immediately after that meeting on the 2:10 p.m. plane, so as to be able to vote on the Boland amendment, so urgently needed in the capital district area of New York State.

Unfortunately, due to an emergency collapse of one runway in the Albany county airport, the flight I had been scheduled to take was canceled. I was diverted to a later flight, which arrived, unfortunately, after the crucial teller vote had been cast. As it turned out, of course, my vote would not have been enough to turn the tide, but I am sorry not to have been able to arrive in time to cast that vote, because added funds in the HEW appropriations bill could have meant a great deal in Albany.

We hear the phrase "crisis in health" more and more often today. This is not an empty shibboleth, but rather the naked truth—a harsh reality that affects every American family. Our health care institutions, including medical schools, hospitals, and public clinics, are in a state of financial starvation, and the fiscal 1971 appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not meet the needs of these institutions. The President has expressed his deep concern for the plight of the health field, but the HEW budget request for fiscal 1971 falls far short of meeting our health care needs. And it is probably true that even if we fund our health care programs to the level of maximum authorization that our health programs will still not be adequate.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in the health manpower and institutional support sections of the emergency health amendment. There is little doubt that the principal cause of our health crisis is the severe shortage in trained health manpower. The needs in this area grow nearly every day and full funding of the health manpower program is absolutely necessary.

When our country needs 48,000 more doctors, 17,800 more dentists, 150,000 more nurses, and 266,000 more allied health personnel then it is fair to call the present health situation in America severe and unnecessary. It is the responsibility of the Congress to reverse this trend and fund these programs of institutional support to the full amounts authorized.

I understand too that the student loan programs administered under the manpower training programs are in serious difficulty. In 1968, 37 percent of our health professional students received financial aid, but projected figures show that only 14 percent will receive such aid during 1971 under the administration's proposed budget. I believe that all my distinguished colleagues are well aware of the tremendous expense of a medical, dental, or nursing education and the resulting need of financial aid for these students.

Institutional support for medical and nursing schools also falls far below the needs of these schools. In my own area, for example, cuts in Federal aid have severely reduced the effectiveness of several valuable programs and services performed by the Albany Medical College and Albany Medical Center. The importance of these losses to the residents of upstate New York cannot be overemphasized. The situation is exemplified by the decision to eliminate the Clinical Research Center at the College. Fifty percent of the work performed at this research center deals with cancer patients and now, because of a lack of funds, the research center will be phased out of operation. This Boland amendment could rescue the Albany clinical center.

America, then, is faced with a health crisis of major proportions, a crisis that is embarrassing to the United States and uncalled for in light of our great wealth. The time has come now for the Congress to reverse this alarming situation and allocate the funds necessary to start to get our Nation's medical system back on its feet. It is inevitable that some people will get sick, but it is inexcusable and shameful that proper health care cannot be provided to all Americans. No person should have to linger in misery if we have the resources to avoid or at least ease this terrible burden. To do less would be a disgrace. Therefore I trust we can still increase this bill by the amounts contained in the Boland amendment.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I support the conference report on Labor-HEW appropriations and the Boland amendment.

The plight of the Nation's medical and allied health professions schools is desperate and deteriorating and the need for more health manpower in my district in Lucas County, Ohio—as well as across

the country—in reaching critical proportions. Clearly we cannot leave the sick man to care for himself because we have failed to adequately appropriate funds for health manpower.

In 1968 the Congress called for the critically needed massive increases in health manpower of all kinds and passed a series of laws authorizing funds to assist the schools in meeting the new goals. If national priorities are to be maintained in response to the real needs of our changing society, then clearly Congress must deliver on its promise and fulfill its commitment to making sure that there is enough manpower for every American in need of health care.

In doing this we do not mean to ignore the importance of fiscal responsibility and the need to check inflationary pressures and to achieve price stability. But we must be responsive to this most pressing national need and defer expenditures in other sectors of the economy in which activity can be postponed or eliminated. I would suggest, in the alternative, that the President apply the surgeon's knife to paring such questionable ventures as the ABM, MIRV, NASA, the C-5A transport, the SST and high Southeast Asian expenditures.

The administration's proposed health manpower budget for this year tragically underfunds the programs Congress established. This has subjected health professional training institutions to virtually unbearable pressures. For the most part these institutions have not been able to increase the number of their graduates as rapidly as they need to, and, more threateningly, a number of these institutions may, because of financial distress, no longer be able to continue operating.

Student tuition and fees have already been increased beyond the means of many students, and this has overstrained available health profession student loan and scholarship funds. For fiscal 1971, for example, the health professions schools have requested loan funds of \$61 million, while the administration's budget proposal is \$21.6 million. The amount authorized by Congress is \$56 million. In the meantime, the percent of students assisted in the health professions other than nursing, for example, will have declined from 36 percent in 1968 and 1969 to only 13 percent in 1971 under the proposed budget.

The health manpower programs are essential to our achievement of better health for generations to come. Our investment in them reaps tremendous rewards for the American people and will be repaid untold times in the years ahead. Mr. Chairman, Congress must meet its obligation to the priorities it has already so correctly established, by fully funding the authorizations for health manpower programs.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I will support the emergency health amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to H.R. 18515, being the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1971.

Of course, we have heard from the critics of this amendment that it is misnamed and there is no real emergency. That is very easy to say. The true

facts are that there is a very real existing crisis in health care. The word emergency is not just an empty phrase, but a reality. This appropriation bill, H.R. 18515 falls far short of the actual need. As a matter of fact we will be short of the actual need if we funded the maximum authorization which was provided for under the authorization bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in this amendment we are really considering two major programs. One is the health manpower program, which, in general, means the training of doctors, dentists, nurses, and allied health personnel. Second is the Hill-Burton program which, as everyone in America should know, provides grants for medical facilities. In recent years Hill-Burton has been a combined modernization and construction program.

Those of us who consider the support of this amendment are mindful of the suggestion by the present administration that the result of the amendment will be inflationary. The valid answer to these critics is that one of the worst inflationary pressures in our entire economy comes from the low supply of health care manpower and hospital facilities. It is the medical costs spiral which has been skyrocketing worst of all. The money in this amendment, while contended to be inflationary, will in fact supply sorely needed trained health manpower and provide for the modernization and construction of new care facilities and thus tend to be a contribution to controlling inflation by reducing the medical cost increases which are certainly at present the most inflationary of anything in our entire economy.

Mr. Chairman, if statistics mean anything we are told we need 40,000 more doctors, 17,800 more dentists, 150,000 more nurses, and 266,000 more allied health personnel. A rather reliable source of statistics is the Public Health Service which points out that unless we make up this gap now, the needs in 10 years by 1980 will be doubled and the shortage will be twice the figures just enumerated. Up to now, we have made no real effort toward increasing our supply of doctors unless it would happen to be the relaxation of immigration quotas to bring in a few foreign doctors. Our medical schools are in financial difficulties. In my own State of Missouri a dental school at St. Louis has closed its doors.

In the field of health manpower training the student loan program is woefully short. Two or 3 years ago over 35 percent of health professional students could receive financial aid. For fiscal year 1971 under the administration budget only 14 percent could receive aid. Under the committee appropriations only about 24 percent could receive aid.

I suppose all of us to some degree, more or less, are provincial and parochial. In Kansas City, Mo., a portion of which it is my privilege to represent, there is an area we call Hospital Hill. We have two present and pressing problems on the hill. The long-cherished dream of having a teaching hospital in Kansas City was recently realized when the University of Missouri medical school was established at Kansas City. Our hard-pressed State of Missouri managed

to scrape together over \$4 million in State money to be contributed toward the building of this medical school. That institution presently has an application to health manpower for \$9 million. Unless the emergency health amendment is adopted this money may not be available.

Also on this same Hospital Hill in Kansas City there is proposed to be built a teaching hospital in addition to the medical school. The good people of Jackson County have voted county bonds; \$13 million of this money has been set aside for construction of this hospital. An additional \$10 million in Federal funds is sorely needed now. An application is pending for that amount of money from Federal Health Manpower. These figures taken alone may not in themselves be alarming, but the frightening thing is that the present schedule calls for the medical school to accept its first class in September of 1971. It is anticipated that without some construction either this year or next this class will have to use facilities scattered in several area hospitals all over the city.

It was my privilege to talk to a leader in the health area in Kansas City, Homer Wadsworth, who characterized the importance of this emergency health amendment to the Kansas City area in these words:

This is as important a thing as going on out here anywhere. The new medical school and hospital will give us a chance to build a network of facilities to serve the medical needs of the entire western half of Missouri. At the same time we can build a great institution to train and increase the supply of sorely needed doctors and nurses, not only for our area but the entire Middlewest.

Awhile back we all went through the exercise of first passing the Hill-Burton authorization bill and then repassing it over the Presidential veto. Two-thirds of the Members of this House supported the effort to override the veto. In effect, those who so voted said they were in favor of \$317 million for construction grants in fiscal year 1971. The committee bill before us today contains only \$172 million for Hill-Burton construction. Even the health emergency amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND, which added \$80 million, produced a total of \$252 million or \$65 million short of what two-thirds of the Members of the Congress said they wanted when they overrode the Presidential veto.

The question can appropriately be asked, Were those voting to pass the authorization bill over the Presidential veto engaged in an exercise in futility? They were unless appropriations are provided pursuant to that authorization.

Inflation caused by Federal expenditures seems to be the central argument concerning this amendment. For my part, I am ready to meet that argument head on with this thought: The cost of hospital care continues to skyrocket. There are millions of middle-class, middle-income people who are faced with not simply a rise in cost of living but the way it is now when they get sick not only do they have a particular disease to try to cure but they are also faced with the specter of another dreaded disease to

plague them and that is of financial disaster to the point of bankruptcy because they cannot pay for their hospital care.

Repeating, adequate funding of this kind is spending in the investment of the health of America. Once again, expenditures of this kind may be said to be inflationary but certainly if they can contribute toward holding down skyrocketing costs of hospital care, they deserve our support.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the emergency health amendment to the 1971 Labor-HEW appropriation.

I am proud to be a sponsor of the amendment, which is supported by the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Public Health Association, the American Nurse's Association, the American Dental Association, the Ad Hoc Committee on the Nation's Health Crisis, the Urban Coalition, the Center for Community Affairs, the AFL-CIO, the UAW, and concerned health professionals and private citizens throughout the country.

The emergency health amendment would increase the funds in this bill by \$360.5 million, providing absolutely essential support for medical manpower institutional support and student loans, health education facilities construction, Hill-Burton grants, community mental health centers, the National Heart and Lung Institute, pilot dental care projects for needy children, and grants to medical school libraries. Rather than inflate the Federal budget for fiscal 1971, this amendment will serve only to bring the budget request up to 1970 funding levels.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to diminish in any way the Federal commitment to such vital health programs. As our population grows, the need for facilities, health services, and medical manpower has reached crisis proportions. Millions of Americans are doing without essential health care, and it is incumbent upon us to upgrade and expand Government activity before the delivery of health services falls behind the demand irretrievably. It is unconscionable for the administration to forward to the Congress such a minimal budget request, and while the Appropriations committee has moved in the right direction by adding \$134.1 million for HEW health and welfare programs, this increase is far short of the goal we should set for ourselves. Even with passage of the emergency health amendment we will still be \$65.3 million below the authorization for Hill-Burton construction grants, but it is unthinkable for us to maintain this program at the low levels of the 1970 appropriation.

This is no time to be standing still, Mr. Chairman. The need is acute, and the American people are demanding—and deserve—an accounting. For the sake of all those who are suffering from our shamefully inadequate health services today, and for those generations to come, we have a deep moral obligation to move forward and provide health services for our citizens concomitant with our position of world leadership in other areas. We cannot postpone this important de-

cision, and I urge an overwhelming vote in favor of the Emergency Health Amendment today as evidence of our concern for the quality of life for all Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BOLAND and Mr. FLOOD.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 103, noes 151.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE  
GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For carrying out, except as otherwise provided, titles I, IV, VII, X, XI, XIV, XVI and XIX of the Social Security Act, and the Act of July 5, 1960 (24 U.S.C. ch. 9), \$8,651,950,000, of which \$46,000,000 shall be for child welfare services under Part B of title IV, and \$3,000,000 shall be for grants under section 707 of the Social Security Act: *Provided*, That such amounts as may be necessary for locating parents, as authorized in section 410 of the Social Security Act, may be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURKE OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts: page 22, lines 24 and 25, after "(24 U.S.C. ch. 9)", strike out "\$8,651,950,000, of which \$46,000,000" and insert "\$8,715,950,000, of which \$110,000,000".

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I approach this microphone with some misapprehension in view of what has just taken place. However, this is a subject matter in which I have great interest. This amendment should be known as the John Fogarty amendment, because several years ago John Fogarty, who was chairman of this subcommittee, expressed his deep interest in the subject matter, because of the failure of the Federal Government to take its moral part in contributing toward this program in an adequate way.

In fact, the day before John Fogarty passed away, I had a conversation with him out here in the section of the House known as the Cherokee Strip. He said, "Jim, you get the authorization, and I will get the funds when it gets to the Appropriations Committee."

After a great fight in the House Ways and Means Committee, I was able to prevail and have the authorization raised from \$44 million up to \$110 million annually.

The interesting part is that this appropriation deals with the children under child welfare. These children are the most underprivileged children in America. They are the children without parents and without relatives to take care of them. They are in the hands of the State governments and private agencies on whom they depend for their care.

Despite the fact that the Federal Government contributes from 75 to 83 per-

cent for children under the AFDC program—mind you, those children have at least a mother or some relative to take care of them—these children, who have no political voice, no political muscle, who are wards of the State with no voice whatsoever, the voiceless children of America, have been unable to bring about any increase in this appropriation.

This is a reasonable appropriation. I realize that we are faced with many problems. Under the Johnson administration they promised me they would seek additional funds for this item. Under the Nixon administration they promised me they would seek additional appropriations.

This appropriation of \$46 million has remained static not only for the present fiscal year but also for the past 2 fiscal years.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. I should like to commend the gentleman in the well, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE), for his leadership in this area and for his very important effort today to see that these children, children without parents, are given some opportunity to find their way to productive and useful and loving lives.

The proposed increase is very modest, but it is a vital one if we are to give real meaning to the lives of these children who face perhaps a lifetime of sorrow.

I sincerely hope that our colleagues will join the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and adopt this amendment to the pending legislation.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

I should like to point out that as of March 1968 an estimated 644,900 children received services through State and local public child welfare agencies as compared to 607,000 in March of 1967. The total amount of children coming under this program is increasing at the rate of 6 or 7 or 8 percent a year, yet this dollar amount has remained static for 3 years.

I realize that the chairman of the subcommittee, who is in charge of this appropriation bill, has the most difficult job in the U.S. Congress. I realize that he is a man of great heart and great compassion. But I recognize that there has been a failure some place along the line. I do not assess this to him, because of his many duties and the many hours he has to spend with this gigantic appropriation bill, dealing with over \$18 billion.

I am using this means here to try to bring to the gentleman's attention and to the attention of the members of his subcommittee a problem which lies within this area. These are children of child welfare, with no parents, and the Federal Government contributes an average of only 6 percent for their upkeep, while for other children it contributes from 75 to 83 percent. It is unconscionable that this great Government of ours does not do more for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I was about to rise—I did rise, as a matter of fact—to oppose the amendment. I suggest that my friend from Massachusetts withdraw his amendment, and then perhaps he could ask me certain questions in regard to the bill.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I will ask the chairman a question.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman will withdraw the amendment?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. If I withdraw the amendment—

Mr. FLOOD. If and when you do?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I want to apply a little contingency here.

Mr. FLOOD. Why not?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I realize the hour is getting late.

If I could have the assurance of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he will press the administration and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in this particular problem, if he can convince them, and if we can get the backing of the administration on increased appropriations here, whereby we can bring up the level of care for child welfare—if he can give me that assurance, that before the supplemental budget is passed there will be some action taken by his committee to have a little dialog with the agency involved, to see if we cannot get some funds into this particular item. I would make a move to withdraw the amendment.

May I have that real firm assurance on his part?

Mr. FLOOD. You have that assurance.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Now, if I can get the assurance of some of your colleagues on the committee, that would help.

Mr. Chairman, I will comply. I am a realist. I know that if we had won the amendment here today, there would be nothing in there to compel the administration to spend the money, and I would rather have the backing of the administration and the committee in its entirety so that when funds are appropriated they will be expended.

Mr. FLOOD. For the purposes of this debate you have the assurance of the committee.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know if that colloquy we just heard is negotiation, arbitration, or are we writing it officially into the record?

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer my good friend and colleague from Massachusetts, because he was a former speaker of the Massachusetts House. He and I understand legislation, and we understand how it can be brought about.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY  
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452, approved August 20, 1964), as amended, \$2,046,200,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for transfers to the economic opportunity loan fund for loans under title III, and amounts so transferred shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, as authorized by section 602 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and for purchase of real property for training centers: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available for contracts under titles I, II, V, VI, and VIII extending for more than twenty-four months: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for any grant until the Director has determined that the grantee is qualified to administer the funds and programs involved in the proposed grant: *Provided further*, That all grant agreements shall provide that the General Accounting Office shall have access to the records of the grantee which bear exclusively upon the Federal grant: *Provided further*, That those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 and 1969 that set mandatory funding levels shall not be effective during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I was seeking recognition in order to make a point of order prior to the time the gentleman from North Carolina offered his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain the point of order, but the Chair is following the custom of recognizing members on the committee. However, it is in order to make a point of order. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning on page 38, line 25, and on page 39 through line 3. The language reads:

*Provided further*, That those provisions of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 and 1969 that set mandatory funding levels shall not be effective during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

Mr. Chairman, this is legislation in an appropriation bill and sets aside all the earmarking that we provided for in the Economic Opportunity Authorization Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a further point of order under this title and under the heading "Office of Economic Opportunity," on page 38, lines 1 through 25, including the colon after the word "grant", predicated upon the fact that this is further legislation in an appropriation bill and that it involves specifically, Mr. Chairman, the phrase on line 14 "and for purchase of real property for training centers:" and other legislation language which is foreign to an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I will say further that the point of order is not waived by House Resolution 1151 which, of course, was changed by unanimous consent on the House floor to include all points of order against appropriations carried in the bill which are not yet authorized by law are hereby waived.

Mr. Chairman, this is in specific violation of section 602 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which is contained in the bill, page 38, line 13, which act, according to 42 United States Code, referring specifically to section 602, section 2914 in no place allows for acquisition of land, although it does provide for construction repairs and capital improvements.

For all of these considerations, it is my firm belief that the remainder of this section of the bill under consideration should be stricken, and that the point of order should stand.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as usual I am confused. We have just conceded to the point of order of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS). I have before me page 38 of the bill. I am looking at line 11 down to line 15. That we have conceded. I have not the faintest idea beyond that of what is in doubt. This must be what my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, has in mind. I am sure it is, and we have conceded to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

We have no quarrel. But to this specific point, for that reason, of course, I answer, and I repeat for the purpose of clarity that we have conceded precisely the thing which my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) has in mind.

I direct the attention of the gentleman to line 11, beginning there, down to the end of the word "centers," and the colon, on line 15.

The gentleman could not possibly have anything else in mind in the point of order, because it could not be.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), has made his point of order against all language from and including

lines 1 to 25 on page 38. Unless the chairman of the committee can cite authorization language, particularly for the language "and for the purchase of real property for training centers" which the gentleman from Missouri has specified, the Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky will be heard.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if I understand the point of order raised by the gentleman from Missouri, the gentleman moved to strike the language on page 38 from what line through what line?

Mr. HALL. The Chair has just repeated it. Line 1, including the title and the heading, down through the colon following the word "grant."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard further, lines 1 through 5 including the amount authorized and appropriated, \$2,046,200,000, follows the language in the authorization bill. We do have some new language commencing on lines 14 through 15 that is not in the authorization bill presently, but this is the language that has been carried on previous appropriation bills. The language that I specifically refer to that is not in the authorization bill is on line 14 after "1964," commencing with "and for purchase of real property for training centers."

Now, this language is not in the authorization bill.

The language commencing on line 18 and the rest of the paragraph down to line 21 is language on an appropriation bill, in my judgment, because there is nothing in the authorization bill. But we certainly do not want the amount that is appropriated for the economic opportunity act stricken from this bill. It is in strict compliance with the authorization amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

There are ample precedents for ruling a complete paragraph out of order, if any part of that paragraph is out of order. The gentleman from Kentucky has conceded that part of it is not in order, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: on page 38, line 1, insert the following:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY  
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452, approved August 20, 1964), as amended, \$2,046,200,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for transfers to the economic opportunity loan fund for loans under title III, and amounts so transferred shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, and for construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, as authorized by section 602 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be available for contracts under titles I, II, V, VI, and VIII extending for more than

twenty-four months: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for any grant until the Director has determined that the grantee is qualified to administer the funds and programs involved in the proposed grant: *Provided further*, That all grant agreements shall provide that the General Accounting Office shall have access to the records of the grantee which bear exclusively upon the Federal grant.

Mr. MICHEL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, let us see what you have in there first.

Mr. MICHEL. If the gentleman will withhold for a moment, I can explain it very simply.

All that I have done in my amendment is to strike out the words beginning on page 38, line 14, "and for purchase of real property for training centers;" and left the balance of the page precisely as it is, except down on line 25, after the word "grant" there will be a period, and the last part of that sentence will be stricken.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman for his explanation. His amendment is acceptable to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) to dispense with the further reading of the amendment?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, the point of order against the amendment is that all of the language to which the amendment addresses itself on page 38 of the bill, H.R. 18515, has been stricken.

Mr. Chairman, there is no way that we can amend something that is not before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) has offered a separate amendment to insert a new paragraph, and the amendment is in order.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as I understood the colloquy of the gentleman from Missouri when he was making his point of order, he had specific reference to lines 14 and 15, which I deleted in my amendment.

Now over and above that, the last sentence on line 25, page 38, "*Provided further*, That those provisions," inasmuch as that was the language which he cited as being subject to a point of order, I of course offered the amendment deleting that objectionable phrase and I submit that the balance of the page is what has traditionally been carried in the OEO appropriation bill.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it is too late to make a point of order, but the Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I believe the Chair cannot avoid it, inasmuch as the gentleman has

the time and he has yielded to me. I appreciate the Chair's statement. I, too, know that it is too late to make an additional point of order. I simply want to raise a point, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding because I know the last thing he intends to do is to put words in my mouth.

Actually the Chair would confirm the fact that I cited the phrase "and for purchase of real property for training centers" as an example only of unauthorized legislation in this body. If one would want to take the further proviso beginning on line 18, neither is this authorized legislation. Neither is there any other authorized legislation in this area. For this reason it was all stricken. For this reason the gentleman's amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard in opposition to the amendment? If not, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALL) there were—ayes 99, noes 31.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONAS. May I respectfully remind the Chair that I was recognized, and that the Chair allowed a point of order to intervene only, and I had been recognized. The Chair ruled that since a point of order had been made, the Chair would dispose of the point of order first.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair respectfully states that the point of order did intervene following the gentleman's recognition. The Chair intends to recognize members of the committee in the order of their seniority. The Chair, therefore, recognized the gentleman from Texas. The Chair will later recognize the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHEL. Did the Clerk read through the section concluding with line 3, page 39?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the understanding of the Chair that he did.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONAS. I respectfully ask the Chair to rule that my amendment does precede the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas. My amendment goes to line 5, page 38, and my information is that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas comes at a later point in the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. A whole paragraph is open to amendment at the same time. Therefore, the line does not determine the order of the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'HARA. As I understand the situation, all the language on page 38 and the first three lines on page 39 were stricken under a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'HARA. At that point, following that ruling of the Chair, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) offered an amendment to the bill which restored a good part of that language.

Is it not correct, Mr. Chairman, that if anyone wanted to amend the language of the Michel amendment, he should have offered his amendment while the Michel amendment was pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Does the gentleman from Texas offer an amendment?

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: After the colon on page 38, line 25, insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That of the sums appropriated under this Act not more than \$33 Million shall be spent for the purpose of carrying out programs under section 222 (a) (5), not more than \$4,000,000 shall be spent for the purpose of carrying out programs under section 222(a) (8), not more than \$3,000,000 shall be spent for the purpose of carrying out programs under Sec. 222(a) (9), and not more than \$5,000,000 shall be spent for the purpose of carrying out programs under part A of title III."

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment comes too late. It should properly have been an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL. It now comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order. It would seem to me, if I understand the language of the gentleman from Texas, it is a new paragraph. It would not come under but would follow the text of my amendment which I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand it in that light. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is a continuation of and is an addition to the amendment just agreed to and is in the form of a proviso and is not in the form of a paragraph or new section to the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify the amendment. I ask that it be an amendment which shall be inserted at the be-

ginning of page 39, as a separate paragraph.

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

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Chair must rule the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is out of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 408. The Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized to transfer unexpended balances of prior appropriations to accounts corresponding to current appropriations provided in this Act: *Provided*, That such transferred balances are used for the same purpose, and for the same periods of time, for which they were originally appropriated.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for its usual thorough review on the HEW appropriations bill, and to single out for special praise the members of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare. Recommending funding levels for so many worthy programs in a period of budgetary constraint is surely one of the hardest jobs in the Congress. Our thanks go to the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), the ranking subcommittee member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULL), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY), the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

I am gratified by the committee's action in adding \$92 million for the National Institutes of Health. This action is both hardheaded and courageous. It is hardheaded because the facts show that we are losing ground in medical research because appropriations are not even meeting the rising costs of existing programs. We cannot afford to scrap programs once begun and to risk the dismantling of research teams whose work is a matter of life and death for millions of Americans. I am relieved to see that \$25 million of the increase is for cancer research. This mysterious and dreadful disease strikes two out of three American families. The Federal share of cancer research has amounted to 80 percent of total expenditures, and due to rising costs, effective dollars spent on cancer research in fiscal 1970 are only about two-thirds what they were in 1966. The committee's action in the field of research will help to reverse this disheartening trend.

The committee's action is courageous because it is a bold assertion that health is perhaps our highest human priority. Diseases such as cancer are greater killers than war. Debilitating and crippling illnesses make the enjoyment of a full life impossible for many Americans. And American achievements in medical research are a primary source of our prestige as a Nation abroad.

We must reduce Government spending in the many programs which do not affect the well-being of millions of Americans, and do not signal our concern for

human life to millions abroad. Let us continue to work to put first things first.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time at the outset to congratulate the committee on an outstanding bill in the labor, health and welfare subject areas.

As the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), has indicated, \$2.3 billion in excess of last year's budget, a total bill of \$18,824,000,000, certainly cannot be sneezed at. I want to thank the chairman of the committee and the committee particularly for augmenting the bill in the amount of \$2.7 million for health manpower assistance for formula grants for schools of veterinary medicine. The administration proposed to totally cut these funds and I agree with the committee. As I testified before the committee, there is little reason to discriminate in this important subject area.

In addition, I commend the committee for the augmentation in resources for the animal resources program. As the committee indicates, this program has deteriorated from \$15.1 million in 1969 to \$12.5 million requested in this year's budget by the administration. The committee has responded with a \$2½ million augmentation restoring funds to the \$15 million 1969 level, an increase of \$800,000 over last year's program.

Being very health conscious and while I appreciate the great work done by the committee, I certainly must support further amendments of my colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) to further liberalize spending in these important subject areas.

Mr. Chairman, money may not be everything, if one has enough of it. If one does not—well, to take one of many examples, there are perhaps 5,500 Americans who are currently in the process of dying because they cannot afford an artificial kidney machine. This is more than five times the number of the lucky few who get the machines.

Why should this be? Why should American citizens be forced to die because they cannot lay out \$20,000 for a machine? We have spent billions to put men on the moon; we eagerly set up crash programs for every weapons system we conceivably need and many we do not. But when we turn to the health of our citizens, we suddenly become cost conscious.

Let us look at it another way. The most significant performance indexes of a country's health programs are life expectancy and infant survival. It has been many years since the United States ranked in the top 10 by either of these measures.

Why should this be? Is there any conceivable excuse for it? We are the richest country in the world. We have the biggest gross national product and the highest per capita income. Why do we not have the best medical care in the world?

We have two problems.

First, medical care is becoming astronomically expensive. We must think of perhaps doing something along the lines of a compulsory health insurance plan or a Kaiser-Permanente-type prepaid group practice plan. Either way, the Govern-

ment is going to have to subsidize the premiums for those who cannot pay. Senator KENNEDY, the United Auto Workers, and others have recently made some excellent proposals we will need to consider very carefully.

The second problem, to which the emergency health amendment addresses itself, lies in the fact that our health programs would be inadequate to service all our citizens, even if there were no cost problem. We have a shortage of buildings and equipment. But more urgently, we have a shortage of trained people.

The health manpower shortage is severe at present, and it is going to get a lot worse if we don't get on the stick. If present trends continue, in 10 years we will be short 26,000 doctors, 56,000 dentists, 210,000 nurses, and 432,000 "allied health professionals"—veterinarians, pharmacists, optometrists, and so forth.

The proposals of the administration can best be described as not very benign neglect. To cite one of many possible examples, where schools of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, optometry, and so forth, requested \$43 million in student loan funds and we authorized \$35 million, the administration budgeted \$12 million. The Vice President once expressed concern at the thought of being operated on by a surgeon who entered medical school under a disadvantaged-minority program. If we follow his administration's recommendations, he could some day find himself with no surgeon at all.

The emergency health amendment is no cureall. It is not enough. But it will help considerably. It will cost about one-third as much as a single Safeguard ABM complex, and it will go us a heck of a lot more good.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, in the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971, two institutions of medical science are deserving of our attention and support: medical schools and community mental health centers.

Sixty-one out of one hundred seven medical schools have applied for grants on the basis of financial distress. Many medical schools are threatened with closing if they cannot obtain special funding. The critical needs of these schools must be met.

The budget includes \$60,100,000 for staffing grants for community mental health centers. The committee has added \$20,000,000 to the bill for staffing grants for the centers. The amount requested by the budget would not even enable the Health Services and Mental Health Administration to continue obligations on staffing grants already initiated, some witnesses have testified.

One example of a center desperately in need of a staffing grant is the East Central Missouri Mental Health Center, in Mexico, Mo. The center serves a six-county area, nearly 10,000 people. I am advised that the center has a 21-in-patient capacity and the staff sees over 150 people on a regular outpatient basis. In the first 4 months of this year, the center lost in excess of \$30,000, and their current monthly losses are running

\$8,000. With reference to the East Central Missouri Mental Health Center, Dr. Woodrow Lee, administrator of the Audrain, Mo., hospital says:

Without immediate support from Federal staffing grants, we will not be able to survive.

With the critical shortages we face in medical manpower and hospital space, I recommend the full authorized funding of all vital programs and support for the emergency health amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, little has been said in the debate about the need for dental research and dental care. This is unfortunate. At long last, there have been breakthroughs in thwarting caries with its attendant pain and destruction. Moreover, 15,000,000 children in our country have never had the care of a dentist, a condition that must be corrected.

The American people pay out of their pockets each year for dental care more than \$4 billion, and a \$4 billion industry is worth attention, especially when it is realized that some 23,000 Americans sit down each year in a doctor's office and are told they have oral cancer. The condition brings death within a few years, or to others surgery upon their jaws or tongues so that they can never fully resume their normal life—23,000 a year. That is not a small number.

Or, let us consider cleft lip and palate. I do not suppose many people realize that it's disabling and disfiguring and that the correction of it is a long, tortuous process. What may not be known is that one out of every 750 live births in this country is a baby afflicted with this cruel disability, some 6,000 new cases each and every year. If that little baby is not given proper care, I do not care how much ability, energy or aptitude he has, he is not ever going to be a schoolteacher or a doctor, or a salesman, or any of a hundred other careers you can name. Thus, Mr. Chairman, dental disease is not all toothaches and jaw fractures. It is for these things too that the private sector spends some \$4 billion a year.

That is the private sector. Government on all levels contributes many more hundreds of millions of dollars. The current Federal estimate is some \$300 million a year for all kinds of dental activities. It is questionable whether it is all spent wisely, and that is not only my opinion. It is the opinion of most private dentists. That is the opinion, too, of private dental groups like the American Dental Association. That is the opinion of Federal dentists, and the opinion of Federal dental agencies, unanimously.

If each of us was asked to give an off-the-cuff description of dental disease in this country, all those descriptions would share at least one element: that dental disease is endemic, that nearly everyone is susceptible to it and suffers from it. That is true. What is equally true is that most manifestations of dental disease are not only preventable but readily preventable. Most of us nowadays have enough sense to know that we go to the dentist for preventative care, to have our oral health checked. But we also go for what we think of as such routine services as having teeth pulled,

teeth filled, dentures or crowns or bridges fitted.

If preventive care is delivered to people early enough in their life they will be able to maintain sound oral health all their life. In other words, we must concentrate on children, not to the exclusion of other age groups, but as a matter of emphasis. It is a simple matter as well as a sound one. It not only makes professional sense but when it comes to the public programs, it makes fiscal sense as well.

Let me report to you just two statistics from studies for which we must vote funds of dental care under medicaid that nail down this point about fiscal sense. For instance, take dentures, which are in many respects the ultimate failure of a person's dental health since it means there are no natural teeth left at all. In one medicaid study, dentures constituted only 3 percent of the services rendered but consumed 43 percent of the available funds. On the other hand, take a finding in one study with regard to children under medicaid. It shows that more than half the bills for children under 5 years of age were for less than \$20.

Obviously, there is a lesson to be learned from this comparison. We need to do some experimentation in differing methods of delivery: do we use the school system, for example, as a focal point for delivery of children's care or do we look elsewhere? We need, as well, to experiment within differing settings for children in rural areas may well need a different structure than those living in the midst of cities.

This entire, commonsense concept made its impression on this House in 1967 and we authorized an amendment to the Social Security Act to begin a series of such pilot experimental projects. In testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, Dr. John Gardner, then HEW Secretary, estimated \$5 million as being first-year costs of the projects, which were to run for 4 years. Contrast that sum with the \$110 million or so now spent under medicaid for dental services. How much of that \$110 million is spent to repair disease that should not have occurred and would have not occurred had we had a sound children's program? How many more years we want to pay out such tens of millions of dollars annually rather than invest a few million for the pilot programs to which I refer?

The Senate, in 1967, followed the lead of the House in approving the concept embodied in section 510. But there the matter has rested. There was no supplemental request for funds in fiscal 1968. There was no request for funds in fiscal 1969. There was no request for funds in fiscal 1970.

However, thereafter, two things were done: first, a modest amount of money was added to the fiscal 1970 budget to begin planning of the projects. The amount was \$200,000, one of the smaller sums that will be mentioned during the debate, but not too small for it to be discovered and totally eliminated by the executive branch under the 2 percent authority we gave it last year. A second action was taken in fiscal 1970 when the

House Committee on Appropriations, in its report, said to the executive branch, and I quote:

The Committee is concerned about the lack of a coordinated program for the dental health of children while so many Federal dollars are being spent under Medicaid and similar programs to treat dental conditions in adults that could have been prevented. The Committee will expect that some of the funds provided in this appropriation will be used pursuant to the authorization in section 510 of Title V of the Social Security Act relating to special project grants for dental health of children.

Now, surely that is plain language. Surely, no interpreter needs to be hired to tell the appropriate agency what is meant by it. Unfortunately, the Department did not listen and nothing was done.

Now we are in fiscal 1971. What is budgeted for this program, a program to help us put our dental care policies on a rational basis and, in the long run, almost certainly save us a great deal of money? So far as can be discovered, there is no intention to truly implement these projects. There is a vague reference in the Committee hearings to a paltry \$180,000 that might be spent on these projects, not nearly enough.

Mr. Chairman, we must begin now. We must insert a reasonable sum in this budget to undertake the dental research that must be initiated.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to advise the Members that I intend to offer a motion to recommit, that will take the form of section 208, which was deleted from the bill, minus the provision where the Secretary had some discretionary authority as to whether or not he could bail out a particular State if it got into any particular trouble.

My motion to recommit will be the precise language of the section which our Subcommittee deleted from the bill before we reported the measure to the full Appropriations Committee.

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, although I should point out that none of these estimates take into account the escape clause which would permit exceptions to be made to the 110-percent limitation by the Secretary. These exceptions would of course reduce the amount of savings.

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 not 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 now 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.

The provision permits the Secretary to make exceptions to the limitation when he determines that it would impair in a significant way the effective operation of the program involved. This exception provision can be used for those States which have a good case to make.

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 staff. Like, SSA, they are better able to absorb workload increases.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Does this 110-percent ceiling apply to administrative costs and training costs and benefits?

Mr. MICHEL. No, not to the benefits. I specifically said that we were talking about administration and training.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not blame the gentleman from Illinois for offering this amendment. After all, he has a standard to bear and he bears it well. But this is a bad amendment.

Listen to this: This amendment will adversely affect some 40 States. It will have the greatest adverse effect on those States with the poorest programs and with plans to improve them. It will mean that those States that built up their programs during 1970 will actually have to cut back.

But I think a member of the administration, an assistant secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, in commenting on its effects with regard to model cities probably set forth the case against this amendment better than I can. Let me read from his letter which is dated June 9, 1970:

Possible Consequences Resulting from Passage of Section 208:

Model Cities which are implementing jointly funded programs under the affected titles may be forced to cut back their operations if their FY '71 full-year budget must be equivalent to their partial-year spending in FY '70.

With no new start funds available, Model Cities will be forced to use 100% supplemental dollars for their needed social service projects, thus circumventing programs normally within the domain and expertise of HEW.

And, Mr. Chairman, I am still quoting the Assistant Secretary of HUD. His letter continued:

Without the incentive of funds for implementing programs, much of the effort which has gone into interagency coordination, joint programming and institutional change will produce no results and further efforts will be abandoned.

The hopes and expectations of many neighborhood residents will be destroyed.

Many Model Cities Programs will be seriously hampered in their efforts to make a substantial impact on the social and eco-

nomie problems of their model neighborhoods.

Supplemental funds will be insufficient to provide the scope of program necessary to meet the needs of residents, particularly for the child care projects which are used as supportive services for manpower components as well as educational opportunities for pre-school children.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the Assistant Secretary's conclusions. And I am still quoting his letter:

#### CONCLUSIONS

The passage of Section 208 of the HEW appropriations bill would reduce the effectiveness of the Model Cities Program by substantially decreasing HEW involvement in a key program area. It would disrupt patterns of interagency cooperation and coordination which have been carefully nurtured in local communities. Furthermore, it would inhibit the development of service programs which would serve as vital support mechanisms for any future Family Assistance legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the motion to recommit should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am heartbroken and I cannot continue to read the administration's opinion in opposition to my friend's amendment. I therefore suggest that the motion to recommit be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

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 directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MICHEL. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves to recommit the bill H.R. 18515 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 34, after line 23 insert:

"Sec. 209. 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."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 362, nays 14, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

YEAS—362

Abbutt	Clark	Fraser
Adair	Clausen,	Frelinghuysen
Adams	Don H.	Frey
Addabbo	Clawson, Del	Friedel
Albert	Clay	Fulton, Pa.
Anderson, III.	Cleveland	Fulton, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.	Cohelan	Fuqua
Andrews,	Collier	Gallfanakis
N. Dak.	Collins	Garmatz
Annunzio	Colmer	Gaydos
Arends	Conable	Gettys
Ashley	Conte	Giaimo
Aspinall	Conyers	Gibbons
Ayres	Corbett	Gonzalez
Baring	Corman	Goodling
Barrett	Coughlin	Green, Oreg.
Belcher	Cowger	Green, Pa.
Bell, Calif.	Culver	Grover
Berry	Daniel, Va.	Gubser
Betts	Daniels, N.J.	Gude
Bevill	Davis, Wis.	Hagan
Blaggi	de la Garza	Haley
Biest	Delaney	Hall
Bingham	Dellenback	Halpern
Blackburn	Denneny	Hamilton
Blanton	Dennis	Hammer-
Blatnik	Dent	schmidt
Boggs	Derwinski	Hanley
Boland	Devine	Hansen, Idaho
Bolling	Dickinson	Hansen, Wash.
Bow	Diggs	Harrington
Brademas	Dingell	Harsha
Brasco	Donohue	Harvey
Bray	Dowdy	Hastings
Brinkley	Downing	Hathaway
Brooks	Dulski	Hawkins
Broomfield	Duncan	Hays
Brotzman	Dwyer	Hébert
Brown, Calif.	Eckhardt	Hechler, W. Va.
Brown, Mich.	Edmondson	Heckler, Mass.
Brown, Ohio	Edwards, Ala.	Helstoski
Broyhill, N.C.	Edwards, Calif.	Henderson
Broyhill, Va.	Ellberg	Hicks
Buchanan	Erlenborn	Hogan
Burke, Mass.	Eshleman	Hollifield
Burlison, Mo.	Evans, Colo.	Horton
Burton, Calif.	Evins, Tenn.	Howard
Button	Fascell	Hull
Byrne, Pa.	Feighan	Hunt
Byrnes, Wis.	Findley	Hutchinson
Cabell	Fish	Jacobs
Camp	Fisher	Jarman
Carey	Flood	Johnson, Calif.
Carter	Flowers	Johnson, Pa.
Casey	Foley	Jonas
Cederberg	Ford, Gerald R.	Jones, Ala.
Celler	Ford,	Jones, N.C.
Chamberlain	William D.	Karth
Chisholm	Foreman	Kastenmeyer
Clancy	Fountain	Kazen

Kee	O'Hara	Slack
Keith	O'Konski	Smith, Calif.
Kleppe	Olsen	Smith, Iowa
Kluczynski	O'Neill, Mass.	Smith, N.Y.
Koch	Passman	Snyder
Kyl	Patman	Springer
Kyros	Patten	Stafford
Landrum	Pepper	Staggers
Langen	Perkins	Stanton
Latta	Pettis	Steed
Leggett	Philbin	Steiger, Ariz.
Lennon	Pike	Steiger, Wis.
Lloyd	Pirnie	Stephens
Long, Md.	Poage	Stokes
Lowenstein	Podell	Stubblefield
Lujan	Poff	Stuckey
Lukens	Preyer, N.C.	Sullivan
McCarthy	Price, Ill.	Symington
McClary	Price, Tex.	Taft
McCloskey	Pryor, Ark.	Talcott
McDade	Pucinski	Taylor
McDonald,	Purcell	Teague, Calif.
Mich.	Quile	Teague, Tex.
McEwen	Quillen	Thompson, N.J.
McFall	Railsback	Thomson, Wis.
McKneally	Randall	Tiernan
McMillan	Rees	Tunney
Macdonald,	Reid, Ill.	Udall
Mass.	Reid, N.Y.	Ullman
Madden	Reifel	Van Deerlin
Mahon	Reuss	Van Der Jagt
Marsh	Riegle	Vanik
Martin	Rivers	Vigorito
Mathias	Roberts	Waggonner
Matsunaga	Robison	Wampler
May	Rodino	Watkins
Mayna	Roe	Watson
Meeds	Rogers, Fla.	Watts
Melcher	Rooney, N.Y.	Whalen
Mikva	Rooney, Pa.	Whalley
Miller, Calif.	Rosenthal	White
Miller, Ohio	Rostenkowski	Whitehurst
Mills	Roth	Whitten
Minish	Rousselot	Widnall
Mink	Roybal	Wiggins
Minshall	Ruppe	Williams
Mize	Ruth	Wilson, Bob
Mizell	St Germain	Wilson,
Monagan	Sandman	Charles H.
Moorhead	Satterfield	Winn
Morgan	Saylor	Wold
Morse	Schadeberg	Wolff
Morton	Scherle	Wright
Mosher	Scheuer	Wyatt
Moss	Schneebell	Wyder
Murphy, Ill.	Schwengel	Wyle
Myers	Scott	Wyman
Natcher	Sebelius	Yates
Nedzi	Shibley	Yatron
Nelsen	Shriver	Young
Nichols	Sikes	Zablocki
Nix	Sisk	Zion
Obey	Skubitz	Zwack

NAYS—14

Abernethy	Flynt	Montgomery
Ashbrook	Griffin	O'Neal, Ga.
Bennett	Gross	Schmitz
Burleson, Tex.	Landgrebe	Thompson, Ga.
Chappell	Michel	

NOT VOTING—55

Alexander	Esch	MacGregor
Anderson,	Fallon	Maillard
Calif.	Farbstein	Mann
Anderson,	Gallagher	Meskill
Tenn.	Gilbert	Mollohan
Beall, Md.	Goldwater	Murphy, N.Y.
Brock	Gray	Ottinger
Burke, Fla.	Griffiths	Pelly
Burton, Utah	Hanna	Pickle
Bush	Hosmer	Pollock
Caffery	Hungate	Powell
Cramer	Ichord	Rarick
Crane	Jones, Tenn.	Rhodes
Cunningham	King	Rogers, Colo.
Daddario	Kirwan	Roudebush
Davis, Ga.	Kuykendall	Ryan
Dawson	Long, La.	Stratton
Dorn	McClure	Waldie
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Weicker

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.  
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Cunningham.  
 Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Brock.  
 Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Burton of Utah.  
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hosmer.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Pelly.  
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Cramer.  
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Crane.  
 Mr. Caffery with Mr. Burke of Florida.  
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. MacGregor.  
 Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Rhodes.  
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Weicker.  
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Roudebush.  
 Mr. Hanna with Mr. Maillard.  
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Pollock.  
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Ichord with Mr. Bush.  
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Powell.  
 Mr. Ottinger with Mr. King.  
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. McClure.  
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Beall of Maryland.  
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Esch.  
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Dawson.  
 Mr. Mann with Mr. McCulloch.  
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Goldwater.  
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Hungate.  
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Anderson of California.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF JULY 27

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the rest of this week, if any, and the program for next week.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiring of the distinguished minority leader, we have no further business this week. We will ask to go over upon the announcement of next week's program.

The program for Monday and Tuesday is as follows: Monday is District day, but there are no District bills.

During Monday and Tuesday we will continue the consideration of H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. That will be the total business of the House on Monday and Tuesday insofar as I know, except for a continuing appropriations resolution for 1971, which will be the first order of business on Tuesday.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week the program is as follows:

H.R. 17880, the Defense Production Act Amendments, subject to a rule being granted.

H.R. 18546, the Agricultural Act of 1970, subject to a rule being granted. If one of these rules comes out ahead of the other, we will reverse the order of consideration, if necessary.

H.R. 13100, to extend programs for training in the allied health professions, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

H.R. 14237, to amend the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

This announcement is made with the further reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER THE CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule on Wednesday next may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I make this announcement at this stage of the legislative program. I feel it is imperative to finish our program for next week, even if that means meeting on Friday and Saturday. We must do this in order to complete the balance of the legislative business before the recess. I hope all Members will cooperate, as I know all of us want to leave here as scheduled on August 14.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Could the gentleman from Oklahoma tell us if he knows of any conference reports that may be coming up on Monday?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I know of none, I will say to the gentleman. May I say that I believe the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) is here and he might want to add some comment with reference to the program for next week.

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

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

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement which has been made by

the distinguished majority leader in his colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader, in respect to the program for Monday and Tuesday.

I would simply like to say this—and I appreciate the gentleman yielding for this purpose—it is our hope to put in a full day Monday and Tuesday, with the single exception that has been noted, and by that I mean I would hope no one plans dinner until after 7 o'clock. I say this because as I understand the legislative program from the leadership and the volume of work scheduled between now and the August recess, that these 2 days are probably going to be "it" for reorganization. I say this further to alert Members because many are interested in and concerned about reorganization. Therefore, we have these 2 days during which to do our job and it is my earnest hope that everyone will be here to do that job. I urge that they will be here on Monday and Tuesday so that we can complete action on congressional reform by Tuesday night.

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

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

Mr. SCOTT. I would ask the distinguished majority leader if he could tell us what has happened to the unsolicited credit card bill, and if it will be programmed for consideration sometime in the future?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield further, the answer to the gentleman's question is "Yes." We had programmed it for this week but, obviously, we cannot get to it. The two bills scheduled for this week, which we are programming again next week, were ahead of the credit card bill on the program. In view of the bills we have added to the program for next week, we could not hope to reach the credit card bill for floor action.

It is not, as we understand from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, one of those bills that must be handled immediately, but we do intend to take it up.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, we receive a lot of mail from constituents who are concerned about this particular bill. It may not be a piece of major legislation, but I would hope that the gentleman would program it at the earliest convenience.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished minority leader will yield further, there is no question but that we will program the bill. We want to do it. I think everyone is for the bill insofar as I know.

I want to add that in addition to the business we have scheduled, there are several privileged matters ahead of us between now and the time we adjourn for the August recess and some of these might be called up.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I might add further to the distinguished majority leader that there is one mat-

ter that has received sufficient signatures in the discharge process, the so-called Women's Equal Right Amendment to the Constitution. I have heard that the principal proponent of that, the gentleman from Michigan (Mrs. GRIFFITHS), has indicated she intends to bring it up, or bring it to the floor on Monday, August 10.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield further, that is what the gentleman from Michigan indicated to me, and that is one of the privileged matters. It is of the highest privilege. We have two District bills, and they will be brought up on that same Monday, so those are privileged matters for that day. And, of course, we have another bill that has been in the Committee on Rules long enough to be privileged, and we do have to operate within the boundaries of privileged legislation that might be called up.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the minority leader. It seems to me that in the absence of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross), that someone ought to inquire as to what became of Friday this week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as far as Friday of this week is concerned, we had hoped that we could meet. We discussed the matter with the various committee chairmen, and they were not prepared to go on with the program.

But I do hope that our admonition will be heeded, that we want to finish the program we have announced for next week, even if it requires a Friday or Saturday meeting. I hope the Members will try to adjust their schedules from now on to meet on Fridays and Saturdays if necessary.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, for one further observation, that was precisely what I did this week. I remember the story of the boy who cried "Wolf," and I will say no more.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, we accept the responsibility, because we must, for making the announcement, and we hope that we will get the cooperation of the committees handling the bills to finish them next week. This we must have, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

#### PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION DAY, 1970

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1952, 18 years ago, the Governor of Puerto Rico, with the approval of our Federal Government, proclaimed the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Under the provisions of the constitution adopted on that day by the Puerto Rican people, an elected legislature enacts all Puerto Rican laws. Religious freedom is assured and racial discrimination is unlawful under this constitution.

The Commonwealth constitution, moreover, is considered a model of democratic principles. By its adoption, a semi-colonial area evolved from a status of dependency into a condition of partnership with our Federal Government. Puerto Rico thenceforth became fully autonomous in local affairs, and its dignity as a self-governing unit within the national framework could be altered only by the mutual consent of the Puerto Rican and Federal governments.

Today, Puerto Rico's citizens are citizens of the United States, and enjoy practically all of the privileges of statehood except that of national suffrage. In terms of democratic fulfillment, Puerto Rico occupies the highest rank ever attained by an American territory prior to admission to the sisterhood of States. Since 1947, the people of Puerto Rico have enjoyed the right to elect their own Governor, they are permitted to participate in most Federal programs, including social security, and are not subject to pay taxes. On the other hand, their sons are subject to military duty in America's armed forces and their voice is silent in the election of national officers and in the determination of national policies.

The only direct influence the people of Puerto Rico have on the Congress of the United States is through their Resident Commissioner, who has unlimited right to talk in committee and on the floor of the House, but cannot vote in either place. As the House of Representatives continues its deliberations this week on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, it is possible that the law may eventually be changed to give the power of voting in committee and on the House floor to the Resident Commissioner.

I want to take this opportunity to commend Honorable JORGE L. CORDOVA, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, who was elected to serve in the 91st Congress and has done an outstanding job in representing his people since coming to Congress.

The annual observance of Puerto Rican Constitution Day is of great importance because it represents to a proud people an enlightened affirmation of freedom and self-government which they fashioned on their own. The people of Puerto Rico are masters of their own destiny, and over the years, have transformed their land into a showcase of democracy in action.

Moreover, they have accomplished something of an economic miracle, and today, the Puerto Rican economy is the best in Latin America and the average per capita income the highest. The people have lifted themselves up by their own bootstraps to an elevation unattained by the citizens of any other country in Latin America.

Mr. Speaker, in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, reside many, many thousands of Americans of Puerto Rican descent, and as their Con-

gressman, I know firsthand of the many valuable contributions they have made to our community, our city of Chicago, and our Nation. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate them and the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as they join in this anniversary celebration, and I extend to them my best wishes for continuing peace and prosperity in the years ahead.

#### POLICE CHIEF IVAN A. ROBINSON OF DOWNEY, CALIF.

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, occasionally a man with exceptional qualities of leadership and dedication that distinguish him from his peers is appropriately honored by his community. On July 31, 1970, Police Chief Ivan A. Robinson of Downey, Calif., will be recognized for his unusual and above-average contributions to his community, State, and Nation. The event is prompted by his retirement after 30 years of service in the field of law enforcement.

Robbie, as he is affectionately known, gained an international reputation through the use of a documentary film of the Downey Special Enforcement Detail by the Federal Laboratories by the FBI and other law enforcement agencies throughout the United States of America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South America, and Mexico. This widespread use attests to the expertise and high training standards in riot and crowd control demanded by Chief Robinson.

This Police Department in Downey, Calif., was established in 1957 when the area became a municipal corporation in Los Angeles County. Ivan Robinson was selected by the mayor and council to be the first police chief of the new city. The story of the organization and development of the department was written up at the request of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and was published by him in the June 1962 issue of FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

Many civic, fraternal, church, and service organizations have been the beneficiaries of his abilities and contributions. The Salvation Army, the Red Cross, the Community Chest, the Boy Scouts of America, the YMCA, Rotary International, Downey Methodist Church, DeMolay, and many others are included in the list.

Mr. Robinson's knowledge and dedication have been demonstrated as president of the Los Angeles County Peace Officers' Association in 1965-66, and in 1968-69 when he served as president of the California State Peace Officers' Association. In both organizations he has held membership since 1949 and served as an officer and on committees involved in every aspect of law enforcement.

Civil defense, California Chiefs of Police, International Association Chiefs of Police, have received contributions of service from Chief Robinson. With all of this extra activity, the city of Downey has enjoyed the service and protection

of one of the finest police departments in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is a personal privilege to salute Chief Ivan A. Robinson on the occasion of his retirement and wish him Godspeed and many happy years of continued personal service in whatever endeavor he enjoys.

#### LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FACILITIES FOR HANDICAPPED PERSONS

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

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation that would provide tax exemptions for renovation of buildings to provide facilities especially designed for handicapped persons.

This bill provides that a taxpayer owning a business or commercial building may deduct up to \$3,000 in taxes for any one building to finance construction of a single access ramp, when no ground level exists, for persons using wheelchairs; a single ramp or elevator to allow persons using wheelchairs to move between floors; and such special equipment as may be required to make a restroom, one each for males and females, accessible to handicapped persons.

Also included as a deduction would be a ramp leading to a walkway in front of a building whenever a curb would ordinarily exist between the parking lot and such a walkway.

We owe our handicapped citizens every convenience to make their daily routine less difficult by providing them with facilities easily accessible to them.

Therefore, I now introduce this bill for consideration by my distinguished colleagues, and urge the expeditious passage of this legislation.

#### CONCERNING "THE AMENDMENT TO END THE WAR COMMITTEE"

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, over in the other House the architects of surrender are busily at work attempting to build support for a new proposal that will insure an American defeat in Vietnam and in the eyes of the world.

They call themselves "The Amendment To End the War Committee."

And they are trying their hardest to tell the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to hang on for another year and then we will go home and give them what they could not take by force.

They are doing their best to assure the whole world that the American people will not stand up for their friends or their commitments anywhere in the world—not in Vietnam, not in Asia, not in the Middle East, not in Europe, and not in the Americas.

They are doing all they can to assure the world that Americans believe peace

comes before freedom and that the road to world security lies backward through Munich.

To convince the people that they are the only ones who want peace they are running a series of newspaper ads and television spots. They are, in fact, advertising in favor of surrender.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Members of this House will not be fooled by their pious tones. Neither will most of the Members of the other House and neither will the American people.

#### LET THE AMERICAN PEOPLE PARTICIPATE IN PRISONER OF WAR PETITIONS

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

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, all Americans are deeply concerned about our military personnel who are being held prisoners in North Vietnam. Many dedicated Americans are circulating petitions asking that information be provided by Hanoi about our boys being held and that they be accorded humane treatment under the Geneva Convention.

Just the other day, Mr. Speaker, I saw a Member passing a petition among the Members here in the Chamber. I have personally signed a petition that is being circulated in my district by a dedicated Customs Service officer. We must do everything within our means to help these men. They have done their duty, they have served their country, they have obeyed their orders, and whether we agree or not with the situation as it exists, these are our own flesh and blood.

I know President Nixon is doing all he can as Commander in Chief, but I think we could do more. I think we all know that world opinion is now regarded as important in the decisionmaking of the world powers, and that much of the dissent over the war is considered by the Communists as favorable to their cause.

So now I believe we have here the perfect way for all Americans to join in a humane and charitable effort—an effort we would make even in behalf of a stranger—we can now make in behalf of our own.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Federal Government—and all State governments—should extend all possible help to those who are circulating such petitions and see to it that Americans are given the maximum opportunity to sign them. Therefore, I would respectfully ask that the President, through an Executive order or in any other appropriate manner—order that these petitions on behalf of our prisoners of war in Vietnam be made available or be allowed to be placed in all Federal offices of the country. I would respectfully ask that the Governors of several States do likewise in all State offices.

This is the least we can do—let the American people have an opportunity to participate in this vital project.

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, veterans hospitals' employees salaries are based upon a national scale. In some instances this places the VA hospitals at a disadvantage since there are not sufficient inducements to draw professionals into VA hospital work. We bear the responsibility of insuring that if VA hospital employees are paid on a national scale there must be other inducements to draw top men into working for our VA patients.

Some of the inducements would be decent hospital facilities, and the expansion of both training and educational activities for VA hospital employees. For this, our Veterans' Administration needs sufficient funds.

When one considers that the VA medical and hospital program provides 13 percent of the medical care for the Nation and is the largest program of its kind, the importance of full funding is clear. It is time to meet this responsibility and insure the continuation of the program and the attainment of the finest medical care for our VA hospital patients.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, veterans' hospital wages must be realigned to provide for the differences in costs of living across the Nation. What may well be adequate wages for a VA hospital worker in one area, may be very inadequate salaries for comparable workers in another part of the Nation. What is really needed is an area wage scale.

#### VETERINARIANS SERVE, TOO

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

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, with a large part of our population in urban centers, most people get to know their veterinarian only when their pet becomes sick or is injured.

Many people do not appreciate that the veterinary profession has a very broad and important role, not only in the production and safeguarding of the food which human beings eat, but that veterinarians have an important role in medical research and control of disease, and particularly those transmissible from animals to man. There are a good many treatments and cures for human ailments, and surgical techniques, which originated in veterinary medicine. Immunological discoveries in veterinary medicine have often paved the way for preventative medicine of great importance to mankind.

I make no apology for an effort on my part to try to enlighten my colleagues in Congress on the role in our society of my colleagues in the veterinary medicine profession.

As a part of that educational effort, I am including in the RECORD the annual address of American Veterinary Medical Association president, Dr. E. W. Tucker, which I urge all of you to read for a better understanding of the interests, and the role in human affairs, of our profession, which is making a very vital contribution to human welfare:

#### PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

(By Dr. E. W. Tucker)

Honored guests, distinguished visitors, fellow veterinarians, and your families, I bring you warm greeting from the rest of AVMA and thank you for the honor of speaking to you today at this Planary Session.

I doubt that any other AVMA Presidential Inaugural speech has been delivered in like conditions—with competition from so many diversionary activities here in the heart of the entertainment capital of the world. It would be foolish for me to tell jokes because many complex problems occupy our thoughts and actions in today's world. The news media are obsessed with vivid portrayals of the violence of the Southeast Asia conflict; of the undeclared war in the Middle East; crime in the streets; the black vs. white controversy; world-wide; the protests by students everywhere and at all educational levels; the problems and effects of drug abuse; the chaotic environmental pollution puzzle; confusing court and governmental actions; the lack of confidence in "the establishment", and with more demands for government to do all; overpopulation; permissiveness; and hunger.

Add to this list substandard or ghetto housing, ecological problems, incomplete delivery of health care; cancer and infectious diseases, and a host of other topics and I wonder where in the world are we going? How can we solve these urgent problems?

The answers to these questions are beyond my abilities, except to realize that change is inevitable. Each one of us has accepted some change in action or attitude recently and surely more changes are coming. Worldwide unrest affects us just as much as that within our own country and has direct bearing on our lives today and in the future.

You may ask, "Why is he talking about all these things? What have they to do with the AVMA and veterinary medicine?"

My answer is that all these problems concern us as highly educated citizens of our communities. Many of the problems have very direct bearing on our profession, our lives, and our livelihood. We as veterinarians can materially help to solve several of the most important questions now before us.

Of the domestic issues, public opinion polls place fighting pollution second only to fighting crime. Is this a current fad or will there be sustained effort to improve the quality of our air and water? Quoting Dr. Etzioni, chairman, Department of Sociology, Columbia University, New York, N.Y., "The complicated problems that pollution control poses can be handled only in part through a crash program. Public and legislative commitment ought to be built up for a long pull. But even if one day water and air are again as pure as they were before man polluted them, many other environmental problems, from ugly cities to overcrowding—will still be with us.

"Now we should continue to give top priority to 'unfashionable' human problems. Fighting hunger, malnutrition and rats should be given top priority over saving wildlife, and improving our schools over constructing waste disposal systems. If we must turn to 'environment,' first attention should be given to the 57,000 Americans who will lose their lives on the roads in 1970."

To contrast with Dr. Etzioni's quote is this one by Allan Barnes, M.D., Johns Hopkins University, School of Medicine: "Christopher was born August 22, 1969. When he is 35 years old, the world will be twice as populated as it was that August 22nd. When he is 55 years old, the population will again have doubled—making it four times the size it was on the day of his birth. This number, 16 billion people, approaches global saturation. Clearly, if he survives to 65, he will see a population incompatible with life. The genera-

tion which must face population saturation is being born now. When Christopher looks back to see what society was doing to prevent catastrophe, where will he find your name written?"

If, indeed, Christopher does look back he will find the veterinary profession and AVMA were active in making it possible for people to live in 2025. We must face facts today and consider life in future decades.

Babies will continue to be born. These humans need good food, air, and water. Knowledge gained through research at our colleges and farms has made animal protein from meat, milk, and eggs available in adequate quantity to most Americans. Yet changes are rapidly affecting all food animal veterinarians.

For many of us the family farm operation is nearly gone. Successful farming today is big business and big business has little regard for sentiment. Monetary profit is paramount. To reduce or eliminate professional fees may be an objective. Purchase of drugs and biologicals from peddlers is one way to get along for a while, then when real trouble develops, "call the veterinarian," and put the blame on him for not salvaging the herd. That is the way it goes many times in dairy and beef cattle and swine herds.

Of course this is the wrong approach. There are veterinarians who are expert in feed-lot animal care and nutrition. There are others highly capable in disease control and nutrition of dairy cows in large product units. But we need more qualified men for this expanding agribusiness. The challenge of large animal practice still exists.

Large animal clinicians in veterinary colleges have been encouraged to include more information on feed-lot management, and care and nutrition of livestock in concentrated areas. Short courses, illustrated lectures and field tours as part of continuing education show our interest in this developing operation. Research and field observations will continue to provide answers to economical food production.

But several things bother me. First, why do we continue to be at the mercy of real estate developers? Why do we let them transform prime farm land in housing, or plazas, or industrial centers, and permanently remove fertile land from agriculture? Why not encourage developments on poor agricultural land or arid or rocky soil?

Second, what methods will be devised for waste disposal from the feedlots and other concentrated livestock operations? Where will the excreted drugs, pesticides, and bacteria go? Will they travel via natural drainage to brooks, rivers, or lakes? Or will they percolate into the ground water?

Already highway salt is contaminating water supplies in many areas of the northern states. Pesticide pollution of water is not restricted to agricultural or large animal use. What happens to the solutions used for ectoparasite control on small animals? How many gallons of pesticides go into sewerage systems, only to end in lakes, rivers, or the ocean? Why should waste disposal not be of prime concern now? The U.S. Department of Agriculture has pilot study projects underway, but it behooves all of us to contribute what we can to local solutions of these problems.

This brings me to ecology, wildlife, and fish-farming. We know that some rocks on the moon age back to 4.3 billion years, yet we know only a small part of what makes nature "tick." We are woefully lacking in knowledge of wildlife behavior, breeding, nutrition, diseases, and interrelationships. Knowledge of fish culture and propagation is only elementary, yet the fastest growing agricultural enterprise in the southeast is catfish farming.

It is heartening to see the enthusiastic, aggressive approach to the problems of aquatic animal health taken by the veteri-

nary college at the University of Georgia, and to know of other work being done at Texas A&M University, and by individuals elsewhere. However, we need more work at more veterinary colleges on fish and wildlife problems.

The basic knowledge of anatomical relations, physiological chemistry, pathology, bacteriology, virology, and epidemiology make the veterinarian a logical choice to lead a team of workers. Let's get on with the job right now.

Another urgent domestic issue is delivery of health care. To me this term "delivery of health care" encompasses nearly everything having to do with human health—from emergency service to rest homes for the aged; from comprehensive health planning to epidemiology; and from zoonoses to nutrition. This may be a broader viewpoint than that which many people have, but nothing in health delivery is singular—everything is interrelated.

There is no formula, to my knowledge, which incorporates veterinarians in comprehensive health planning. Why not? Veterinarians are important members of research teams and administrative agencies throughout the country, working on problems ranging from cancer research and heart disease to space medicine. Contributions by veterinarians to the solutions of human health problems in the past and at present are known to all of you.

I regret that importance of these contributions was not recognized in February. How some people in our national government could overlook the importance of meat, poultry, and other food inspection by veterinarians in the Department of Agriculture and the military services, forget the reduction of bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis, fail to recognize the actions of the veterinarians in public health and regulatory work, and discard the efforts of academic staff, research, industrial, and food animal veterinarians, is more than I can understand. It was disappointing to read in the budget message that only animal lovers would be upset by the elimination of \$2.7 million as institutional grants to colleges of veterinary medicine in fiscal year 1971.

This brings up the big point that veterinarians individually and in all organized groups should let their accomplishments be made known. We must make it clear that foods don't originate in the market place. With 70% of our population living in cities how can we expect these people to know what we do if we don't tell them? I am annoyed each time a cat or dog owner asks with astonishment why cows or pigs need attention from a veterinarian. This shows me that I have failed in client education. More veterinarians must show the broad knowledge they have.

Such knowledge can nicely be applied in comprehensive health planning. Who knows the road, terrain, and people better than the large animal or mixed practitioner? He can also help counsel officials in disaster control programs and can help guide residents on matters of first aid, nutrition, and principles of disease prevention, safety and sanitation by working with social clubs, Scouts, FFA, and 4-H. Counsel to the Board of Health on all problems of animal origin should be a natural.

What has been done about all this? I have asked a Council and staff of AVMA to prepare articles for use in professional and lay publications indicating where veterinarians could be involved. The National Center for Disease Control of the U.S. Public Health Service has been asked to prepare an outline showing where veterinarians could be active in comprehensive health planning. Sustained effort on explanation of veterinary activities should be maintained.

When I was elected as President-elect, I

was asked what my objectives were for my term in office. I replied that I had no revolutionary new concepts—rather that I would work to solve existing problems.

Some of these have already been mentioned but I have said nothing about AVMA organizational structure or the mechanics of operation. Now is not the time for detailed discussion of that. But it has seemed to me, for years, that contact between AVMA and members needed vast improvement. Our excellent Journal does a fine job of reporting activities, etc., in the "yellow pages," yet members seem to be relatively poorly informed.

To try to improve the situation, Drs. Herick, Brown, and I have represented AVMA at all meetings we could attend. Although this is no easy chore, we are happy to learn about local problems, and to discuss affairs with members. Chicago staff is willing and available, too; all we need are invitations to be with you.

We have asked that AVMA Executive Board members be invited to attend the annual meeting of each constituent association in their Districts. In a few Districts we know the board members' attendance is not possible, but in most of them it is possible, and I urge this improved liaison. AVMA depends on strong constituent associations and should help these constituents wherever and whenever possible.

I think we are now working well with the special practice oriented groups; that these will be asked to do more in the future by way of joint meetings and continuing education. I hope that by sensible cooperation among all groups, part of the needless duplication of programs will be eliminated. AVMA certainly can and will help if given the chance. Some speakers, now booked more than a year ahead, are losing their enthusiasm for appearances. We must correct this situation.

About our veterinary colleges. So far I have visited only seven, but I have been impressed by the earnest dedication to work by the faculty members I have met. They are producing graduates well grounded in science and basic veterinary medicine, in addition to doing research.

Faculty members deserve commendation for their efforts in teaching, research, and all the other things they do. Too often we take these people for granted, criticize what they do and what they don't do. New teaching methods enable faculties to expose more information to the students each year. The situation is not perfect, yet praise is in order for what they are doing in these difficult changing times.

Veterinary college students have not received the attention from AVMA that I think they deserve. I want each AVMA student chapter visited each year by an elected officer or other AVMA official; I want to see more financial and moral support of their worthwhile projects; I want to see 100% membership of students in chapters and later in AVMA.

These students have questions which require answers. We will all benefit from the conversations. The students are smart, dedicated, and have goals to be outstanding veterinarians and to improve the profession.

There is no connection, of course, but two hours after I arrived on the Ohio State campus, April 29, the riot broke out. Although we were on the peaceful side of the river, locked University buildings prevented our meeting. In spite of the turmoil elsewhere, veterinary students did show up to hear about the AVMA. It is reassuring to talk with veterinary students and to realize their stability. They should have more help from the AVMA Foundation for scholarship loans and grants. This cannot be done because of low level contributions from members. Only the Women's

Auxiliary has carried its share. I say the Foundation must either be renovated, or let's discard the whole idea. To continue as at present is not complimentary to veterinary medicine.

These points I have made are only a few of those we face today. You have been very patient to listen so attentively. I hope that in your reflective hours in the future you will think of poor Christopher and his problems, how veterinary medicine and you will provide the means for him to reach age 55, and whether your contribution will justify your name being written on the list of those who care.

#### EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WATSON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks news coverage of the hearings conducted by the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity would lead most Americans outside the South to believe that the southern people, black and white, are forms of sub-Americans who should conform without question to massive Federal interference in their school systems while areas of the North should remain free from such discriminatory treatment.

I deeply resent the whole atmosphere under which the hearings were held which were obviously designed to malign the South and were devoid of any objectivity. Even more deeply I resent a liberal Member of the Senate, who knows absolutely nothing about the South, pretending to have all the answers for our region of the country. I am also fed up with the self-righteous, hypocritical double standard that people like the chairman of this committee apply in dealing with social problems of which they know nothing. If the Senator from Minnesota wants to examine in depth social attitudes and prejudices of which he should know a great deal, I respectfully suggest that he tell the Nation about the traditional plight of the Indians in his home State.

The hearings in themselves were a charade and a sham. They were conducted like mocked trials with obviously carefully selected witnesses who were chosen on the basis of what they were expected to say and what the committee wanted them to say. I do not know of an instance since the infamous Reconstruction era of a more blatant example of rigged hearings.

The arguments used by the chairman and so-called friendly witnesses to cram integration down the throats of the southern people were just absurd. But the rhetoric did clearly reveal the extraordinary length that liberals will go to malign anyone who dares to disagree with them, especially if the person disagreeing happens to be a southerner.

Mr. Speaker, it has often been said that the most intolerant and biased individual in our society is a liberal and yet the whole concept of liberalism is one in which free discussions and different opinions are supposedly solicited.

If the fair-minded, thinking people of this Nation need any more proof of example of northern liberal intolerance toward the South, the hearings conducted by the Senator from Minnesota should convince them.

For a century the South has been treated as if it were not even a part of the Nation, and our people have been hounded and criticized for our beliefs. Northern liberal politicians and newsmen have angrily and sanctimoniously denounced us because we dare to have a philosophy which differs from their own.

But, Mr. Speaker, I say this most emphatically, this sick intolerance must cease if this Nation is to survive. The very decline of America can be laid at the feet of northern liberal moral decline and its witchdoctor sociology.

If America is to maintain its greatness and its standards, the South will lead the way. Northern liberals, whose philosophy of permissiveness has produced a scene of rampant dope addiction, rock bottom moral standards, unprecedented lawlessness and a diminished patriotism, have forfeited the right to speak for any section of this country, much less the Nation itself. In fact, if philosophical denunciation is in order, the people of this Nation, regardless of region, should denounce in the strongest terms, northern liberal thoughts and actions, and tell them that we shall have no more of it.

#### EEOC'S "MORE POWER" GRAB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the authors and cosponsors of H.R. 17555 say this effort to expand the powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission will further promote equal employment opportunities for American workers who are members of minority groups. This conclusion is totally incorrect. I cannot support the principles of this bill.

We must remember that all employment must be based on employee qualifications. This is as it should be. The employee's ability to perform determines the cost and quality of goods produced and services rendered.

I have repeatedly stated that the United States is a land of opportunity for everyone. A high school education is available to all of our youth; vocational-technical high schools have been built by the thousands.

It only follows that youth who are members of minority groups should take advantage of this education in order to qualify to properly compete for all employment.

I know that almost all trade unions have been carrying on active recruitment programs to get minority group youths employed in their apprentice programs. However, the trade unions have not been successful in this effort. Many members of minority groups who pass the most basic apprentice examination either fail to show up for work or last only a few weeks on the job.

Obviously, they are not willing to take the time to properly learn a trade. Many of them would rather receive \$10 or \$15 less a week on welfare for doing nothing than put forth the effort to learn a trade which would eventually pay them a most substantial income. This same welfare which provides higher payments to fatherless families is breaking up the family structure and this causes more school dropouts.

The obvious advantage enjoyed by minority group members today is illustrated by the fact that colleges and universities are actively recruiting students from the ranks of minority groups. Many colleges and universities have lower standards of admission for minority group students and even subsidize them with scholarships.

I submit that the bureaucratic powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission need no further fattening. It already has enough. Its personnel have made it clear enough that they want more power and that they have been something more than zealous in pushing the power EEOC already enjoys.

For example, I am informed that, back in 1965, only four employees of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., then working on the world's largest aircraft carrier, were prepared to charge discrimination. Yet the EEOC summoned the full measure of its power to threaten the company's defense contracts, force a quota system of minority hiring, and compel the employers to sign an agreement that "conditions of the employee's skill and ability" were not "germane" to hiring.

In insisting that "conditions of employee's skill and ability" were not "germane" to hiring, the EEOC is attempting to commit a travesty on our American system. Our American system has long recognized an employee's skill and ability and has rewarded those who increase their skill and ability.

Yet, rather than attempt to stimulate members of minority groups to take advantage of the education available to them and to serve apprenticeships to learn trades, the EEOC would endanger our American system by simply legislating that quotas of minority groups be hired regardless of their skill and ability.

H.R. 17555 would permit EEOC to issue cease-and-desist orders in cases of discrimination allegedly practiced by companies or by labor unions and to reinstate or hire employees and conduct periodic checks to ascertain that EEOC orders are being carried out. Imagine what the EEOC bureaucrats would do with that additional power.

Consider, further, the additional impact of H.R. 17555's providing EEOC with the additional power to directly petition a court of appeals to force a company or a labor union to comply with EEOC's own orders based on EEOC's own prejudged findings of evidence of discrimination.

To grant the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission the power to bypass the Department of Justice in moving to the judicial branch with an executive branch legal action would establish a

dangerous precedent which could lead to other agencies, bureaus, and departments seeking to bypass the Department of Justice.

I think, further, that the effort to give the EEOC the power, as provided in H.R. 17555, to go to court over the head of the Justice Department with EEOC's self-acquired cases against industry and against organized labor is particularly peculiar and suspect in view of a critical fact which, presumably, we are supposed to ignore: The fact that, under title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which H.R. 17555 seeks to expand, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice has been greatly expanded and has been substantially reorganized in the interest of greater effectiveness in the defense of civil rights.

Back in 1957, when the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice was established, it was permitted about 15 lawyers. It now has 104 lawyers on the job, with more coming in to bring the Division to authorized strength of 133 lawyers, even as the Division seeks authorization to expand its recently-established Employment Section to 40 lawyers from its presently authorized strength of 30.

I insist that there is absolutely no justification for this effort by EEOC to pressure the Congress into giving it greater powers in the name of "Enforcement" of "Equal Employment Opportunities"—unless, of course, we wish to justify the well-established bureaucratic desire to perpetuate itself in power and to take unto itself ever greater, more authoritarian, power.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my distinguished colleagues to give most serious consideration to this which, to all of us, should be a most frightening—and real—possibility.

#### FUTURE AUTOMATIC ADJUSTMENTS IN PAY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) was recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which is officially recommended by the administration to provide for future automatic adjustments in the pay of Federal employees.

In 1962, this Congress established the policy that the pay of our Federal employees should be comparable to the pay of employees in private industry for the same levels and types of work. In the intervening years, we have not had a very good record in implementing this comparability principle.

Several "one-shot" pay enactments in 1964 and 1965 fell far short of achieving full pay comparability, primarily because of the wage-price guidelines then laid down by President Johnson. The 1967 pay bill contained a three-step pay raise which accomplished a reasonable degree of comparability on the effective date of the third pay raise, July 1, 1969. The 6-percent pay raise, retroactive to January 1 of this year, which was recom-

mended by President Nixon and enacted on April 15, 1970, was another major effort to achieve full pay comparability.

However, it is evident that we are not going to either achieve or maintain full pay comparability until or unless we enact a permanent, rational, and orderly means for doing so.

The legislation recommended by the administration is intended to accomplish this objective. At least, it is a very sound basis upon which our committee can work to produce meaningful legislation on the subject before Congress adjourns this year.

For the information of the Members, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter from the Honorable Robert E. Hampton, Chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the proposed legislation to the House, a sectional analysis of the bill, and a statement of purpose and justification:

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1970.

Hon. JOHN H. McCORMACK,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am transmitting for the consideration of the Congress proposed legislation "To amend title 5, United States Code, to direct the President to adjust the rates for the statutory pay systems, to establish an Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries, and for other purposes." A draft bill, a sectional analysis of its provisions, and a statement of purpose and justification are enclosed.

In presenting his postal reform legislation, the President proposed new procedures for the adjustment of the salaries of postal workers. It is now important that an improved continuing procedure be established for adjusting the salaries of Federal employees under other statutory salary systems. These employees must be assured that their pay rates will be kept up to date in relationship to salaries paid in the private sector.

This proposed legislation is needed to reduce the time lag between salary surveys and schedule adjustments and to make other improvements in the procedure for applying the pay comparability policy adopted by Congress in 1962. It affords an appropriate role to employee organizations, the President, and the Congress. Employee organizations would be consulted by an agent of the President on the coverage of the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey, the salary comparison process and the adjustments required to achieve comparability with private enterprise salaries. An impartial Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries would review the findings of the President's agent and consider the views of employee organizations with respect to the analysis and pay proposals in the agent's report. This Advisory Committee would report to the President.

After reviewing the reports and recommendations of his agent and of the Advisory Committee, the President would make the appropriate salary adjustments and would report his actions to the Congress. If in any year the President should find it inappropriate to make the adjustments because of a national emergency or economic conditions affecting the general welfare, he would have to present an alternative plan to the Congress before September 1 which would become effective on October 1 unless either House disapproved on or before September 30.

The draft bill contemplates that the first two salary adjustments will be effective January 1, 1971 and January 1, 1972. Subsequently, these effective dates will be October 1 of each year, in order to get into better phase with the budget cycle.

Enactment of this draft bill will build on

the precedents set in 1967 and in 1970 (1) by reducing the time lag and (2) by providing for a review of findings by an impartial group. It is necessary to implement properly the sound pay-fixing principles established by Congress in 1962. We urge that it be given prompt and favorable consideration.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that the enactment of this draft bill would be in accord with the program of the Administration.

A similar letter is being sent to the President of the Senate.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. HAMPTON,  
Chairman.

#### SECTION ANALYSIS

(To accompany a draft bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to direct the President to adjust the rates for the statutory pay systems, to establish an Advisory Committee on Federal salaries, and for other purposes)

The first section of the draft bill provides that the act may be cited as the "Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1970."

Section 2 of the draft bill amends title 5, United States Code, by revising and restating sections 5301 and 5302, relating to the congressional policy for fixing pay rates for Federal statutory schedules, and by adding a new section 5302a, creating an Advisory Committee on Federal salaries.

The revised section 5301 continues the policy of the Congress that rates of pay for Federal statutory schedules shall be based on the principles that there shall be equal pay for substantially equal work, that pay distinctions shall be maintained in keeping with work and performance distinctions, and that Federal pay rates shall be comparable with private enterprise pay rate for the same levels of work. The pay systems covered by these principles are identified as those for the General Schedule, the Foreign Service, and the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans Administration.

The revised section 5302 sets forth the procedure for carrying out the policy expressed in section 5301. The major change from existing law is the provision directing the President to make the annual adjustments by October 1 of each year. Similar authority on a temporary basis was, however, given to the President by the pay acts of 1967 and 1970.

Subsection (a) of the revised section 5302 requires that an agent of the President, after consulting with employee organizations, shall make an annual report to the President comparing Federal statutory salaries with private enterprise rates for the same levels of work as reflected in appropriate Bureau of Labor Statistics surveys and recommending appropriate adjustments in Federal salary rates. After considering the report of his agent and the recommendations thereon of an impartial Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries, the President would be required before October 1 of each year to adjust rates of the Federal statutory schedules. These adjustments would be effective on the first day of the first applicable pay period beginning on or after that date. Under existing law, the President makes recommendations to the Congress and the adjustments must be made through the regular legislative process.

Action by the President under revised section 5302 is mandatory. Under subsection (b) in any year that he determines it inappropriate to make the adjustment required by the law because of national emergency or economic conditions affecting the general welfare, he must prepare and transmit to Congress before September 1 in that year such alternative plan as he deems appropriate, and if before September 30 neither House has disapproved, the President's alternative plan shall become effective on October 1. Should

either House disapprove, however, the President would have to make the adjustment required by section 5302, subsection (a) (2), of this bill.

By including specific dates, the provisions in subsections (a) and (b) of the revised section 5302 ensure that actions will be taken and become effective at a time certain and that there will be no retroactive adjustments.

Revised section 5302(c) requires that the President's agent in carrying out its role under subsection (a) must consult with employee organizations regarding the coverage of the BLS survey, the salary comparison process, and the adjustments in salaries required to achieve comparability with private enterprise salaries and must include the views of the employee organizations in its report to the President.

Revised section 5302(d) provides that the adjustments made by the President have the force and effect of statute and shall be printed in the Statutes at Large and in the Federal Register and included in the Code of Federal Regulations.

Under the provisions in revised section 5302(e), adjustments in pay rates under this authority would not be equivalent increases for purposes of computing waiting periods for step-increases under the General Schedule.

Revised section 5302(f) authorizes the President, or such agencies as he may designate, to prescribe conversion rules for making pay adjustments.

Revised section 5302(g) provides that other provisions in this section will not impair the authority of agencies to fix rates of pay by administrative action.

The new section 5302(a) of title 5, United States Code, establishes an Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries and prescribes its functions.

Subsection (a) of that section provides that the Committee shall be an independent establishment composed of three members appointed by the President from outside the Federal Government. The Chairman will be designated by the President from among the members. Except for initial appointments, members will serve six-year staggered terms.

Subsection (b) requires that the Committee shall (1) review the annual report of the President's agent; (2) consider such further views and recommendations with respect to the analysis and pay proposals contained in the annual report of the President's agent as may be presented to it in writing by Federal employee organizations, the President's agent, other Federal officials, and such experts as it may consult; and (3) report its findings and recommendations to the President.

Subsections (c)-(e) contain customary provisions for administration of a Committee of this type, including authority for the employment of experts and consultants under 5 U.S.C. 3109 and of such other personnel as necessary to carry out its functions. It also provides that each member of the Committee will receive the daily equivalent of the rate for Executive Schedule level IV for each day he is engaged on work of the Committee and will receive travel expenses, including a per diem allowance, under 5 U.S.C. 5703(b).

Section 2(b) of this draft bill makes conforming changes in the analysis of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code.

Section 3 provides that the President may make the initial adjustment required by section 5302(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, as revised by this draft bill, without regard to the provisions relating to the Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries. This authority would be used only if the date of enactment of the legislation should be so near the date on which the President would be required to make the adjustment that it would not be feasible to establish the Committee and allow time for it to become opera-

tional. This section also fixes the beginning of the first pay period on or after January 1 as the effective date for the adjustments in 1971 and 1972. In future years the adjustments would be effective in October.

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION**  
(To accompany a draft bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to direct the President to adjust the rates for the statutory pay systems, to establish an Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries, and for other purposes)

The purpose of this draft bill is to provide a continuing improved procedure for adjusting salaries for General Schedule employees, Foreign Service employees, and doctors, dentists, and nurses in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans Administration. This legislation is necessary to properly implement the policy adopted by Congress in 1962 for relating the rates in these schedules to salaries paid for similar work levels in the private sector.

As stated in section 5301 of title 5, United States Code, the policy of Congress is that Federal pay fixing be based on the principles that—

(1) There be equal pay for substantially equal work, and pay distinctions be maintained in keeping with work and performance distinctions; and

(2) Federal pay rates be comparable with private enterprise pay rates for the same levels of work.

This draft bill is designed to reduce the time lag between salary surveys and schedule adjustments and to make other improvements in the procedure for applying the pay comparability principle to the adjustment of salaries for these Federal career employees.

Enactment of the salary review and adjustment procedures in this draft bill would afford an appropriate role to employee organizations, the President, and Congress. Employee organizations would be consulted regarding the coverage of the Bureau of Labor Statistics survey, the salary comparison process, and the adjustments in Federal salaries required to achieve comparability with private enterprise salaries.

In addition, employee organizations would be afforded the opportunity to have their views and recommendations with respect to the annual report of the President's agent considered by an impartial body. The proposed legislation would establish an Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries composed of three members appointed by the President from outside the Government service for six-year staggered terms. The Advisory Committee would review the annual report of the President's agent and give thorough consideration to such further views as might be presented with respect to the analysis and pay proposals in that report by unions, professional organizations, and other Federal officials. Upon completion of its review, the Committee would report to the President.

This proposal would vest in the President the responsibility for adjusting statutory schedules each year in accordance with policies established by law. Congress would continue to deal with changes in policy by the usual legislative process.

By giving the authority to the President, action can be completed in a much shorter time following the comparison of Federal and private enterprise salaries. When the President arrived at a decision on what adjustment was needed to raise Federal salaries to comparability with private enterprise rates, that adjustment could be put into effect in a timely manner. Now the President's recommendations must be sent to Congress where the necessary legislative action generally takes a minimum of two or three months and sometimes a much longer period.

Especially in times when salaries in the private sector are increasing rapidly, the Federal employee should not have to wait for the adjustment to which he is entitled.

The draft bill fixes a date on or before which the President must adjust the salaries each year. If for reasons of national emergency or economic conditions affecting the general welfare the President should consider it inappropriate in any year to make the adjustment required by law, he would have to prepare and transmit to Congress in advance his alternative plan, and if neither House of Congress disapproved on or before September 30, the plan proposed by the President would become effective on October 1.

The draft bill specifies an October effective date for the adjustments. An exception is made, however, for the first two adjustments. Section 3 of the bill specifies that these adjustments will be effective in January 1971 and January 1972, respectively. The October date is introduced so that the survey schedule may be adjusted to better accommodate to the budget cycle. The time lag between the survey and the effective date of the adjustment would be unchanged. The survey would be made earlier and the adjustment would be made earlier. With the present survey schedule and a January adjustment, it is necessary to seek a supplemental appropriation not only for the current year but also for the next fiscal year.

Federal salary rates must be adequate to enable the Government to employ persons well qualified to conduct its programs; they must be fair to Federal employees and they must be fair to the taxpayer.

Salaries fixed in accordance with the principles established in 1962 meet these objectives. This draft bill reaffirms the established principles and provides improved procedures for carrying them out.

The achievement of true comparability dictates that the annual adjustments be made on a timely basis. The draft bill assures that this will be done by requiring that the President make the adjustments by a certain date.

Congress has established the policies. Congress can by this proposed legislation establish the needed authorizations for the continuing administration of the program. As with any other program administered by the Executive Branch, Congress will oversee the work and consider and enact legislation as needed to change it.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. Over 3 percent of the U.S. population is enrolled in college. Both Canada and the Soviet Union have approximately 2 percent of their population enrolled in colleges.

#### JULY 25—ANNIVERSARY—PUERTO RICO ATTAINED SELF-GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. CORDOVA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, I invite our colleagues to pause with me for a

moment in these proceedings to mark our observance on this Saturday, July 25, of the anniversary of two historical events for Puerto Rico. It was on July 25, 1898, that the first troops of the U.S. Army landed at Guánica on the southwest coast of the island and were welcomed by most of the people of Puerto Rico.

It is an anniversary which has for centuries been observed as an official holiday. Prior to 1898, Puerto Rico, as a part of Spain, celebrated this anniversary as the feast of St. James, the patron saint of Spain, from which country our people derive their culture and language, and with which we shared four centuries of history.

Although Puerto Rico achieved in the early months of 1898 a very substantial degree of self-government granted by the liberal regime which came into power in Spain late in 1898, this newly received measure of freedom had scarcely been implemented when the American troops arrived, and were welcomed as the harbingers of true freedom in the new world.

I must say our people, who by the end of 1899 were practically unanimous in looking forward to joining the Union as a State, and meanwhile achieving self-government as a territory, were grievously disappointed when Congress denied them American citizenship, and reduced them to a colonial status, in the Foraker Act which in 1900 provided the first civil government under the American flag.

Congress finally granted our people American citizenship, and a small measure of self-government, in 1917. The recognition of our rights as citizens progressed some 30 years later with the appointment by the President of the first native-born Governor of Puerto Rico in 1946 and the extension by Congress to Puerto Rico of the right to elect its own Governor in 1947—the first time this right had been acknowledged with regard to any American community other than a State. This was followed by congressional action in 1950 authorizing Puerto Rico to adopt its own constitution, and in 1952 by the congressional approval of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The effective date of the 1952 constitution was July 25, a date deliberately chosen because of its historical significance in Puerto Rico, as the feast of St. James, and as the anniversary of the landing of Gen. Nelson Miles and his troops in Guánica in 1898.

So Mr. Speaker, I invite our colleagues to join all Puerto Ricans, in Puerto Rico and in the mainland, in celebrating July 25 as a date redolent with significance in the history of Puerto Rico, and with the hope which all of us in Puerto Rico share of achieving full self-government.

man from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, to say that the Nation faces a crisis in health care is neither startling nor original.

We have heard this assessment from President Nixon; from former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert Finch; from various Members of Congress; and from a host of editorial writers, news commentators, academicians, and health professionals.

There are, in fact, few Americans who would argue the point any longer.

Despite burgeoning governmental programs; the tremendous growth of private health insurance plans in recent years; a \$60 billion-a-year health industry; and a \$38 billion outlay annually in private expenditures for their own health care, the people of this country are viewing—with mounting concern—the widening gap between the promises and the realities.

We say that health care is a right, not a privilege.

But the difference between a right denied and a privilege withheld of little moment to a person who needs health care and either can't get it when he needs it or cannot afford it when he finds it.

And so we are far from the point where the goal that all of us share—adequate health care for all Americans—seems readily attainable.

But the search for solutions is on.

The problem is no longer whether we assure the right to adequate health care to those who expect it and demand it.

The problem is how we should go about it.

Let us be thankful that there is no shortage of ideas on that score. Already we have a double handful of proposed solutions and the likelihood of a dozen more being introduced in the months ahead.

And whether we are talking about the Rockefeller approach, the AFL-CIO approach, the Kennedy approach, or the approach taken by the Committee of 100, all of them advocate sweeping changes in our health care system.

For all propose, in one form or another, a national health insurance plan.

These plans deserve the most careful scrutiny, Mr. Speaker, as will the alternatives they are certain to generate. For no thornier problem confronts us on the domestic scene, none cries out for a workable solution with more urgency, none poses a greater need for hard, original thinking.

As Victor Hugo once wrote:

Greater than the tread of mighty armies is an idea whose time has come.

The idea of national health insurance is an idea whose time has come. The question is no longer whether or not we need a national insurance plan. The question is what plan? And when can we develop one that works?

Early in this session—to be precise, in January a year ago—I introduced a bill

which seemed to me to have considerable merit.

It stemmed from an American Medical Association concept and was drafted after extensive discussions with AMA spokesmen.

Essentially, my bill took a split-level approach to the problem.

The first part was designed to meet the needs of those presently covered under the title 19 medicaid program. Under the plan, each low-income person or family would receive a certificate for the purchase of a qualified and comprehensive health insurance plan.

This protection would be made available to those unable to pay for health care without cost or contribution to themselves, since the cost of the program would be borne entirely by the Federal Government.

At the second level, tax credits would be granted on the basis of the individual's gross income for the purchase of qualified health benefits coverage. These credits would be based on a sliding scale of gross income and would be larger or smaller according to need.

Since the introduction of that bill, a great deal has happened, Mr. Speaker.

We have held continuous hearings on the Ways and Means Committee from October of last year until May of this year.

We have listened to hundreds of witnesses, heard dozens of ideas, and exchanged uncounted hours of dialog.

Not surprisingly, my own thinking has been modified and rechanneled as a result of the experience.

If it is possible to identify a common concern, shared it seems to me by most, if not all of my colleagues on the committee, that concern is how we are going to control the costs of these programs.

Medicare and medicaid, for example, are beset by soaring costs. And they are limited programs.

How, then, are we to control the costs of an across-the-board national health insurance plan without bankrupting the Nation or wasting billions of tax dollars?

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today another national health insurance bill which represents, in my view, a vast improvement over its predecessor by reason of the fact that it encompasses a built-in mechanism for cost control.

I am being joined in this by my committee colleague, Representative JOEL T. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Let me outline the measure for you briefly.

"Medicredit," as the AMA has christened it, recognizes that our population falls roughly into three categories.

In the first are those who are unable to pay the cost of adequate health care for themselves or their families.

In the second are those who can pay a portion of this cost—small or large, but depending upon their respective abilities.

The third category consists of those with a reasonably full ability to pay.

For those unable to afford health insurance, the Federal Government would buy basic comprehensive health coverage by providing the individual, or head

#### THE FULTON-BROYHILL BILL: NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE THROUGH THE "MEDICREDIT TAX INCENTIVE PLAN"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

of the family, with a certificate that could be used to buy hospital and physicians' services.

Similar certificates would be provided for those with a low tax liability—say, \$300 or less.

Those with a tax liability above that amount would be given income tax credits upon their establishment of expenditures for qualified health care plans. The amount of the credit would vary with tax liability. For example, a taxpayer with a \$500 tax liability would receive 70 percent of the annual premium cost as a credit against the taxes he owed. A family with a \$1,200 tax liability would receive 20 percent against its tax liability.

Let me stress that this bill is based on net taxable income rather than gross income, as provided in my original bill. This seems to me an improvement, in that net taxable income screens out inequities in tax liability—thereby reflecting more fairly a taxpayer's ability to pay—and for that reason furnishes a better yardstick of need than gross income.

In order to receive his tax credit, the taxpayer would need to show that he has purchased a qualified insurance or prepayment plan.

A qualified plan would be one where both the benefit package and the carrier or group had been approved by the appropriate State agency, which would follow established guidelines in developing this qualifying program.

A Health Insurance Advisory Board, to be chaired by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and to include the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and public members, would provide the guidelines necessary to carry out the program; plan and develop programs for maintaining the quality of medical care; oversee the financial aspects of the program; and concern itself with the effective use of available health manpower and facilities. The Health Insurance Advisory Board would report annually to the President and the Congress.

As basic benefits under any qualified plan, medicredit requires 60 days of inpatient hospital services, including maternity services; all emergency and outpatient services provided in the hospital; and all medical services provided by an M.D. or a doctor of osteopathy, whether performed in the hospital, home, office or elsewhere. Supplemental benefits could also be provided under the plan and paid for either with tax credits or, in the case of those unable to pay, with certificates.

This approach does away with the need for medicaid, Mr. Speaker. Under title 19, we have been saying—even to the self-sufficient who can clothe, house, and feed themselves—"spend yourselves to the point of indigency, and then we will move in to help."

Medicredit reverses that thinking. It says, in effect:

"The Federal Government will see that you get insurance protection against the cost of illness so that you will not be reduced to indigency.

An advantage to the plan is that it takes into account the varying costs of health care from region to region by

dealing with commercial insurance companies, Blue Cross, Blue Shield, or any prepaid group plan operating in any part of the country, on the basis of an acceptable program reflecting regional costs.

Before going into the third element of this legislation, Mr. Speaker, let me express my conviction that the use of the insurance mechanism is essential to any successful program of national health insurance. Without Blue Shield, Blue Cross and the commercial carriers under contract to the Social Security Administration, medicare would have been an administrative nightmare. In fact it becomes increasingly clear that the private sector should be involved even further in the medicare program, as should any other program that seeks to deliver adequate health care at a price Americans can afford.

To summarize, then, the bill does away with the need for medicaid and places all those presently covered by medicaid in the mainstream of health care.

For the higher income individuals and families, the bill offers realistic incentives to purchase comprehensive health care coverage on a voluntary basis.

The bill utilizes to the fullest extent the private carriers and plans and allows the competition of the marketplace to operate in maintaining cost control and insuring quality of care.

Medicare would be unaffected by this bill's passage, for only those under 65 years of age would be covered by medicredit.

Briefly, now, a word on costs and cost controls.

As wealthy as this country is, there are limits to what we can undertake.

An across-the-board national health insurance plan, operated regardless of need, will carry a price tag of sobering size. And no such plan I have yet seen includes—at least to my satisfaction—a mechanism which promises effective cost control of the taxpayers' money.

This brings us to an essential element of medicredit—its provision of peer review.

This bill calls for a constant and unremitting policing mechanism.

The appropriate medical societies would be charged with establishing a peer review mechanism that would, among other things, review individual charges and services, wherever performed; review hospital and skilled nursing home admissions; review the length of stays in hospitals and skilled nursing homes; and review the need for professional services provided in the institution.

The process of ongoing review can have nothing but a salutary effect on the providers of services, thereby cutting down on the occasional or unintentional abuses that would otherwise occur.

Patterns of abuse would be detected, and the abusers either suspended from or excluded from the program. Exclusion could follow action by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare upon the recommendation of the peer review committee.

In the case of fraud, or other clear intentional misconduct, the peer review

committee would be expected to bring charges before the appropriate licensing body.

And in the event that a peer review committee was not established by the medical society within a reasonable time, or if established was not functioning, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in consultation with the medical society, would be empowered to appoint a peer review committee that would function.

I am frank to admit, Mr. Speaker, that I am chary at this point of offering cost figures on medicredit or any other of the plans now under discussion. We have seen the cost estimates of medicare and medicaid, for instance, drastically underestimated in the past.

I will say this, however:

Medicredit will cost a third as much, or a half as much, as some of the alternatives we have heard proposed. And its total net cost will reflect tax savings to the Federal and State Governments of the money spent on medicaid—about \$5 billion a year presently, about \$7 billion in projected increases.

Mr. Speaker, I am requesting that this measure be laid on the table for 10 days in order to allow others to study it, and, if they see fit, join Representative Broyhill and me as sponsors.

Let me now summarize briefly the provisions of the bill I introduce—the "Health Insurance Assistance Act of 1970."

#### HEALTH INSURANCE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970

Summary of Legislation: It is proposed to incorporate in a single bill programs for: (1) the financing of health care for low income persons; (2) cash incentives through tax credits for the acquisition of comprehensive health insurance coverage; and (3) a structured statewide system for peer review of utilization, charges and quality of services. The first two are incorporated under Title I, the last under Title II.

#### TITLE I—FEDERAL FINANCING OF VOLUNTARY HEALTH INSURANCE

As to the first two parts of the proposal, the Federal Government would assist in the financing of medical and hospital care for individuals and their dependents through participation in the cost of insurance policies of their choice—100% premium payment for the low-income groups, and graduated participation in the payment of premiums for other persons, based on their federal income tax liability.

Entitlement to benefits would be determined with reference to federal income tax liability of an individual in a particular year (base year).

#### Part A—Health care provision for low-income groups

Certificates for Health Insurance: An individual having a tax liability of \$300 or less in a base year would be entitled to a certificate acceptable by carriers for health care insurance for himself and his dependents. Insurance purchased with such a full-pay certificate would require no beneficiary participation in health care charges.

The carrier, as defined in the bill, would present the certificate to the Federal Government for redemption.

#### Part B—Incentives for purchase of health insurance

Election of Tax Credit or Insurance Certificate: Federal contribution to insurance purchased by individuals under this part of

the program would be scaled in favor of low-income taxpayers—from 98% if the taxpayer's base year income tax is between \$301 and \$325, to 10% when his tax liability exceeds \$1,800. A table of allowable percentages for related tax liabilities is included in the bill.

As an example: If in 1970 a family of four has \$6,500 of income, and uses the standard tax deduction, its tax liability will be \$493. The family would receive a tax credit of 73% of the premium cost. If his premium for a qualified health insurance plan or policy is \$600, the taxpayer could reduce his income tax liability from \$493 to \$55 (\$493 less \$438). The same family with an income of \$10,500 would receive a 20% tax credit and reduce the tax liability by \$120 (assuming the same \$600 premium cost).

A policy purchased under this program will contain deductibles: \$50 per hospital stay, and 20% coinsurance on the first \$300 of medical services.

**Qualification of Participating Carriers:** To participate in the plan any carrier would have to qualify under state law, provide certain basic coverage, make coverage available without preexisting health conditions, and guarantee annual renewal. An assigned risk insurance pool among carriers would be utilized as appropriate.

**Health Insurance Coverage:** Basic benefits in a 12-month policy period would include 60 days of inpatient hospital care. To encourage utilization of less expensive facilities, two days in an extended care facility would count as one day of the 60 days allowed. Other basic benefits would include emergency and outpatient services, and all medical services provided by a doctor of medicine or osteopathy. These are minimal requisites to any qualified insurance policy under the program.

A supplemental coverage could provide, in addition, one or more of the following: prescription drugs not otherwise covered, additional days of inpatient and extended care services, blood in excess of three pints, personal health services when furnished on written direction of a physician, diagnostic and therapeutic services, and catastrophic coverage of all hospital and medical costs, up to \$25,000, after the first \$300 of incurred expenses borne by the beneficiary.

**Health Insurance Advisory Board:** A health insurance advisory board of eleven members, including the Secretary of HEW and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and other persons qualified by virtue of education, training, or experience, would be appointed by the President with Senate consent. The Board would establish minimum qualifications for carriers, and in consultation with carriers, providers and consumers would develop programs designed to maintain the quality of health care and the effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower and facilities. It would report annually to the President and Congress.

#### PART II—PEER REVIEW (PRO)

Peer review would be employed as a system of review of utilization, charges and quality of services. As proposed in the bill, the Secretary of HEW would enter into agreements with State Medical Societies for the establishment by the societies of peer review organizations.

In establishing administration within a state, the State Medical Society would appoint a five-member Commission and a nine-member Advisory Council. The Commission would then divide the state into administrative areas, and appoint a three-member Local Review Panel and a five-member Local Advisory Council for each such area. All members of the Commission and of the Panels would be doctors of medicine or osteopathy. The Advisory Council would have consumer, provider, and carrier representation. If the

State Medical Society would not or could not establish a peer review organization, the Secretary would create the Commission and carry out the peer review organization provisions within the terms of the act.

**Hearing and Review:** Each Panel would consider and review information supplied by individuals, institutions, hospitals, government agencies, and carriers. Random selection would also be employed for peer review.

When the facts as alleged so warrant, the Panel would have authority to order a hearing of a provider, and the provider would have the right to counsel. If the provider is a member of a specialty or allied health service, a person representing such service would be required to sit with the Panel in an advisory and consultative capacity. On the basis of its determinations on the hearing, the Panel could recommend, but not impose, disciplinary action.

Any recommendation for disciplinary action would be reviewed by the Commission, which could accept, reject or modify it. If the Commission finds that disciplinary action is warranted, it will make such recommendation to the Secretary.

**Disciplinary Action:** The Secretary will review and act upon a commission's recommendation for disciplinary action and may impose a penalty no greater than that recommended by the Commission, providing, however, that in the case of a first-time penalty, the provider may be suspended from participation in the program for a period no longer than one year. Continued violations giving rise to a subsequent hearing and recommendation for disciplinary action would be punishable by longer suspension or complete exclusion by the Secretary from participation in the programs. Upon showing of cause, however, the Secretary could reinstate a provider or reduce the period of exclusion.

The provider would have a right to judicial review of a determination of suspension or exclusion.

**Evidence in other Proceedings:** Evidence and information adduced under PRO and determinations made with respect thereto would not be admissible in any other action, civil or criminal.

**Notice to Patients:** An individual under suspension or exclusion would be required to take steps to advise his patients that medicare (or other federal health program) will not pay or reimburse for his services during the period of his ineligibility.

**Protective Action and Communication:** Action of a Commission or Panel member, or the supplying of information in carrying out the purpose of the PRO program, would not be a basis for legal liability.

**Reimbursement of Expenses; Termination of Agreement:** Expenses of PRO would be reimbursed by the federal government. An agreement to establish and operate a PRO would be terminable by the Secretary if the State Medical Society failed to discharge its obligations and responsibilities thereunder; or by the Medical Society by giving reasonable notice.

#### MILITARY HEALTH CARE TAKES AN IMPORTANT STEP FORWARD

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, in a quiet and little-publicized ceremony at the Pentagon, Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, administered the oath of office as Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Environment), to Dr. Louis M. Rousselot.

Dr. Rousselot has been serving as a Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health and Medicine.

The importance of this occasion to the health and welfare of members of our armed services and their dependents cannot be overestimated. Prior to yesterday the Department of Defense had kept relegated to a nonstatutory position the individual responsible for the overall health needs of the armed services.

As a result of the insistence of the House Armed Services Committee, and notwithstanding objections from many sources, the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical) was reestablished by law in last year's procurement authorization act. A new charter was written for this office and hereafter the individual occupying the office will be responsible for not only health, but environmental problems affecting the armed services.

Dr. Rousselot is extremely well qualified for the position to which he has been elevated. He is an eminent surgeon and was professor of clinical surgery at New York University before coming to Washington to succeed Dr. Shirley Fisk, another noted physician. Others who have occupied this important position, either as Assistant Secretary or Deputy Assistant Secretary, are Dr. Melvin Casberg, Dr. Randolph Lovelace, Dr. Frank Berry, and Dr. Richard Meiling.

I can speak for all members of the House Armed Services Committee when I say we are pleased that Dr. Rousselot has been appointed to this position. We are also pleased that we succeeded in raising this position to a statutory office. Now the physicians, dentists, nurses, and others responsible for the health needs of our armed services will have a champion to whom they can turn who will serve in a statutory office that cannot be eliminated.

I am confident that the wisdom of our insistence that the health needs of our armed services be put under the direct responsibility of an individual occupying a statutory office will prove to be not only a wise move, but will also be of great assistance to the Surgeons General and the various Directors of the health services of our Armed Forces. Yesterday's action may also prove to be a vital and important step toward solving many of the medical, dental and nursing problems of our armed services, not the least of which is assured health care, the retention of competent physicians, dentists, nurses, and all others whose primary duties involve the physical and mental well-being of our service personnel and their dependents.

#### LEGISLATION TO HELP WIDOWS OF SERVICEMEN KILLED IN VIETNAM

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, a national columnist published an article which was

printed in the Washington Post of July 17, 1970, which told the tragic story of the death of Sgt. Maj. James H. Palmer, who was killed as the result of ground fire striking his helicopter while he was on a mission supporting ground troops in Vietnam. Even though Sergeant Major Palmer was recommended for the Silver Star for gallantry, our Government, according to the columnist, "abruptly ended payments to help keep his son in a special school for children with learning difficulties."

The article went on to say that Mrs. Palmer, who has two other children, "must pay \$205 a month to keep her 15-year-old son in a special school in Falls Church, Va. If her hero husband had lived, they would need to pay only \$65."

The columnist said:

There are 55 other wives like Mrs. Palmer who have lost Government aid for handicapped children because their husbands were killed in action.

Unfortunately, the story is true.

A Member of the other body announced on July 17 that he would introduce a bill to correct this situation.

I would like to remind that Member and also the entire membership of the House and Senate, that the House has on two occasions passed a bill to correct this gross inequity: We first passed such a bill in the 90th Congress on August 1, 1968—only to have it die in the Senate. In this session, we passed H.R. 8413, a similar bill, on February 16, 1970, but as yet, no action has been taken in the Senate.

Let me quote from the report on H.R. 8413:

Section 1079(d) of title 10, United States Code, provides a program of assistance in the case of dependents of a member of the uniformed services who are moderately or severely mentally retarded or who has a serious physical handicap. Benefits include training, rehabilitation, special education, and institutional care. The program is limited to the dependents of active duty personnel. Therefore, retarded or handicapped dependents of personnel in Vietnam would, under the present workings of the law, lose their eligibility under the program when the service member dies while in receipt of hostile fire pay, or from an illness or injury incurred while eligible for such pay. His dependents would continue to be eligible for benefits under section 1079(d) of title 10, United States Code, with the same cost-sharing arrangement, until eligibility is otherwise terminated.

It was only right that the Armed Services Committee report these bills to the House of Representatives to help ease the burden of a widow whose husband has made the supreme sacrifice, and the House in its wisdom, and on two occasions, agreed with your Armed Services Committee by unanimously passing such legislation.

#### THE C-5A—QUESTIONS BEG FOR ANSWERS—PRESUMPTIONS BEG FOR FACTS

(Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I have become deeply distressed about the ripple

effect that often follows statements and charges made about military programs. Statements are sometimes made which, though perhaps meant to be fair, give a distorted picture because they are based on incomplete or inaccurate information or because those who do not have a deep knowledge of military programs arrive at conclusions which are not correct. These statements and charges are then picked up and repeated through various media and, as a result, false ideas gain wide currency.

I fully appreciate the right of every Member of Congress to utilize whatever resources he may have available to support his position on a controversial matter.

Because of my concern in this matter, I am going to take the time, despite my reluctance to get into personal debate, to set the record straight on some charges made against the C-5A by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Back on December 15, 1969—in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 29, pages 39229-39231—the gentleman from Pennsylvania inserted an article alleging some 25 deficiencies existed on the C-5A aircraft. The alleged deficiencies were listed in brief as findings by the General Accounting Office. The gentleman in question did say:

This should not be considered as an official GAO report.

However, the article left the distinct impression that the alleged deficiencies were findings and conclusions of the GAO on the C-5A as a whole. It was not clear from reading the article that the information supplied was not a complete statement of the GAO, and it was not pointed out, as the General Accounting Office at the time had pointed out to the gentleman, that GAO "could do no audit verification of the information with the short time available." It was also not pointed out that the findings applied only to one specific aircraft, the C-5A No. 9.

There has only recently come to my attention the report which was supplied to the gentleman from Pennsylvania back in December. Because the inference is so different if one reads the complete GAO language rather than the summations put in the Record back in December, I am going to insert in the Record at this point all of the list of 25 items provided by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, followed in each case by the complete text of the GAO statement. Quite frankly, I think it will be seen that the impression left by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD article is quite different than that provided by the complete GAO material.

In particular, the gentleman's insertion in the Record failed to include the essential qualifying observation of the GAO in the case of most of these alleged deficiencies to the effect that they "were not considered a problem." As a matter of fact, of the 25 alleged deficiencies listed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, 20 were characterized by GAO as not constituting any significant problem.

I cannot understand why these brief observations of the GAO were not listed by the gentleman. I urge all Members to

read and compare each of these 25 items carefully and then to decide for themselves whether the material included in the Record represents an adequate effort to give Members of the Congress the whole truth on the issues involved. As I indicated, I am taking the trouble to do this at this particular time because of the wide currency that overstated charges can receive if not answered. The material follows:

#### TWENTY-FIVE ITEMS ON THE C-5A AND GAO OBSERVATIONS CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

First. The primary restriction on the airplane is the result of the static wing failure. It is limited to a maximum of 2G's stress which means the cargo compartment may not be loaded with more than 100,000 pounds.

#### GAO DATA

*There is a primary restriction on the airplane because of the static wing failure. Air Force has imposed a safety of flight restriction. It's a supplement to the Operating Manual for the airplane. The restriction is that the A.F. has to fly the airplane at a maximum of 2G stress. This means that the cargo body cannot be loaded with more than 100,000 lbs. of cargo until the restriction is lifted. Not expected to be lifted at time first squadron becomes operational currently scheduled for June 1970. Lockheed thinks it has a satisfactory fix. Present plans are that the fix is to be incorporated in the production line on A/C #34. 1 thru 33 to be retrofitted. Not considered a problem.*

#### CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Second. There has been a limitation of load imposed in one area of the cargo compartment because of pressurization problems. Like the wing deficiency, this is also a structural problem.

#### GAO DATA

*Pressurization vs. cargo-load—Limits cargo load in one area of the cargo department. Structural problem in this one area. They are currently working on this. No problem.*

#### CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Third. Failures have been experienced with the engine mounts. Therefore, restrictions have been imposed on engine throttle limits and the plane cannot take off from unimproved runways.

#### GAO DATA

*Throttle of Engine—This restriction is related to a problem of engine mount failures. The restriction limits fuel applied to the engine. This means that airplane can't be flown from unimproved field. This could be a problem. The strike at G.E. No problem now.*

#### CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Fourth. The speed of the craft has been limited as a result of design problems within the ailerons.

#### GAO DATA

*Air Speed Limitations—Operating manual has a graph of the aircraft speed—has 3 zones (green, yellow & Red). Yellow zone is the outer limits of the airplane performance envelope. The restriction is that the speed cannot go into the yellow zone. It is due [to] a design problem on the aileron. Have a fix but not fully tested. Expect to be o.k.*

#### CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Fifth. Problems exist in the terrain-following altimeter. The pilot cannot rely on its accuracy.

#### GAO DATA

*Radar Altimeter—There are a number of these on the airplane. One of these altimeters is a terrain-following altimeter. Is used when airplane flies low to ground. It has some technical problems and pilot cannot rely on the altimeter. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Sixth. The terrain-following radar has not been tested and cannot be used.

## GAO DATA

*Terrain-following Radar System—The system is not completely tested. Don't use until it is demonstrated. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Seventh. Abnormal stress has occurred within the engine fan blades at certain speed settings. These speeds must be avoided.

## GAO DATA

*Engine Fan Blade Stress Limits—Stress occurs at some specific RPM setting. Engine should not be allowed to stay at this RPM for extended periods.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Eighth. A design problem in the pitch trim flap system prevents full operation.

## GAO DATA

*Pitch trim system—There are 3 of these systems on the airplane. No one of the three can be operated simultaneously with the others. This is because of a minor design problem. Not considered a problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Ninth. A problem exists in the landing gear that prevents the use of cross-wind landing capability.

## GAO DATA

*Landing Gear Cross Wind Position System—This system permits wheels to be positioned when landing in a cross-wind. Has problems, not fully tested. May have impact on training. Still can be landed in cross-wind normally. Can't teach pilot on how to operate system right now.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Tenth. Problems with the landing gear prevent the use of the "kneeling" capability until a proposed temporary fix is incorporated.

## GAO DATA

*Forward kneeling—Restricted use—cannot forward kneel the plane. Found problem with nose landing gear when plane kneeled. Found temporary fix, being incorporated. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Eleventh. The cargo door system cannot be operated in flight. The correction to this problem has not yet been tested. This means the plane cannot be used for parachute drops of cargo.

## GAO DATA

*Cargo door system limits—Cannot operate door in flight. Have found correction but not tested yet. Don't expect to use airdrop during training. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Twelfth. The automatic pilot cannot now be used, and as a result the pilot must maintain manual control of the plane at all times.

## GAO DATA

*Automatic Pilot System—Not to be used. Problem may have been solved, currently testing, expect solution will work. Expect to lift restriction in a short time. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Thirteenth. Because of the autopilot problem, the automatic throttles do not operate properly.

## GAO DATA

*Automatic Throttles—This is tied into the automatic pilot system. Tests not completed. Not a problem area.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Fourteenth. The use of the multimode radar has been restricted.

## GAO DATA

*Multi-Mode Radar—Use of this system is restricted. Not yet completely tested. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Fifteenth. The pitch augmentation system is not operable in flight.

## GAO DATA

*Pitch Augmentation—Not operable in flight. Has some problems in system. No problem for training.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Sixteenth. There is a problem with the slat disconnect drive.

## GAO DATA

*Slat Drive Disconnect—If disconnected in flight, pilot must land or go back to have someone connect it for him. Cannot be corrected during flight. Design problem and disconnection very rare. May affect training.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Seventeenth. The inertial doppler auxiliary computer has not been fully developed or tested.

## GAO DATA

*Inertial Doppler Auxiliary Computer—Limited use. Not fully developed. Testing not completed. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Eighteenth. Use of the stall limiter system is restricted.

## GAO DATA

*Stall Limiter system—Use is restricted. Can't use the warning device to tell when a stall is imminent. Is being improved. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Nineteenth. The flight director computer has not been completely tested.

## GAO DATA

*Flight Director Computer—Limited use. Not completely tested. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Twentieth. There is a problem with power surges in the multimode radar in switching from auxiliary to internal power.

## GAO DATA

*Multi-Mode Radar—When airplane is on ground and using auxiliary power unit, the radar must be turned off before switching to airplane power to avoid surge of power. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Twenty-first. Then engine anti-icing devices do not operate effectively.

## GAO DATA

*Engine Anti-icing—The engine doesn't anti-ice efficiently. It is for preventing ice from forming on the engine. Not considered a problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Twenty-second. There are mistakes in operating manuals.

## GAO DATA

*Amplification Emergency Gear Hydraulic System—This is an operating manual deficiency—Doesn't create a problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Twenty-third. The nose landing gear signal light does not work.

## GAO DATA

*Nose landing gear signal—Light in cockpit not functioning properly. Requires pilot to inspect nose landing gear. Pilot has to look and see if gear is in place and locked. No problem.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Twenty-fourth. The go-around altitude system has not been fully tested and limits are placed on its all-weather landing capabilities.

## GAO DATA

*Go Around Altitude Subsystem—This is part of the all-weather landing system. Has not been fully tested. Not used to fullest limits of its capabilities.*

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Twenty-fifth. And finally, the automatic liferaft release does not work.

## GAO DATA

*Automatic Life Raft Release—Raft would have to be released manually. Don't expect [it] to be used in training program. No problem.*

## MILITARY SPENDING REPORT OF THE MEMBERS OF CONGRESS FOR PEACE THROUGH LAW

(Mr. MOORHEAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I think that the hucksters in the Department of Defense not only have outdone themselves but have acted irresponsibly with regard to our national security.

On July 16, 1970, Mr. Jerry W. Friedheim, a deputy in the public information office, announced at a routine press briefing that the military spending report of the Members of Congress for peace through law contained secret information. I would charge that this statement of Mr. Friedheim—if his information is correct—is a severe breach of national security.

The congressional staff study was prepared using only information from public sources. Admittedly, even public sources occasionally print classified information. If there were any published material the republication of which in a congressional study would involve national security, strong, quiet steps should have been taken to delete it. Instead, Mr. Friedheim called attention to the classified information, if it truly is classified, by announcing it in a press conference.

If the Soviet intelligence network had failed to read the New York Times and the relevant trade journals—now they know the straight dope from Mr. Friedheim.

His lack of judgment is appalling. He seems motivated more to intimidate the Congress than to protect the basic security of the country. I for one do not take this matter lightly and think that it would be appropriate for Mr. Friedheim to resign immediately.

I also deplore the casual way in which this whole matter was handled by the Pentagon. Matters concerning the national security should be given top priority attention. If, indeed, the Pentagon felt that there was information in the report that would compromise the Nation's security, strong measures should have been taken to prevent the distribution of the material rather than using it for propaganda purposes.

Let me tell you how long the Pentagon knew about this report and its contents. In early June, one of the few preliminary draft copies of this report in existence turned up in the Pentagon security group.

After this report had been thoroughly reviewed by the supersleuths in the Pentagon who ostensibly think constantly of the Nation's security, copies were sent to selected members of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees on June 20. It was not double wrapped in accordance with security regulations,

and there was no notification made to these members that the Pentagon had submitted them classified information. If the report contained this, handling it constituted serious breach of security on the part of the Pentagon.

It was not until July 8, almost 3 weeks later that Richard Capen, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs almost casually sent a letter to Senator HATFIELD indicating that there was classified information included in the report and that they would await the Senator's instructions on how to deal with these problems.

I charge that this is an irresponsible manner in which to handle a situation if it were critical to the national security.

Why was a letter to Senator HATFIELD—pointing out the existence of classified information—sent to an office in which the staff person who received it did not have a security clearance?

Why was Senator HATFIELD not contacted personally by an official of the Pentagon's security group who could identify the classified portions? The staff person who wrote the section in question could have been contacted and the questionable information could have been deleted immediately. There were limited copies at that time and the probability was high that all of them could have been located and changed.

If the draft was reviewed in mid-June—why did it take the Pentagon 3 weeks to contact Senator HATFIELD?

Regulations affecting the Nation's security are not political playthings to be bent and twisted at will. When these regulations are misused as in this case and when the cloak of security is spread over purely public information in attempts to intimidate Members of Congress—then the proper use of security is weakened. Such abuse unfortunately has led to an increasing lack of credibility in our whole security system. This is intolerable.

I suspect that the security question has again been grossly abused in this case—that this whole question was raised in an attempt to discredit this report and to discourage future efforts by the Congress to become informed on military questions and to arrive at some sort of independent judgment.

I have made a number of calls to Mr. Friedheim and Mr. Capen to ask them to identify to me privately those sections of the report that contain classified material and I assured them that we could cite public sources of the information. It has been a full week now since their charge and my first call, and they have yet to come forth with an itemized list of violations. According to people who are familiar with security reviews it would take a maximum of 8 hours to review our military spending report. So where is the Pentagon with their specifics?

Unless Mr. Capen can immediately come forward and justify his handling of this case he should resign immediately.

This is not the first time that I have encountered the misuse of security classification in the past year to intimidate and hopefully silence criticisms on national issues.

The case of A. E. Fitzgerald, the de-

posed Air Force cost expert, who was fired by the Pentagon as a result of his testimony before Congress, is probably the most serious case in point. In the spring of 1969, after Fitzgerald's testimony on the C-5A cost overruns, Mr. Seamans, Secretary of the Air Force, told the House Armed Services Committee that Fitzgerald had passed confidential documents to Members of Congress. This was a wholly unsubstantiated and false charge as admitted later by Seamans himself—but was never changed in the public record of that hearing. Seven months later in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, he told me that he was sorry—that the charge was false. This is a serious charge to make against a person and should not be allowed to pass lightly. Seamans had four months in which to change the record or at least to make a public statement setting the record straight—he never did.

The major point is that the Air Force used a completely false "security" violation charge in an effort to discredit Fitzgerald's accurate and honest testimony. Moreover, this unconscionable tactic worked, at least with the Armed Services Committee. Following Seaman's false charge the members of the committee exhorted Seamans to fire Fitzgerald—less than 6 months later, Seamans announced that A. E. Fitzgerald's job had been abolished.

Once again, the Defense Department is dragging out the red herring of security in order to avoid and obscure the real issues. Once again, ad hominem is substituted for logic. Once again, the taxpayer is being bewildered by a smoke screen of phony security charges. The Pentagon's true purpose is, I believe, to scare off faint-hearted economy advocates.

Well, I have news for the Pentagon. At least some advocates of economy and truth in Government are not going to be scared off.

The Department of Defense has made very serious charges. Here and now, I challenge them to produce facts to back up their charges. If the Department of Defense can prove their charges let them to so, and bring appropriate legal action. If Members of this body who have supported the Pentagon's charges can back up their accusations, let them do so.

At this point, I will yield time to any Member who wishes to present specifics to back up the Pentagon's charges—I will be prepared to answer these charges in the RECORD tomorrow.

If the Pentagon's charges cannot be proved, I suggest that some high-level resignations are in order. In particular, I suggest that Mr. Friedheim and Mr. Capen should resign forthwith.

They appear to be guilty of breaches of security. If the material contained in the staff study, in fact, was not classified then these gentlemen have violated security regulations, for it is a breach of regulations to knowingly classify information that is not classified. If the material is classified, then it was not transmitted in accordance with security regulations. In either case security regulations have been broken.

There appears to be an emerging pattern whereby the Pentagon through the abuse of security regulations more and more seeks to discredit, intimidate, and silence dissent.

This my colleagues is doubly dangerous. It harms those who would oppose the Pentagon, and it stifles criticism and free exchange so necessary to our form of Government. Equally important, it demeans and therefore weakens true national security. The enemy of this Nation lies outside the country, it is not our citizens within.

Those who abuse security regulations, and misuse them ultimately compromise the Nation's security. For these reasons, Mr. Friedheim and Mr. Capen should be called upon to resign on the basis that they have exercised extremely poor judgment in this case.

#### IMPORTATION OF BEEF

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, for over a year and increasingly during the past 6 months, we have read in our national news media and heard from a well organized and foreign financed lobby of the need for increased importation of beef into the United States.

This is, I contend, a malign proposal which would bring catastrophic results to our domestic cattle producer. Before the administration or Congress makes any further hasty and unqualified decisions with regard to the abolition of our present quota system, I think we should take an indepth look into the plight of the cattle producer and his importance to our entire Nation.

The production of beef in the United States is big business. It is the largest of the agriculture industries and in 1969 had total sales of \$20 billion or 27 percent of the total farm sales. Let me point out at this time that the cattle industry receives not the first penny of Federal subsidies—a unique accomplishment in these times.

Beef is important to the economy of all 50 States. There is some form of cattle production in all States. In several States beef accounts for 60 to 70 percent of the total farm sales. In eight others it amounts to more than 50 percent and in 34 States more than 10 percent. Thirty-five States at the present have more than 1 million head of cattle.

In 1969 there were over 10 million farm employees with a large percentage of them being directly or indirectly involved in the production of beef by way of the beef industries consumption of grain—of which it is the largest single consumer.

To the consumer, beef is the largest single item in the weekly grocery basket. It is little wonder that the housewife feels she has a vested concern in the price of beef.

Domestic production, we see, does have an important role in the economy of our Nation. A prosperous beef industry is a necessity if we are to maintain a healthy farm picture. History has shown us that

prosperity on the farm is an indication of the well-being of the Nation as a whole.

The situation facing the cattle industry today is pure and simply one of their existence being threatened by increasing amounts of beef imports which are serving to disrupt the domestic market. The question facing us is whether as responsible legislators we will sacrifice our domestic producers to satisfy the expansion desires of the foreign exporters of beef or whether we will take action to protect our farmers here at home.

The problem is not a new one. It has been with us for a number of years. By 1958 it had reached serious proportions with the rate of imports increasing nearly three times over the previous year from 249,447 million pounds to 636,397 million pounds. By 1963 imports of beef had skyrocketed to 1,032 million pounds and in 1964 hit a peak of 1,185 million pounds. This latter figure is equal to the combined cattle production in South Dakota, North Dakota, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming for that year. These are the States that we usually consider to be at the heart of our domestic beef production. Comparing population growth to increase in beef imports in the years between 1957 and 1964, we see that while population rose slightly over 6 percent the rate of increase of cattle imports was nearly 500 percent.

The cause for this sudden and serious increase is twofold. The European Common Market in the early 1960's imposed stringent restrictions on beef imports from nonmember nations. At present they have tariffs of 58 to 118 percent ad valorem on cattle while the United States maintains a 3-cent per pound or 11 percent. This is 47 percent less than the smallest Common Market equivalent.

This action by our European allies forced nations like Australia, whose beef imports account for 50 percent of its total exports, to find another market. The United States because of its large demand and high prices was the natural substitute. The United States at this time had few tariff restrictions and was thus readily available for foreign imports.

The second reason for the notable increase in these 7 years was the technical advancements in refrigeration and the faster and more efficient means of transportation. This is why in the years between 1957 and 1964 beef importation into the United States rose five times what it had previously been. The continued existence of large numbers of our domestic producers was in doubt.

The domestic market was flooded and we had a full fledged crisis on our hands. The market for steers crashed with the result being that large numbers of cattlemen were forced out of business. In the fall of 1962 choice steers were selling for slightly over \$30 per hundredweight. By January the price had fallen to \$27.27 and in May of 1964 hit rock bottom with a \$20.50 price. This is a decline of \$10 in a period of less than 24 months. I ask you how many other industries have been accorded such ill treatment and have continued to strive to exist.

The cattle industry was in serious trouble. Gross cash income fell \$350 million while the total farm income dropped

\$700 million. The farm parity ratio dropped to a 75 percent figure in April of 1964. This was the lowest level since the depression years of the 1930's.

The increase in imports to 11 percent of our total production of beef had brought a chaotic state of affairs to the cattle farm. Foreign beef accounted for more than 1 month of our total domestic production or 4.1 million head of beef at 800 pounds in 1964.

The entire economy felt the backlash of this disaster on our cattle farms. The sale of farm equipment, trucks, cars, grain, and other related products suffered with resulting drops in sales of 10 to 50 percent. This was not a regional crisis or one affecting only a minority of our population. It was of national concern and affected the pocketbooks of all Americans.

Senator Hruska made a vain attempt during these crisis months to amend the Wheat-Cotton Act of 1964 with a proposal to establish an effective quota on beef imports. This measure that would have been the saving grace for a number of beef producers and a great boost to all others failed in the Senate by two votes—44 to 46.

Later in that year a compromise measure was passed. This "milk-toast substitute" was offered by Senators MANSFIELD and MCGOVERN and was supported by the Democratic administration of Lyndon Johnson. It did nothing but to temporarily relieve the problem and is the primary reason why now, 6 years later, we are faced with another crisis situation. If the Hruska bill had become law, many of today's problems would have been prevented.

The 1964 legislation serves to limit certain quantities of foreign meat—fresh, chilled, and frozen beef, veal, and mutton. The base quota for beef imports was set at 725,400,000 pounds. This was the average for the years between 1959 and 1963. May I point out at this time that a large percentage of our present problem has stemmed from this base figure which in its conception was made to include the tragic year of 1964 which saw imports rise to crisis proportions. Because of this, the base quota in all following years has been out of line with the real situation.

The United States, as always, willing to satisfy the foreign producer, had built into this law a figure that has allowed foreign imports to increase yearly at a rate equal to our domestic production increase. Because of this figure, allowing our overseas competition to share in our growing market, from 1965 to 1969, imports have increased from 848.7 million pounds to 998.8 million pounds, an increase of 27 percent.

In addition the Mansfield-McGovern bill provided a 10 percent override to exist. This trigger figure, 10 percent above the established quota figure, had to be reached for the quota to be implemented. I ask you what was the purpose in establishing a quota at all, if we are going to allow foreign competition to exceed their allowed imports by 10 percent year after year. This has been just another loophole in the 1964 legislation which has put additional hardships on our domestic producers.

In 1968 and every year since, all overseas nations exporting beef into the United States agreed to a self-restraint program which would put total imports slightly below the trigger figure of 110 percent. In 1970 this large figure was to be 1,098.7 million pounds. This is 62.6 million pounds above the established figure or 6 percent of the total imports.

In recent years the beef producing nations of the world have gone to long lengths to circumvent these agreements and their restrictions. These nations apparently feel as though they deserve a larger share of the American market and are willing to disavow their agreements to secure increased profits from the market.

The profits from exporting beef to America cannot be undervalued. For example, Australia, the largest exporter of beef to the United States, yearly receives over one-quarter of a billion dollars from these exports.

Australia and other nations have devised a transshipment plan to get this increased share in the American market. This is a method of using a third nation to actually ship the beef into the United States while in actuality it has originated in a second nation—usually one of the large beef export nations. This allows beef to enter the United States under a third nation's quota and not be counted against the quota of the country of origin.

May I commend President Nixon and Secretary Hardin for their recent actions to curb this illegal method of importation.

In 1970 this problem has again reached crisis proportions. The 1964 legislation has finally been exposed for its many loopholes. During the first 4 months of this year beef imports have totaled 425.9 million pounds or 40.1 percent of the total quota for the year. This can be compared to 318.4 million pounds in 1969 and 295.8 million pounds for 1968 during the same time period.

If foreign shipments continue at the same rate they have established during the first quarter of this year, they will exceed the 110 percent level in 10 months or by the end of September.

It is apparent through the actions of these exporting nations, specifically their rapid shipments, that they feel the United States is prepared to give them a larger part of our market by either not imposing the quota or when the trigger figure is reached revising it or totally disregarding it.

The beef situation here at home has been complicated further by its becoming the whipping post for the gripes of the consumer. A congressional subcommittee of this body recently proposed that the Federal Government set up another of its commissions to determine the amount of beef needed and to then balance foreign imports with domestic production. The Commission is to be composed of six Members of the Senate, six Members of the House, and six appointees of the President. Not a single provision is made for representation of the cattle industry on this Commission which is to determine its future. I contend that this would be unlawful Government control of an industry, and of an industry that has been

able to and will continue to be able to manage its own affairs in an effective manner without outside interference.

The mayor of our largest city has called for unlimited imports of beef into our Nation. He argued that the consumer was unable to pay the high prices for beef and that a policy of free trade with regard to beef would be the solution to the situation and give the housewife needed added savings.

Once again the cattle industry has become the scapegoat for politicians searching for the support of the urban family with total disregard for the livelihood of our rural producers.

If these men for one moment would consider what their pragmatic proposals would do to the cattle producer and eventually to the consumer they would have reservations, I am sure.

Let us look at the price of beef during the past two decades and see just how much the cattle industry has profited from our booming economy. In 1964 the average hourly wage for the manufacturing industry was \$1.78 while in April of this year it had skyrocketed to \$3.38, or almost doubled. Since 1960 consumer services other than rent have risen 46.3 percent, per capita disposable income is up 63 percent, the cost of all food has increased 29.6 percent yet the price of retail meat has increased only 20.7 percent and only a small portion of that has gone to the cattle producer.

In 1950 the price of cattle was \$29.28 per 100 pounds for choice steers. This year 1970, two decades later, the price has taken a phenomenal 3 percent increase to \$30.52. If we use the current dollar, with it being in 1970 worth only 60 cents of the 1950 dollar, we see that the figure would fall to \$18.31.

It is thus obvious that the cattle producer has not profited from our bountiful economy. Of the 20.7 percent increase in meat prices he has received only 3 percent. The remaining 17.7 percent has gone to the meat packer and the retail market, much of which has been eaten up by wage increases.

Yet the mayor of New York proposes that we increase beef imports. I will grant that for a time the prices of beef would be lower but this would be the result of over supply. In the long run great increases would be shown. Because of the foreign competition, domestic producers would be driven out of business and America would then become dependent on foreign suppliers who would undoubtedly force prices to skyrocket to a figure they felt was the highest American consumers would pay. How can we expect American industries to compete with their overseas counterparts which often pay hourly wages of less than 30 cents? How can we permit the American housewife to become totally dependent on foreign cattle production for her dinner table?

A second argument for the increase in imports is the fear that the domestic market cannot meet added demands for beef in the coming years.

In 1969 red meat consumption was 182 pounds per person, or the fifth largest in the world. Of this 182 pounds, 110.7 pounds were beef. This is an increase of

25.7 pounds over the 1960 figure. To the average American beef is an important part of his daily food consumption, we see.

Increased production of beef comes from three sources: First, increasing the number of feed cattle through the reduction in slaughtering of calves, second, reduction in slaughter of nonfed steers and heifers and, third, increased production of cattle from birth.

In the area of increased production through decreased slaughter of calves, since 1950 the rate has fallen 50 percent. The slaughter of nonfed cattle has dropped from 5,664,000 to 3,033,000 head. In the increased production from birth, in 1969 there were 330,000 additional head and in 1970 there will be an estimated additional 1 million by the end of the year. This is the first significant change in cattle population in the last 6 years. The cattlemen of America are interested in meeting the additional demand for beef and are actively working to do so.

For a moment let us look at what the USDA estimates our needs to be in the next 5 years. By 1975 they estimate we should need 25.8 billion pounds of beef for consumption. This is computed using the estimates of population growth of 1.1 percent per annum and the estimate of added increase in beef consumption of 1 percent per year.

This would be an additional 4 million head of cattle in addition to our present 110 million. We now have over 1½ million beef producers and if during the next 5 years, each would increase their herds by three cows, we will meet the additional demands. If we give the cattle ranchers a reasonable price incentive and assurance of their future, there is no reason why they cannot meet the need for 4 million more head of cattle.

The price of beef is not unreasonable when one considers the larger extents that all other consumer goods and services have increased. The cattle industry, I have pointed out, can meet the domestic demand of the future. I ask you why then should we give the foreign producers an increased share in the American market when our domestic industry can meet the demands put on it?

In the past 2 years the quota law and related agreements have worked to at least a somewhat effective control of beef imports. They have served to stabilize the volume of imports and have given the American farmer some assurance of what the market will be like. On the other hand they have give the foreign producer a fair share of the American market.

The developments of 1970 have forced us to now consider amendments to the present law—Public Law 88-482 to protect our own cattlemen. They can not endure another crisis like the one in 1963-64. The time is now to enact legislation to come to the aid of our cattle producers.

Under H.R. 9407, my bill, and related bills, a quarterly quota on imports would be established. This would make fluctuations such as those that occurred in the first quarter of this year impossible. It would give the American beef producer an accurate estimate of what he could

expect the market to be like in a particular month.

This legislation would abolish the 10 percent trigger figure. Why should we allow imports to reach a level of 10 percent above the quota figure before the quota is put into effect. It would extend the quota to include fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of lamb, swine, all beef and pork sausage and prepared and preserved pork, beef, and veal.

It would maintain the base figure at 725,800,000 pounds but in doing so would eliminate the growth formula which has allowed imports to reach 998,000,000 pounds in 1969.

This bill would change the mechanism which the Secretary of Agriculture is to use to establish the volume of imports. These levels in the future would be set according to recorded levels of imports with the quota being then imposed on the actual level of imports and not the Secretary's estimate.

Finally the bill would provide that all offshore purchases of beef, veal, lamb, pork, and mutton be included under the quota of the country of origin. This would include all purchases by the Department of Defense for our troops at home and abroad.

Congress must take action now to protect our cattle farmers. The recent actions by the President have helped the situation but they have hardly eliminated them.

It is now up to each of us to take actions to protect this very valuable area of American production before time runs out.

Abraham Lincoln once related that:

He hadn't learned much about economics and especially foreign trade but I do know that if we use American steel to make railroad ties, we have the money and the ties; whereas if we bought the ties from a foreign mill we don't have the money.

In this session of Congress when we are considering all types of tariff restrictions, let us keep these words of our 16th President in mind. Let us never forget that the purpose of our Federal Government is to serve the people of the United States first and foremost. This is not to say that we should follow a policy of protectionism and isolate ourselves from the rest of the world. We all know that foreign imports and our own exports are valuable parts of our economy. But when foreign imports endanger the livelihood of our own domestic producers, as has been the case with the beef industry, it is time for positive preventive steps to be taken.

#### GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF BROADCASTING IN THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. TIERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, 1970 is the golden anniversary of broadcasting in the United States. A current radio commercial claims 50 years of great accomplishments by broadcasters, and "The best is yet to come." That statement holds true for the overwhelming majority of broadcasters in America, but

there are others who fall so far short of greatness that they cast a blot on the record of the entire broadcasting industry. I believe we have an example of just such a station's performance before the Federal Communications Commission at the present time.

Radio Station KTRG in Honolulu, Hawaii, has been cited for 26 alleged violations of the Communications Act of 1934. It is on open record that the FCC has received numerous and continuous complaints of a serious and substantial nature concerning the operation of KTRG. When one looks further into the "complaints," it is clear that the record of KTRG is shocking. If the 26 allegations submitted by the Chief of the FCC's Hearing Division are true, then surely this license should be revoked immediately.

KTRG is accused of: utilizing access to the public airways to obtain money from members of the Japanese community with threats that otherwise their character will be defamed over the station's facilities; violations of the personal attack rules; violation of the fairness doctrine; and the use of the broadcast facilities for personal benefit—that is, the advancement of the campaign for Governor of Hawaii by KTRG's president, David Watumul. Add to these breaches of duty the allegations that KTRG apparently staged the shutdown of the station in order to spur its listeners into a massive letterwriting campaign to the FCC urging quick renewal of their license, and we have a case of monumental misuse of the public airways.

In the bill of particulars published by the FCC it is further noted that KTRG employed a man who used filthy Japanese language to insult and slander members of the Japanese community. Station KTRG has taken editorial positions on controversial issues of public importance without affirmatively seeking to encourage and implement the presentation of contrasting views. It is further alleged that KTRG has not been law abiding. The station publicized its intention to refuse to comply with the census laws of the United States, and has urged and encouraged others to do the same. The allegations also say that the facilities of KTRG were used to encourage unlawful activities.

If there is any substance of truth to any of these allegations then surely KTRG should not be on the air today. This station showed no desire to ascertain community needs and purposely distorted issues and comments of listeners for their own personal benefit. The actions of this station are an affront to the people of Hawaii, and I find it a personal affront that we in Congress and the FCC allow this condition to continue.

There are too many deserving people who would like the opportunity to use a radio license for the benefit of the community, for us to allow any licensee to continue broadcasting when his performance is so overwhelmingly pathetic. The FCC has said that the complaints against KTRG "raise questions as to whether the licensee has been operating KTRG in conformity with Commission rules and regulations and in the public interest."

I contend that such a statement by the Commission raises questions in my mind as to whether they have any comprehension of the public interest. If they had, the FCC would surely not make such a weak statement concerning KTRG. The FCC has been too lenient for too long on scofflaws and those broadcasters who openly disregard the public interest and corrupt the use of this very valuable franchise. If the Commission hopes to gain any respect as a regulatory agency, it must begin to deal forthrightly with those whose choice to disobey the rules. KTRG should not go unscathed.

I would like to remind my colleagues that over a year ago I brought out how WIFE, a station in Indianapolis, had misused its franchise to broadcast. The WIFE and KTRG cases underscore the inadequacies of the Communications Act of 1934. It is clear that the public has not been served by these broadcasters. They should not be on the air today.

These are the cases that have come to my attention. One wonders just how many other licensees are so prostituted.

It is clearly not in the public interest that the FCC, in the face of reckless disregard of their rules, should treat these cases so lightly. The Congress should not be forced to act as a watchdog over the agency set up to insure that the field of communications is used for the public's interest, convenience and necessity.

The public has the right to have a broadcast industry that attempts to deal fairly with issues and tries to meet community needs. Clearly, WIFE, KTRG, and how many others we do not know, are failing miserably in this regard.

We, as elected officials, must not let such ineptitude exist. These cases are blatant reminders of how our system is failing the people. The Congress is already late in its effort to reclaim communications in America for the people. Let us not drag our feet any longer.

#### BUCHWALD ON COMMISSIONS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House that Art Buchwald tells it like it is.

As chairman of the Special Studies Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I have been presiding over a study into the operations of Presidential commissions. The subcommittee has held two sets of hearings so far this year, which are now available. Additional hearings will be held. They have demonstrated the ephemeral quality of these commissions.

Mr. Buchwald's column of July 23, 1970, in the Washington Post reports on the secret burial grounds of reports and studies made by Presidential commissions. Our evidence indicates that most reports are buried and that individuals who have served on such study groups do feel a deep personal loss when their work has been buried. In fact, we have been informed that our count of past Presidential commissions practically conforms to a count of the headstones in the ceme-

tery. Further, the area appears to contain adequate space for the reports of present and future commissions. Mr. Gottfried Snellenbach, the caretaker of the burial area for Government reports since the Harding administration, is so knowledgeable on the subject of Presidential commissions that we have extended to him an invitation to testify at our next hearing.

At this point in the RECORD, I submit the article by Mr. Buchwald referred to above:

#### COSTLY REPORTS VIEWED GRAVELY

(By Art Buchwald)

This is a government of reports and studies. No matter what happens in this nation the first solution is to appoint a commission to study it. The commissions take one year, two years, some even longer, and then they make their report to the President. If the President agrees with the report, it's released to the nation. If he or his staff disagrees with it, it's buried. But where?

Just by chance I discovered the secret burial grounds of reports and studies made by presidential commissions. The cemetery is located on a hill overlooking the upper Potomac. It is quiet and deserted, and only the chirping of birds or the call of a hoot owl can be heard.

Mr. Gottfried Snellenbach has been caretaker of the burial area for government reports since the Harding administration, and after I assured him I would not dig up any of the graves, he let me enter the large well-kept grounds.

"We've got some of the great reports of all times buried here," Mr. Snellenbach said. "We've got reports that cost \$20 million, and we've got reports that cost \$2,000, but in the end they all wind up here, buried 6 feet under."

"Sir, what kind of reports are resting here?" "It might be better to ask what kind of reports aren't buried here. We have reports on violence, studies on blacks, students, unemployment, the economy, the Communist threat, housing, health care, law and order. You name it, and we've buried it."

"How does a report find its final resting spot in this setting?"

"Well, as you know, the President is always appointing a commission to study something or other, and after the study they're supposed to hand in a report. Now, lots of times the President has no intention of paying any attention to the report, and it's dead before it's even written. Other times someone on the President's staff reads a report handed in by a commission and says, 'This stuff is dynamite. We have to kill it.'

"In some cases the President says, 'Let's release this report to the press and then bury it.' Occasionally a report will just die of heartbreak because nobody pays any attention to it.

"In any case, after the report is dead, it has to be buried, because if you're President you don't want someone finding it at a later date and using it against you.

"So every week each report that has died is placed in a pine box and loaded on a government hearse and brought up here, where we have a simple ceremony before lowering it into the ground.

"If it's a blue ribbon panel report that's been killed in action, we give it a 21-gun salute. Otherwise, we lay it to rest with as little fuss as possible."

"This cemetery goes for miles and miles," I said.

"No one knows how many reports have been buried here by the different Presidents."

"Mr. Snellenbach, this is a beautiful cemetery and very impressive, but why does the government go to so much trouble and expense to keep it up for nothing more than paper reports?"

"You must understand that most of the men asked to serve on the presidential commissions are very important citizens. They spend months and years working on these reports, and they feel very close to them. When their reports are killed or buried, these men feel a personal loss. Many days you will see them sitting here next to the tombstones of their studies, tears rolling down their cheeks. No matter how long you work here, it still gets to you."

#### MERCURY CONTAMINATION— ADMINISTRATION IN ACTION

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1970, I brought to the attention of the House the inadequacy of the abatement action involving mercury contamination being undertaken by the Departments of Interior and Justice.

I now wish to report that Secretary Walter Hickel announced on July 22 that he is seeking legal action against 13 U.S. industrial firms for "discharge into the Nation's waterways" of enough mercury to be "a serious hazard to public health." I commend Secretary Hickel for his action.

At the same time it was announced that the Department of Justice representative conferring with Mr. Hickel stated that no firm decision had been made yet, on whether or how to take action.

If the facts disclose that the discharge of mercury wastes is a serious hazard to the public's health, I urge the Department of Justice to bring suit promptly utilizing as grounds for the action the Federal Water Quality Administration Act and the Refuse Act of 1899. Discharge of mercury wastes into our water can be a serious hazard to man and warrants responsible abatement action. The Department of Justice should revoke its present guidelines to its attorneys which allows suits against "accidental and infrequent" industrial polluters but permits day to day dumping of mercury by polluters. The Department should demonstrate initiative and leadership by using the legal tools that the Congress has provided.

#### THE ANNIVERSARY OF PUERTO RICO CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 18 years ago this Saturday there began one of the most impressive experiments in American history. Truly the date July 25, 1952, marks the beginning of one of the most satisfactory agreements ever reached by this Government with any group of people. For on this day 2,500,000 Puerto Ricans were given assurance of all the liberties and the freedoms enjoyed by their fellow American citizens.

It is small wonder that the people in Puerto Rico and their kinsmen living here celebrate with deep emotion the anniversary of the adoption of their con-

stitution which brought commonwealth status to their delightful island home.

I count it a distinct honor and a cherished memory to have been permitted by the late Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas to chair the deliberations of this body during the enactment of the legislation which changed Puerto Rico's status of a semicolonial area of virtual dependency to full partnership with our Federal Government.

I recall with deep satisfaction my privileged association with the almost legendary "saint of Puerto Rico," my good friend and former Governor, Luis Muñoz Marin, Working month after month with the Puerto Rican people's hero and his many fine associates was indeed a most rewarding and gratifying experience.

This anniversary date is of greater significance to our Puerto Rican neighbors than that of the day in July 1898 when American military forces wrested the island from the four-century domination by Spain.

It is a date of even greater historic significance than the date in 1899 when Puerto Rico was officially ceded to the United States under the Treaty of Paris.

This is true even though the years 1898 and 1899 marked the end of years upon years of hopeless thralldom and abject poverty for every man, woman, and child—a span of slavery years dating back to Columbus' discovery of the area on his second voyage in 1493 and its subsequent settlement by Ponce de Leon in 1508.

Unfortunately, for many reasons Puerto Rico was not granted the status of an incorporated territory which meant that although belonging to this country, she still was not a part of it. It is true that this Government did offer certain rights from time to time on a piecemeal basis.

Thus, it was that with the adoption of the Constitution—a mandate which evolved after months of dedicated joint effort on the part of political leaders of Puerto Rico and the United States, the people of Puerto Rico were given the opportunity to help themselves with the ardent support of this Government.

Gov. Luis Muñoz Marin then began implementing his far-seeing plan called Operation Bootstrap. His vision and his leadership coupled with the magnificent support of his people wrought a miracle within a short time. The plan began raising the annual income by doubling and tripling the pitiful \$126 level of 1952 until now it is well over \$1,000. Illiteracy has been virtually wiped out, poverty has been significantly reduced, and health conditions so improved that the lifespan has been raised from 46 years to 70 years in just 18 years.

On each visit to Puerto Rico over the years, I have been thrilled with the economic progress and cultural achievements which mark life under the Commonwealth. No amount of praise would do justice to the people who have worked so hard to make Puerto Rico now the "Showcase of the Carriibbean." All of us can take great pride that Puerto Ricans are no longer just poor relations but are now well-to-do relatives.

Although Puerto Rico has not solved all its problems, it is devoting concerted

efforts by the people and their elected leaders to do so. Much of the success of these efforts is due directly to the fine constitution which spelled out clearly the nature and extent of Puerto Rico's right to govern itself.

The constitution provides for a clear division of the powers within three coordinating branches of government—the legislative, executive, and judicial—and by assuring that each of which checks and balances the other. This gives the people of Puerto Rico maximum protection of their interests and their rights.

Mr. Speaker, too often we here on the mainland think of Puerto Ricans in terms of those who remain in the Commonwealth. We should remind ourselves of the hundreds of thousands who live and work throughout this land. We should remind ourselves of the tens of thousands of Puerto Rican young men who serve their country in our Armed Forces—many of them as volunteers. During the Korean war more than 60,000 Puerto Rican soldiers fought in our armed services of which number over 54,000 were volunteers.

We should remind ourselves of the great contribution which our Puerto Rican citizens are making to our daily lives culturally, politically, and economically. It might surprise you to learn that in New York City alone last year, Puerto Rican workers earned more than \$800,000,000 and paid over \$60 million in taxes. This in spite of getting too often the most menial jobs because of limited language proficiency and job experience.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the people of Puerto Rico both here and at home. I commend them for making such a success of their efforts under their 18-year-old constitution that they have provided a vivid vindication of the democratic process. They give us living proof that the traditional American way with its belief in human liberty and its belief in government by consent of the governed is workable and satisfactory.

I trust that during this anniversary date each year hence will be marked by the same success and splendid achievements which mark this Puerto Rico Constitution Day.

#### CONGRESSMAN HUNT INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT SALE OF GUN COLLECTOR LISTS BY IRS

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill that would prohibit the public disclosure of the names and addresses of persons licensed as collectors pursuant to the Gun Control Act of 1968.

It will be recalled that there was considerable concern and public protest when it became known that the Internal Revenue Service was selling, at cost, pre-addressed mailing labels of licensed firearms dealers and collectors. My concern, and particularly that brought to my attention by the collectors themselves, involves the essentially private nature of the activity of a gun collector, commonly carried on in his home, and the threat to his security which the widespread dis-

closure of his identity poses. For example, a concerned resident of Columbus, Ohio, brought to my attention the theft in that city of an extensive gun collection from a residence followed by the gutting of the home when the burglars set fire to it as they left. I am not suggesting that there was any causal relationship between the sale of gun collector lists by the IRS and the theft and damage that occurred in this particular instance. However, I am saying that because of the indiscriminate availability of this type of information, the risk of such incidents is immeasurably increased.

In the aftermath of this situation, general legislation was introduced, which I cosponsored, that is designed to limit the sale and distribution of mailing lists by any Federal agency for purposes of commercial or other solicitations. That measure amends the so-called Freedom of Information Act. The bill I am introducing today, however, amends the Gun Control Act of 1968 and precludes any authority for the public disclosure of gun collector lists which might be claimed under the Freedom of Information Act. In my estimation, a careful reading will show that the Gun Control Act did not contemplate the public disclosure of this information, nor does the Freedom of Information Act require it under any stretch of the imagination. That any policy guidelines in this respect are lacking in the Gun Control Act is evident from the fact that identifying information relative to gun collectors has been indiscriminately disclosed in the past in mailing list form.

It is of some temporary consolation that the IRS has discontinued this practice as confirmed in a letter to me from the Assistant Commissioner for Compliance, Donald W. Bacon:

We have concluded that a list of collectors is necessary solely because the law requires all licensees—not merely those engaged in business—to be furnished the compilation of relevant State and local ordinances. Under our Automatic Data Processing system and within the framework of the Freedom of Information Act, the names and addresses of licensed collectors can be separated from the list of dealers.

Accordingly, in the future the names and addresses of those persons licensed as collectors under the Gun Control Act will not be disclosed.

Personally, I do not feel there should be this loose administrative discretion in such an important matter. The Gun Control Act should not be permitted to become dependent upon the future exercise of this discretionary authority, an insidious form of harassment that carries with it a high risk of endangering those who are merely complying with the law while engaging in an unquestionably legitimate, although private, activity; namely, gun collecting.

The following Members join me at this time in sponsoring the legislation and urge its prompt consideration: Messrs. CARTER, CLANCY, DON H. CLAUSEN, DANIELS of Virginia, DENNEY, DEVINE, ESHLEMAN, GOODLING, KING, KYL, LATTI, MIZE, SAYLOR, SCHADEBERG, SEBELIUS, and WATKINS.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. JONES of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. OBEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. HATHAWAY (at the request of Mrs. MINK) for July 22 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. RIEGLE) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WATSON, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. WILLIAMS, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. CORBETT, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. MILLER, of Ohio for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CORDOVA, for 5 minutes, today.  
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PATMAN, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, for 15 minutes, today.  
Mr. LEGGETT, for 60 minutes, on July 28.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GUDE, prior to the vote on H.R. 18515 today.

Mr. BIAGGI to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter prior to the vote on the Boland amendment.

Mr. RANDALL to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter prior to the vote on the Boland amendment.

Mr. FLYNT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIEGLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHADEBERG.  
Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.  
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
Mr. ZWACH in three instances.  
Mr. ROBISON.  
Mr. LANDGREBE.  
Mr. HALL.  
Mr. SHRIVER.  
Mr. MORSE in two instances.  
Mr. BROTZMAN.  
Mr. BUSH.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.  
Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.  
Mr. ROUSSELOT.  
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.  
Mr. LUJAN in two instances.  
Mr. HANSEN of Idaho.  
Mr. HARSHA.  
Mr. HALPERN.  
Mr. BOW in four instances.  
Mr. HARVEY.  
Mr. ASHBROOK.  
Mr. MCKNEALLY.  
Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLFF) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RODINO in five instances.  
Mr. FRASER.  
Mr. NIX.  
Mr. ANNUNZIO.  
Mr. WALDIE.  
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in two instances.

Mr. BOGGS.  
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.  
Mr. WOLFF in four instances.  
Mr. TUNNEY in three instances.  
Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances.

Mr. LEGGETT.  
Mr. MOLLOHAN in five instances.  
Mr. KARTH.  
Mr. HATHAWAY in two instances.  
Mr. MARSH.  
Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.  
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in two instances.  
Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts in two instances.

Mr. FLOWERS in three instances.  
Mr. MILLER of California in five instances.

Mr. HAGAN in two instances.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 17619. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3279. An act to extend the boundaries of the Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 27, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

July 9, 1970.

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

To THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the "Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946," Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Christine S. Gallagher	Clerk	\$15,098.89
Lacey C. Sharp	General counsel	15,098.89
Hyde H. Murray	Associate counsel	16,967.67
Louis T. Easley	Staff consultant	12,247.88
Betty M. Prezioso	Secretary to general counsel	8,073.75
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	8,073.75
Martha S. Hannah	do	8,073.75
Marjorie B. Johnson	Secretary to associate counsel	8,073.75
Catherine L. Bernhardt	Calendar clerk	8,073.75
George F. Missibeck	Printing editor	8,747.16
Investigative staff:		
John A. Knebel	Assistant counsel	12,247.88
Mildred P. Baxley	Staff assistant	8,073.75
Fred T. Ward	Assistant staff consultant	8,581.20
Mary P. Shaw	Staff assistant	5,811.02
Doris Lucile Farmarco	do	5,811.02
Doris R. Swischer	do	4,959.24
Bert Allan Watson	do	938.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$200,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	88,431.55
Amount expended, Jan 1-June 30, 1970	46,709.13
Total amount expended, Jan 1, 1969-June 30, 1970	135,140.68
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	64,859.32

W. R. POAGE,  
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession (Standing or Select Committee)	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Paul M. Wilson	Clerk and staff director	\$16,671.35
Kenneth Sprankle	Special assistant	2,091.84
Jay B. Howe	Staff assistant	16,507.32
Robert L. Michaels	do	3,277.47
Robert M. Moyer	do	16,507.32
G. Homer Skarin	do	16,507.32
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	16,507.32
Samuel R. Preston	do	16,507.32
Hunter L. Spillan	do	15,568.53
Aubrey A. Gunnels	do	15,325.63
Henry A. Neil	do	15,325.63
Francis G. Merrill	do	14,649.68
Keith F. Mainland	Staff assistant to chairman	14,649.68
George E. Evans	Staff assistant	14,649.68
Earl C. Sitsby	do	14,649.68
Peter J. Murphy	do	13,671.65
William G. Boling	do	11,780.24
John M. Garrity	do	11,549.64
Robert Foster	do	11,549.64
Milton B. Meredith	do	9,863.79
George A. Urian	do	8,761.69
Dempsey B. Mizelle	do	8,649.76
Robert C. Nicholas	do	8,593.77
Thomas J. Kingfield	do	8,593.77
Donald E. Richbourg	do	8,456.80
Gary C. Michalak	do	5,717.45
Thayer A. Wood	do	1,233.68
Samuel W. Crosby	Special assistant	16,507.32
Lawrence C. Miller	Editor	11,780.24
Paul V. Farmer	Assistant editor	8,084.96
Francis W. Sady	Administrative assistant	6,597.76
Austin G. Smith	Clerical assistant	6,672.28
Gerard J. Chouinard	do	6,228.13
Judith A. McClure	do	5,464.57
Dale M. Shulaw	do	5,464.57
Daniel V. Gun Shows	do	4,336.57

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Randolph Thomas	Messenger	\$5,083.75
Gerald F. Meyer	Minority clerk	13,253.41
Enid Morrison	Staff assistant to minority Clerk-stenographer	9,343.21
Naomi A. Rich	do	6,008.56
Patrick M. Hayes	do	6,337.93
William J. Neary	do	6,337.93
Mary H. Smallwood	do	6,337.93
Catherine M. Voytko	do	6,337.93
John F. Walsh	do	6,337.93
T. Robert Garretson	do	6,337.93
Jennifer J. Neilson	do	4,417.81
Robert Carrere	do	596.38
Leta M. Buhman	do	6,337.93
Margaret A. Riley	do	5,089.21
Margarita V. Turner	do	1,056.32
Judith M. Strachan	do	4,347.37
Peggy C. Ehringhaus	do	6,337.93
Jimmy Ray Fairchild	do	6,337.93
Patricia Hutchinson	do	6,337.93
Neta C. Messersmith	do	2,989.59
Winifred A. Pizzano	do	6,337.93
Katherine D. Coupe	do	6,337.93
Barbara B. Blum	do	6,337.93
David H. Kehl	do	6,304.98
Mary Ann Bond	do	1,615.76
Mike Crew	do	4,225.29
Ronald A. Rash	do	5,942.67
William E. Martin	do	5,464.57
Helen W. Phillipsborn	do	3,835.66
Keith E. Heiberg	do	1,723.60

Amount of expenditures previously reported	\$532,099.96
Amount expended, Jan 1-June 30, 1970	552,645.28
Total amount expended, July 1, 1969-June 30, 1970	1,084,745.24

GEORGE MAHON,  
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATION

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Surveys and Investigations staff:		
Paul J. Mohr	Director	\$14,292.69
Cornelius R. Anderson	First assistant director	13,574.81
Leroy R. Kirkpatrick	Second assistant director	13,103.49
Lillian M. Mackie	Clerk-stenographer	7,151.45
Mary Alice Sauer	do	6,769.20
Agriculture, Department of:		
Diels, M. H.	Investigator	2,720.95
Robinson, J. F.	do	8,079.74
Streiser, A. J.	do	11,546.03
Army Audit Agency:		
Fukutome, B. T.	do	11,082.00
Commerce, Department of:		
Kammer, R. G.	Editorial assistant	2,731.00
Specht, D. H.	Investigator	1,565.67
Defense Contract Audit Agency:		
Herron, M. A.	do	11,119.07
Export-Import Bank:		
McNair, K. D.	Editorial assistant	2,664.59
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Bennett, C. L.	Investigator	13,902.72
Bosko, A. P.	do	11,959.36
Brummitt, D. A.	do	12,925.76
Carson, D. W.	do	14,227.84
Currall, W. G.	do	13,419.20
Franklin, R. M.	do	13,250.88
Funkhouser, P. K.	do	10,643.52
Goedtel, J. G.	do	13,250.88
Groover, L. C.	do	10,647.04
Hanson, J. F.	do	13,577.60
Hieronymy, N. H.	do	8,953.92
Ivy, C. M.	do	13,250.88
Law, W. C.	do	14,120.00
McGahey, H. B.	do	13,902.72

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Magee, E. H.	do	\$13,902.72
Maher, M. F.	do	13,603.52
Michalski, J. E.	do	13,250.88
Sanderlin, C. H.	do	13,250.88
Schaum, E. V.	do	13,250.88
Scully, J. E.	do	13,250.88
Shannon, A. J.	do	13,902.72
Smith, H. J.	do	13,250.88
Szoka, C. E.	do	10,277.28
Thompson, I. M.	Stenographer	1,370.22
Torrence, R. E.	Investigator	13,577.60
Welch, W. H.	do	14,227.84
Wood, H. B.	do	13,902.72
Health benefits		1,568.38
Life insurance fund		1,169.51
Retirement fund		20,518.30
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Meyer, G. F.	Editorial assistant	4,214.00
Read, M. J.	Investigator	3,977.75
Interior, Department of:		
Thompson, P.	Editorial assistant	4,431.73
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:		
Carey, B. F.	Investigator	11,404.36
Dorn, R. J.	do	6,668.19
Tariff Commission:		
Taylor, J. A.	do	7,010.95
Transportation, Department of: Marikie, H. J.	do	3,595.60
Treasury, Department of: O'Brien, D. A.	Editorial assistant	4,795.61
Travel expenses		116,421.47
Miscellaneous expenses		365.29

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$1,015,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	364,501.08
Amount expended, January 1, 1970-June 30, 1970	631,593.17
Total amount expended, July 1, 1969-June 30, 1970	996,094.25
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	18,905.75

GEORGE MAHON,  
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John R. Blandford	Chief Counsel	\$17,752.50
Frank M. Slatinshek	Assistant Chief Counsel	17,623.98
Earl J. Morgan	Professional staff member	17,266.74
William H. Cook	Counsel	17,266.74
Ralph Marshall	Professional staff member	13,671.66
John J. Ford	do	13,671.66
George Norris	Counsel	13,127.16
James F. Shumate, Jr.	do	12,738.31
William H. Hogan, Jr.	do	9,015.24
Mary Jo Sottile	do	8,755.28
Oneta L. Stockstill	Executive secretary	10,570.63
Berniece Kalinowski	do	8,600.94
L. Louise Ellis	do	8,600.94
Edna E. Johnson	do	8,600.94
Dorothy R. Britton	do	8,600.94
Doris L. Scott	do	6,453.45
Innis E. McDonald	do	5,596.80
D. Carleen Poole	do	5,596.80
Ann R. Willett	do	5,366.64
Brenda J. Gore	do	5,366.64
Constance E. Hobart	do	4,721.98
Emma M. Brown	do	4,673.03
James A. Deakins	Clerical staff assistant	6,503.30
Issiah Hardy	Messenger	4,664.86

**TAFF, ARMED FORCES INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE (PURSUANT TO H. RES. 105, 106, AND 750, 91ST CONG.)**

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John T. M. Reddan	Counsel	\$17,266.76
John F. Lally	Assistant counsel	12,543.87
Richard A. Ransom	Professional staff member	12,543.87
H. H. Cantus	do	5,967.18
Albert R. Simonds	do	5,736.84
Rose C. Beck	Secretary	6,453.45
Adeline P. Tolerton	Clerk	5,236.07
Joyce C. Bova	Secretary	4,492.90
Sally Moore	do	1,470.97
Diane Trowbridge	do	1,413.48
William B. Short	Clerical staff assistant	7,060.04
Sanford T. Saunders	Security officer	6,503.29
Kenneth W. Tompkins	Messenger	280.28

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures H. Resolution 106 and H. Resolution 750	\$425,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	141,157.73
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1970-June 30, 1970	96,901.35
Total amount expended, Jan. 1, 1969-June 30, 1970	238,059.08
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	186,940.92

L. MENDEL RIVERS,  
Chairman.

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY  
To the CLERK of the HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<b>Standing committee staff:</b>		
Paul Nelson	Clerk and staff director	\$17,740.05
Orman S. Fink	Minority professional staff member	17,740.05
Charles B. Holstein	Professional staff member	16,474.50
Curtis A. Prins	Chief investigator	14,961.19
Benet D. Gellman	Counsel	16,474.50
Joseph C. Lewis	Professional staff member	17,673.82
Mary W. Layton	Secretary to minority	9,764.20
Donald G. Vaughn	Assistant clerk	8,269.02
Total		119,097.33

<b>Investigative staff (H. Res. 271):</b>		
Jeanne Abrams	Secretary	5,007.61
Linda M. Barnes	do	3,537.77
Richard C. Barnes	Assistant clerk	7,955.24
Jane N. D'Arista	Research assistant	3,458.12
James F. Doherty	Counsel	15,341.80
Dolores K. Dougherty	Assistant clerk	7,737.96
Carolyn Easter	Secretary	1,135.83
Robert J. Geline	Assistant clerk	5,835.61
Linda Hechtman	do	5,368.63
Helen Hiltz	do	8,260.56
Linda L. Hoff	Secretary	4,856.73
Joseph J. Jasinski	Professional staff member	13,111.39
Laurance G. Henderson	do	17,673.82
Mary-Helen Kesceker	Secretary	3,930.29
Mary E. Kirk	Assistant clerk	4,656.73
Mildred S. Mitchell	do	8,698.44
Richard Neiman	do	2,131.14
Graham T. Northup	Professional staff member, minority	16,433.47
Margaret Rayhawk	Secretary	7,118.17
Alicia F. Shoemaker	Secretary to minority	9,499.62
Elizabeth Stabler	Professional staff member	11,134.51
Peter D. H. Stockton	do	10,790.63
Gary Tabak	Counsel	10,600.98
Lester Carl Thurrow	Professional staff member	2,667.83
Robert E. Torrance	Assistant clerk	4,218.01
Total		190,959.89

H. Res. 271	\$442,500.00
H. Res. 783	331,000.00
GAO-authorized adjustment	100.00
Total	\$773,600.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (itemized above)	773,600.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	327,058.49
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1970-June 30, 1970	211,357.28
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970	538,415.77
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	235,184.23

Wright Patman, Chairman.

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY  
HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE**

**To the CLERK of the HOUSE:**  
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<b>Housing subcommittee (H. Res. 272):</b>		
Anita Allison	Secretary	\$3,448.28
Terrence Boyle	Minority research assistant	4,563.34
Kenneth W. Burrows	Staff director	14,700.50
Jean Clarkson	Secretary	1,613.56
Michael T. Corbett	Assistant clerk	7,797.74
Patricia A. Eley	do	4,779.10
David Glick	Counsel	17,515.96
George Gross	do	15,301.33
Emily Hightower	Secretary	6,099.12
Casey Ireland	Minority staff member	17,515.96
Barbara Kling	Secretary	5,440.09
Margaret J. Leary	do	8,698.44
John J. McEwan	Housing consultant	4,647.24
Gerald R. McMurray	Research assistant	11,380.51
John Nicholson	Minority staff member	8,128.93
Catherine Smith	Secretary	4,242.24
Doris Young	Assistant clerk	8,040.18
Total		143,912.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 272)	\$600,100.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	228,722.37
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970	150,121.97
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970	378,844.34
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	221,255.66

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman.

JULY 4, 1970.

**COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
To the CLERK of the HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Hayden S. Garber	Counsel	\$13,316.57
Clayton D. Gasque	Staff director	11,472.75
Leonard O. Hilder	Investigator	10,259.64
James T. Clark	Clerk	14,977.41
Othello Steinkuller	Secretary	8,260.56
Betty C. Alexander	do	7,637.15
Peggy L. Thornton	do	7,637.15

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sara Anna Watson	Assistant counsel	\$8,093.79
John E. Hogan	Minority clerk	11,998.64
Camille G. Butler	Secretary	4,974.98
Charles E. Jackson	Investigator	4,974.98
Whitney L. Turley	do	8,552.18
Patricia Freedman	Secretary	4,083.20
Michael L. Payne	Temporary clerk-typist	448.35
Marcellus C. Garner	do	438.96

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$100,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	37,255.49
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1970-July 1, 1970	33,975.92
Total amount expended, Jan. 1, 1969-July 1, 1970	71,231.41
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	28,768.59

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—  
STANDING COMMITTEE**

**To the CLERK of the HOUSE:**  
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert E. McCord	Chief clerk and senior specialist (Jan. 1-June 21, 1970)	\$16,864.78
Hartwell D. Reed, Jr.	General counsel (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	17,357.90
William F. Gaul	Associate general counsel (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	17,752.40
Benjamin F. Reeves	Editor of committee publications (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	17,752.40
Louise Maxienne Dargans	Research director (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	17,752.40
Marian R. Wyman	Special assistant to chairman (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	15,034.08
Austin P. Sullivan, Jr.	Legislative specialist (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	13,261.31
Louise M. Wright	Administrative assistant to chief clerk (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	11,672.57
<b>Minority:</b>		
Michael J. Bernstein	Minority counsel for education and labor (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	17,752.40
Charles W. Radcliffe	Minority counsel for education (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	17,752.40

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	(1)
Amount of expenditures previously reported	\$283,224.47
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970	162,952.64
Total amount expended, Jan. 1, 1969-June 30, 1970	446,177.11
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	(1)

CARL D. PERKINS,  
Chairman.

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—FULL  
COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING STAFF**

**To the CLERK of the HOUSE:**  
The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved

August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeannine M. Anderson	Secretary (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	\$4,833.50
Carole J. Ansheles	Assistant clerk (June 1–June 30, 1970)	434.64
Donald M. Baker	Associate counsel (labor) (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	17,752.40
Goldie A. Baldwin	Legislative assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	6,354.95
Dean Gregory Barker	Assistant clerk (June 11–30, 1970)	289.76
Donald F. Berens	Administrative assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	10,588.54
William H. Cable	Junior researcher (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	3,386.01
Howard Daniel Cohen	Assistant clerk (Jan. 5–31, 1970)	376.06
Elizabeth A. Cornett	Administrative assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	8,260.56
Lelia T. Cornwell	do.	6,190.27
Stephen J. Dryden	Assistant clerk (June 29–30, 1970)	28.98
Margery H. Engel	Research assistant (June 8–30, 1970)	460.29
Eydie Gaskins	Administrative assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	6,190.27
Janet R. Inscore	Secretary (Jan. 1–31, 1970)	101.19
Shirely R. Mills	Secretary (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	6,918.79
David E. Pinkard	Assistant clerk (June 15–30, 1970)	231.81
David B. Putnam	Staff assistant (Jan. 5–June 30, 1970)	3,887.10
Thomas F. Remington	Assistant clerk (Jan. 1–Jan. 31, 1970 and June 8–June 30, 1970)	767.14
Ruth A. Ruttenberg	Assistant clerk (May 1–May 31, 1970)	434.64
Cathie Sue Shepherd	Assistant clerk (May 18–June 30, 1970)	622.98
Michael D. Sherman	Assistant clerk (June 1–June 30, 1970)	434.64
Mary L. Shuler	Secretary (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	6,041.51
Jeanne E. Thomson	Legislative assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	8,839.23
Nancy J. Tyler	Junior researcher (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	2,599.21
Samuel C. Vanneman	Legislative specialist (May 1–June 30, 1970)	1,091.84
John E. Warren	Junior researcher (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	4,147.91
Minority: Robert C. Andringa	Minority professional staff assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	9,921.41
Sheldon J. Batchelder	Research assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	3,715.19
Mark Burnstein	do.	500.48
Phillip Bursley	Research assistant (June 22–30, 1970)	120.12
Glenda D. Campbell	Secretary (June 1–30, 1970)	507.48
Albert Edwin Clark, Jr.	Research assistant (June 1–30, 1970)	607.06
Robert L. Durst, Jr.	Minority research assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	5,203.44
Louise W. Finke	Secretary (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	6,536.56
Anita M. Gerhardt	do.	5,298.98
Crawford C. Heerlein	Minority clerk (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	12,131.06
Will Henderson	Assistant clerk (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	4,452.50
Martin L. LaVore	Minority legislative coordinator (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	10,282.40

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas H. Rhodes	Research assistant (Jan. 1–23, 1970)	\$391.63
Silvia J. Rodriguez	Secretary (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	4,067.08
Dean W. Rudy	Research assistant (June 1–June 30, 1970)	452.57
Walter J. Sears, III	Research assistant (Jan. 1–Jan. 5 and June 1–June 30, 1970)	708.06
Dorothy L. Strunk	Administrative assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	5,127.62
Mary Ann Rospendowski (Wagosh)	Secretary (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	4,242.24
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures 1969–1970		\$819,200.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		307,189.12
Amount expended, Jan. 1–June 30, 1970		184,000.46
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969–June 30, 1970		491,189.58
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		328,010.42
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		

JULY 15, 1970.

**SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, No. 1  
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Janet Allemand	Secretary (June 26–30, 1970)	\$100.06
Christina L. Bitting	Secretary (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	4,250.33
Harry J. Hogan	Counsel (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	10,600.98
Sally K. Kirkgasler	Research assistant (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	4,974.98
Ricki Lynn Ninomiya	Research assistant (June 10–30, 1970)	328.61
Robert L. Short	Research assistant (Jan. 1–Mar. 23, 1970)	1,662.52
Betty L. Shupp	Clerk-typist (Feb. 1–June 30, 1970)	1,774.59
Marilyn Rae Stapleton	Staff assistant (Jan. 1–Jan. 31, 1970)	1,149.33
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$120,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		50,831.40
Amount expended, Jan. 1–June 30, 1970		25,273.55
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969–June 30, 1970		76,104.95
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		43,895.05
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		

JULY 15, 1970.

**SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, No. 2  
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the

following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jeunesse M. Beaumont	Clerk (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	\$6,403.63
William C. Dell, Jr.	Research assistant (May 1–31, 1970)	500.48
Maryann T. Krzewinski	Assistant clerk (Jan. 1–31, 1970)	310.03
E. Dennis Muchnicki	Assistant clerk (Jan. 1–May 31, 1970)	768.85
Maureen Orth	Research assistant (Mar. 1–31, 1970)	750.15
Effie J. Nicholakis	Assistant clerk (June 15–30, 1970)	160.07
William George Phillips	Staff director (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	13,127.16
Daniel H. Pollitt	Special counsel (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	3,714.49
Daniel Rutedge Pollitt	Research assistant (June 15–30, 1970)	187.23
Ernest Robinson	Assistant clerk (May 1–June 30, 1970)	214.52
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, 1969–70		\$120,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		52,102.42
Amount expended, Jan. 1–June 30, 1970		26,346.98
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969–June 30, 1970		78,449.40
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		41,550.60
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		

JULY 15, 1970.

**GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, No. 3  
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Adrienne Fields	Clerk (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	\$7,435.67
S. G. Lippman	Special Counsel (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	3,183.24
John T. Ridilla	Assistant clerk (June 1–June 30, 1970)	300.13
Robert E. Vagley	Director (Jan. 1–June 30, 1970)	14,617.71
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures 1969–70		\$120,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		45,075.39
Amount expended, Jan. 1–June 30, 1970		32,633.55
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969–June 30, 1970		77,708.94
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		42,291.06
CARL D. PERKINS, Chairman.		

JULY 15, 1970.

**GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, No. 4  
To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved

August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Cynthia A. Crites.....	Staff director (Jan. 1-Apr. 30, 1970)	\$6,223.30
Sharlene P. Hirsch.....	Education specialist (Jan. 1-Mar. 31, 1970)	5,043.39
John F. Jennings.....	Counsel (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	11,904.48
Alexandra J. Kisla.....	Clerk (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	6,800.67
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, 1969-70.....		\$120,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		56,147.33
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970.....		35,321.65
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970.....		91,469.02
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970.....		28,530.98

CARL D. PERKINS,  
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, No. 5

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Loretta A. Bowen.....	Clerk (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	\$6,868.92
Daniel H. Krivit.....	Counsel (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	12,559.46
Marcia Sue Nelson.....	Research assistant (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	5,572.13
Catherine R. Romano....	Secretary (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	3,862.22
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (1969-70).....		\$120,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		45,274.45
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970.....		36,517.12
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970.....		81,791.57
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970.....		38,208.43

CARL D. PERKINS,  
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, No. 6

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Jack G. Duncan.....	Counsel (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	\$10,469.52
Ruth L. Eliel.....	Assistant clerk (June 1-30, 1970)	264.51
Mary K. Gillespie.....	Assistant clerk (June 20-30, 1970)	39.33
Arlene Horowitz.....	Staff assistant (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	4,109.26
Toni Rita Immerman.....	Assistant clerk (Feb. 23-June 30, 1970)	2,356.86
Ronald L. Katz.....	Research assistant (Jan. 1-June 30, 1970)	6,403.63
Nancy A. Neilen.....	Clerk (Jan. 1-Mar. 21, 1970)	1,687.69
Maureen Orth.....	Research assistant (Apr. 1-May 3, 1970)	1,503.65
Anne W. Risdon.....	Assistant clerk (June 15-30, 1970)	160.07
Jack H. Schuster.....	Education specialist (Jan. 13-31, 1970)	585.49
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$120,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		49,456.58
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970.....		35,023.31
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970.....		84,479.89
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970.....		35,520.11

CARL D. PERKINS,  
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford.....	Staff administrator.....	\$7,258.42
Roy J. Bullock.....	Senior staff consultant.....	17,752.40
Albert C. F. Westphal.....	Staff consultant.....	17,752.40
Franklin J. Schupp.....	do.....	16,917.85
Harry C. Cromer.....	do.....	16,671.35
Philip B. Billings.....	do.....	12,985.08
Marian A. Czarnecki.....	do.....	16,671.35
Melvin O. Benson.....	do.....	14,034.11
Everett E. Bierman.....	do.....	13,035.62
John J. Brady, Jr.....	do.....	10,744.03
John H. Sullivan.....	do.....	10,744.03
Robert J. Bowen.....	Clerical assistant.....	6,461.76
June Nigh.....	Senior staff assistant.....	12,411.48
Helen C. Mattas.....	Staff assistant.....	11,042.29
Helen L. Hashagen.....	do.....	10,145.84
Louise O'Brien.....	do.....	9,854.43
Dora B. McCracken.....	do.....	8,140.92
Jean E. Smith.....	do.....	6,436.84
Nancy C. Peden.....	do.....	6,144.47
Paula L. Peak.....	do.....	7,952.03
Diane Gallagher.....	do.....	3,714.49
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures.....		\$350,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported.....		133,203.25
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1970-June 30, 1970.....		75,966.64
Total amount expended, Jan. 1, 1969-June 30, 1970.....		209,169.89
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970.....		140,830.11

THOMAS E. MORGAN,  
Chairman.

JULY 10, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Expenses—Jan. 1-June 30, 1970:		
Full committee.....		\$1,856.09
Special Investigative Staff.....		46,522.82
Military Operations Subcommittee.....		42,650.36
Government Activities Subcommittee.....		45,679.37
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.....		45,261.02
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.....		38,413.05
Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee.....		61,651.90
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee.....		43,179.45
Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee.....		59,815.22
Special Studies Subcommittee.....		66,704.59
Total.....		451,733.87

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
------------------	------------	--

Salaries: Full Committee, Jan. 1, 1970-June 30, 1970:		
Christine Ray Davis.....	Staff director.....	\$17,752.40
James A. Lanigan.....	General counsel.....	17,752.40
Herbert Roback.....	Professional staff member.....	17,752.40
Miles Q. Romney.....	Associate general counsel.....	15,115.06
Lawrence P. Redmond.....	Professional staff member.....	10,236.88
Dolores L. Fel'Dotto.....	Staff member.....	8,260.56
Ann E. McLachlan.....	do.....	8,006.60
Charlotte C. Bickett.....	do.....	7,368.52
John Philip Carlson.....	Minority counsel.....	17,752.40
William H. Copenhaver.....	Minority staff member (from Mar. 16, 1970)	7,901.47
William P. Russell.....	Minority staff member (to Jan. 16, 1970)	692.71

Expenses, Jan. 1, 1970-June 30, 1970:		
Full committee, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman: Expenses.....		1,770.96
Special Investigative Staff, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman:		
Thomas H. Saunders.....	Minority staff member.....	6,627.95
Clara Katherine Armstrong.....	Minority research assistant.....	7,368.52
Julia J. Norrell.....	Research assistant.....	7,956.24
Catherine S. Cash.....	Secretary.....	6,561.48
Annie M. Abbott.....	do.....	6,528.23
Alan Kreshtool.....	Investigator (from May 1, 1970)	1,750.80
Mabel C. Baker.....	Staff member.....	4,885.19
John L. Dodson.....	Clerical staff.....	4,844.41
Total.....		46,522.82

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:		
Douglas G. Dahlin.....	Staff attorney.....	11,019.22
John Paul Ridgely.....	Investigator.....	9,824.10
Joseph C. Luman.....	Defense analyst.....	9,318.48
Catherine L. Koerberlein.....	Research assistant.....	7,561.60
Kathryn M. Rosenbaum.....	Clerk-stenographer.....	4,770.96
Expenses.....		156.00
Total.....		42,650.36

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, chairman:		
Ernest C. Baynard.....	Staff administrator.....	14,649.68
C. Don Stephens.....	Research analyst.....	9,282.23
William M. Jones.....	Counsel (from Apr. 1, 1970)	4,773.60
Irma Reel.....	Clerk.....	6,561.48

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lynne Higginbotham	Clerk-stenographer	\$6,561.48
Michael McGettigan	Investigator	3,450.11
Expenses		400.79
<b>Total</b>		<b>45,679.37</b>

**Int. governmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman:**

James R. Naughton	Counsel	14,649.68
Delphis C. Goldberg	Professional staff member	14,649.68
Gilbert S. Goldhammer	Consultant (Feb. 9-Mar. 24; Apr. 4-May 31, 1970)	5,619.03
Bebe B. Terry	Clerk-stenographer	6,173.27
Marjorie W. Vanderbilt	do	3,959.24
Expenses		210.12
<b>Total</b>		<b>45,261.02</b>

**Executive and legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. John A. Blatnik, chairman:**

Elmer W. Henderson	Counsel	15,301.33
I. Warren Harrison	Legal assistant	8,454.73
Veronica R. Johnson	Clerk	7,368.52
Gilda K. Calderone	do	3,975.44
Ralph T. Doty	Clerical staff	3,183.24
Expenses		129.79
<b>Total</b>		<b>38,413.05</b>

**Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman:**

Vincent J. Augliere	Staff administrator	14,649.68
Norman G. Carnish	Professional staff member	14,649.68
Jack Matteson	Professional staff member	13,198.14
James L. Nelligan	Professional staff member (to June 27, 1970)	11,553.64
Harold F. Whittington	Professional staff member (from June 22, 1970)	562.49
Elizabeth Jayne Bodecker	Secretary	6,561.48
Expenses		476.79
<b>Total</b>		<b>61,651.90</b>

**Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. Dante B. Fascell, chairman:**

M. Joseph Matan	Counsel (to Apr. 30, 1970)	9,766.46
Charles A. Intriago	Assistant counsel	8,747.16
R. Michael Finley	Professional staff member (from Mar. 1, 1970)	5,831.44
Stuart E. Bossom	Legal assistant	7,826.07
Millicent Y. Myers	Clerk	6,561.48
Frances M. Turk	Stenographer	3,926.28
Expenses		520.56
<b>Total</b>		<b>43,179.45</b>

**Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Henry S. Reuss, chairman:**

Phineas Indritz	Counsel	14,649.68
Laurence A. Davis	Assistant counsel	12,006.47
David B. Finnegan	do	12,006.47
F. Clement Dinsmore	Legal assistant	6,337.93
Josephine Scheiber	Research assistant	7,544.81
Catherine L. Hartke	Stenographer	6,561.48
Expenses		708.38
<b>Total</b>		<b>59,815.22</b>

**Special Studies Subcommittee, Hon. John S. Monagan, chairman:**

Louis I. Freed	Staff administrator	14,649.68
Jacob N. Wasserman	Counsel	13,474.37
Herschel F. Clesner	do	13,419.10
Peter S. Barash	Legal analyst	9,334.96
Charles P. Witter	Staff member	7,729.56
Marilyn F. Jarvis	Stenographer	7,101.58
Expenses		995.34
<b>Total</b>		<b>66,704.59</b>

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, H. Res. 214 and H. Res. 752, 91st Cong.

Amount of expenditures previously reported	\$1,750,000.00
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970	818,791.93
	451,733.87
<b>Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970</b>	<b>1,270,525.80</b>
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	479,474.20

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,  
Chairman.

JUNE 15, 1970.

**COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION**

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Chief clerk	\$17,752.40
Robert D. Gray	Auditor	13,671.65
David S. Wolman	Personnel analyst	13,671.65
Louis Silverman	Assistant clerk	9,072.08
Graney S. Jaynes	do	5,464.57
Robert H. Frank	Legal counsel	7,637.15
Dianne S. Gaujot	Assistant clerk	2,798.42
Mary F. Stolle	do	5,956.80
Margaret H. Schuler	do	803.32
Melvin M. Miller	Minority clerk	14,847.81
Judith K. Holes	Assistant clerk	5,244.26
Thomas J. Hart	do	2,478.36
John C. d'Amecourt	Staff director on Subcommittee on Library and Memorials	8,140.92
Mary Susan Mattson	Assistant clerk	2,621.85
Eric Honick	do	433.59
Gwenda R. Green	do	5,195.29
Thomas A. Tangretti	Printing clerk	5,040.24
Paula Scraggs	Assistant clerk	5,040.24
Stuart G. Weinblatt	do	283.60
Carolyn L. Jana	do	3,568.91
Rita A. Stewart	do	833.55
Marie Alexander	do	3,597.34
Salig Bendit	do	398.81
Alex Sanger	do	800.19
Keith McBee	do	1,967.64

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

Amount of expenditures previously reported	\$800,000.00
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1970-June 30, 1970	84,049.53
	70,543.97
<b>Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970</b>	<b>154,593.50</b>
Balance unexpended	645,406.50

SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL,  
Chairman.

JULY 13, 1970.

**COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS**

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 19, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Sidney L. McFarland	Staff director and chief clerk	\$17,673.82

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
------------------	------------	--

William L. Shafer	Consultant on mining, minerals, and public lands	\$16,277.65
Lewis A. Sigler	Counsel and consultant on Indian affairs	15,584.74
Charles Leppert, Jr.	Assistant counsel and consultant on territorial affairs	14,425.83
Lee McElvain	Assistant counsel and consultant on national parks and recreation	11,590.12
Dixie S. Barton	Clerk	8,552.18
Patricia Ann Murray	do	8,552.18
Patricia B. Freeman	do	7,536.46
Susan A. Gardner	do	6,960.33
Kathleen Sandy	do	6,960.33
Salaries paid pursuant to H. Res. 117 and H. Res. 786, 91st Cong.		
Jim T. Casey	Consultant on irrigation and reclamation	13,671.65
Miriam Waddell	Clerk	5,810.94
Marston L. Becker	Printing clerk	7,469.26
Edward Gaddis	Messenger	4,250.33

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures

Amount of expenditures previously reported	\$195,000.00
Amount expended, Jan. 19-June 30, 1970	78,406.39
	32,200.67
<b>Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970</b>	<b>110,607.06</b>
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	84,392.94

WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Chairman.

JULY 13, 1970.

**COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY**

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<b>Standing committee:</b>		
Donald G. Sanders	Chief counsel	\$16,335.08
Alfred M. Nittle	Counsel	13,576.94
Glenn E. Davis	Editorial director	14,585.70
Robert M. Horner	Chief investigator	12,236.46
William G. Shaw	Research director	12,163.14
Juliette P. Joray	Recording clerk	10,411.32
Mary M. Valente	Administrative secretary	8,617.18
Annie Cunningham	Chief, Files and Reference Section	8,082.17
Helen M. Gittings	Research analyst	8,056.98
Lorraine N. Veley	Secretary	6,337.93
<b>Investigating committee:</b>		
Victoria Appell	Clerk-typist (appointed June 15, 1970)	211.09
Margie D. Biggerstaff	Secretary	4,525.26
Daniel Butler	Assistant documents clerk	4,713.84
Mary Jo Chapman	Clerk-stenographer	3,139.55
S. Janice Coll	Secretary	5,230.65
Harry T. Cone	Information classifier (appointed June 15, 1970)	253.75
Sue Daniels	Information analyst	3,730.47
Florence B. Doyle	Clerk-stenographer	4,115.31
Elizabeth L. Edinger	Editor	7,969.74
Rochelle E. Epstein	Clerk-typist	3,154.12
Daniel R. Ferry	Assistant counsel (appointed, Mar. 1, 1970)	5,836.85
James L. Gallagher	Research analyst	7,754.75
Ruth Ann Gerbec	Information classifier	3,361.97
Isobel Hurwitz	do	3,361.97
Leo William Ivory, Jr.	Assistant documents clerk	2,917.95

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Doris R. Jaeck	Information analyst	\$4,770.96
Mildred V. James	Clerk-typist	3,345.98
Judith H. Joseph	Clerk-typist (Feb. 3, to June 8, 1970)	2,353.38
Millie Fay Lee	Secretary (resigned Feb. 15, 1970)	1,109.84
Gail B. Lewis	Information classifier	3,361.97
John F. Lewis	Coordinating editor	12,193.39
Kathleen C. Marche	Information classifier (resigned Feb. 15, 1970)	792.91
Virginia Masino	Receptionist	3,455.57
B. R. McConnon, Jr.	Investigator	8,311.56
Elizabeth B. Medina	Secretary (appointed Mar. 26, 1970)	2,483.56
David E. Muffley, Jr.	Documents clerk	4,606.10
Monica Rae Munger	Clerk-typist (resigned Jan. 25, 1970)	422.82
Maureen P. Ontrich	Information analyst	4,193.71
Alma T. Pfaff	Research analyst	4,819.92
Peggy F. Pixley	Editorial clerk	4,770.96
William T. Poole	Research analyst	4,795.44
Robert Poos	Research analyst (appointed May 1, 1970)	2,753.52
Stuart Pott	Investigator	5,568.49
Rosella A. Purdy	Clerk-typist (resigned Mar. 31, 1970)	510.84
Josephine S. Randolph	Secretary	5,252.40
Audrey Rollins	Secretary (appointed May 18, 1970)	986.39
Herbert Romerstein	Investigator	8,040.18
Stephen H. Romines	Assistant counsel	8,755.29
Karen Sue Russell	Information classifier	3,139.97
Jean W. Rutledge	Secretary	5,522.70
Richard L. Schultz	Associate chief counsel (appointed Mar. 6, 1970)	8,163.93
Richard A. Shaw	Investigator	8,023.39
Thomas Q. Simmons	Investigator (appointed Apr. 6, 1970)	2,880.14
Linda E. Spirt	Clerk-stenographer	4,452.50
Barbara C. Sweeney	do	4,129.05
Neil E. Wetterman	Investigator	7,139.04

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$850,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 366,049.14

Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1970-June 30, 1970 224,605.00

Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970 590,654.14

Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1970 259,345.86

RICHARD H. ICHORD,  
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
<b>Clerical staff:</b>		
W. E. Williamson	Clerk	\$17,752.50
Kenneth J. Painter	1st assistant clerk	14,186.00
Marcella Johnson	Assistant clerk	8,422.24
Frank Mahon	Printing editor	9,334.96
Mary Ryan	Clerical assistant	6,661.18
Mildred H. Lang	do	6,661.18
Hazel J. Collie	Staff assistant	8,379.68
Elsie M. Karpowich	Clerical assistant	6,661.18
Marion Earl Thomas	Staff assistant	6,272.06
Edward M. Burson	Staff assistant (minority)	14,186.00
<b>Professional staff:</b>		
William J. Dixon	Professional staff member	17,752.50

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James M. Menger	Professional staff member	\$17,752.50
Robert P. Guthrie	do	17,752.50
Kurt Borchardt	do	17,752.50
Additional temporary employees under H. Res. 116, 320, and 815:		
Lewis E. Berry, Jr.	Minority counsel	17,752.50
Helen M. Dubino	Staff assistant (minority)	13,300.76
Barbara L. Bullard	Clerical assistant (minority)	5,860.32
Darlene B. McMullen	do	3,805.63
Eleanor A. Dinkins	Clerical assistant	6,661.18
F. Martin Kuhn	Staff assistant	11,672.60
Michael A. Taylor	do	11,672.60
Theodore H. Focht	Special counsel	13,898.24
Christine M. Fawcett	Clerical assistant (minority)	4,412.05
Walter J. Graham, Jr.	Staff assistant	11,672.60
Joseph T. Kelley	Messenger (from June 15, 1970)	235.68
William S. Townsend	Staff assistant (to C. O. B. Mar. 31, 1970)	5,863.30
James T. Glenn	Staff assistant (from Apr. 1, 1970)	5,836.29
Violet M. McCarthy	Clerical assistant (from Jan. 19, 1970)	4,536.20
Stuart A. Chalew	Clerical assistant (from June 1, 1970)	500.48
Special Subcommittee on Investigations:		
Robert W. Lishman	Chief counsel	17,752.50
Daniel J. Manelli	Attorney	12,322.86
James R. Connor	Staff assistant	12,325.77
Russell D. Mosher	do	4,942.30
Elizabeth G. Paola	Clerical assistant	6,661.18
S. Arnold Smith	Attorney (to Jan. 15, 1970)	813.94
William T. Druhan	Staff assistant	12,752.00
James P. Kelly	Chief investigator	13,292.86
James F. Broder	Special assistant	12,325.77
Robert L. Rebein	Staff attorney	13,292.86
Benjamin M. Smethurst	Special assistant	13,292.86
Michael F. Barrett, Jr.	Attorney (from Apr. 13, 1970)	5,142.27
Mark J. Raabe	Attorney (from Feb. 16, 1970)	8,958.01
Elizabeth A. Eastman	Clerical assistant	5,950.90
Lucy M. Gossett	do	5,950.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$1,060,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 444,552.86

Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970 276,389.12

Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970 720,941.98

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970 339,058.02

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,  
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bass E. Dick	Staff director	\$17,752.40
Benjamin L. Zelenko	General counsel	16,885.48
Herbert Fuchs	Counsel	16,474.50
Garner J. Cline	do	14,497.80
R. Frederick Jett	do	13,356.00
Donald G. Benn	Associate counsel	12,022.00
Jerome M. Zeifman	Counsel	12,092.13
Frances Christy	Clerical staff	9,359.63
Jane C. Caldwell	do	8,584.67
Gertrude Clara Burak	do	7,637.15

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carrie Lou Allen	Clerical staff	\$7,226.23
Lorraine W. Beland	do	7,226.23
Roberta E. Eisenberg	do	6,727.67

SALARIES PAID JAN. 1 THROUGH JUNE 30, 1970, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 93, 118, and 780, 91ST CONG., INVESTIGATIVE STAFF

Employee	Position	Salary
Joanne E. Bell	Clerical staff (from May 1, 1970)	\$1,200.76
Pearl Chellman	Clerical staff	4,347.37
Stephen R. Conafay	Clerical staff (from June 1, 1970)	344.21
James J. Faris	Counsel	9,020.45
Paul S. Fenton	Associate counsel	7,001.86
Howard W. Fogt, Jr.	do	7,309.74
William B. Forti	Economist	10,479.60
Austin T. Fragomen, Jr.	Assistant counsel	6,727.66
Mary Shea Gaffney	Clerical staff	4,355.35
Phyllis R. Goldberg	Clerical (through Mar. 11, 1970)	1,431.19
Alma B. Haardt	Clerical staff	6,008.56
Toni T. Harrington	Clerical staff (through Jan. 16, 1970)	367.27
William Thomas Hutton	Assistant counsel	6,119.62
Jane F. Johnson	Clerical staff (from Apr. 20, 1970)	1,568.08
Katherine Ely Kaplan	Clerical staff	4,673.02
Michael Kelemonic	do	6,337.93
Florence T. McGrady	do	6,337.93
Bernice McGuire	Clerical staff (through Mar. 31, 1970)	2,065.89
Thomas E. Mooney	Assistant counsel	5,835.61
Franklin G. Polk	do	11,672.57
O'Wrighten Delk Simpson	Investigator (through May 31, 1970)	4,447.73
Sharon Lee Sites	Clerical staff (from Mar. 24 through Apr. 3, 1970)	262.88
Mary G. Sourwine	Clerical staff	5,613.26
Annelie Tischbein	do	3,975.44
Louis S. Vance	Messenger	4,452.50
Rosalie C. Warback	Clerical staff	3,450.11
John F. Winslow	Assistant counsel	7,574.19

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures \$500,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported 239,455.82

Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970 141,921.61

Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970 381,377.43

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970 118,622.57

EMANUEL CELLER,  
Chairman.

FUNDS FOR PREPARATION OF UNITED STATES CODE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS

<b>A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):</b>		
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1969		\$128,170.24
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1970		52,716.04
Balance June 30, 1970		75,454.20
<b>B. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code:</b>		
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1969		7,632.32
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1970		4,870.30
Balance June 30, 1970		2,762.02
<b>C. Revision of the laws, 1970:</b>		
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1969		21,140.58
Expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1970		19,446.56
Balance June 30, 1970		1,694.02

JUNE 30, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profes-

sion, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert J. Ables	Chief counsel	\$17,752.35
Ned P. Everett	Counsel	14,233.98
Ernest J. Corrado	do	11,664.91
Richard N. Sharod	Minority counsel	12,102.53
Robert J. McElroy	Chief clerk	16,080.77
William B. Winfield	Clerk	11,196.01
Frances P. Still	Assistant clerk	8,649.68
Vera A. Barker	Secretary	8,277.54
Virginia L. Noah	do	7,838.66
Albert J. Dennis	Investigator	9,554.63
Investigations committee staff:		
Ralph E. Casey	Special counsel	17,752.35
Thomas A. Clingan, Jr.	Counsel	14,138.04
Donald A. Watt	Editor	9,039.60
William R. Everett	Assistant clerk	2,125.17
Norman M. Barnes	Investigator	4,779.11
Lucy L. Summers	Secretary	5,810.92
Diane G. Kirchenbauer	do	4,779.11
Jane C. Wojcik	do	6,461.76
Pauline M. Dickerson	do	7,334.93
Ronald W. C. Watt	Assistant clerk	708.39
Joseph S. Helewicz	Investigator	2,004.87
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		
		\$310,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		
		126,365.49
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1970-June 30, 1970		
		85,714.80
Total amount expended, Jan. 1, 1969-June 30, 1970		
		212,080.29
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		
		97,919.71

EDWARD A. GARMATZ,  
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE  
TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee staff:		
Johnson, Charles E.	Chief counsel and staff director	\$17,752.40
Bray, B. Benton	Associate staff director	17,491.08
Martiny, John H.	Counsel	17,491.08
Irvine, William A.	Assistant staff director	17,491.08
Kazy, Theodore James	Senior staff assistant	17,491.08
Fortune, Francis C.	Coordinator	13,040.35
Smorlodo, Victor C.	Senior staff assistant	14,178.98
Thornton, Elsie E.	Chief clerk	11,132.31
Wells, Barbara M.	Secretary	7,838.64
Simons, Blanche M.	do	7,553.21
Investigative staff, pursuant to H. Res. 268, 301, and 869 of the 91st Cong., 2d sess.:		
Barton, Richard A.	Staff assistant	9,951.58
Bates, Kathryn E.	Secretary	5,654.48
Bebick, Joan E.	do	4,515.95
Borger, Deanne L.	do	5,293.18
Brown, Lorraine L.	do	4,673.02
Ciaravella, Jo Ann	Secretary (from Apr. 20, 1970)	1,843.25
Coultrap, Ray H.	Staff assistant (minority) (from Mar. 1, 1970)	4,269.08
Davis, Stewart A.	Staff assistant	9,397.09
Devlin, Ralph J.	do	12,890.43
Dowd, Maureen B.	Intern (from June 1, 1970)	334.33

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Fisher, Mitchell J.	Intern (from June 15, 1970)	\$213.55
Fuchs, Thomas	Intern (from June 22, 1970)	104.29
Gabusi, John B.	Staff assistant	10,509.96
Gould, George B.	do	11,672.57
Green, Thelma R.	Secretary	6,337.93
Griffith, Thomas B.	Intern (from June 22, 1970)	97.73
Harding, Delois	Secretary	3,902.63
Hart, Sally	Secretary (to Apr. 15, 1970)	2,725.93
Higgins, Michael A.	Intern (from June 15, 1970)	231.25
Hitchcock, John E.	Intern (from June 1, 1970)	334.33
Howard, Alton M.	Printing editor	8,755.29
Kennedy, Thomas R.	Staff assistant	10,264.56
Lloyd, Max T.	do	15,171.78
Maginnis, Mary E.	Intern (from June 15, 1970)	231.25
Marmon, Victor Ira	do	213.55
Miller, W. Kenneth	do	231.25
Myers, Lois G.	Secretary	5,827.40
Napier, Margaret G.	do	4,673.02
Palmer, Fred D.	Research assistant	7,427.32
Pendleton, Maria R.	Document clerk	7,544.81
Peters, Dorothy L.	Assistant document clerk	6,445.15
Quigley, Michael A.	Intern (from June 1, 1970)	334.33
Raymond, Anthony J.	Staff assistant (minority)	10,729.94
Rutan, Jeanne	Intern (from June 5, 1970)	528.43
Snipes, Justine P.	Secretary	6,727.67
Ward, Sara L.	do	7,907.20
Williss, Donna L.	do	4,673.02

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		Total
		\$806,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		348,371.56
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970		196,493.32
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970		544,864.88
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		261,174.16

THADDEUS J. DULSKI,  
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Richard J. Sullivan	Chief counsel	\$17,632.27
Lester Edelman	Counsel	14,058.14
Lloyd Rivard	Engineer consultant	14,585.70
Clifton W. Enfield	Minority counsel	17,183.70
Stephen V. Feeley	Subcommittee clerk	10,866.50
Dorothy A. Beam	Executive staff assistant	9,734.29
Meriam R. Buckley	Staff assistant	8,222.06
Sterlyn B. Carroll	do	6,403.63
Investigating staff:		
Richard C. Peet	Assistant minority counsel	14,585.70
Ronald L. Martinson	Subcommittee clerk (terminated Mar. 6, 1970)	2,292.69
Audrey G. Warren	Subcommittee clerk	10,434.10
Sheldon S. Gilbert	Associate minority counsel	9,516.10
Augusta P. Peterson	Subcommittee clerk	8,252.22
Robert F. Spence	do	8,140.92
Joseph A. Italiano, Jr.	Editorial assistant	7,880.66
Erla S. Youmans	Minority staff assistant	7,754.75
Sara B. Hilber	do	5,162.66
Linda L. Williams	do	4,673.02

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Nancy Brayer	Staff assistant	\$4,606.30
Peggy Lynn Clements	do	4,476.73
Harvey C. Simms, Jr.	Clerical assistant (Jan. 5, 1970-Jan. 23, 1970)	275.44
Maryann D. Conway	Staff assistant	5,810.94
Emily B. Loosier	do	5,268.70
Cynthia J. Van Sant	Staff assistant (as of Apr. 1, 1970)	1,857.24
Rosemari E. Gaughan	Staff assistant (as of May 18, 1970)	862.46
Frederick S. Beckman, Jr.	Clerical assistant (as of June 10, 1970)	322.71
Patricia Maguire	Minority clerical assistant (as of June 18, 1970)	199.77
Special Subcommittee on Federal-Aid Highway Program:		
Walter R. May	Chief counsel	17,482.75
John P. Constandy	Assistant chief counsel	16,277.65
Salvatore J. D'Amico	Associate counsel	12,279.06
John P. O'Hara	do	12,279.06
Carl J. Lorenz, Jr.	do	12,465.97
Robert G. Lawrence	do	11,360.04
George M. Kopecky	Chief investigator	15,293.20
Sherman Willsee	Professional staff member	12,279.06
Paul R. S. Yates	Professional minority staff member	13,584.84
Kathryn M. Keeney	Chief clerk	7,737.96
Stuart M. Harrison	Staff assistant	9,302.02
Mildred E. Rupert	do	6,304.98
Agnes M. GaNun	do	6,107.37
Shirley R. Knighten	do	5,260.55
Martha E. Downie	Minority staff assistant	5,703.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:		Total
		\$486,000.00
H. Res. 259		587,000.00
H. Res. 801		1,073,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		492,744.32
Amount expended Jan. 1-June 30, 1970		288,204.71
Total amount expended Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970		780,949.03
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		292,050.97

GEORGE H. FALLON,  
Chairman.

JULY 13, 1970.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Waller Batson	Professional staff member (P)	\$9,903.36
Laurie C. Battle	Counsel (P)	17,752.40
Robert D. Hynes, Jr.	Minority counsel (P)	16,227.23
Mary Spencer Forrest	Assistant counsel (P)	10,049.29
Winifred L. Watts	Secretary (C)	7,600.81
Jonna Lynne Cullen	do	5,738.41
William W. Belcher	Messenger (C) (Mar. 1-June 30, 1970)	720.72
Total		67,992.22
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$5,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		2,407.67
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970		321.00
Total amount expended, Jan. 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970		2,728.67

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970... \$2,271.33  
 WILLIAM M. COLMER,  
 Chairman.

JULY 9, 1970.

**COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS**  
**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles F. Ducander	Executive director and chief counsel.	\$17,752.40
John A. Carstarphen, Jr.	Chief clerk and counsel.	16,892.93
Philip B. Yeager	Counsel	16,892.93
Frank R. Hammill, Jr.	do	16,220.22
James E. Wilson	Technical consultant	15,487.56
Mary Ann Robert	Secretary	6,777.54
Emily Dodson	do	6,495.02
Carol F. Rodgers	do	6,337.93
June C. Stafford	do	6,337.93
Virginia Robison	do	6,337.93
Investigating staff:		
Richard P. Hines	Staff consultant	15,487.56
Harold A. Gould	Technical consultant	15,487.56
Philip P. Dickinson	do	13,427.04
W. H. Boone	do	16,892.93
William G. Wells, Jr.	do	12,890.43
K. Guild Nichols, Jr.	Staff consultant	8,755.29
J. Thomas Ratchford	Science consultant (from Jan. 11, 1970).	13,269.57
James A. Rose, Jr.	Minority staff	11,654.93
Frank J. Giroux	Printing clerk	7,889.06
Elizabeth S. Kernan	Scientific research assistant.	7,620.42
Denis C. Quigley	Publications clerk	6,337.93
Kieran U. Cashman	Secretary	5,244.26
Martha N. Rees	do	3,634.37
Patricia J. Speed	do	4,673.02
Richard K. Shullaw	Assistant publications clerk.	1,552.86
George J. Feldman, Jr.	Clerical assistant (from June 3, 1970).	280.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$700,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	342,595.89
Amount expended, Jan. 1, -June 30, 1970	200,875.55
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970	543,471.44
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970	156,528.56

GEORGE P. MILLER,  
 Chairman.

JULY 1, 1970.

**COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT**

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Swanner	Staff director	\$17,752.40
Robert G. Allett	Senior staff member	16,039.80
Bennett Wolfe	Assistant staff director	14,178.02
Mariann R. Mackenzie	Secretary	8,982.73
Tempie W. Whittington	Assistant clerk	4,242.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 204; March 12, 1969)..... \$20,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 5,656.22  
 Amount expended, Jan. 1, -June 30, 1970..... 180.80

Total amount expended, March 12, 1969-June 30, 1970..... 5,837.02

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970..... 14,162.98

MELVIN PRICE,  
 Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

**COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS**

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	\$17,673.84
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel	16,474.50
John R. Holden	Professional staff member.	14,617.74
Billy E. Kirby	Professional aide	14,617.74
George W. Fisher	Clerk	16,474.50
Helen A. Biondi	Assistant clerk	10,229.29
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	7,060.02
Morvie Ann Colby	do	6,860.58
Marjorie J. Kidd	do	6,561.48
Investigative staff:		
Philip E. Howard	Investigator	14,521.80
Audrey A. Powelson	Clerk-stenographer	5,170.80
Patricia J. Wilton	do	5,170.80
Candis L. Graves	do	3,387.35
Helen Lee Fletcher	do	3,081.30
Vance L. Gilliam	Records clerk	4,088.64
Russell L. Love	Intern	1,504.14
Lisa Rae Schulberg	Clerk-stenographer	148.43
Michael McHone	Intern	131.94

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$250,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 95,259.86  
 Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970..... 59,932.79

Total amount expended, Jan. 1, 1969-June 30, 1970..... 155,192.65

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970..... 94,807.35

OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
 Chairman.

JULY 7, 1970.

**COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Martin, Jr.	Chief counsel (C)	\$17,673.84
Richard C. Wilbur	Minority counsel (P)	17,673.84
John Patrick Baker	Assistant chief counsel (P)	16,078.07
Robert B. Hill	Professional staff (P)	10,202.34
William T. Kane	do	15,063.80
James W. Kelley	do	14,793.50
Harold T. Lamar	do	14,651.81
Florence Burkett	Staff assistant (C)	6,033.24
Virginia Butler	do	8,056.98
William C. Byrd	do	5,391.12

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Mary Clare Fitzgerald	do	\$4,795.44
William Fullerton	Staff assistant (C), from Feb. 1, 1970.	12,373.20
Grace G. Kagan	Staff assistant (C)	8,056.98
June Kendall	do	8,860.86
Richard Kirkpatrick	Staff assistant (C), to Apr. 1, 1970.	5,300.49
Jerry Knebel	Staff assistant (C)	5,309.52
Elizabeth Price	do	5,860.32
Jean Ratliff	do	4,606.08
Gloria Shaver	do	7,385.28
Arthur L. Singleton, Jr.	do	7,284.87
Eileen Sonnett	do	6,686.16
Shirley Vallance	do	5,309.52
Carole Vazis	do	5,464.56
Hughston Greene	Document clerk (C)	6,403.62
Walter Little	do	6,403.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures..... \$50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported..... 5,626.60  
 Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970..... 8,352.46

Total amount expended, Jan. 1, 1969-June 30, 1970..... 13,979.06

Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970..... 36,020.94

WILBUR D. MILLS,  
 Chairman.

JULY 15, 1970.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON CRIME**

**To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:**

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Elkan Abramowitz	Special counsel (May 22 1)	2,535.73
Stephen N. Abrams	Press assistant	3,967.27
Weston Adams	Associate counsel (Jan. 21 1)	10,617.01
Stuart R. Allen	Chief investigator (May 4 1)	3,959.89
Michael Amrine	Research director (Feb. 15 1)	2,255.70
Thomas H. Barksdale, Jr.	Special counsel (Feb. 12 1)	2,105.58
Avanell K. Bass	Office manager	5,933.59
Leroy C. Bedell, Jr.	Investigator	7,956.24
Beverly Bondy	Secretary	4,083.65
Arthur E. Cameron	Associate counsel and assistant to the chairman.	12,449.09
Marian Canty	Secretary to the chairman.	5,375.15
Frederick B. Collison	Investigator	6,627.95
Alliene E. Correll	File clerk (Apr. 1 1)	1,987.71
Joseph M. Ribben	Associate chief investigator.	11,672.57
Elsworth D. Dory	Investigator (Feb. 13 1)	5,906.26
M. Faye Downey	Secretary (Apr. 1 1)	1,700.09
Lina Mabel Duran	Secretary	5,301.37
Hazel K. Edwards	Secretary to the executive director (Feb. 16 1)	3,851.77
Peter Emmet Fleming, Jr.	Special counsel (June 1 1)	3,312.37
Robert H. Fleming	Information director	14,577.74
Paul B. Galvani	Special counsel (May 22 1)	2,535.73
Roberta S. Gerson	Secretary to the chief counsel (Apr. 21 1)	2,061.64
Mary M. Goulart	Finance officer	5,598.18
Julian Granger	Secretary (June 28 1)	9,231.24
Deborah Hastings	Research assistant	3,120.48
Patricia C. Hester	Secretary (Mar. 1 1)	3,188.39
Lake E. High, Jr.	Researcher (Apr. 10 1)	3,221.89
Rebecca S. Hoffert	Investigator (May 15 1)	2,854.22
John F. Kane	Chief hearings officer	10,502.40
John L. Koening	Investigator (May 19 1)	4,505.39
Alvin J. Lorman	Investigator (Feb. 16 1)	6,189.63

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Raphael J. Madden	Research assistant (June 15)	\$311.66
Albert W. Overby, Jr.	Associate counsel (Jan. 4)	372.17
Paul Louis Perito	Chief counsel (Apr. 1)	8,749.68
Michael D. Petit	Press officer (Apr. 3)	7,980.81
Mary G. Poore	Secretary	5,072.88
Andrew Radding	Assistant counsel	7,586.79
Larry Reida	Associate chief counsel	14,193.98
Paul K. Rooney	Special counsel (May 22)	2,535.73
Alberta E. Sandel	Secretary	3,899.97
Margaret M. Schauer	do	5,040.24
Michael Condon Shea, Jr.	Assistant counsel (May 31)	5,744.88
Susie Stallings	Secretary (Apr. 1-May 1)	1,590.32
Arnold G. Shulman	Assistant counsel	8,260.56
James F. Southerland	Executive director	14,114.99
Marilyn H. Yost	Secretary (Feb. 15)	1,188.73
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures H. Resolution 399 and 808		\$975,000.00
Amount of expenditure previously reported		317,423.44
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970		306,038.09
Total amount expended, July 1, 1969-June 30, 1970		623,461.53
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		351,538.47

<sup>1</sup> Appointment.  
<sup>2</sup> Termination.

CLAUDE PEPPER,  
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1970.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE RESTAURANT TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas J. Campbell	Staff director	\$7,956.24
Judy A. Crowe	Secretary	3,292.51
Total		11,248.75
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$40,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		7,425.81
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970		11,493.45
Total amount expended, August 1969-June 30, 1970		18,865.26
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		21,134.74

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,  
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1970.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

##### TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles E. O'Connor	General counsel	\$17,061.86
Marilyn Wilkinson	Secretary	4,258.41
Howard Greenberg	Consultant	16,449.89
William A. Keel, Jr.	Research analyst	16,335.08
Donna M. Santoro	Secretary	3,698.46
Christine A. Santoro	do	3,219.68
Justinus Gould	Counsel	14,920.70
Myrtle Ruth Foutch	Clerk	7,880.66
Thomas J. Oden	Counsel	7,553.21
Bryan H. Jacques	Staff director	17,673.82
Henry A. Robinson	Counsel	14,920.70
Berry C. Williams	do	14,920.70
Joanna G. O'Rourke	Secretary	4,379.69
Melissa Ravenel	do	4,323.10
Gregg Potvin	Counsel	8,336.70
Susan E. Driggers	Secretary	3,714.49
Donald B. Roe	Counsel	3,978.12
Linda Kay Wells	Secretary	1,135.83
Carol Ann Fowkes	do	2,511.22
Melissa Jane Dooley	Typist	987.18
Mary E. Owens	Clerk-typist	1,326.06
Jeanne Arnou McNaughton	Secretary	1,795.11
Wilma Housewright	do	400.09
Patricia Anne Bishop	do	367.38
Edward D. Boyd	Staff assistant	765.28
Fred M. Wertheimer	Minority counsel	12,890.43
Margaret L. Carpenter	Secretary, minority	4,187.13
John M. Finn	Assistant minority counsel	8,487.23
Bernadette O. Romanesk	Staff assistant, minority	3,967.34
Martin Yale Fisher	Staff assistant, minority	782.23
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$855,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		367,574.04
Amount expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1970		207,844.16
Total amount expended, Jan. 3, 1969-June 30, 1970		575,418.20
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		279,581.80

JOE L. EVINS,  
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1970.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

##### TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Harold J. Warren	Clerk and counsel	\$14,649.68
Charles S. Brewton	General counsel	14,393.84
George T. Ault	Professional staff member	9,981.81
Cary H. Copeland	do	8,140.92
Thomas L. McNamara	do	6,337.93
Mattie I. Echols	Secretary	5,162.66
Steven Marshall Bernard	Clerk assistant	216.62
Lee Sherman Cox	do	216.62
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures		\$118,800.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported		54,451.14
Amount expended, January 1-June 30, 1970		59,256.22
Total amount expended, July 1, 1969-June 30, 1970		113,707.36
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1970		5,092.64

JOHN SPARKMAN,  
Chairman.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

##### TO THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134(b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1970, to June 30, 1970, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Laurence N. Woodworth	Chief of staff	\$19,999.98
Lincoln Arnold	Assistant chief of staff	17,945.64
Arthur Fefferman	Chief economist	17,917.42
Nicholas A. Tomasulo	Legislation counsel	15,867.51
Robert R. Smyers	Refund counsel	15,859.30
Dennis P. Bedell	Assistant legislation counsel	13,591.85
James H. Symons	Statistical analyst	15,216.28
John Germanis	do	12,119.58
Herb Chabot	Legislation attorney	12,418.15
Albert Buckberg	Economist	12,337.66
Michael D. Bird	do	12,340.22
Harrison B. McCawley	Refund attorney	11,672.57
John Broadbent	Legislation attorney	11,203.70
Joseph P. Spellman	do	10,214.10
Anastasia Connaughton	Statistical clerk	9,835.33
Joseph E. Fink	do	9,835.33
Bernard M. Shapiro	Legislation attorney	8,630.11
Joanne McDermott	Secretary	7,265.42
Leon W. Klud	Economist	8,155.26
Carl E. Bates	Refund attorney	7,847.10
Linda Savage	Secretary	5,783.46
Blanche Nagro	Secretary (refund)	5,778.00
Mary W. Gattie	Secretary	5,518.84
Jamie L. Daley	do	5,200.71
June Matthews	do	4,809.02
Linda B. Pruitt	do	4,454.89
Amelia Del Carmen	do	4,681.21
Marcia B. Rowzie	do	4,553.56
Sharon M. Feinsilber	Secretary (refund) (as of May 25, 1970)	3,805.63
Meade Emory	Legislation attorney (as of May 25, 1970)	2,650.68
Katherine Keller	Secretary (as of June 15, 1970)	203.64
Hollis Dixon	Accountant (through Feb. 15, 1970)	2,064.93

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	\$607,715.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported (July 1, 1969-Jan. 1, 1970)	297,350.04
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1970-July 1, 1970	304,515.95
Total amount expended, July 1, 1969-July 1, 1970	601,865.99
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1970	5,849.01

RUSSELL K. LONG,  
Chairman.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:  
2240. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 22, 1970, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on Wenatchee, Wash., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted May 5, 1966 (H. Doc. No. 91-370); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2241. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application by the Central Oregon Irrigation District, Redmond, Oreg., for a supplemental loan under the Small Reclamation Projects Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2242. A letter from the Chairman, Lewis

and Clark Trail Commission, transmitting the Commission's final report, pursuant to Public Law 88-630; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2243. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in the cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2244. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases in which the authority contained in section 213(d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of certain aliens, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 212(d) (6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2245. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on progress and problems in implementing the Federal Claims Collection Act of 1966; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2246. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on problems in approving and paying for nursing home care under the medicare program in California, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; 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. 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; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1329). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1087. An act for the relief of Vernon Louis Hoberg (Rept. No. 91-1323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1703, an act for the relief of Rosa Pintabona (Rept. No. 91-1324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1704. An act for the relief of Lillian Biazzo (Rept. No. 91-1325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2863. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cumerah Kennington Romney (Rept. No. 91-1326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2976. An act for the relief of Margarita Anne Marie Baden (Nguyen Tan Nga) (Rept. No. 91-1327). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3136. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Guy Andre Blanche (Rept. No. 91-1328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Public Bills and Resolutions

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of the XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California: H.R. 18599. A bill to prohibit commercial flights by supersonic aircraft within the United States until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare finds and reports that such flights will not have detrimental physiological or psychological effects on persons on the ground, and to prohibit the escalation of aircraft noise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING: H.R. 18600. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resources, that the U.S. requirements for low-cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy need; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan: H.R. 18601. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia: H.R. 18602. A bill to increase the authority of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for construction purposes from the U.S. Treasury by increasing from 6 to 10 percent the limitation on the amount of general revenue the District of Columbia is permitted to expend each fiscal year for principal and interest; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CORBETT: H.R. 18603. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to direct the President to adjust the rates for the statutory pay systems, to establish an Advisory Committee on Federal Salaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EILBERG: H.R. 18604. A bill to amend the Sherman Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of price increases in certain industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH: H.R. 18605. A bill to amend the Truth-in-Lending Act to eliminate the inclusion of agricultural credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLOOD (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. KEE, and Mr. STANTON):

H.R. 18606. 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. HUNT (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DENNEY, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ESHLEMAN, Mr. GOOLING, Mr. KING, Mr. KYL, Mr. LATTI, Mr. MIZE, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. PETTIS, and Mr. DOWNING):

H.R. 18607. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury shall not disclose to the public the names and addresses of certain persons licensed as collectors of firearms and ammunition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California: H.R. 18608. A bill to amend Public Law 875, 81st Congress, the Disaster Relief Act of 1969, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORGAN: H.R. 18609. A bill to provide a program to improve the opportunity of students in elementary and secondary schools to study cultural heritages of the major ethnic groups in the Nation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MYERS: H.R. 18610. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resources, that the U.S. requirements for low-cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELLY: H.R. 18611. A bill to provide a temporary program of extended unemployment compensation and a temporary increase in the rate of the Federal unemployment tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. CONTE, and Mr. SYMINGTON):

H.R. 18612. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to suspend, in whole or in part, economic and military assistance and certain sales to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. GUDE, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. STANTON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. TAFT, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, and Mrs. GREEN of Oregon):

H.R. 18613. A bill Voluntary Military Manpower Procurement Act of 1970; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COWGER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ESCH, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FISH, and Mr. FRIEDEL):

H.R. 18614. A bill Voluntary Military Manpower Procurement Act of 1970; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McDABE, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORSE, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. QUIE, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHWENDEL, and Mr. SHRIVER):

H.R. 18615. A bill Voluntary Military Manpower Procurement Act of 1970; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WYDLER: H.R. 18616. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require the installation in school buses of restraining devices for the protection of children; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHLEY (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATA, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VANIK, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 18617. A bill to provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as a result of restrictions imposed on domestic commercial fishing by a State or the Federal Government; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 18618. A bill to establish a National Economic Equity Board to protect the public interest in price stability and the control of inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 18619. A bill to establish the Offices of Delegate from the District of Columbia to the Senate and Delegate to the House of Representatives, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GETTYS:

H.R. 18620. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide that monthly social security benefit payments shall not be included as income for the purpose of determining eligibility for a pension under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. MOSHER):

H.R. 18621. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by providing for the orderly regulation of dumping in the coastal waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 18622. A bill to declare that the U.S. holds in trust for the Pueblo of Cochiti approximately 3,308 acres of land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 18623. A bill to make certain individuals who participate in civil disorders civilly liable for damages to persons who suffer loss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18624. A bill to impose an excess profits tax on the income of corporations during the period of military involvement in Southeast Asia, in order to establish a fund to provide for the improvement of the quality of medical care, housing, and education in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. POWELL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. LEGGETT, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 18625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to disallow any deduction for contributions to elementary and secondary schools which discriminate on the grounds of race; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZELL:

H.R. 18626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a current deduction for certain expenditures incurred to make buildings accessible to handicapped persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 18627. A bill to regulate travel agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STUCKEY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. KEE, Mr. WOLD, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. SLACK, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HAYS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. GRAY, and Mr. WHALEY):

H.R. 18628. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resources, that the U.S. requirements for low-cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ZION, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. CLARK, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. MELCHER, and Mrs. HANSEN of Washington):

H.R. 18629. A bill to establish a Commission on Fuels and Energy to recommend programs and policies intended to insure, through maximum use of indigenous resources, that the U.S. requirements for low-cost energy be met, and to reconcile environmental quality requirements with future energy needs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 18630. A bill to establish an Intergovernmental Commission on Long Island

Sound; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BUSH (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. FREY, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WOLD):

H.J. Res. 1327. Joint resolution to set forth a national policy on the stabilization of the population of the United States of America; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. Res. 1159. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the U.S. maintain its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 18631. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosanna Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 18632. A bill for the relief of Maurice R. Seaquist, Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 18633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Andrea Pasion and her minor daughter, Benedicta Pasion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 18634. A bill for the relief of Satenig G. Shalvardjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

430. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to teachers' retirement, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

554. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the item veto of legislation by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

C. G. COMUNTZIS, MORGANTOWN, W. VA., PRESIDENT, 70TH INFANTRY DIVISION ASSOCIATION, WORLD WAR II, SENT RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THAT ASSOCIATION RELATIVE TO VIETNAM CONFLICT TO THE PRESIDENT

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 23, 1970

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Gus Comuntzis, of Morgantown, W. Va., a good citizen and patriotic American, has sent me a copy of a resolution adopted at the biennial meeting of the 70th Infantry Division Association, World War II, held recently in Reno, Nev.

The resolution, which was sent to the President, was passed by the association unanimously.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE 70TH DIVISION ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION

The 70th Infantry Division Association, PO Box 42, Topeka, Kansas, at its biennial meeting at the Mapes Hotel, Reno, Nevada on 27 June 1970 adopted the following resolution:

"We, the members of the 70th Infantry Division Association, being Americans first, being civilians who proudly served our country as soldiers in World War II, who fought militarily for the preservation of freedoms and being men who are vitally concerned with regard to the sacrifices of American G.I.s in the sphere of the Vietnam conflict;

being Americans who disdain and oppose the expressed apathy, complacency, disloyalty and general lack of patriotism so existent among many of our fellow Americans; being men who support the exercise of eternal vigilance required for the preservation of our God given liberties, do hereby resolve that we support any and all efforts on the part of our elected government, and those of our President in his role as Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces, in the necessary performance of military action in Vietnam and Cambodia, provided such action is in the best interest of protecting the lives of American fighting men, would serve the purpose of ending the state of conflict and hasten to secure the release of Americans held as prisoners of war.

Furthermore, we do hereby resolve that our government be so urged towards an objective of concluding the war with honor in Vietnam; but under no circumstances should a peace be concluded without the mutual release of all prisoners of war. To