

John F. McGuire, III  
Peter T. Metzger  
Dennis R. Miller  
Alex G. Mitkevich  
Roy E. Moffit, Jr.  
David L. Moody  
Ronald V. Murray  
Richard Myers, III  
William C. Neasham  
Richard E. Nelson  
James H. Patterson  
Paul L. Persinger, Jr.  
Jackson S. Pharris, II  
Terry R. Phelps  
Stephen E. Potter  
James P. Rathbun, Jr.  
Robert W. Rathbun  
Joseph F. Riley, III

Raymond W. S. Schellinger  
Walter P. Schortmann  
Richard R. Schwabe  
Harvey W. Senter  
John D. Siattum  
Danuel L. Smith  
Terry A. Smith  
John D. Stokes  
William G. Strohlein  
Thomas G. Tomkowiak  
Joseph E. Tommaney  
Samuel S. Trant  
Neal W. Vanhouten, Jr.  
Bill W. Vaughn  
David A. Wellman  
Charles N. Wells

William J. Wesley  
Rufus T. Williams, Jr.  
William T. Williams  
Robert C. Wooten

Donald W. Workman  
Charles W. Wright  
Glenwood H. Yopp, Jr.

## U.S. MARSHALS

Marshall F. Rousseau, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Texas for a term of 4 years.

Jose A. Lopez, of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Puerto Rico for the term of 4 years.

Edward S. King, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of New York for the term of 4 years.

Charles W. Koval, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years.

Juan C. San Agustin, of Guam, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Guam for the term of 4 years.

Johnny M. Towns, of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Alabama for the term of 4 years.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 13, 1970:

## DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

J. Fred Buzhardt, Jr., of South Carolina, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense.

## U.S. ATTORNEY

George Beall, of Maryland, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Maryland for the term of 4 years.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, August 13, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Let integrity and uprightness preserve me; for I wait on Thee.*—Psalm 25: 21.

O God and Father of us all, who art a strong tower of defense to all who keep faith with Thee, We Thy children come before Thee in gratitude for Thy steadfast love and Thy enduring truth. In Thee alone is our hope and in Thee alone is the strength of our Nation.

In our restlessness may we know the peace of Thy presence, in our fears the faithfulness of Thy spirit and in our uncertainties the certainty of Thy creative love. May our little efforts for good be supported by the greatness of Thy power and the goodness of Thy grace.

We remember in Thy presence all those bound to us by the ties of family, friendship, and the fellowship of working together; all who work for our country at home and abroad; all who serve in our Armed Forces and for our prisoners of war. Give to us such a depth of social vision and such a width of social concern that we shall seek the release of the captives, the end of war, and the coming of peace.

In the spirit of Him who sought the good of all mankind, we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3102. An act to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior can make fisheries loans under the act.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 91-354, appointed Mr. BURDICK and Mr. COOK to the Commission on the Bankruptcy Laws of the United States.

## TRIBUTE TO VINCE LOMBARDI

(Mr. MURPHY of New York asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Vince Thomas Lombardi is a Brooklyn-born New Yorker who epitomizes the advent of the golden millennium of professional football; the tough but humble taskmaster, emperor of the Green Bay Packers and now, the coach who made the Washington Redskins a winner in his first year at their helm.

Much has been recorded about this loquacious man, called by many a "living legend," but who, in fact, combines Puritan ethic and a Catholic boyhood with a belief in two-fisted American salesmanship and the Knute Rockne school of evangelism—a very mortal man.

Whatever it takes to become a successful football coach, however, Lombardi has. He inspires spartan pride, discipline, and determination in his players.

Lombardi says:

I'm a religious man. I've got a great deal of faith in God, a great deal of dependency on God. I don't think I'd do anything without that dependency. We don't pray to win. I do think we pray to play the best we can to keep us free from injury. And the prayer we say after the game is one of thanksgiving.

This then, Mr. Speaker, is the man I pay tribute to today.

The Green Bay job came to Lombardi when he was 45, and it gave him his first taste of real power. But the toughness was instilled by his father, Harry, an immigrant Italian meatcutter who settled first in Bensonhurst, Brooklyn, and later raised his family in Sheepshead Bay.

Lombardi was an all-star fullback at St. Francis Prep, but switched to guard when he played for Fordham, then one of the great citadels of collegiate football. As a 5-foot-10, 170-pound guard who flouted the odds, he convinced himself he could become one of the famed "Seven Blocks of Granite," and did, naturally, in 1934, 1935, and 1936.

Making up in ferocity what he lacked in poundage, Lombardi played with disregard for injuries that has become legendary. Lombardi says in his own book, "Run for Daylight":

No one is ever hurt. Hurt is in your mind.

But in one Fordham game, Lombardi was repeatedly jabbed in the mouth by an opposing tackle. He did not falter on a single play, but it later took 30 stitches to close the cuts inside his mouth.

Lombardi still likes to quip:

When I got home that night I certainly was hurting in my mind.

Of course, Lombardi got his grounding in the dividends that can be reaped from sacrifice for a goal, respect for authority and commitment to duty from another master, Col. Earl "Red" Blaik, at West Point—the man he admits had the single greatest influence on his life.

Lombardi worked 6 years—1948-54—under Red Blaik at the Point and no doubt this is where he picked up his military bearing and organizational genius which runs on military precision.

I know, for Mr. Lombardi was my coach when I was privileged to play on the great Army teams of that era.

But just before his association with the equally legendary Blaik, Lombardi was a high school coach at St. Cecelia's in Englewood, N.J. There he got an understanding of the kid inside the man as a chemistry teacher and coach, and gained a small measure of fame by taking his teams through 36 games without a defeat. Yet, in 8 years there—1938-46—he never made more than \$3,500 annually. He returned to Fordham briefly, acting as freshman coach in 1947.

With Blaik's assistance, Lombardi was signed as an offensive line coach by the New York Giants in 1954. He was slated to become head coach when Jim Lee Howell retired, but Green Bay grabbed him and in 1959 Vince Lombardi had his own football team. The rest is history.

Packer teams coached by Lombardi won 141 games, lost 39 and tied four. This amazing .783 record gave Green Bay five National Football League championships—three of them in a row—plus victory in both the 1967 and 1968 Super Bowl games. As Art Modell, president of the NFL and owner of the Cleveland Browns said over those victories:

This is for quotation and all caps: Vince Lombardi is without a doubt the greatest coach in the history of professional football.

But after a year of personal purgatory—retirement from the coaching ranks, he relinquished his general manager post at Green Bay last year to come—lock, stock, and legend—to accept full responsibility for the Washington Redskins, a fun-loving group that last won an NFL championship in 1942, had a dismal 126-190-15 record since then, including an indifferent 5-9 performance on the eve of Lombardi's arrival.

At his first press conference, the new boss of the 'Skins told reporters:

Gentlemen, it is not true that I can walk across the Potomac River—not even when it is frozen.

But, with a voice that thunders like a sonic boom, he stoked the fires of determination in his players, reversed the accepted tide of chronic losing and kindled a spirit of awe and optimism in the 50,000 faithful who cram Robert F. Kennedy Stadium every Sunday. If he could not walk on water, he certainly performed a miracle in leading the Redskins to their first winning season in ages—seven wins, five losses, and two ties.

Clearly, Lombardi has high hopes of turning the Redskins into another victory dynasty like the Packers. And just as clearly, Washington's victory-craving fans believe his messianic mystique will produce that miracle.

Mr. Speaker, Vincent Thomas Lombardi, 57, will not resume his duties as head coach this year. On July 27, he underwent a second major operation within 30 days.

So we fans may have to wait a little while for that championship. The extensive surgery has ruled out any prospect of his return in time to handle the demanding jobs of coach and chief executive officer. But Vince Lombardi is fighting as only he can to rebound. This man, a daily communicant whose early parochial training never deserted him; this man who attends mass every morning and who throughout the years has led his team in prayer before and after games, now needs our prayers.

And so it is the privilege of the Congress today to pay tribute to Vince Lombardi—the coach and the man—to let him know that our prayers are with him. To us, he is still a "Block of Granite."

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in and associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) whose own life has exemplified faith, courage, and fortitude under great stress in the Armed Forces and in his political career.

As one who has known and been inspired by the progress of Vince Lombardi for over 40 years, I wish to recite some of the highlights of his career since he came from the Sheepshead Bay section of Brooklyn as a schoolboy to become the best known and best loved figure in American football.

In 1932, Vince Lombardi transferred from Cathedral Preparatory Seminary to St. Francis Prep where he played fullback and was a shotputter. Upon graduation the following year he attained a 4-year scholarship to Fordham University. At Fordham he played right guard on the famous "Seven Blocks of Granite" in 1934, 1935, 1936, graduating magna cum laude in 1937. While working on his law degree at Fordham he taught physics and coached football at St. Cecilia's High School in New Jersey.

Following World War II, Vince Lombardi became assistant coach at Fordham in 1947-48 under Ed Danowski. The

following year he went to West Point as assistant to Earl Blaik and in 1954 left the Academy to become assistant coach of the New York Giants under Jim Lee Howell.

In 1958 Vince left the Giants to go to Green Bay where he remained for 10 years compiling a record of six division championships, five NFL championships, and two superbowl victories. He retired in 1967 from active coaching to devote full time to his duties as general manager of the Packers, but 2 years later came out of retirement and moved to Washington, D.C., and gave the Redskins their first winning season since 1955, ending a 14-year famine.

In May of this year, Vince Lombardi became the original inductee into the Fordham Hall of Fame. He was appointed a trustee of Fordham University to serve a 3-year appointment. In 1967 he was awarded the Fordham Insignis Medal which is the highest honor, other than an honorary degree, that the university can bestow.

Today, Vince Lombardi is one whom athletes in all sports regard as standing shoulder to shoulder with Knute Rockne. He has been a model for our youth. In a sense, he is the coach of our generation.

Now he is engaged in a struggle with illness and we know he will battle and win. We hope and pray that he will win that struggle and live to serve all that is good in America for many years. He has everything going for him—the love and prayers of millions of Americans— young Americans particularly. His life exemplifies all that is good in society, in faith, in devotion to his church, and to his country.

#### TRIBUTE TO VINCE LOMBARDI

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

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Vince Lombardi had his greatest triumphs in Green Bay, my own hometown, and I know I speak for all its people, and indeed for millions of Green Bay Packer fans throughout Wisconsin, when I join today in this special tribute to a remarkable man.

Vince came to Green Bay when our football fortunes were at their lowest ebb; he led the Packers to one of the great golden eras in the history of sport, and he left us, not only with the memory of that magnificent feat burning bright, but with a spirit of excellence and victory so deeply instilled that no Green Bay fan doubts that the Packers will once again triumph.

But, we in Green Bay, and, indeed, the Nation as a whole, owe more to Vince Lombardi than the thrills he gave us on the football field. He made excellence, determination, discipline, and dedication—words that somehow had started to lose their meaning—meaningful once more. He showed that spirit—in the face of adversity—has its own rewards. He set the tone for an entire generation of athletes.

Vince now faces his own personal hour of trial. We know he will meet it with

the same qualities which have distinguished his career—courage, determination, and a humility stemming from a deep-seated faith in God. We who came to know him best want him to know we are behind him. He gave us the courage to say with confidence that "The Pack will be back." We join the Nation in its prayers that Vince, too, will soon be back.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and join in this deserved tribute to a truly outstanding American. The thoughts and prayers of many in the Sixth District are with Vince Lombardi.

#### TRIBUTE TO VINCENT LOMBARDI

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the other Members on both sides of the aisle who have spoken in praise of that great American, Vince Lombardi. It has been my privilege to know Vince Lombardi for a good many years. We were more or less contemporaries as far as football was concerned. We both coached. I should say, however, he has been infinitely more successful than I in that profession.

We have been friends. I have been the beneficiary for having known Vince Lombardi for a number of years. Let me say we all hope and trust that Vince Lombardi's health improves and that he is again able to make a wonderful contribution to a better America.

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I join him and the others in this tribute to one of the great Americans of our time.

I think it was evident to everyone who had the slightest interest in athletics and particularly football that the spirit of Lombardi began to manifest itself with the Washington Redskins the very minute he took over, and the upsurge of success that followed his appointment was something that was really splendid. We wish Vince Lombardi a speedy recovery. We all look forward to seeing him go on and coach the Redskins to the championship.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague and his comments about a great American, Vincent Lombardi.

Vince Lombardi's years as an outstanding student and athlete at Fordham University located in my Congressional District in the Bronx, his reputation as one of the famous Seven Blocks of Granite of the mighty Fordham foot-

ball teams of the 1936 to 1939 years, his talent as a coach and builder of character in men, and his promotion of hard but fair play both on and off the gridiron have endeared him to millions of Americans across the Nation. Today, Mr. Lombardi is engaged in a crucial battle against a serious ailment that threatens his very life. It seems ironic that this robust, clean-living man whose booming roar is balanced by his hearty laugh, is now subdued by a quick-striking disease.

Let us offer our fervent prayers for the quick recovery of Vincent Lombardi, devoted father, loving husband, idol of millions of Americans and an outstanding member of the Italo-American community, and hope that he will soon return to the active outdoor life he loves so much and performs so well.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Vincent Lombardi is one of those legends of time and as long as men participate in sports and admire courage, leadership and determination—then they will talk about "Coach Lombardi."

He showed the tenacity that was to mark his life as one of the collegiate "Seven Blocks of Granite." He would inspire a nation as the coach of a football legend called the "Green Bay Packers."

Going to Green Bay from the New York Giants, he began to build. The legend grew as the names of Bart Starr, Paul Hornung, Boyd Dowler, Jerry Kramer and Jim Taylor became a part of the sports legend that is typically American.

Perhaps no team in the history of football captured the imagination of the American people as did the Packers during that period. They took three consecutive National Football League championships. No other team had ever done so before—or since. Victories in the first two Super Bowls only added to the record.

Lombardi came here to Washington last season and gave us a squad which was imbued with the fierce competitive spirit that has been typical of the man.

Americans admire their sports heroes. In Vince Lombardi they found so much to admire that he has become one of the authentic heroes of our time.

I think I speak for all America when I say "We're pulling for you, Coach."

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we who are fans of the Pittsburgh Steelers hold Vincent Lombardi in awe and reverence but also in great affection. We join in the prayers for the quick and complete recovery of this giant in the field of American sports.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, Vincent Thomas Lombardi, and in offering a prayer for his speedy recovery.

Certainly every football fan, and probably most Americans, know the miraculous job he performed with the Green

Bay Packers, in the process of which he became a living legend.

Most football fans know, too, that he built that victorious dynasty through hard work, emphasizing fundamentals, and strict discipline. He drove the Packers hard, probably harder than any other professional football team. But he drove himself hard, too. For him there was no off season, just a change of emphasis. He asked much from his players, but he never asked more than he himself was already giving.

We in the Third Congressional District of New Jersey are particularly aware of the accomplishments of Coach Lombardi, because he has been a resident of Rumson, in Monmouth County.

Coach Lombardi can be an inspiration to us all in these troubled times. When radicals on the right and left scream "freedom" and "liberty" in their chaotic race to destroy the institutions of America, we can point to Coach Lombardi and the Packers to demonstrate that success in any field comes through hard work, discipline, and dedication.

We here in Washington Redskin country have a special interest in Coach Lombardi's recovery. The people of New Jersey's Third District have a special interest in the speedy recovery of their respected neighbor. We join with all the Nation in praying for his speedy and complete recovery and send him all our good wishes.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern for Coach Vince Lombardi of the Washington Redskins. Vince is over at Georgetown Hospital at this hour, fighting the toughest battle of his entire life. But something about him tells me that he shall pull through.

Vince is a natural leader of men, as all District of Columbia sports fans know. He built the Green Bay Packers into the greatest professional football team ever known to man. Then he came here, to see if he could do the same thing for Washington; and the results already have been gratifying.

But Vince, a great player and a superb coach, is also a hundred percent American citizen. When asked to be one of the sponsors of Honor America Day last July 4, Vince said, sure; he would do it; he was all for honoring America. But he was not going to do it if it was only going to be a partisan exercise for those who espoused certain policies abroad and at home. He was not going to do it unless he was joined by members of the opposition party as well. And so he was. And thus Honor America Day became an all-American day as well, free of strife and full of good fellowship.

For that single act, Americans owe Vince Lombardi a debt of thanks. I would like to extend to the coach and his family my sincerest best wishes and hope for his recovery.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Vincent T. Lombardi—a great coach, a great man, and a real inspiration to football and America—has suffered two serious operations in 2 months. But if courage and faith will help determine his recovery, I believe that next year, he will re-

turn to the fields of friendly strife he loves so well.

Vince Lombardi, who is really a living legend, is a true coaching genius—brilliant, dynamic, and phenomenally successful. When he became head coach of the Green Bay Packers, that team had won only one game the previous year, but a few years later, because of his superb leadership, the Packers won the professional football championship.

Of course, he was fortunate to have outstanding players, too—Starr, Taylor, Hornung, Kramer, and several other stars of the gridiron. Yet I do not think that any player, coach, or fan, would deny that Vince Lombardi's tremendous coaching ability was a major reason for starting and continuing that amazing dynasty. He instilled in his players a fierce desire to win—and that is one of the reasons they won year after year, for desire is vital to victory in any field, but especially in sports.

He came to Washington to coach the Redskins in 1969 and the team achieved its first winning season in 14 years. And although Pliny the Elder reminded us that the only certainty is that nothing is certain, I have a strong feeling that Vince Lombardi will return to coach the Redskins and that the Nation's Capital will have a championship professional football team in a few years.

My hopes and prayers are with him as he faces this serious battle. With God's help, I know he will win this fight, too, for his spirit and his goodness are unconquerable.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in joining my colleagues in paying tribute to a fine American and charismatic coach, Vince Lombardi.

Being a Chicago Bear fan I suffered through many defeats at the hands of Coach Lombardi and his Green Bay Packers. Many's the time I have sat cold as an iceman's pants in Wrigley Field and thought some mighty unpleasant thoughts about the man we honor today.

Nevertheless, one always admires and respects a man who knows his job thoroughly and consistently proves his worth to his chosen profession. Vince Lombardi is such a man and I was delighted when he decided to come out of coaching retirement to guide our Washington Redskins.

Seldom does an individual win the praise of those who oppose him. Even less seldom is that man well liked by all. Mr. Lombardi is the exception that proves the rule and I have no doubt that his worst rivals on the football field would agree with me.

The dynamic character and keen ability of Mr. Lombardi have proved to be an inspiration to the young people of this country. He has provided entertainment and healthy competition for players and fans alike. My admiration for him is unlimited and I hope the first season game of the Redskins will see Coach Lombardi back at his command post in front of the home team bench.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, of all the great athletes to have been born and raised in Brooklyn, N.Y., Vince Lombardi best epitomizes the courage of the

sport he represents. Tough, but humble, determined but always fair, Coach Lombardi more than any other man has helped raise professional football to its present position of national popularity.

Lombardi's first association with football came on the sandlots of Bensonhurst and Sheepshead Bay, in Brooklyn, where his father, an immigrant meat-cutter, settled and raised his family.

He was an all-star fullback at St. Francis Prep. Later, when playing for Fordham, he overcame his relatively small size to become one of the famed "Seven Blocks of Granite" on Fordham's offensive line.

Lombardi's career in pro football began in 1954, as the offensive line coach of the New York Giants. New Yorkers remember with pride and longing the powerful offensive machine Lombardi fashioned in his 5 years with the Giants.

In 1959, to the regret of New York football fans, Lombardi left the Giants to take the head coaching job at Green Bay.

When Coach Lombardi took over the Packers, they were notorious as the doormats of the rugged NFL Western Conference. Within 2 years, though, the coach's remarkable ability had transformed the Packers into perennial world's champions.

Packer teams coached by Lombardi won 141 games, losing only 39, and tying 4. This fantastic .783 record gave Green Bay five NFL titles, three of them consecutively, and victory in both the 1967 and 1968 Super Bowls. Art Modell, president of the NFL and owner of the rival Cleveland Browns gave Lombardi the highest praise one football man can give to another, saying:

Vince Lombardi is without a doubt the greatest coach in the history of professional football.

After a year of self-imposed retirement from the coaching ranks, Lombardi gave up the post of general manager at Green Bay to take over the reins as head coach of the Washington Redskins. In his first press conference as coach of the 'Skins, Lombardi said:

Gentlemen, it is not true that I can walk across the Potomac River—not even when it is frozen.

However, with the legendary determination only he can inspire, Vince Lombardi performed a miracle of his own by leading the once hapless 'Skins to their first winning season in recent memory.

Mr. Speaker, Vince Lombardi will not be at the helm of the Washington Redskins again this season. On July 27, he underwent major surgery for the second time in 30 days. The newspapers report that he is resting comfortably, and we are all sure that he is fighting back with the determination and spirit that only he can muster. This man, who has contributed so much to football and to American life, now deserves the hopes and prayers of all Americans. It is a privilege to join my colleagues in Congress today in paying tribute to Vince Lombardi—the coach and the man. We know he will pull through, and we are looking forward to seeing him back in action soon.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. MURPHY) who has long been familiar with Vince Lombardi both as a coach and as a personal friend.

It gives me great pleasure to have the opportunity to join this tribute to Vince Lombardi, whose unequalled feats as a professional coach have thrilled us all for the last decade.

Like all football fans, I mourn Coach Lombardi's temporary absence from his role as savior of the Washington Redskins and look eagerly forward to his speedy return.

Coach Lombardi's teams have exemplified qualities that we would all do well to emulate. He has that rare ability to mold widely diverse elements into a unified, cohesive force. At Green Bay he molded the flamboyance of a Paul Hornung, the raw power of a Jim Taylor, and the cool efficiency of a Bart Starr with countless other degrees of ability and personality and produced the most successful football team of our generation and possibly of all time.

Today, when the strident voices of many competing elements threaten the stability of our system, we might reflect on the single-mindedness of purpose and devotion to a goal that has been and still is a mark of Coach Lombardi's teams. Leadership of this caliber is vital to success not only on the football field, but in any endeavor worth undertaking.

Again, I commend Vince Lombardi on his achievements and urge that we mirror his talent of unifying individuals without subverting individuality.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, when Vince Lombardi was the leader of the Green Bay Packers, his players used to say that when Lombardi told you to jump, you only asked, "How high?"

During the Packers golden decade, Coach Lombardi became a living legend, not only because he was a winner, but also because he won the love and respect of his team, and the admiration of 4 million Wisconsinites.

Today, Coach Lombardi is hospitalized, fighting as only he can to bounce back from two serious operations within a month.

I know that every American wishes Coach Lombardi a speedy recovery, and is eagerly awaiting the day when his thunderous voice will once again be heard along the sidelines.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY, in paying tribute to an outstanding Italo-American, Coach Vince Lombardi of the Washington Redskins, and I commend Congressman MURPHY for taking this special order.

Vince Lombardi is a legend in his own time. As offense coach with the New York Giants, as assistant coach of the Army team at West Point, as coach of the Green Bay Packers, and currently as coach of the Washington Redskins, he has compiled an admirable winning record.

At Green Bay he won three straight National Football League titles and two Super Bowls. He was named "Coach of the Year" by AP and UPI in 1959 and

1961. As a result of his coaching skills and an impressive record of 62 wins and only 16 losses during his early years as coach of the Packers, the Associated Press in 1962 named the Green Bay Packers "Team of the Year." During the brief time that he has served as coach of the Washington Redskins, he is already well on his way toward turning that team into a winner, too.

Vince is the son of immigrant Italian parents, and in the true immigrant tradition, worked hard and raised himself by his own bootstraps to become a man admired by his contemporaries and to become a source of inspiration to the young people of America in the field of athletics.

He graduated from Fordham University and earned his law degree from the Fordham School of Law. He took his first coaching job at St. Cecilia High School in Englewood, N.J., and from this position, launched his legendary career as one of the greatest football coaches America has seen in this century.

Vince Lombardi is hospitalized, and like the champion he has always been, he is fighting to recover from two serious operations within a month. Our thoughts and prayers are with him and with his lovely wife and his two wonderful children at this difficult time, and we know he will soon be back at his post to lead the Washington Redskins to a victorious year.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, there is a small college in western Pennsylvania called St. Vincent College, named after the charitable man of so long ago who spent his life helping the poor.

But when football fans in Green Bay, and now Washington, implore "St. Vincent" to intercede on behalf of their favorite team, the fans are not referring to the college's patron.

They are calling on Vincent Thomas Lombardi, supersuccessful football coach, a man whose very name has become a euphemism for self-sacrifice, determination, and respect for authority.

It is natural enough for lovers of football to attribute messianic qualities to Vince Lombardi. He brought National Football League championship trophies, one after another, lined up like firewood to warm the hearts of the Packer fans in Wisconsin. When he came to the Redskins last year, he brought with him that victorious aura—and Washington's first winning season in over a decade. Of course, his task in Washington has been eased by the presence on the team of two boys from Hawaii, Ray Schoenke and John Hoffman.

Today, as Vince Lombardi fights his way back to good health, I join my colleagues in wishing this fine man, this courageous man, this religious man, the quickest possible recovery.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man who has given the American people hour after hour of entertaining and exciting football. Coach Vince Lombardi has inspired his players to give their utmost on the gridiron and in so doing has inspired millions of Americans. He is a man respected by management, players, coaches, and millions of fans.

I was deeply grieved to learn of Vince's

current illness. He is presently hospitalized after two serious operations within a short period of time. I am sure that Vince is fighting his illness with all the determination that made him a football legend. The American people are rooting for him and praying for his complete and speedy recovery.

I am proud to pay tribute to this great New Yorker and great American and am looking forward to seeing him taking charge on the gridiron real soon.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from New York in this very well-deserved tribute to the coach of the Washington Redskins, Vince Lombardi, in wishing him a complete recovery. I feel that professional football and for that matter the country needs him back on the sidelines.

As a rabid Chicago Bear fan, I obviously had to admire the wonderful football dynasty that Vince Lombardi developed while coaching the Green Bay Packers. In 1 year under his command, the Washington Redskins showed great improvement. It is obvious that Coach Lombardi was able to inspire his team to the type of effort that produces victory. He did so in the great traditions of American sportsmanship setting an example for dedication, perseverance, performance, excellence and personal sacrifice that is the formula for success in any field of endeavor.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues today in wishing Vince Lombardi a swift recovery from his second operation. We join his family in sharing their concern for his well-being and avidly await his return to the gridiron.

Before Vince came to Washington, we knew him as the mentor of the World Champion Green Bay Packers. The name of the legendary coach became a household word. His rival teams and rival sport fans respected the man who was responsible for much of their disappointment and frustration. Every team would take pride in playing well against the Packers despite the almost inevitable prospect of defeat. The people of Green Bay love Vince. Green Bay is proud of its hero and cherishes the landmark street that bears his name.

Although we usually think of Vince as a football coach, we also respect him for his character. There are numerous stories about his sense of fairness and ability to instill unity in a team. There is one story that I will never forget. The Packers had just finished dinner and were ready to leave. The manager of the restaurant informed Vince that the black players would have to leave through the rear exit. Since the blacks had to leave through the rear exit, Vince escorted the entire team through the rear exit. Vince could never tolerate discrimination and judges his players by their ability and desire and not the color of their skin.

Before Vince came to Washington, there was little interest in the Redskins. After just 1 year of his tutelage, the Redskins were converted into instant winners. Suddenly, there is a sense of excitement and a vibrant interest in the Redskins. To no one's great surprise, the foundation for a future championship

contender materialized. For the first time in years there is insufficient space to accommodate the throng of fans that wish to attend a game to cheer the Redskins on to victory.

Vince's charisma has permeated the entire city. When Washingtonians see him on the street, in a restaurant, or on television, they take pride in his being part of this city.

We all look forward to the day when Vince will reassume the reins and fulfill the hopes of the Washington Redskins—molding them into champions second only to the Boston Patriots. If any man can return and fulfill this dream, Vince can.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks concerning Mr. Vincent Lombardi, and that the remarks of Members may be printed in the RECORD after the approval of the Journal.

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

There was no objection.

#### CONGRESS CALLED UPON TO OVER- RIDE DOUBLE-BARRELED PRESI- DENTIAL VETO

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today we in Congress face an historic occasion. This is the first time in living memory that the Congress has been called upon on one day to vote to sustain or override a double-barreled Presidential veto of two appropriation bills.

The President says that total spending must be kept within his budget limits.

Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress would go further toward fiscal responsibility and appropriate total funds below his total budget figure.

But Mr. Speaker, we, the elected representatives of the people, have the right and constitutional duty to determine where those cuts will be made.

The President wants to spend and spend—for a new manned bomber—in a missile age; for a new aircraft carrier—in a missile age; for AWAC's—a warning system against bombers—in a missile age.

We in the Congress, in time of trouble at home, believe we should take some of the money we are wasting on military spending and allocate these resources to educating our young people and redeeming the centers of our civilization, the cities of the United States.

#### COMMENDATION OF THE VOLUN- TEERS FOR VIETNAM

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to

commend Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, chairman of the Volunteers for Vietnam, Congressman WILLIAM O. COWGER and the other members of this volunteer committee who went to Vietnam in early June and made a thorough study of U.S. involvement in Vietnam. This was the second time this committee has been to Vietnam; the first time was in 1967.

I find the report of the volunteer group to be generally in agreement with our own findings, that is, those of the Select Committee on U.S. Involvement in Southeast Asia.

The volunteer's report is impressive and I recommend to the Members that they read the special order in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I again compliment Congressman SCHWENGEL and the other members of his team for bringing to the attention of the Members of the House and the American people this up-to-day information on Vietnam.

#### PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, AU- GUST 21, TO FILE CERTAIN RE- PORTS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight, August 21, to file one or more legislative reports.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been exactly 1 month since we commenced consideration of H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. On the sporadic occasions on which we have considered the bill since that date we have had meaningful debate and discussion on this important legislation. Significant improvements have been made in the bill as it was reported from the Rules Committee.

Among the most important changes made to date are the following:

- First. Record teller votes;
- Second. Elimination of proxy voting in committee;
- Third. Assurance of funding for minority staffing;
- Fourth. Faster quorum calls;
- Fifth. Televising committee hearings; and
- Sixth. Public disclosure of committee votes.

We must not let these significant and important reforms die.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a superstitious person, and so the fact that today is August 13, and the fact that we commenced consideration of this legislation on July 13, do not in and of themselves concern me. However, the continued, and

unjustifiable delays in consideration of this bill do bother, and do bother me a great deal. It is my humble opinion that it bothers the people of this country a great deal too. It would be my prediction that the voters of this country will make this point quite clear to Members during the coming 3 weeks.

It is my sincere hope that the Members of this great House will return from the recess determined to "overcome the jinx of the 13th," if it exists, and give the people of this Nation the meaningful congressional reform which they want, deserve, and are entitled to receive.

#### EXPLANATION FOR THE UNUSUAL NUMBER OF MEMBERS ABSENT DURING QUORUM CALL 272 YESTERDAY

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

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's rollcall No. 272, a quorum call, reflects the absence of an unusual number of Members from this Chamber. I take this occasion to remind my colleagues that the reason for this unusual number of absent Members from the Chamber yesterday was because they were attending the last rites and the burial of our beloved former colleague, the late Honorable G. Robert Watkins.

Mr. Speaker, this was a poor time for a quorum call in view of the number of Members who were absent from the Chamber in order to pay their last respects to one of our Members.

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

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

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I might point out that one of the largest congressional delegations in history to attend the funeral of any departed Member attended the funeral of the late Honorable G. Robert Watkins. We counted 52 Members in attendance at the cemetery. A fitting tribute to one of the great Americans of all time.

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

#### 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. 277]

Anderscn,	Cunningham	Hathaway
Tenn.	Daniels, N.J.	Hébert
Bevill	Dawson	Hull
Boggs	Dennis	King
Bray	Diggs	Leggett
Buchanan	Edwards, Ala.	Long, La.
Cabell	Fallon	McCarthy
Caffery	Fuqua	McCulloch
Chisholm	Gallagher	Maillhard
Clay	Gibbons	Mayne
Cramer	Hansen, Wash.	Meskill

O'Neal, Ga.	Price, Tex.	Roudebush
O'Neill, Mass.	Pryor, Ark.	Ryan
Ottinger	Ralick	Scheuer
Passman	Rees	Wold
Pollock	Relfel	
Powell	Rooney, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 381 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

#### PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 18970

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, August 21, to file a report including minority and separate views, of course, on the bill, H.R. 18970.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL REFUGE SYSTEM ENDANGERED

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation this morning I was holding hearings on the migratory bird hunting season and bag limits.

In the course of the hearings, a fact came to light that very much distressed me, and I hastened over here to report to the House of Representatives that the administration has issued a most unwise order to the Department of the Interior directing that agency to sell 10 percent of its land holdings.

Included in this order to see 10 percent of land holdings as near as I can ascertain is the national refuge system administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service. The land in question shall be sold without regard to the value of the land or to its value to the national refuge system. This means that 3 million acres out of 30 million acres are up for disposal. Depending on how the figure is interpreted and depending on the lands selected, every single acre of land bought from duck stamp receipts will be required to be sold. This will be in open defiance of the intent of this Congress. The Department of the Interior and national conservation organizations have been working very hard over the years to establish a national refuge system which will preserve or bird population, with one stroke of the pen of Richard Nixon this system can be wiped out unless a very real change is made in the order.

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

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to my dear friend and mentor, the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Is it not a fact that most of these lands are purchased with duck stamp money and that it is a separate fund?

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from California is entirely correct. A large

portion of these lands are purchased by the duck stamps which are acquired each year by the sportsmen and duck hunters of this land. This means that the lands that have been purchased with this hunter contribution, and which have been operated under the very careful management of the Department of the Interior will be dissipated by the administration unless this order is rescinded. This action by the administration can very well result in the destruction of our great refuge system, and dissipation of millions of acres of refuge, recreation, and hunting lands. It can destroy our whole land management program for these purposes.

#### PRESIDENT'S VETO OF HOUSING AND EDUCATION BILLS

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am voting to override the President's veto on both the education and housing appropriations. The Nation must have these additional funds in both areas, and we should seek other areas of the budget for pruning rather than these two areas. The impact of the President's veto on West Virginia alone is enormous. The difference in his recommendations and those passed by the Congress are substantial.

Mr. Speaker, the amount that the Congress appropriated over and above the President's request for education is less than the total of money that could have been saved if we had postponed funding the SST for a year and had simultaneously limited the payments under the farm program to no more than \$20,000 per farm. Had we taken those two measures, we would have saved the taxpayers more than half a billion dollars, far more than needed to finance the \$434 million increase in education.

Mr. Speaker, the SST and farm payments over \$20,000 have very little effect on West Virginia or many other States, for that matter. But under the President's request, West Virginia would receive only \$32.5 million for education, but under the House-Senate action, West Virginia will receive nearly \$40 million, and that means a great deal to the people of my State and its future growth and welfare.

The State of West Virginia cannot do without a realistic commitment to education, nor can any other State. The value of gigantic payments to corporate farmers and the development of a supersonic transport is dubious indeed when set in comparison.

#### OFFICE OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill (H.R. 16916) making appropriations for the Office of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, the objec-

tions of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), for 1 hour.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the veto message of the President in the body of the RECORD prior to the vote on the question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

#### SPENDING WITHOUT REVENUES IN HAND OR IN SIGHT: THE THREATENING DISASTER

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it is said that the President is trying to blame Congress and Congress is trying to blame the President for the economic plight the country is in. I would like to sidestep that exercise and talk about the substance of the real problem.

Mr. Speaker, it is not difficult to pin an authentic "big spending" label on both the administration and on Congress. Last year the administration asked for and spent in total, about \$12.2 billion more than was spent the prior year. The Congress made the money available for expenditure. So we are in the same boat together.

The fundamental problem, however, is not necessarily big spending. Much big spending for high priority purposes is inevitable. Holding spending in reasonable bounds is, of course, part of the problem. But what threatens disaster is big Federal spending without revenues in hand or in sight to pay the bills.

#### DEFICITS, DEFICITS, DEFICITS

The Federal funds deficit for the current fiscal year will likely be within the range of \$13 to \$20 billion. The Federal funds deficit last year was \$13 billion.

The administration is working on the budget for fiscal year 1972—next year—and the deficit in Federal funds for next year could easily be in the \$20 to \$30 billion range unless revenues are materially increased or spending drastically reduced. An increase in revenues would have to be a joint effort of the administration and the Congress. No agreement to drastically cut spending or sharply increase revenues is anywhere in sight. That is the alarming situation which places both Congress and the administration in an untenable position.

#### REALISTIC CONFRONTATION WITH THE ISSUE

Reducing a few items in the pending bills today would not be a monumental step. Perhaps it could be a straw in the wind toward preventing the collapse of the housewife's dollar. Perhaps it could shock the administration and the Congress and the country into the mood for a realistic confrontation on the issue of spending and revenues.

#### THE DOLLAR CRISIS OF 1968—A REPEAT?

Do you remember the dollar crisis of 1968 when we had a \$28 billion budget deficit and the Secretary of the Treasury

flew to Europe to calm the nerves of world bankers who were beginning to demand gold for dollars? The Secretary of the Treasury at the time warned that we were on the brink of disaster. Do you remember our response? It was a sharp cut in spending and the 10-percent surtax. Big spending without the funds in hand or in sight is rapidly propelling us toward that brink again and the Federal funds deficit next year could very possibly approximate the 1968 figure.

Our spending demands are multiplying and we are not providing the wherewithal to cope with them.

#### THE INDIVIDUAL'S POCKETBOOK STAKE

The dollar lost about 5 cents last year as a result of inflation. Deficit spending played its part. The housewife at the grocery store can buy less and less month by month with funds available to her. This is not too significant to the well-to-do but the poor are suffering the consequences of this intolerable situation.

It would have a wholesome effect if Congress and the administration showed the will to meet the situation head on. That is far more important than the dollars involved in the veto messages.

#### JOINT RESPONSIBILITY

The administration has requested in the two vetoed bills, \$21.4 billion. This is \$700 million above the previous year's total. Congress has increased that amount by \$1 billion. In other words, 95 percent of the funds involved were requested by the administration. This total sum is the principal inflationary pressure, not the congressional add-on. The add-on only makes a bad situation worse.

I do not discount the fact that much of the above-the-budget money in the bills—especially the independent offices-HUD bill—will not be actually paid out in the current fiscal year and thus the impact on actual spending from the sums above the budget would not be at a maximum this year; the impact would come in fiscal 1972 and thereafter. The fiscal 1972 budget is due for presentation to Congress in 5 months. The administration is looking down the gun barrel toward that budget submission and decisions of the greatest magnitude in regard to spending and revenues will have to be made.

Inflationary pressures neither begin nor end in the Halls of Congress. If the Congress gave the administration every penny it has requested in the budget in spending authority—and not 1 penny more—the problem would be approximately the same as it now is. Massive spending—beyond Federal revenues available—supported by both the administration and Congress is the backbone of the difficult fiscal problem which is confronting us.

#### THE VETOED EDUCATION BILL

With respect to the education bill, the Committee on Appropriations promised last year and again early this year that we would undertake to enact an education appropriation bill in time for the schools to know how much money would be available from Federal funds before they started the new school year this fall. We have fulfilled our pledge.

Many of the schools will be starting

next week or soon thereafter. We must avoid a repetition of the disruptive delays of last year. Time is of the essence. Under the circumstances at this time I see no logical alternative to overriding the veto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NATCHER). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

#### THE INDEPENDENT OFFICES—HUD BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, as to the independent offices-HUD bill, the Committee on Appropriations tried to write the bill within reasonable limits and we did. The House thought the committee was too economy minded and added \$375 million.

The Senate added \$1.2 billion above the President's budget.

Congress and the administration are in this problem together, and there is no easy answer. If the veto is sustained, there is no assurance that the bill will be improved.

In my capacity as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have been pounding the table and shouting from the housetop that the administration and the Congress should make a more determined effort to hold the line in Federal spending in the absence of any assurances of funds in hand or in prospect to pay the bills.

In the light of the \$13 billion Federal funds deficit of last year, the anticipated Federal funds deficit of this year of probably more than \$13 billion, and the prospect of a more appalling Federal funds deficit next year—in the absence of increased revenues—I have no logical alternative under these particular circumstances except to vote my approval of the bill as originally written by the House Appropriations Committee which means a vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking member of the minority on the Appropriations Committee (Mr. Bow).

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has made another fine address to this body. However, I believe his conclusions are only half right when he says that he is going to vote to sustain the veto of the HUD bill. I believe his decision on the other bill is a mistake.

The votes today on two Presidential vetoes are not votes pro or con the desirable programs involved; they are votes for or against inflation. I will vote to sustain the vetoes.

Adjusting priorities while fighting inflation is a delicate operation. For the first time in 20 years the Nixon budget provides more for human needs than for defense. Nixon defense cuts have permitted \$1 billion more for education this year than in fiscal 1969. I am for that, but there is no place to get the other half billion Congress has added except from inflation. I am for a fair share of the tax dollar for housing and related

program, but I am against appropriating more than we can afford.

We will never cut the cost of living if we continually increase the cost of government.

If Congress sustains these vetoes, then we can quickly prepare new bills that will provide adequate support for these

programs, including the additional funds needed for veterans hospitals. My conferences with the President lead me to believe that he would approve the budget increase for medical care for veterans provided the unnecessary inflation of other activities in this bill are overcome.

I include the following tables to illustrate the commitment of the Nixon administration to the programs contained in these bills, as compared with the last budget request of the previous administration, and also the effect of congressional action on the education budget request this year:

## EDUCATION

	1970 Johnson budget estimate	1971 Nixon budget estimate	Vetoed bill		1970 Johnson budget estimate	1971 Nixon budget estimate	Vetoed bill
Elementary and secondary education	\$1,525,876,000	\$1,614,693,000	\$1,846,968,000	Research and training—special foreign currency program	\$4,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000
School assistance in federally affected areas	315,167,000	425,000,000	551,068,000	Salaries and expenses	43,375,000	46,733,000	45,164,000
Education professions development	136,100,000	136,100,000	135,800,000	Student loan insurance fund	10,826,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
Higher education	897,259,000	857,525,000	967,880,000	Loans to higher education institutions (obligations)		(10,000,000)	(25,000,000)
Vocational education	279,216,000	440,046,000	494,196,000	Participation sales insufficiencies	2,918,000	2,952,000	2,952,000
Libraries and community services	155,625,000	59,446,000	85,040,000	School desegregation funds		150,000,000	75,000,000
Education for the handicapped	85,850,000	95,000,000	105,000,000				
Research and training	90,000,000	118,329,000	90,077,000				
Education in foreign languages and world affairs	20,000,000	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	Total, Office of Education	3,566,212,000	3,966,824,000	4,420,145,000

<sup>1</sup> Included under higher education in fiscal year 1971.

## INDEPENDENT OFFICES—HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Selected items	Johnson budget estimate, 1970	Nixon budget estimate, 1971	Vetoed bill	Selected items	Johnson budget estimate, 1970	Nixon budget estimate, 1971	Vetoed bill
NASA	\$3,760,527,000	\$3,333,000,000	\$3,268,675,000	Model cities:			
NSF	500,000,000	513,000,000	513,000,000	As shown in the budget including advances	\$2,000,650,000		
VA	7,740,985,000	8,960,528,000	9,065,528,000	Actually requested for the fiscal year	750,000,000	\$575,700,000	\$575,600,000
(VA medical care)	(1,541,701,000)	(1,752,200,000)	(1,857,200,000)	Urban technology—Research	25,000,000	55,000,000	30,000,000
Renewal and housing assistance:				Mortgage credit:			
As shown in the budget including advances	2,161,250,000			Home ownership assistance cumulative annual contract authorization	125,000,000	325,000,000	325,000,000
Actually requested for the fiscal year	1,661,250,000	1,782,000,000	2,123,000,000	Rental housing assistance cumulative annual contract authorization	125,000,000	325,000,000	325,000,000
Urban renewal:				Rent supplement program cumulative annual contract authorization	142,000,000	197,000,000	177,000,000
As shown in the budget including advances	(1,500,000,000)			Federal home loan interest adjustment payments		250,000,000	85,000,000
Actually requested for the fiscal year	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,350,000,000)	Total bill:			
Low Rent public housing annual contribution	(473,500,000)	(654,500,000)	(654,500,000)	As shown in budget including advances	18,200,182,000		
Metropolitan development	344,750,000	307,200,000	641,500,000	Actually requested for the fiscal year	15,525,182,000	17,468,223,500	18,009,525,300
(Water and sewer facility grants)	(135,000,000)	(150,000,000)	5500,000,000				

## DEFENSE

Item	Johnson budget estimate 1970	Nixon budget estimate 1971
I—Military personnel	\$24,384,200,000	\$24,226,800,000
II—Operation and Maintenance	21,941,000,000	19,512,045,000
III—Procurement	23,240,900,000	17,690,000,000
IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	8,174,100,000	7,401,600,000
V—Other		302,621,000
Subtotal		69,133,066,000
Proposed for rescission		-387,400,000
Total	77,740,200,000	68,745,666,000

## CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE EDUCATION APPROPRIATION BILL—SUMMARY OF CHANGES FROM THE BUDGET

President's budget	\$3,966,824,000
Increases:	
Mandatory formula grant programs	+559,865,500
Discretionary programs	+39,961,500
Subtotal	599,827,000
Decreases: Discretionary programs	-146,506,000
Net change	+453,321,000
Conference agreement	4,420,145,000

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply disappointed that the President has seen fit to veto the Office of Education appropriations bill for fiscal 1971. It is essential that the Congress override this veto and get these needed Federal funds on their way to schools, colleges, and libraries before the academic year begins next month.

If the veto should be upheld it may be October before a new bill can be enacted. Last year the veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill resulted in a delay of over 2½ months, from December 1969, to March 1970. If we are going to have these last-minute annual vetoes of education appropriations bills, we shall never get on to a reasonable schedule of making the

amount of Federal education funds known to the recipients well in advance of the beginning of the school year.

This is a good bill, and it should be enacted, the conference report passed the House by a vote of 370 to 30, and the other body by 88 to 0. These votes reflect the considered judgment of the Congress and the Congress should stick by that judgment.

The President justifies the veto on the grounds that the amount in the bill is some \$435 million over his budget request—roughly 10 percent. But the important thing about the effect of Federal expenditures on the economy is not one bill or \$435 million in a budget of some \$200 billion, but the total of all Federal expenditures after all appropriations bills have been passed. The record of the Congress shows that it is fiscally responsible: Last year, the total money appro-

riated by the Congress for fiscal 1970 was \$6.4 billion less than the budget requests of the administration. The Congress regularly reduces Executive budget requests, and I am sure will do so again for fiscal 1971.

The issue is not inflation—the issue is whether the President is to dictate national priorities as between expenditures down to the last decimal point, and deny to the Congress its constitutional duty of setting national policy through legislation. I urge this House to defend its historic responsibilities and vote to override the veto.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker because of the extreme seriousness of the overall fiscal problem and particularly

the problem on the two appropriation bills we face today, I do not intend to speak as a Republican, and I do not think Members on the other side should approach the debate on this vote as Democrats. This should be a nonpartisan concern.

As the distinguished gentleman from Texas has said, this basic issue transcends whether we are a member of the legislative branch on the one hand, or an individual in the executive branch on the other. I look at the problem we face today as a Member who spent 14 years on the Committee on Appropriations, serving with the distinguished chairman of the committee, and many others, including the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD). It was a great and exhilarating experience. The members of that great committee over the years have done an excellent job, and I know in this case they did the best they could in marking up the bill and in the conference.

But, unfortunately, because of pressures from the inside and outside, and particularly pressures from the other end of the Capitol, we have ended up with a conference report that in reality is \$1 billion more than the budget recommended by the President in these two appropriation bills.

In this particular appropriation bill for the Office of Education the add-on, over and above the President's recommendation, is \$453 million even though President Nixon's budget recommendations were greater than those of his predecessor.

I do not blame the members of the subcommittee, or this House Committee on Appropriations. There are outside forces, there are pressures from the other end of the Capitol that I believe have forced this crisis on us. The crisis is here. The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, has put his finger on it in the remarks that the gentleman made on the floor of the House not more than 10 minutes ago. Let me read what the gentleman from Texas said:

The federal funds deficit for the current fiscal year will likely be within the range of \$13 billion to \$20 billion. The federal funds deficit last year was \$13 billion. The administration is working on the budget for fiscal year 1972, next year, and the deficit in federal funds for next year could easily be in the range of from \$20 billion to \$30 billion unless revenues are materially increased, or spending drastically reduced.

The gentleman from Texas has warned every one of us, whether you are on that side of the aisle or whether you are on this side of the aisle, or whether you are a Democrat or whether you are Republican, throughout the country we face a fiscal crisis of major magnitude. And I happen to think the issue is best presented—best presented, I repeat—by this headline that appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on yesterday. The headline reads, "Nixon vetoes two bills to save \$1 billion. That is the issue."

If you vote to sustain the President's veto you are contributing to the maximum in an effort to save \$1 billion.

Now, I am frank enough to admit that maybe we will not save \$1 billion, but

we ought to try, and we ought to try right now: \$453 million on this appropriation bill and \$541 million on the next appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, this morning we had a meeting and one of our Members raised the question in this way—and I think this is the way we ought to look at it—suppose you had a public referendum on each of these appropriation bills in each of your congressional districts right now? How do you think the voters in your district would vote?

I venture to say that the public would support the veto in both cases so as to save a total of \$1 billion.

Second, approximately a week ago we had a vote here which I think indicated the public point of view. It was a relatively insignificant vote to authorize an increase in pay for two of the employees in the House of Representatives. It involved a couple of thousand dollars in each instance. The vote was overwhelmingly against the increase in pay for those two individuals. I do not intend to mislead the Members, I voted for the legislation but that is not the point.

However, in the debate, one of the Members, and I do not remember from which side of the aisle, pointed out the overall fiscal problem involving the Federal Government in a very specific way. The Member who spoke condemned the pay increase. As I recollect, the applause in the gallery was overwhelming. That was an indication of how your constituents feel.

So I say to you, do not be bludgeoned by a lobby here and a lobby there. Your constituents are going to look at these two votes today on this basis—whether you are willing to save \$1 billion. You can, you should, and I hope we will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have the high honor and great privilege of yielding 5 minutes to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, what we have just heard from my distinguished friend is what is known as the "scarecrow argument."

The question of inflation is not honestly involved here. The amounts of the increases by the Congress were reasonable under the circumstances in both of these bills.

In the Washington Post this morning's editorial said in referring to the education bill:

But the extra money appropriated by Congress is not especially inflationary in its impact.

The editorial also referred to the impacted area program. Well, you could save tens of millions of dollars there. Do you want to wipe that program out? You are not going to do it—that affects about 300 districts in the country and 300 Members are interested—and I do not blame them. So there is one place where you could save a large sum of money.

I assume that my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, might have the courage to vote to strike out the whole program. But I wonder how many others might feel that the program is a

reasonably necessary program for their district.

While this program does not affect my district, I have gone along with it because I realize it has become more or less a way of life.

The editorial also said:

The extra money which Congress voted for housing and urban development is money for long-term commitments.

This is not money that is going to be spent right away. As the editorial pointed out:

It is unlikely to be expended in the current fiscal year; but it has a vital bearing on undertakings which must be planned for months and even years ahead. Denial of these funds would seriously inhibit the ability of local authorities to start on the rehabilitation measures needed to make our cities livable and to cut the terrible social costs of crime and urban unrest.

Every year I receive 25 to 50 letters from the Governor of Massachusetts, who, politically, is a Republican, urging me to increase the President's budget. And I imagine that Members from other States in which the Governors are Republicans get similar letters and telegrams, without regard to political party. So the question is not inflation. That is a scarecrow item as far as the amounts involved in these bills are concerned.

If some who support the veto, and want to save a lot of money, why do they not wipe out the farm subsidy program? I have supported the farm subsidy program. But let us be clear now.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Why does not the Speaker agree with me that we ought to raise the necessary revenues before we commit more funds than we receive?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will do it. Will you do it?

Mr. MAHON. What did the Speaker say?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will do it. Why does not the President recommend increased taxes?

Mr. MAHON. When we have the money, the Committee on Appropriations will appropriate it for high-priority items, but we do not have the money to appropriate at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The scarecrow issue of inflation raised by some Members in connection with the two veto messages, are on untenable grounds.

Let me make one more observation. Let me show the disturbed state of mind that President Nixon had when he vetoed these messages. In his veto message the President said—

My veto of both of these bills is painful.

If he was coming up for reelection this year, it would be so painful he would sign the bills. The President is secure. Yet he says his action is painful. How painful are we here? The President has 2 years of additional security, as far as the public is concerned. But every Member of this body has to go before the public this year, and it must be painful for my Republican friends, particularly those who come from close districts.

There are many items in these bills

which will cause pain. It is going to be painful to cut funds for veterans' health; \$100-and-some-odd million would be wiped out in connection with medical care and hospitals.

It will be painful for our cities in their rehabilitation programs. It will be awfully painful, and that painful situation is going to confront Members.

So when the President said it was painful for him, I point out that it would be exceedingly painful for Members of Congress who are coming up for reelection this year.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, every day we learn something. This is the first time I knew, according to the words of the Speaker, that this is a political issue. I thought we were talking about fiscal responsibility. I have listened to my good friend the Speaker many, many times, and I think this is the first time, in the speech he just made, that he did not quite add up, and I say that respectfully.

Economists are agreed that fiscal restraint is basic to achieving stability in prices. And there is no denying that as Members of Congress we share with the President the responsibility for exercising such restraint.

The question before us today is simply this: Are we going to support the President in his efforts to hold the line against further increases in the cost of living for those who can least afford higher and higher prices?

Are we going to help the President hold the line against higher interest rates which hurt most the very people we want to help in our education and urban renewal programs?

Are we going to join with the President in holding the line against a bigger tax deduction from the paycheck of the already overburdened wage earner?

Make no mistake about it—unless this body responds to the President's request to reconsider actions previously taken on these appropriation bills the end result will be higher prices, higher interest rates, and higher taxes. As spokesman for all the people we represent we will have betrayed their trust to do that which best serves the many and not a favored few at the expense of the many.

No one of us can fail to understand the President's statement that his decision to veto these measures was "painful." Certainly, no one can accuse him of political expediency. He made no new friends among the special interest groups who mobilized their forces in a massive emergency "operation override" within hours after news of the vetoes had been announced by the White House. I certainly will not vote to override what is in the best interests of the country as a whole to serve the special interests of a shortsighted few.

The reasons the President set forth in his veto message for his actions are not to be taken lightly. And I have a feeling that all right-thinking citizens will applaud his courage, admire his consistency, and share the concern reflected in his words of warning.

The President has acted in a manner worthy of the responsibilities of his office as President of all the people. I ask: Are we as responsible? Or if you override do you have the courage to say to your constituents that we have to raise their taxes?

I urge the Members of this body to now act in a manner worthy of our responsibilities which we share with the President for promoting the general welfare of our beloved country. I urge, as sincerely and as earnestly as I know how, that you vote to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when President Nixon took office in 1969, the first order of business was to ask the Congress to raise the national debt \$12 billion. I voted for a tax reform bill, so-called, which I am told will lessen taxes some \$9 billion. I have already voted this year to increase the national debt another \$18 billion. Also today we are with information that these two bills total another billion dollars over the budget. Practically every appropriations bill put in front of us this year has been \$500 million over the President's budget. And current publications all forecast a probable deficit this year of from \$13 to \$20 billion.

In other words, we are running this Nation into bankruptcy. I want to tell everybody in this House I am going to vote to sustain this veto. I am not going to be part of the scheme to destroy the fiscal integrity of the United States, and in order to save this country from virtual bankruptcy, I am going to vote to sustain both these vetoes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the ranking minority Member of this committee (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, may I say at the very outset that with these last two vetoes of HEW appropriation bills, I am getting far more exposure here in the well of this House than I crave, believe me.

Mr. Speaker, when we brought the conference report on this vetoed education bill to the floor, I said at the time that I was "very distressed that this second or third appropriations bill to go to the President for his signature is in the neighborhood of a half billion dollars over his request, and I suspect it might be tempting for the President to veto it in view of the very serious fiscal situation we find ourselves in today, particularly so when there are several other appropriations bills waiting in the wings that in the aggregate are several billion dollars over the President's budget request."

By way of quick review, Members will recall that the 1970 HEW bill that was vetoed carried \$4.2 billion for education and the final version of that appropriation bill ended up at a level of \$3.8 billion for 1970.

Now, the President's 1971 budget request came to us at a level of \$3,966,000,-

000, or slightly in excess of \$150 million over the spending level for the previous year, for 1970. The bill ultimately, as we all know, ended up \$453 million over the President's budget.

This \$453 million over the President's budget in the main is made up of increases in mandatory formula grants. As a matter of fact, the increases in mandatory grants in this bill of \$560 million are really greater than the net increase over the budget, and these of course include such items as the \$111 million for impact aid, \$160 million for ESEA, title I, \$23 million for supplementary services, ESEA, title II, \$50 million for equipment and minor remodeling, \$50 million in the area of vocational education and grants to the States and a variety of others.

In the interest of time I shall insert the entire list in the RECORD at this point.

The information is as follows:

MANDATORY FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS RECEIVING INCREASES OVER BUDGET

(In thousands of dollars)

Office of Education appropriation/activity	1971 budget	Conference action	Difference
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
Maintenance and operations (874)...	425,000	536,068	+111,068
Elementary and secondary education:			
Educationally deprived children (ESEA I).....	1,339,050	1,500,000	+160,950
Supplementary services (ESEA II).....	120,393	143,393	+23,000
Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III).....		50,000	+50,000
Vocational and adult education:			
Basic vocational education grants:			
Grants to States (VEA, part B).....	300,336	350,336	+50,000
Consumer and homemaking education (VEA part F).....	15,000	21,250	+6,250
Work-study (VEA, part H).....		5,500	+5,500
Students with special needs.....	17,000	20,000	+3,000
Higher education:			
Direct loans.....	176,925	243,000	+66,075
Aid to land-grant colleges (Bankhead-Jones Act).....		10,080	+10,080
University community services (HEA I).....		9,500	+9,500
Undergraduate equipment.....		7,000	+7,000
Construction grants (HEFA I & II).....		43,000	+43,000
Community education:			
Public libraries:			
Services (LSCA I, III, IV-A, IV-B).....	35,459	40,709	+5,250
Construction (LSCA II).....		7,092	+7,092
Education for the handicapped: State grant programs (ESEA VI).....	31,900	34,000	+2,100
Total.....	2,461,063	3,020,928	+559,865

<sup>1</sup> Net amount is as follows:  
President's budget..... \$3,966,824,000

Increases:	
Mandatory formula grant programs.....	+559,865,500
Discretionary programs.....	+39,961,500
Subtotal.....	599,827,000
Decreases:	
Discretionary programs.....	-146,506,000
Net change.....	+453,321,000
Conference agreement.....	4,420,145,000

Mr. Speaker, with these increases in mandatory formula grants it seems to me we are tying the President's hands in his attempt to control spending.

I have been listening in recent weeks and, yes, earlier today, to the distinguished chairman of our Appropriations Committee, and his repeated warnings about our fiscal problems. He has time and time again taken the floor to remind us that under the unified budget concept we are taking in more revenue in our trust fund accounts than we are spending in these same accounts, and that tends to improve our overall fiscal picture. There is no doubt about it.

While the latest official projections would indicate we have a deficit in this fiscal year of \$1.3 billion, we all know it is going to be considerably more than that. The last official estimate publicized is based upon additional revenue being generated to the tune of \$4.6 billion in either increased or extended taxes of one kind or another. It would appear to me that at most the President will be getting only that revenue generated by an extension of excise taxes, and that will be about \$600 million. So if we do not enact any kind of tax legislation here, like the Speaker said he was willing to support, of some \$4 billion, we have to add that to the officially announced deficit of \$1.3 billion, and we have a minimum deficit of \$5.3 billion. If the economy does not improve, we are going to have a further loss of revenue, and the picture will be much worse.

So there is no question about it. If Members want to fund these programs at a higher level than what they are currently being funded, we have to be thinking seriously about tax increases to cover the cost. We just cannot have it both ways.

We cannot afford to go down this road here in this Congress without restraining some of our own spending proclivities.

In my opinion the vast majority of the American people will back up the President in his attempt to cut Federal spending by a billion dollars with these two vetoes we are considering today.

These education and housing appropriation bills are only the third and fourth of this session to reach the President's desk, and there will be 10 more to follow, of regular appropriation bills. We might just as well face up to the issue at this time as to whether or not we are going to help the President keep Federal expenditures in line or open up the floodgates as the session wears along.

I intend to vote to sustain both vetoes and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the House to override the President's veto of H.R. 16916, the Office of Education appropriation bill for 1971.

I do not intend to indulge in any partisan political rhetoric. I have never been very good at it, and I do not intend to try now. However, I must say that I think the President's reasons for vetoing this bill must be political, because the veto certainly will not stand up when measured by any other standard. Do not misunderstand me, gentlemen. I am not

against politics. Politics is a very important function in our Government. However, we should recognize this veto, naked, for exactly what it is.

Why do I say this? First of all because this veto, if sustained, will cause further delay—remember this back home—further delay and uncertainty in the allocation of Federal funds to thousands of school districts back home and to colleges all over the nation. It will hurt the schools and it will hurt the students. Do not forget that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill came out of the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee of which I am the chairman, I was the floor manager of the bill in the House. After our experience with the 1970 Labor-HEW bill, which was not enacted until March 5 of this year—March 5 of this year—we made a solemn vow, as far as the House Committee on Appropriations was concerned, that we would do everything in our power to enact an education appropriation bill for 1971 as early as possible. Remember? We began hearings on this bill on March 4. We reported it out on April 9. Remember these dates. It passed the House on April 14. It is now August 13. In a very few weeks—now hear this—in a very few weeks the Nation's schools and colleges will open their doors for the 1970-71 school year. If this veto is sustained, no one, but no one, knows how long it will take to put through another education appropriation bill which would be acceptable both to the Congress and the President. No one, but no one, knows how many weeks or how many months it will be before thousands of school districts would receive title I funds. These are your school districts. Keep that in mind. You will hear about it.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I do not see how the expenditure of \$239 million in outlays for 1971 in this bill over the President's budget can possibly have any measurable effect upon the Nation's economy. The amount at issue between the President and the Congress amounts to one-tenth of 1 percent of the total Federal budget for 1971, and about one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the gross national product. I am not an economist, but I think I can recognize miniscule figures when I see them.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee yield to me for just one question?

Mr. FLOOD. To the gentleman from Michigan? Of course.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee yield for just one question?

Mr. FLOOD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if it is not true that if this veto were sustained that the existing continuing appropriation resolution would take care of the problem the gentleman mentions, in other words there would be Federal funds available under the continuing resolution?

Mr. FLOOD. Well, there would be Federal funds available for the next month or two. It is mainly a question of degree.

Of course, what the gentleman says is true.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not the continuing resolution expire on October 1?

Mr. FLOOD. It is either October 1 or October 15, but in either case it is a stop-gap measure, as the gentleman infers, and not a very good substitute for the regular appropriation bill.

There are many line items in this bill. I will not mention them all. They are legion. But I would like to mention a few of the increases over the President's budget which led to the veto.

Wait until you hear about this one—wait until you hear about this one—just so you will know what you are doing: Impacted area aid. Did you ever hear of that one? This bill is \$126 million over the President's budget. Do not forget that. That is one of your prize pigeons.

Education for the handicapped. You are against that? Well, I do not think so, really.

Vocational education. You were enthused about that when you authorized it.

The community colleges—these wonderful, new community colleges in your communities, one a week we are giving birth to. A \$43 million increase. You are against that?

Let me just recite some of the increases over the President's budget that are in the bill:

Impacted area aid.....	+\$126,000,000
Title I, ESEA.....	+161,000,000
School equipment (NDEA III).....	+50,000,000
Supplementary services and guidance, counseling, and testing (ESEA III).....	+23,000,000
Bilingual education.....	+3,750,000
Education for the handicapped.....	+10,000,000
Vocational education.....	+54,000,000
NDEA student loans.....	+67,000,000
Aid to land-grant colleges.....	+10,000,000
University community services.....	+9,500,000
Construction grants for community colleges.....	+43,000,000
Public libraries.....	+12,000,000
College libraries.....	+5,400,000
Educational broadcasting facilities.....	+7,000,000

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are the programs, and the House has heard about them again and again. These are programs for the people of every Member's district. Mr. Speaker, there is no dividing aisle in this House on this bill. You passed the conference report on this bill on July 16. And what was the vote? 357 to 30. Remember? The other body passed the conference report 88 to nothing. These were not partisan votes, and the vote we are about to take should not be partisan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the veto be overridden.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5

minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

(Mr. CRANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, regarding the Presidential vetoes of the pending appropriations bills, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a copy of an editorial which appeared in this morning's Chicago Tribune:

#### TWO MORE VETOES

Some members of Congress have expressed surprise at Mr. Nixon's veto of the two latest appropriation bills, one for aid to education and the other for various agencies, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Expressing surprise is a subtle way of implying that Mr. Nixon's action was unexpected, unwarranted, and therefore presumably unwise.

If anything is surprising, it is these expressions of surprise. Mr. Nixon has consistently attacked the two bills for overshooting his spending goal—the education bill by \$453 million and the other bill by \$541 million. On June 22 he vetoed a hospital construction bill that exceeded his request by \$350 million, and he explained perfectly clearly that he was doing so because the added spending was unnecessary and would be inflationary. Did Congress expect him now meekly to accept an added burden amounting to nearly \$1 billion?

Congress may very well override these vetoes as it did the hospital construction bill veto. Even the White House concedes that the chances of sustaining the education bill veto are slim.

But if Congress does override one or both of these vetoes, it will be demonstrating its own weakness, not the President's. It isn't easy for a President to veto bills for such popular and generally worthy purposes as hospitals, schools, and urban affairs. Mr. Nixon did so because he was convinced that the added money was unnecessary or could not be efficiently spent, and that it would be inflationary.

"My veto of these bills is painful," he said, "but necessary to hold down the rising cost of living. I flatly refuse to go along with the kind of big spending that is wrong for all the American people."

To override the vetoes will prove that Congress, unlike Mr. Nixon, prefers the easy and painless way out. This, especially during an election year, is to be as generous as possible with federal funds. True, the inflationary effects will ultimately hurt everybody, including the supposed beneficiaries of Congress' extravagance. But this is a matter that many congressmen prefer not to think about, at least until after the election.

If it should happen that Congress does have second thoughts and does cut out some of the excessive spending, as it did when Mr. Nixon vetoed a labor-welfare appropriation bill in January, then Mr. Nixon's courage will have paid off and we shall be gratified [we might say surprised, but won't] at Congress' wisdom.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, this matter today should not be political. But, unfortunately, I am afraid that it has been put into the realm of politics. I do not believe anybody ought to vote for or against this veto on the basis of whether it will help him to be reelected or not.

I would hope each of us would vote either for or against this on the basis of his own personal conviction as to what is best for his country.

I do not think anybody can say that a billion dollar deficit in two particular appropriation bills is not inflationary. To me every deficit is inflationary.

I do not know anything about "black hat" deficits or "white hat" deficits. For anybody to say that these deficits are not inflationary as compared to all others—this to me is a kind of reasoning that is even more than specious. It is incomprehensible.

Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is called upon to either agree or disagree with the President of the United States on an assessment of economic priorities. The Congress has passed and sent to the President two appropriations bills, which together exceed the President's budget by almost \$1 billion. The President has vetoed these bills, on the basis that the amounts in excess of the budget would tend to exacerbate the inflationary spiral, and to raise the cost of living for the average American.

I doubt that very many Members of this body would challenge the President's statement. I think most of us realize that increased Government spending at this time can be accomplished only at the expense of inflation, increase in the cost of living, and decrease in the value of the dollar. However, many of our Members will vote to override these vetoes because of their sincere devotion to the various categories of Government expenditures included in these bills. And they will do so in the sincere belief that each of these Government endeavors is indispensable, and must be funded at the level provided in the bills, or the public weal would suffer.

Many of us will vote to uphold the President's veto, because we believe that the increase in the cost of living is the most important domestic problem facing the Congress and the administration. We will not be voting this way because of any lack of devotion or appreciation for the programs involved in these appropriations bills. In fact we will be voting with the clear belief that there will be other appropriations bills addressed to these programs, and that they will not go unfunded for the next year.

We do, however, feel that the overall public welfare demands that inflation and the rise in the cost of living be stopped, and stopped as soon as possible. In choosing priorities, we must put this as the No. 1 domestic priority. Closely followed by this priority is the belief of many of us that the programs financed by these bills should be financed as adequately as is possible under the present conditions of Government finances.

There are many Members of the House who will vote to override these vetoes, in the sincere belief that a budget balance will finally be obtained by huge cuts to be made in the Defense appropriations bill. We have heard pronouncements, mainly from Members of the other body, that the defense appropriations bill could be cut by as much as \$10 billion.

These estimates of huge cuts tend downward to more modest but still unrealistic figures. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that the Defense budget for fiscal 1971 is already a tight budget. The President and the Secretary of Defense, with the cooperation of the uniformed members of the armed services, have already cut their budget to the bone and sometimes into the very marrow. The reduced American presence in Vietnam caused by the success of the Vietnamization program has allowed us to reduce our troop level. In fact, the Defense budget from 1968 to 1971 is down by \$17.3 billion. This cut has been made in the face of rising costs, and while attempting to wind down a war. While this occurred, other Federal programs have gone up in their expenditure level by \$18.4 billion.

As an illustration of the problem faced by the Department of Defense, if our troop level today were the same as the troop level in 1964, just to pay the troops would cost us 11 billions of dollars more than it would have cost to pay the same number of troops in 1964.

I realize that it is a comforting thought for many of our Members to contemplate the so-called Vietnam dividend. The facts are that this dividend has already been largely used. It will become necessary, unless the SALT talks are completely successful, for the Department of Defense to increase expenditures in the next few years in the fields of research and development, and in the procurement of more sophisticated global weaponry. We are all very much in hope that the SALT talks will succeed, and that much of this additional outlay can be avoided. However, I think it would be absolutely foolhardy for us to place the economy of the United States for the years to come in jeopardy, relying on the complete success of the SALT talks. We can hope for that success, but we certainly should not plan for it.

I see no corners to turn, and no stones to hide behind. The time has come for the Congress to join the Executive and bite the bullet. The President's vetoes are correct, considering all the factors of life in the 1970's, and they should be upheld.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it was only a few months ago that we were in here because the President had vetoed the bill for the same purpose and the President used the same excuse. The President was sustained on that occasion, and this House and the Senate went ahead and reduced his overall budgets by an additional \$6.4 billion. He was robbed of his excuse for inflation. And we did him one better. We reduced his budget by another \$6.4 billion.

But inflation did not disappear. We had more inflation. Obviously, pointing the gun at a one billion dollar shift in a trillion dollar economy is not the real cause of inflation.

I supported that override a few months ago, but I did so with an apology, because in that bill—some of the higher priority items were somewhat smothered, and some of the lower priority items were put up at the top.

But I say that today there is no need for anybody to apologize for what is in this bill. This is as good a bill as it is possible to write for 1971 for the Office of Education.

Let us look at exactly what is in this budget and what we did to it. We provided for increases totaling \$556 million. We also provided for decreases of \$103 million, making a net increase of \$453 million, the figure the President used. Of the \$556 million increase, \$492 million was for grants to States and local governments. This is not money to be spent

in Washington or wasted. This is a shift of the burden of taxation in this country.

The Federal Government is now paying only 8 percent of the cost of education. Children are educated in the local school districts. The property owners local district pay the necessary taxes to operate the schools in the district. As a result of the education the child receives, as an adult he can produce more, and when he moves off to another State, he pays more Federal income tax. The local government pays the tax to educate the child to enable him to produce more, and the Federal Government collects more income taxes as a result.

We are now making a shift that should have been recognized a long time ago. We need a broader base for education.

The President has said that he wants to help the States. I have heard him make that statement several times. I saw several State governors on TV Sunday. We saw Republican governors elbowing one another out of the way trying to get their hands out further toward the Federal dollars. They wanted to solve their fiscal crises that way. Well, here is a chance to help them. Give them some of these Federal grants. We have \$40 million more in this bill for Federal grants to States and local governments than the total increase over the President's budget compared to what he has requested.

So actually the increase in this bill represents an increase in grants to local government primarily.

I am inserting a table at this point to show the increases in grants per State:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION—ALLOCATION OF GRANTS TO STATES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT—COMPARISON OF 1971 AMENDED REQUEST AND 1971 CONFERENCE REPORT  
[Budget request included nothing for impact aid although President recommended \$425,000,000 by message. Report included \$536,000,000]

State and outlying areas	1971 amended request	1971 conference report	Difference	State and outlying areas	1971 amended request	1971 conference report	Difference
Total.....	\$2,446,535,189	\$3,400,819,218	\$954,284,029	Montana.....	\$9,848,418	\$17,042,583	\$9,194,165
Alabama.....	63,239,784	84,252,949	21,013,165	Nebraska.....	17,477,844	26,370,132	8,892,288
Alaska.....	4,829,683	24,501,679	19,671,996	Nevada.....	4,677,556	9,355,493	4,677,937
Arizona.....	22,246,132	36,162,449	13,916,317	New Hampshire.....	7,136,890	10,933,115	3,796,225
Arkansas.....	38,190,816	47,374,375	9,183,559	New Jersey.....	62,846,017	86,118,295	23,272,278
California.....	194,189,374	308,266,773	114,077,399	New Mexico.....	18,933,951	33,379,172	14,445,221
Colorado.....	24,085,296	41,035,766	16,951,470	New York.....	262,405,414	325,698,961	63,293,547
Connecticut.....	26,241,368	34,428,682	8,187,314	North Carolina.....	90,809,283	118,527,743	27,718,460
Delaware.....	7,090,510	15,478,969	8,388,459	North Dakota.....	10,727,481	16,927,233	6,199,752
Florida.....	69,661,894	95,592,300	25,930,406	Ohio.....	94,785,425	123,017,000	28,231,575
Georgia.....	68,022,940	97,102,404	29,079,464	Oklahoma.....	35,642,214	55,292,217	19,650,003
Hawaii.....	8,905,283	21,188,243	12,283,243	Oregon.....	22,311,263	28,923,006	6,611,743
Idaho.....	9,347,933	13,772,614	4,424,681	Pennsylvania.....	116,058,725	145,685,576	29,626,851
Illinois.....	105,464,792	137,144,077	31,679,285	Rhode Island.....	10,738,281	16,486,339	5,748,058
Indiana.....	44,991,312	57,868,670	12,877,358	South Carolina.....	52,286,673	70,114,530	17,827,857
Iowa.....	33,482,095	41,376,199	7,894,104	South Dakota.....	12,064,678	18,803,341	6,738,663
Kansas.....	25,480,512	39,286,107	13,805,595	Tennessee.....	61,741,043	78,793,315	16,998,272
Kentucky.....	56,747,207	75,389,619	18,642,412	Texas.....	147,991,255	201,417,464	53,426,209
Louisiana.....	58,763,928	73,347,502	14,583,574	Utah.....	12,638,655	22,577,776	9,939,121
Maine.....	10,835,486	15,959,837	5,124,351	Vermont.....	6,417,050	7,914,376	1,497,326
Maryland.....	37,779,766	70,068,806	32,289,040	Virginia.....	58,045,631	103,889,495	45,843,864
Massachusetts.....	52,334,115	77,097,027	24,762,912	Washington.....	32,569,562	51,513,353	18,943,791
Michigan.....	88,679,827	109,899,861	21,220,034	West Virginia.....	32,482,292	38,593,650	6,165,358
Minnesota.....	43,170,213	54,490,269	11,320,056	Wisconsin.....	42,597,161	52,780,311	10,183,150
Mississippi.....	59,193,317	71,326,344	12,133,027	Wyoming.....	5,341,488	8,363,598	3,022,110
Missouri.....	52,238,874	70,102,218	17,863,344	District of Columbia.....	12,802,482	19,840,122	7,037,640

Let us look at the specifics. On impact aid, which was mentioned here, the increase is \$126 million. The President says he wants to reform that program. I do too. He wants 90 percent for A category pupils and 45 percent for B's. This bill provides 90 percent for A's, just what he wants, and 65 percent for B's and \$8.8 million he wanted for hardship cases. This is the first time in many years that we have had a difference in A's and B's. This bill provides the first real long step toward reform.

As late as 2 years ago no one would have dreamed this big step could be taken in the 1971 appropriation bill. Reform cannot be accomplished in 1 year. This bill provides a long step toward reform, and these are also grants to States or local governments.

Funds for elementary and secondary education were increased \$232.3 million. That is grants to States or local governments.

There is an increase for the handicapped of \$10 million, \$2 million of which is grants to States, and \$3 million is for early childhood programs. Everybody agrees this is the program which saves on welfare costs a few years down the road. On vocational education, the increase was \$50.15 million, of which

almost all, \$50 million, is for grants to the States.

Then there is student assistance, a net increase of \$48.175 million was included in this bill. The President wanted to use the loan guarantee program all the way. It costs more, not less, to use the loan guarantee program. So we are saving money by increasing the NDEA loans instead of using the loan guarantee program to that extent. Some of these students could not find a bank to get a loan from anyway, so we are helping them in that case, and at the same time saving money.

Next is aid to the colleges, the increase was \$62.28 million, of which, as the chairman said, \$43 million in aid for construction for community colleges. These are State-supported colleges. So again we have aid to the States, grants to the States.

On libraries, the increase was \$25.594 million, and that includes public libraries that are supported by local taxes.

But on the other hand, with all those grants to the States, we cut research \$28.25 million. That is all money spent out of Washington.

The bill also cut \$75 million from his desegregation recommendations. It is really \$275 million, because he has al-

ready said he is going to ask for a total of \$350 million. That almost offsets the total increase in the bill. The program has not been authorized and he wanted an open-ended right to spend the money any way he sees fit. The \$75 million might all be spent out of Washington. We do not know.

So I say what is really involved here is a shift in part of the tax burden from State and local government to the Federal level.

Now, the Republicans are in an enviable position. Obviously, the President feels he needs an excuse for inflation. This inflation problem is kind of getting to him. His high interest approach has not worked. He tried to blame Congress last year but lost the excuse because Congress sustained the veto and cut the budget. If enough Republicans do not vote to override and make it two-thirds today, the President is going to be robbed of his excuse again—and what can he say this fall?

So the Republicans can help the President save his excuse for inflation by voting to override, and at the same time to help their constituents. By voting to override the President can have his cake and my friends on the Republican side eat it too. By voting to override, the Demo-

crats can help the Governors meet their demand for more Federal help and help education too.

What a happy day—by voting to override all can get what they want and I urge my colleagues to vote yes to override the veto.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have always enjoyed the sign that former President Truman had on his desk which read, "The Buck Stops Here."

In vetoing H.R. 16916 and H.R. 17548, President Nixon has said, literally and figuratively, "the buck stops here." Agreeing with the President that these bills are superinflationary, I have voted to sustain his necessary and courageous action.

Fiscally responsible Members of Congress know full well that the Government cannot indefinitely spend more of the taxpayer's money than it receives. It is a simple and straightforward fact. A fact that every American citizen knows to be true, yet day in and day out, some Members of Congress act as if they believed that spending money is "the solution" to all our national problems.

Today's major, national domestic problem is inflation. Federal spending that caused the enormous \$25 billion deficit in fiscal year 1968 has since slashed the value of the dollar by 11 percent. Last year inflation robbed Americans of \$60 million of their savings in banks and life insurance.

The problem of inflation cannot be solved simply by the President issuing "warnings" to industry and labor to halt wage and price increases. The problem cannot be solved by the President using the dictatorial methods of wage and price controls urged upon him by some Democrats. No. The only way to stop inflation is by setting an example—that is, leadership—and the President is doing that in his veto messages. What is needed is cooperation from the Congress.

Congress has been asked one major question with regard to Government spending: "Will this new expenditure, when tied to all the others, require increased taxes or cause a deficit which would bring about an increase in prices?" With respect to the bills recently vetoed, there is no question in anyone's mind that the question has been answered in the negative. The independent offices appropriations bill exceeded the administration's budget request by \$541 million. The appropriation bill for the Office of Education is \$453 million over the budget request. That is over \$1 billion worth of pressure on what we already know is going to be another deficit year.

The question of the control of inflation is not one for the President alone. Mr. Speaker, the control of inflation is justifiably an equal responsibility of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, the veto message by President Nixon on Tuesday is one of the most perplexing documents that I have seen since entering the Congress.

Of course, I recognize that it is the President's prerogative to veto whatever he chooses. He need not even give the Congress his reasons for rejecting a piece of legislation.

But on Tuesday, the President gave us his reasons. I regret to say that they do not comprise a rationale.

The President, in his veto message, spoke of "big spending" by the Congress. I am sure all of us share his concern. Surely no one here this afternoon wants to feed the economic troubles of inflation and recession that face this country.

Yet the size of the entire education bill for fiscal 1971, \$4.4 billion, is less than the cost overruns for some of our overgrown military projects.

The amount of money in the education bill which the President objected to, \$453 million, is nearly \$300 million less than the administration planned to spend to bail out the Penn Central Railroad after it collapsed into bankruptcy.

Where was the complaint about big spending then? Where was the uproar about big spending when the administration sent its budget request for foreign assistance to the Congress? We cut that request by \$655 million—more savings in that item alone than the amount of money at issue here today.

Where was the complaint about big spending when the administration sent its budget request for the Departments of the Treasury and the Post Office to the Congress? We cut that request by \$73 million.

Where was the cry about inflationary spending when the President sent his request for the State-Commerce-Justice-judiciary appropriations bill to Capitol Hill? That item was trimmed by \$136 million.

What of the President's request for the Department of Transportation? The House of Representatives cut it by \$36 million. The administration's request for the Department of Agriculture was reduced by \$81 million. The administration's request for Public Works-AEC funds was cut by \$26 million.

I could go on. But what I want to know is where the opponents of "big spending" were hiding at the time these budget requests were sent to the Congress.

That is a fact which I believe has escaped many in the public. In this one session of Congress, the House of Representatives has cut the administration's specific budget requests by a net of \$572 million.

Yes, we have raised the President's budget in several areas. We did vote to spend more for education. We did vote to spend more so that our cities may be renewed and our citizens may have decent homes. We did vote to spend more for public health and hospital construction, for water and for sewers.

Yet when you match the raises against the cutbacks, the House of Representatives has reduced the President's budget requests for fiscal 1971 by more than \$572 million. We have trimmed the President's running budget by more than \$7 billion since he took office. And we are being charged with "big spending."

Mr. Speaker, there is a deep inconsistency in that accusation. For as we all know—we have seen it happen to various programs—the President and his budget office have the power to impound appropriations if they feel that an expenditure is not wise.

I recall an incident several months ago, when the President vetoed his last appropriations bill. That one was for hospital construction and renovation.

In that last veto message, the President specifically objected to language in the bill which required that he spend the appropriation. Were it not for that language, the President said, he could impound the funds.

That is as true today as it was 2 months ago. The President could impound at least \$435 million from the Federal budget if he desired, and the veto of this education bill would be unnecessary.

We must remember that while it is the Congress which puts the appropriations into the Treasury, it is the Executive who spends the money.

And often enough, Mr. Speaker, that money is not expended. I will give you only one example.

At the Duke University Medical Center in Durham, N.C., more than \$17,000,000 in research grants have been either not funded or turned down since January 1970.

This is money which has already been appropriated. It is money for cancer research, and for studies into the problems of heart disease, and blindness, and the infirmities of the aged and the poor. It is money which has not been spent by this administration.

I also would like to know, Mr. Speaker, why there was never a suggestion, never a signal, that the administration found this education bill to be objectionable. After all, the bill was passed in the House by 357 to 30 and in the Senate by 83 to 0.

Had we been told beforehand that there was a provision in this bill that displeased the President, we might have corrected the situation.

We might not. It is entirely possible that we would have still viewed the education of our children as a higher priority than the bankrolling of a dictator, or the financing of a railroad, or the payment of a cost overrun. But we would have had the chance to consider other action.

Yet there were no warnings from the White House. In fact, I am told that the veto of the education bill took even some members of the White House staff by surprise.

Mr. Speaker, we must have better communication with the administration than we have had on these two vetoes and on the veto of the Hill-Burton Act appropriation. It serves no purpose for these confrontations between the Congress and the President to continue.

If the President disagrees with the spending priorities of the Congress, then it is incumbent on him to let us know not after legislation is enacted, but while it is before the House. There are enough delays in the legislative process without taking the additional time to consider needless veto messages.

And I do consider these vetoes to be needless. For the President himself has acknowledged that he can impound appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make two more points. First, if the Federal Government does not provide funds for education,

then the local governments will be forced to turn for revenue to those who are already overburdened by taxes: the Nation's property owners.

It is the property owners, the people who finance local bond issues with taxes on their homes, who will suffer along with our children if this veto stands. And if they do not assume the burden—we all know about the success of bond issues today—then it would be an educational tragedy.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I want to read from a statement made earlier by President Nixon in remarks about the importance of education. I quote:

When we talk about cutting the expense of government—either federal, state, or local—the one area we can't shortchange is education. . . . When you cut expenditures for education, what you are doing is shortchanging the American future. For our children to have a better chance than we have had, we have to constantly spend more.

I could not in good conscience vote to sustain this veto without feeling that I was shortchanging education in America. I will vote to override.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is confronted with two Presidential vetoes—one—the bill H.R. 16916, pertaining to appropriations for the education crisis throughout our country. The other bill, H.R. 1748, pertaining to appropriations for the Executive Bureaus and to provide funds for community facilities, water and sewer installations, veterans' educations, housing and other essential domestic programs affecting millions of our citizens.

It is remarkable that only a few months ago the President, through a veto, curtailed temporary operations of thousands of schoolrooms throughout the country. That veto affected millions of students because various school installations could not arrange for their current school program on account of the President's veto. Today we are faced with another veto, which if not overridden will again throw a cloud over the progress of the American school system and affect the education of millions of our American youth.

In several of the speeches during the presidential campaign in 1968 President Nixon assured the American people that any economizing he would recommend during his administration would not be in the necessary expansion of American education. The Congress, in increasing the President's budget on education programs, is merely carrying out the wishes of millions of taxpayers, including primarily the parents of American schoolchildren. The vast majority of cities demand that school opportunities be not curtailed, but are desiring school facilities expansion in order to accommodate the Nation's increased school population, especially in urban centers.

About 72 percent of the Nation's population now resides in metropolitan areas. The local property owners of the city areas are bearing the heavy school tax burden of this influx of population into their communities. On account of the cost of living and the added school tax load and paying high interest on school

bonds, the vast majority of our people are demanding school aid from the Federal Government. On account of the two major vetoes in 1970 curbing our education expansion and progress I firmly believe the education crisis in metropolitan areas will be one of the main issues in the coming campaign.

The second veto under consideration by the House today affects the living conditions of a great segment of population in metropolitan areas. This bill provides additional money for necessary municipal facilities, including housing expansion, water facilities, sewers, veterans' education and other programs which, if provided with sufficient funds, will be expended by the States and cities within the States. I firmly believe that 90 percent of the Governors of the States of both parties, if consulted, would advocate the overriding of the President's veto of this legislation.

I firmly believe that the President and his advisers in sending up these two vetoes of highly necessary, humanitarian legislation, are possibly playing politics in order to have some excuse for the administration's failure to curb inflation, unemployment, and provide excuses for the recession now existing throughout the Nation.

In the President's news conferences and broadcasts, unfortunately, he endeavors to pass the responsibility for inflation on to the Congress and accuses the Congress of unreasonable expenditures.

Unfortunately, the President nor Vice President AGNEW nor any of their political speakers never inform the people that the present Congress has reduced his budget by approximately \$6,370,000,000. This figure was mainly composed of approximately a \$5 billion reduction of his \$80 billion defense and armaments budget. The Congress reduced his foreign aid budget by almost \$2 billion.

His two vetoes on education legislation and also on the community facilities legislation are brought about because the Congress increased the education budget by approximately \$1 billion and the community facilities by approximately four hundred million.

The above figures alone should satisfy the American public that these Presidential vetoes are ill advised and for some reason are being used as political propaganda to discredit the Congress of the United States. I do hope both vetoes are overridden today.

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, the obligation of this House could not possibly be more clear. The wage earner and housewife can no longer be hoodwinked into thinking that they can get tremendous increases in Government services without paying tremendous prices for them.

The American people know what happens when the Government spends more money than it receives in revenue. They know that when spending exceeds income the Government must borrow money to meet its obligations. From 1960 to 1968 we had to borrow over \$60 billion. When the Government borrows in the market at this exorbitant rate, it reduces available money for private uses and forces interest rates up.

Now the special interest groups are all shouting for increases in their own pet projects and say we should take the money away from something else. Spending for space and the Department of Defense are usually singled out for big cuts. I agree that they should be reduced. They have been reduced significantly. The 1971 Nixon budget for defense is more than \$17 billion less than the Johnson budget for 1968. The space program has been reduced to the extent that serious unemployment has resulted in the space laboratory areas of Florida and California. Lesser cuts must be made in other low priority programs and reasonable increases are indicated in education, health, and environment control.

If this House fails to employ fiscal responsibility at this time, we will continue to suffer the same triad of diseases that have plagued us for the past 10 years.

I am unalterably opposed to high prices. I am unalterably opposed to high interest rates. I am unalterably opposed to high taxes.

I entreat my fellow legislators to forsake the politically expedient role of Santa Claus and to vote to save the country for the honest hardworking taxpayers who deserve responsible representation.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, today we are faced with two very difficult votes. That is, whether we will agree with the President that an increase of \$152 million for education and an increase of \$388 million for urban development is sufficient or whether we need to increase these appropriations by an additional \$1 billion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all agree that our children should have a good education, and we provided for this in increasing education funds by \$152 million. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel that another billion dollars is excessive unless we are ready to increase taxes, and I certainly am not ready to do any such thing.

Mr. Speaker, I vote today to reduce Government spending by \$1 billion.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the important question before this body today is not whether we are for education and urban development or against it, but whether the Federal Government can afford to partake in the type of big spending which would drive prices up and demand higher taxes.

In an attempt to care for the urgent needs of our cities, the President's original urban development request was double the amount in the last fiscal year of the previous administration. Congress exceeded this budget request by \$541 million. As the President stated, this kind of excessive spending would cause the deficits that drive interest rates up and make it literally impossible for the housing industry to speed its recovery. This bill would therefore be detrimental to just those persons it was originally designed to aid.

Although the President's original budget request for the Office of Education was a \$972 million increase over fiscal 1969, producing 28 percent more spending than in the previous administration's

last fiscal year, Congress appropriated \$453 million over this request. It is important to note that total spending on federally supported education programs will be nearly \$12 billion in 1971. This amount is the highest figure in history.

As the President stated, we now spend more than our tax system can produce. The average American must pay for this type of spending spree by higher taxes.

In an effort to balance the budget, the President is determined to prevent further inflation. I join with President Nixon in saying "no" to a higher cost of living, higher interest rates, and higher taxes. I strongly feel that the increases proposed by the appropriations legislation before us again today are not in the best interests of all the American people.

For these reasons, I support the efforts of the President and sustain his veto.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President has vetoed two major, domestic appropriations bills, and the House must decide to let these actions stand or to override them. I shall vote in both cases to override the action of the President.

The President's skillful and pervasive use of national television in this effort is an ominous note for those of us who are going into the lists this fall.

I oppose the President's decisions today at great risk. My political instincts urge me to avoid the confrontation: my conscience and my sense of fairplay command that I accept the challenge, along with the others of my colleagues.

There is a great irony here today. Over in the Senate, the President is achieving a victory because authorization is being given to him to widely expand the deployment of his antiballistic-missile system. I have always supported and will continue to support a strong defense posture. But when the House debated the military authorization bill earlier this year, I supported the unsuccessful effort to hold ABM expenditures to funds needed for continued research and development and to postpone what I deeply believe to be an imprudent and unwarranted deployment of this weapon system at this time. We were confronted during that debate with a mass of conflicting testimony as to the feasibility of the program. We are faced now with a Presidential decision to hold the line and retrench on education, water and sewer facilities, urban development, housing, veterans programs, and other vitally needed domestic programs. There is no question in my mind as to their importance. Congress will make substantial cuts in the budget requests of the President, more than enough reduction in the total budget to allow for these modest increases in vital programs which Congress has made.

Congress has a solemn obligation to exercise its judgment on the matter of priorities of Federal spending. I happen to believe that it is important to make inroads on the awesome backlog of our domestic needs. Unlike the President, I believe that funds are needed for education more than they are needed to bail out mismanaged big businesses. The President wanted hundreds of millions

of dollars for welfare payments to railroad companies. He supported the continuation of a bloated subsidy program to big nonfarming farmers. I believe that there is a matter of basic priorities here, and I am not afraid to say that I feel that education and housing are far more important to Americans as a whole than welfare for railroads and wealthy southern and midwestern farmers. This is the question which faces the House today.

When the largest banking houses in this country raised the prime interest rate by a full percent last year, the highest since the Civil War, it was estimated that this act alone was going to cost the American people \$15 billion in purchasing power. The administration condoned the increase. It did not lift one finger to come to the aid of the small businessman, the consumer, the potential home buyer. And yet, Congress has the temerity to add funds for education and housing, and we are faced with the wrath of the White House. Someone's priorities are out of whack, I submit that they are not ours.

As Members of the House of Representatives, we have the right and a duty to act independently of the executive branch in pursuit of the common good. We do not have the tremendous resources of national television to make our case. We are at a terrible disadvantage. Nevertheless, the House cannot afford to back down. It cannot afford to sacrifice its constitutional responsibility to contribute an independent direction to the course this Nation is following.

There, no doubt, will be those who will scream that this is strictly a partisan matter, to which I say "rubbish." There is nothing partisan about a veteran's hospital that is under-equipped and under-staffed; there is nothing partisan about a suburban town or village whose sewage facilities are all but non-existent; there is nothing partisan about urban decay. These are problems facing all Americans, regardless of their political philosophy or their political persuasion.

The President should not ask education and housing to carry the burden for his failure to curb inflation in this country. To my way of thinking, the administration policy of promoting high interest rates and unrestrained credit is deeply responsible for the economic mess we find ourselves in, not education expenditures, not veterans programs, not the national housing crisis, not urban decay, and certainly not the hard-pressed suburban and rural communities who desperately need sewer and water facilities.

If the President's veto is sustained, then the desperately needed additional 120 million dollars for VA hospital and outpatient facilities will go down the drain. If the veto is sustained far less than 20 percent of the approved applications for sewer funds can be met. If the veto is sustained the elementary and secondary education act will suffer a severe blow.

I share the realization of the President that Federal expenditures must be controlled. That is why we pared \$5 billion off his budget last year. But we are

being victimized by the tremendous command of the executive branch over the mass media in America. We may not be able to make our case in the face of these odds. It is my hope that the House will sustain its earlier actions and override the vetoes of these bills.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, lacking the profound economic insight that would lead President Nixon to conclude that his veto of the education bill is "in the interest of all the American people," I can only look at the facts as they arrange themselves before me—essentially the same pot of tea leaves, so to speak—and wonder what the President sees in them that I do not see.

In his veto message the President said it was "painful but necessary to hold down the rising cost of living." To have signed the education bill would have been, in his view, "saying yes to higher prices, yes to higher interest rates, yes to higher taxes."

In the case of the education bill we are talking about a difference of \$453 million—the amount by which the bill exceeded the President's request. I do not question the President's sincerity when he said he found it "painful" to veto the bill. But I wonder if he will find it equally "painful" to sign the defense procurement bill containing the \$322 million approved by the Senate yesterday for the Safeguard antiballistic missile system. The Senate vote yesterday was a clear victory for the President. I wonder if his anguish over spending will be as intense when the defense package arrives on his desk with most of the \$19.3 billion he has requested intact, as it appears it will be. That is approximately \$75 billion for instruments of death as opposed to \$4.4 billion for education.

Recently the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law Military Spending Committee released a very interesting "Report on Military Spending." One conclusion of the committee was:

Military spending is not only the major cause of inflation but is itself a major victim in terms of increasing the cost of its own operations. The Indochina war and our continued role in it is a major contributor to the inflationary problem in particular sectors of our economy.

The cost of that war is \$17 to \$32 billion a year depending on whose method of cost accounting is used. And we are talking here about a \$4.4 billion education bill.

Mr. Nixon says the education bill will produce higher taxes. In my district, the Ninth District of California, the bill would provide \$1.1 million in special aid for federally impacted areas. If that veto is not overridden, if the bill is not passed as it stands, the amount of Federal funds for education will be substantially reduced in my district. Yet the citizens of my district will have the same number of schools to maintain, the same number of children to educate, the same number of books to buy or—as an alternative—they will have to accept a drastic reduction in the quality of education. There are no other choices. They will either pay out of their own pockets,

through their property taxes, to maintain the quality of education at its present level or they will have to cut back.

It is a fact today, in my district and in most of the urban areas of the Nation, that children go to classrooms that are overcrowded and underequipped. In many if not most cases they are getting little more than custodial care.

The schools of the District of Columbia are a prime example, as the recent report indicated. Yet we have a nationwide teacher surplus, an artificial surplus of trained people ready and eager to do the job. Yet there are not enough jobs because there is not enough money. Santa Clara County in my district has a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 6.1 percent. If the figure was available for the entire district I believe it would be close to 12 percent. Many of these unemployed are teachers or could readily be trained as teacher aides. Many more of them are highly skilled engineers and technicians whose skills could be harnessed for the enormous task of cleaning up and preserving our environment. Yet the President has not called for a plug nickel for serious reconversion programs, for peacetime research and development programs in which these people could be employed.

What am I to tell the unemployed teachers? What am I to tell the parents of children herded into classrooms with 30 or 40 students to a teacher? What am I to tell my constituents when their property taxes increase to meet the rising cost of education, a cost which is already a crushing burden to them?

Am I to tell them, as the President did, that painful as it is, we cannot spend more money for education? Am I to tell them that our resources are not great enough to provide the instruments of death demanded by the military and still permit us to educate our children? Am I to tell them that the business of death, right now, is more important than the business of life?

Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Nixon succeeds in his campaign to convince the American people that a spendthrift Congress is responsible for the failure of his economic policies, it will be the greatest fraud since the Gulf of Tonkin incident.

If we play the President's game of neglecting such basic needs as education and housing while permitting him to continue our present level of military spending, we will be courting disaster.

Let us, for once, get our priorities straight, and let us vote accordingly.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am as anxious as anyone to meet the fiscal crisis of our Nation. I voted to sustain a presidential veto of an education bill earlier this year. I believe no Federal program should be sacrosanct when the fiscal condition of our Nation is in jeopardy. I believe we here in this House as well as the President, ought to be concerned about the plight of the taxpayer and the devastation of inflation.

It appears to me that one increase in the education bill is "impact aid," so called. There may be faults, inequities, and abuses in the Federal aid for impacted areas bill, but the faults cannot be cured by an appropriations bill. The

corrections ought to be made in the legislative committee. If changes are to be made in the "impact aid" bill—and I think many should be made, and soon—the authorization bill ought to carry the changes.

At this late date, I cannot vote to sustain this veto of an education appropriation bill.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am confident that every Member of this body believes in education of our young people. We all will and have voted for as much money as possible for the purpose of providing the best education possible for the youth of our Nation.

I am supporting the President's veto of the appropriation bill for education, not because I want to hurt education, but because I am deeply concerned about this terrible inflation that is hurting all segments of this country, including education.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives indicated to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that he would vote for a tax increase to pay for greater spending programs. I know the Speaker is sincere in his belief that more taxes is preferable to cutting expenditures. That is his right to think tax increases are better than economy.

But for me, I am voting in the interest of our poor overtaxed citizens by cutting some of the appropriations. Even if it is education, I am certain that even it too can continue to do the fine job it always has and economize at the same time.

A vote for sustaining the President is not a vote against education, but a vote to prevent more taxes. It is a vote for the taxpayer.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, simply stated, I support overriding the President's veto of the education appropriations bill for 1971 and the housing and urban development appropriations bill for 1971.

As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has pointed up in a recent bulletin, the education bill contains increases primarily consisting of \$232 million for elementary and secondary education and \$126 million for Federal impact aid and \$110 million for higher education.

The HUD appropriations bill increases are primarily for \$350 million for urban renewal programs, \$350 million for water and sewer grant facilities, and \$105 million for veterans medical care facilities.

The President says that by vetoing these items totaling \$1,273 billion he can control inflation. I have said before, it is a question of really what the President wants to emphasize. The President has supported \$200 million additional for Lockheed Aircraft. He supported \$200 million for the Penn Central Railroad. He supported \$200 million plus for the development of the SST, plus a \$2.3 billion escalation in the ABM.

The President believes, however, that these business expenditures are not inflationary, but that education, handicapped and vocational education, local antipollution public works, veterans hospitals and local hospital construction would be inflationary.

The President believes that inflation

can be controlled by 9- and 10-percent interest rates, and I believe these rates merely contribute to bank profits and higher taxes.

I believe that a red hot trillion dollar economy must be controlled by wage and price controls and severe presidential jawboning of major industry as opposed to the rather superfluous surplus or deficit of \$1 billion which the President now considers to be monumental. The country is starved for leadership which does not appear to be forthcoming from the White House.

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, excessive Government spending is the prime cause of inflation. In the last 9 years the Federal Government has spent \$60 billion more than it has taken in. This has created the booming inflation which has pushed up costs to the average worker, the housewife, those living on fixed incomes, and all Americans.

These vetoes were not made to reduce appropriations. The sole question is how much of an increase there should be this fiscal year for education and for the independent offices appropriations. The President's budget request for education was for 28 percent more than that requested in the last year of the previous administration, only 2 years ago. To this increased amount Congress piled on an additional \$453 million.

It should be of particular interest to us in the Northwest that no housing funds are in controversy. The areas in dispute are urban renewal, water and sewer grants. In these areas alone plus housing subsidies, the President's budget request was double the outlay of the last year of the last administration. Congress then added a whopping \$453 million over and above this figure. Veterans hospital money is not involved because the President has made it clear he will approve the additional amount of \$105 million for this purpose.

We face a serious budget deficit this year. When the Government goes in the hole, it must either raise taxes, or compete with the private sector for borrowing money, all of which raises interest rates and throws gasoline on the inflation fires.

We should stop kidding ourselves. We should either fight inflation on all fronts, or admit that we don't mean business and sit back and watch prices continue to rise for all consumers.

For these reasons, I have determined that I can best help both education and the housing industry by backing the President in his fight to contain inflation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the President's veto of the education bill. The President has told us in his veto message that he was "determined to hold the line against a dangerous budget deficit," and that this appropriations bill was "the kind of big spending that would drive up prices or demand higher taxes."

Mr. Speaker, this is a charade, a sleight-of-hand trick which is meant to distract the American people from the true issue of uncontrolled prices. There is nothing in the Constitution that requires the President to spend a penny

of appropriated funds. This veto was not necessary because the President can achieve the same goal merely by not spending the money.

Let us pause for a moment to put this charge of "big spending" into proper perspective. For this fiscal year, 1971, the President requested \$3,966,824,000, and the Congress finally appropriated \$4,420,145,000. Now this is an increase approximately \$453,000,000, or an increase of 11 percent over the budget request.

The President calls this increase "big spending" and yet it represents less than .002 percent of the total Federal budget. Is this two-thousands of a percentage point going to throw the Federal budget out of whack? Is the Congress being fiscally irresponsible by increasing the Federal budget by .002 percent for funds to educate the disadvantaged, funds to buy textbooks, and funds to train the handicapped?

This veto of education funds for 2 years in a row now is especially peculiar when compared with President Nixon's approval of other appropriation bills which exceeded his requests.

Last year the President signed into law the public works appropriations bill which exceeded his budget request by more than 13 percent. There was no veto there. Does the President consider funds for the construction of buildings and dams more important than funds for the education of our young people?

Mr. Speaker, Chicago has received \$65 million in all education programs last year. If we fail to override the President's veto, Chicago would lose approximately \$5 million for ongoing programs. It would mean that programs we are counting on and have budgeted would have to be dropped.

Mr. Speaker, I said the veto was not needed. The President could have brought the appropriation into line with his request by simply ordering the Office of Education not to pay out the increases voted in the impacted areas bill. I have been trying to get impact reform out of my committee for weeks with no help from the adverse motion or its party.

The subcommittee held 10 days of hearings on the Impact Aid Reform Act. Only three congressmen testified in support of the bill, and at least twenty opposed it.

During the hearings the subcommittee discovered that the administration did not have statistics on the effects of this legislation on local school districts. Consequently, the subcommittee has requested that the administration provide the committee with adequate statistics. The last request was made during the second week of July, and to date there has not been any response. The data requested at that time included the following: A listing by school district of the approximate number of "B-out" children since the Reform Act reduces payments for these children by more than 50 percent.

Let us not lead the public. The President knows it is members of his party that get most of the benefits from impact aid and they are not about to support impact reform.

I shall continue supporting economy in Government. But the veto is not an economy move. It is for that reason I shall vote against the veto.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the President's veto of the Office of Education appropriation bill. This action is but another clear indication that the administration has embarked on a policy of billions for defense and not one cent for education. Do the powers that be in the executive branch not realize that today there is a crisis in educational funding throughout this country at every level, but most especially at the local level in elementary and secondary education?

This allegedly inflation-stopping measure will have harmful ramifications throughout the Nation. It has been described as a "crushing blow" by an official of the Philadelphia school system. The president of the board of education advised me only hours ago that an initial analysis of the effect of the veto indicates a loss of millions of dollars in vitally needed Federal assistance to the schoolchildren of my city.

Allow me to itemize some of the anticipated losses to Philadelphia:

Almost a half million dollars lost in Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title II funds for library and textbooks.

Almost a half million dollars lost in National Defense Education Act title III funds for instructional equipment and material.

The effect on impacted aid under Public Law 874 is not presently calculated, but is estimated as substantial.

The Federal aid coordinator of the Philadelphia Board of Education estimates aggregate losses at an excess of \$3 million.

Losses to my State of Pennsylvania are estimated at \$7.8 million in ESEA title III funds and \$11.8 million in student assistance money. These are examples, mind you, not figures indicating the total impact. It is not possible to exactly assess the impact of the President's decision in all areas of assistance with such short notice but it is fair to say that it will be little less than devastating—not only in Philadelphia, not only in Pennsylvania, but in every town and city in America.

We hear much from the executive branch in terms of concern for the young and for education. Yet we see no action.

We are told that this veto is anti-inflationary. But is any thought given to the cost—both monetary and spiritual—with which a crippled national system of education will burden future generations of Americans?

Finally, it is indeed a strange demonstration of concern in this vital area that this shortsighted and callous administration should choose to make the schoolchildren and schoolteachers of the Nation the first casualties in its alleged war on inflation. A few less bombs and a few more books would be a demonstration to our people and to the world that this Nation is not only capable of solving its problem in education, as in other areas, but also that we are indeed doing so.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that the House firmly and clearly override this veto, demonstrating that even if the President is willing to do no more than provide lipservice in meeting the needs of education, that the Congress is resolved and willing to take meaningful action.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I am voting today to override the President's vetoes of the education and housing and independent agencies appropriations with the firm conviction that these appropriations, supported overwhelmingly by both parties in the House and Senate, are fiscally responsible, consistent with our national interests, noninflationary, and an integral part of efforts to reorder our national priorities.

I believe these appropriations are essential and are fundamental to the well-being of the people of this Nation. The American people must not be short-changed in the crucial areas of education, housing, water pollution control, veterans' hospital care, et cetera.

Certainly our economy is in trouble and nonessential Federal spending should be reduced. It is not a question of spending more but of spending more wisely. Only a grossly distorted view of our national needs could justify cutting less than a billion dollars in the areas listed above while we waste at least nine times that on special interest appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, we must accomplish effective cutbacks in nonessential Federal spending. For a start I propose the following spending reductions which will save nine times what will be saved if these vetoes are sustained:

<i>Proposed savings, in billions</i>	
Farm subsidies	\$3.5
Public Works "pork barrel"	3.5
ABM deployment (while continuing research)	1.0
SST	1.0
<b>Savings</b>	<b>9.0</b>

This is just a sample of how Federal spending can be significantly reduced while continuing all necessary programs. This does not take into account the billions that could be saved by cutting excess military spending or ending the war in Vietnam.

Now let us look at how the Congress wants to increase spending on certain vital domestic programs for the good of all Americans:

<i>Increased funding, in millions</i>	
Education	\$343
Handicapped training	10
Libraries	25
Vocational training	54
College student assistance	48
Improved medical care for Veterans	100
Assistance to localities for sewage treatment and control of water pollution	350
Housing	90

These increases coupled with certain cutbacks initiated by the Congress in unsuccessful programs meant a net total increase in the two vetoed appropriations bills of less than \$1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I say let us cut Federal spending. Yes let us cut the \$700 million we are planning to spend to control inflation in Vietnam while inflation runs

rampant here at home. We can cut spending. But not at the expense of our children and grandchildren's education, not at the expense of our wounded and sick veterans, not at the expense of the handicapped, not at the expense of localities that are trying desperately to reclaim polluted waterways, unplug stopped sewers and meet our environmental crisis with success.

What we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a perfect example of the question of what our national priorities should be. The vetoes give a higher priority to Federal giveaways than they do to our schoolchildren, our veterans, our handicapped, or cleaning up pollution. The vetoes pose "people" priorities against bailing out, to the tune of half a billion dollars, special interests such as the Penn-Central Railroad and Lockheed Aircraft.

I reject this logic; I reject the rationale that vetoes money for necessary programs while billions are wasted in military cost overruns, in boondoggles such as the ABM which will not enhance our security, and for the SST which could well destroy the environment in which we have to live.

What especially galls me about the vetoes, Mr. Speaker, is that despite contrived arguments, the extra money appropriated by the Congress will not contribute to inflation. In every case these expenditures are in areas where the dividend received is far better than the initial outlay. This money for schools, libraries, hospitals, pollution control is an investment not only in our future, it is a need that exists today and which once postponed will only mean added costs later on.

But make no mistake, we do need to fight inflation with deep and carefully chosen cuts in nonessential Federal spending. Also, the futile administration policy of trying to control inflation by monetary means with higher interest rates has not worked and, in fact, has added sharply to inflation by increasing the cost of borrowing.

High interest rates have created the following increases in debt service—increase that all must be carried by the taxpayer and which are the significant factor of inflation:

*Annual rate increases, in billions*

Borrowing agent:	
Federal Government.....	\$7
Municipal bonds.....	4
Corporations.....	21
Consumers.....	17

Thus, increasing interest rates have done nothing to cure inflation, but those increases alone now contribute an additional \$49 billion annually to inflationary pressures and increased prices. In the case of the Federal Government and municipal bond debt service increases the public pays the bill in higher taxes; in the case of corporate and consumer borrowing the expense is passed on in the form of higher prices for goods and services.

The American public demands and deserves an end to our deepening economic morass. A solution can be found in a responsible, courageous program incorporating the following elements:

Significant but prudently chosen cuts

in nonessential Federal spending.

A reduction in interest rates for all levels of government, home buyers, consumers, and corporations.

A broad reordering of national priorities in which limited resources are more judiciously allocated to vital domestic programs.

Tax reform that will erase inequities and produce more revenue.

Restoration of full employment, recognizing that rising unemployment as recommended by the administration is no way to fight inflation and actually increases the cost of Government by driving welfare costs upward.

Effective use of wage and price authority approved by the Congress and requiring action by the executive branch.

More than anything else we must dedicate ourselves to solving our economic problems for only a solvent government with funds for necessary programs can enable us to move forward on meeting our national responsibilities in the 1970's.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have received a large number of telegrams asking me to vote to override the vetoes. Only one, from the chamber of commerce, asked that the vetoes be sustained. Since the content of these telegrams dramatically summarizes the situation I would like to read a sampling of the wires opposed to the vetoes and the lone dissenting telegram which callously ignores the American people:

ALBANY, N.Y.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,  
Washington, D.C.:

I am deeply disappointed in the President's action on educational expenditures. Continued investment in the education of future citizens should have the highest national priority at the same time that educational reforms are being made.

I ask your support in being present tomorrow and in voting to override the President's veto of H.R. 16916.

EWALD B. NYQUIST,  
New York State  
Commissioner of Education.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Congressman LESTER L. WOLFF,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

It is imperative that you be present and join your colleagues to override the veto of the education aid bill by the President. It will be a disaster for the Nation and particularly for the children of New York City if the action of the President is not reversed.

MURRY BERGTRAUM,  
President, New York City  
Board of Education.

ALBANY, N.Y.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Federal financial support of the Nation's public schools is critically needed therefore the New York State School Boards Association urges you to vote to override the presidential veto of H.R. 16916.

JOHN E. GINTER, President.

NEW YORK, N.Y.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,  
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request your vote for education appropriations bill maximum Federal support vital to Fordham University.

MICHAEL P. WALSH, S.J.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the New York Library Association, I strongly urge you to attend the floor debate on August 13 concerning the appropriation act for the U.S. Office of Education and to argue and vote for its passage over the President's veto.

JOHN C. FRANTZ,  
Legislative Chairman,  
New York Library Association.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,  
Washington, D.C.:

The American Institute of Architects is deeply concerned and disappointed over the President's veto of the fiscal 1971 HUD appropriations bill. In 1949, the Congress enacted the national housing goal of a "decent home and a suitable living environment for every American." Practically each year thereafter this goal has been reaffirmed. Despite these good intentions sufficient funds have not been appropriated to fulfill this national commitment. The AIA believes that adequate funding of housing programs is one of the highest ranking national priorities. Accordingly, we strongly urge that you vote to override the President's veto.

REX WHITAKER ALLEN,  
AIA President.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,  
Washington, D.C.:

Full appropriations 235-236, sewer water essential to housing. Urge yes vote veto override Thursday.

LOUIS R. BARBA,  
President, National Association of Homebuilders.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF,  
Washington, D.C.:

Chamber of Commerce of United States urges you support President's veto of education and independent offices appropriation bill budget deficits in recent years especially 1968 major cause of painful inflation still not yet overcome continuing deficits are disservice to American citizens control of budget calls for highest degree of statesmanship if Congress fails sustain veto will reflect callous disregard for taxpayers who are getting fed up with high cost of government.

HILTON DAVIS,  
General Manager,  
Legislative Action Department.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, this is the second education appropriations bill that the President has vetoed, consecutively. Obviously, the administration's priorities are not aligned with those of Congress. For while opposing adequate support of domestic needs, the executive branch has been pressing for expensive military hardware and supersonic transport planes.

The problem is one of priorities, and not of big spending. Congress reduced the budget request by more than \$5.4 billion in the last fiscal year; moreover, over the past quarter century, it has consistently slashed funds from the President's budget request.

Although the Office of Education appropriations are \$435 million above the President's budget request, nonetheless, by the time all of the funds for fiscal 1971 are allocated and appropriated, the total budget request will have been subtracted from, not added to. This prerogative on the part of Congress to determine where the Federal revenue shall be spent,

although exasperating to the administration, is nonetheless beneficial to the Nation.

The Office of Education appropriations measure, including as it does worthwhile programs such as title I programs, school library resources, title III, dropout prevention, bilingual education, education for the handicapped, in addition to vocational and adult education, higher education, education professions development and community education, deserve the full support of the Congress. I hope that we will proffer it.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I recognize how difficult it must have been for the President to decide to veto the Office of Education appropriations.

And I have sympathy for his arguments.

But for many years, as my colleagues are aware, I have striven under both the Johnson and Nixon administrations to assure a higher slot on the priority scale for the critical requirements of education.

Unlike many other areas of Federal support, education revenues are contributed primarily by local taxpayers, local property owners whose tax burden has exceeded their ability to shoulder it.

In California, particularly in Los Angeles, school deficits have already resulted in severe cuts at every level from assistant superintendent on down.

The schoolday has been shortened.

Vital remedial programs are being reduced and in many cases eliminated.

Building maintenance is not being performed.

Trash collections have slowed.

School lawns are not mowed.

Football teams and marching bands have been cut out.

The so-called "frills" have long since been eliminated in many areas, Mr. Speaker.

Now we are witnessing cuts in the most basic education programs.

California faces, moreover, perhaps the largest numerical and percentage increase from "immigration" than does any other jurisdiction.

California taxpayers, who cannot raise the money for the education of their own children, are asked additionally to educate the children of families from other States who have not contributed to the tax base.

Now I do not suggest that we close our State borders.

But I do suggest that this should not be viewed as solely an intrastate responsibility.

As I have said before in this House and will repeat again: education spending cannot be viewed as strictly a program on a par with the many other needs included in the bills that come before us.

It must be viewed as a long-range investment not only in the children but in the Nation itself.

Our Nation is straining under the weight of welfare programs, nutrition programs, job programs, housing programs.

I support all of them, but I recognize their cost.

But I submit that every dollar invested

in education will be returned a hundred-fold in future welfare-related costs we will not have to make if these youngsters in school now can receive the education they need to become productive members of a society which will need their skills.

This is a most difficult decision, Mr. Speaker.

Inflation is robbing education of the limited dollars it already has.

But I must, nevertheless, register my strong conviction in the ultimate economy of education investment now.

I will, through my vote to override the President's veto, reaffirm my conviction that education must receive a higher national priority.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern over the Presidential veto of the \$4.4 billion Office of Education bill and the \$18.1 billion independent offices appropriation. The President's rejection of these two measures—following his earlier vetoes of the Labor-HEW appropriations and the hospital construction bill—is unfortunate. It is so because it raises a political issue at a time when there is so much contention in this Nation and when the President could by his own action take those steps necessary to meet those objectives voiced so strongly in his veto message. If there are funds that ought not to be spent, he does have the authority to withhold them. I do believe that we would all be served best if the President chose to face the issue by making these determinations as the Chief Executive as he has the power to do.

The independent offices appropriations bill would provide \$18,009,525,300 for some 22 departments and agencies, including the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The President's objection that this bill is \$541,301,800 in excess of his budgetary request, fails to perceive several critical domestic needs.

One of the substantial increases in the conference version of the bill is an appropriation of \$105 million for Veterans Administration medical care. At present, VA medical care is unsatisfactory. The Veterans Affairs Committee's recent study detailed the desperate need for increased funds, emphasizing that the VA hospitals were some \$180 million short of anticipated requirements for 1971. It should be noted that VA funding is now remaining constant at last year's inadequate levels under a continuing resolution.

Of particular significance are two specific appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development: \$350,000,000 for urban renewal, and an equal amount for grants for basic water and sewer facilities. Both of these amounts relate to programs involving long-term commitments, and each would provide additional job opportunities for the unemployed. We should be sensitive to the fact that we are facing a period of unemployment because of decreased defense spending. Funds provided here for the initiation of these programs can serve to soften the impact during this transitional period.

There are numerous other worthwhile

items contained in the independent offices bill, such as the \$10 million added by Congress for housing loans for elderly or handicapped families. This appropriation was not included in the President's budget, but its importance is obvious. This and many other needed programs would be lost or seriously curtailed if the veto is sustained. The total cost of all these housing and environmental items would cost \$541.3 million over the President's request, or roughly one-third of the projected cost of the Safeguard ABM system, whose operational effectiveness is still uncertain.

The President's veto of the education bill is equally distressing. As funded by Congress, this legislation would continue a national policy of full support for the promotion of educational opportunity. Directly or indirectly, the \$4.4 billion involved in this bill would benefit some 52 million students throughout the country, a figure representing a full one-fourth of the U.S. population.

A closer examination of the bill's provisions indicates a congressional willingness to take the lead in supporting all aspects of education. Included in the \$453.3 million difference between the administration request and the conference report were appropriations of \$10 million for education for the handicapped, \$110 million for higher education, and \$232 million for elementary and secondary education. An additional \$54 million for vocational and adult education recognizes that effective vocational programs are essential if we are to equip today's young people with the skill, training, and ambition to achieve meaningful participation in tomorrow's increasingly demanding job market.

Extremely significant in light of today's economic climate is the appropriation of \$243 million for national defense education loans, an increase of \$66 million over the administration's budget. There has been much concern recently over the inability of college-bound youths to secure sufficient funds for their education. The primary reasons for this condition, of course, stem from the rising tuition costs, difficulty of obtaining loans from commercial lending institutions, and the elimination of student jobs in the severely depressed job market.

Concerned with this problem, I recently requested that the House Special Education Subcommittee No. 1 take action to increase the maximum amount that can be borrowed by students during the first 2 years of their post-secondary education, from \$1,500 to \$2,000. I urged such action convinced that the present maximum was clearly insufficient in meeting college costs. Now, at this critical time, we should not limit the overall amount that can be made available for student loans.

Overall, the \$4.4 billion in this bill constitutes only a small fraction of the total amount of over \$70 billion annually spent on education at all governmental levels. Still, congressional leadership is critically important in this area, with its objective of seeking full and productive educational opportunities for all Americans. At the recent National Gov-

ernors' Conference in Missouri, the Governors reiterated the call for Federal leadership in this area, asking the Federal Government to assume greater responsibility for the financing of education. In my home state of Connecticut, this bill would distribute over \$30 million to the State's various educational institutions, including some \$3 million in direct student loans.

I doubt that the House will agree with the President that it would be fiscally unwise to override his vetoes. In fact, the reverse would be more accurate: for every \$1 spent on student aid, the Government receives in return approximately \$14 through higher taxes on higher incomes. Education is an excellent investment in human resources, one that will continue to pay dividends in future years. The Senate and House chambers obviously recognized this investment value in giving overwhelming approval to the Education appropriations. Such investments in educational and vocational programs, designed to promote eventual financial independence, can result in long-term savings of social services, unemployment compensation, and welfare payments. In the same manner, the \$105 million designed for VA medical care would act as a depressant on the spiralling medical costs now facing us all. Perhaps most importantly, the appropriations for \$350 million for urban renewal and \$350 million for water and sewer facilities would provide a source of additional employment opportunities for the jobless.

We are in a period of shifting priorities. The programs that are included in these appropriations bills affirm the congressional commitment to those domestic problems requiring immediate attention. The Administration is attempting to use Congress as a scapegoat, blaming it for its own fiscal miscalculations. As I have said earlier, the President does have the authority to manage these funds under his own terms, and he also has the responsibility to do so.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote and I earnestly hope a resounding majority of this House will also vote to override the President's veto of this education appropriations bill for 1971.

The legislative challenge presented to us today is, in my opinion, the establishment of priority spending when there is not enough money to take care of all requested budget items. It is my intense conviction that the immediate, urgent educational needs of the American people and of the cities and towns throughout this country are deserving of the highest priority in the allocation of Federal funds and that these essential needs must be met as completely as we can reasonably do so within our legislative responsibility.

Let us recall that the President himself stated, as a presidential candidate, back on October 1, 1968, this pledge and conviction to the American people, and I quote:

When we talk about cutting the expenses of government, either Federal, State or local, the one area we can't shortchange is education.

Let us also recall that practically ev-

ery responsible education authority in this Nation was and is in favor of this appropriations bill, as passed by the House and Senate and that the measure was approved in the House by a vote of 357 to 30 and in the Senate by 88 to 0.

Quite clearly these votes represent the overwhelming nonpartisan judgment of the Congress that ought not to be negated by presidential action. Nor should it be if the Chief Executive really meant what he said back in October of 1968. There can be no doubt as he then clearly indicated, that education is, indeed, "the one area we can't shortchange." I heartily agree with him in that conviction and I shall, therefore, vote to override the veto.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I voted to sustain the Presidential veto on previous measures, one of which was similar to the vetoed educational appropriations bill we have before us for consideration at this time. I supported the President on these previous occasions even though a substantial amount of funds for my district were involved in both bills. I said at the time, however, that we would never bring an end to inflation unless we were all willing to tighten our belts and to cut expenditures across the board. The only alternative to cutting expenditures is to raise taxes or suffer ruinous inflation, high interest rate, and economic chaos.

It is never easy to reduce expenditures, particularly when it involves our own congressional district. However, if every Member of Congress continues to take such an attitude without regard to the overall good of our country and what is in the long-range best interest of the people they represent, there is no question but what we will ultimately be confronted with a national disaster.

It is, therefore, with great reluctance that I, today, am going to vote to override the President on the educational appropriations bill for fiscal 1971. I will, however, vote to sustain the President on his veto of the appropriations bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and independent offices.

My reason for voting to override the veto of the educational appropriation bill is not because the President is demanding too great a reduction in expenditures in this area but because he has failed to demand a sufficient cut in expenditures in all areas. I feel it is unfair to single out the field of education, particularly when the school systems have had to set their own budgets in anticipation of certain commitments made by the Congress of the United States. To cut these funds at the last minute is bound to cause a much greater hardship to these various communities which could have been avoided if the commitments had not been made to start with. In addition, this administration seems to be determined to end the program for Federal aid to schools in impacted areas not only because they want to reduce expenditures but because they do not agree that this is a Federal responsibility and obligation. I vigorously disagree with the administration's opinion in this regard for the program for aid to schools in

impacted areas is merely a formula by which the Federal Government makes a payment to the communities in which it owns property in lieu of taxes. The formula, in fact, provides revenue for the communities in an amount which is far less than it would receive from taxes if the Federal Government were private industry operating in the same way. My reason, therefore, for voting to override the veto of this bill is due to the fact that one of the primary targets of the cutback in expenditures is in this aid to impacted area programs. The cutback would be approximately 44 percent of entitlement even though the Congress reduced the program this year to 65 percent of entitlement. In the current fiscal year we appropriated funds for 77 percent of entitlement even though we sustained the President's veto of the educational appropriations bill for that year. Mr. Speaker, I am, of course, referring to the "B" category pupils in these impacted areas which are the pupils whose parents either live or work on tax-free Federal property. If this program is not a fair and equitable program, Congress should repeal the act and let the communities know they will no longer receive the funds rather than a hit-and-miss approach by spasmodic cuts in the appropriations.

As I stated earlier, Mr. Speaker, I feel the President should go even further in cutting back expenditures rather than just a few selected projects. There are many extremely wasteful programs still on the statute books in which very little effort has been made in reducing expenditures. I make specific reference to the Office of Economic Opportunity and the so-called war on poverty program which has been one of the most miserable failures in the history of our country and has already cost the American taxpayers approximately \$10 billion in wasted funds.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, I support the President in his courageous efforts to cut expenditures but I insist that these cuts be made in broader areas and in the areas where we have been spending the taxpayers' funds to appease the misfits, militants, and the individuals who would like to destroy our system of government.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the President's veto of the education appropriation bill and to urge my colleagues to join with me in voting to override that veto. I will also vote to override the veto of the Housing and Urban Development appropriation measure for these two bills represent the heart of the Nation's domestic commitment to build a better society. If there are to be any priorities in Government spending, then those priorities should begin with education and housing.

The double veto is difficult to understand in view of the fact that while these bills may appropriate more than the President requested, there is no requirement that the President spend the total amount appropriated. His double veto then can only be explained by political motives and a continuing desire on the

part of the President to blame the Congress for the economic troubles which this administration has done so little to resolve.

In fact Congress has simply done its job by assigning high priorities to education and housing—higher than the President would have liked—and lower priorities to other programs requested by the administration. Together funds appropriated to date are only slightly higher than those requested and the massive military budget has not yet been pared.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I have worked on these appropriation bills and have seen the responsible and bipartisan approach to the budget questions now before this body. Programs of school aid, veterans hospital and medical care, senior citizen housing, urban renewal, model cities, and a number of other major domestic projects are included in these two bills. To veto these measures in the name of economy while urging Congress to approve spending for supersonic transports, ABM's, and new military hardware is to sacrifice basic human needs for political self-advantage.

The Congress has expressed its concern with domestic problems but we are lectured by the President. We are concerned about the conditions in our Nation's cities, about the lack of adequate housing of millions of Americans, and about the need for improved education. We are told that spending in these areas is inflationary. The only answer is to cut spending in other areas for the Congress has decided that education and housing shall be assigned high priorities. I urge my colleagues to vote to override these vetoes and to reaffirm the right of Congress to set national priorities.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the key issue before this body today is not whether we are for education and urban development or against it, but whether the American people can afford this type of big spending which would drive prices up and require higher taxes, or bigger deficits.

To care for the urgent needs of our cities, the President's original urban development request was double the amount in the previous administration. Congress violated this budget request by \$541 million. As the President stated, this kind of excessive spending creates the deficits that drive interest rates up and make it literally impossible for the housing industry to speed its recovery. This bill would work a hardship on those persons it was originally designed to aid.

The President's original budget request for the Office of Education was \$972 million above fiscal 1969. This produces 28 percent more than in the previous administration's last fiscal year. Congress appropriated \$453 million over this request. Total spending on federally supported education programs will be nearly \$12 billion in 1971, the highest figure in history.

To override the veto will require a vote for more taxes on the people. They do not want more taxes.

I join with President Nixon in saying "no" to a higher cost of living, higher

interest rates, and higher taxes. The increases proposed by the appropriations legislation before us are not in the best interests of all the American people.

I applaud the efforts of the President and will vote to support his veto.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge that my colleagues vote to override the President's veto of the \$4.4 billion education bill. The expenditures authorized in this measure not only are not inflationary as Mr. Nixon maintains, but moreover are urgently needed if we are to help provide the upcoming generation with the solid foundation in knowledge they will need to take over the leadership of this Nation in the years ahead.

The President has argued that Congress voted a big education bill because this happened to be an election year. Yet the President was quick to support the \$5 billion plus agriculture bill this body unfortunately passed last week which was one of the most inflationary, goody-packed measures ever to move through the Halls of Congress during any election year.

And the President further argued that to say "yes" to education would be to say "yes" to a higher cost of living, "yes" to high interest rates, "yes" to higher taxes.

Yet he continues to support the billion-dollar boondoggle called the SST which lines the pockets of the rich stockholders of private corporations with the dollars of poor taxpayers.

And while saying "no" to education, he continues to tolerate waste and inefficiency in the Government bureaucracy—which current estimates put at \$30 billion a year.

It appears that the "education" he received from all the special reports by Presidential commissions on improving the Federal executive branch operations has done little to influence his decision to put his own house in order.

Mr. Speaker, the President's argument that this measure will contribute to the highest Federal expenditure in the field of education in the history of this democracy on its face is true. But why is this high expenditure necessary? The inflation which Mr. Nixon so devoutly promised to end 2 years ago has made it necessary just to maintain most existing programs.

Such an argument would be the same as saying that because a wage earner is making more money today than he did in 1960, he does not need an increase in salary. Yet almost all wage earners need increases in salary this year just to keep up with inflation.

The past and present actions of the President in vetoing measures aimed at improving the health and well-being of this Nation can only demonstrate his lack of concern for the average, everyday American.

These hard-working taxpayers have their needs: a good education, good job and advancement opportunities, a good home for their families, a fair shake from their Government.

I hope my colleagues will join with me here today to support education for the sake of this great country's future. The \$4.4 billion appropriated here is a small

investment to make for keeping America strong and ever ready to defend freedom and justice throughout the world.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, inflation is one of the most urgent problems facing our Nation today. Perhaps one of the causes of inflation is the fact that the Federal Government spent more money than it received in taxes during the early years of the Vietnam buildup. I, personally, feel that the practice of "spending what you do not have" does contribute, though in a small way, to inflation. Thus, I strongly endorse fiscal responsibility by keeping expenditures in line with revenue.

Since entering Congress, I have supported funding reductions in areas which I feel should receive a lower priority, such as foreign aid and farm subsidies. On the other hand, I have supported increased expenditures in areas which I feel are crucial to insure our continuance as a strong, viable nation and measures which would improve the quality of life, such as pollution control, education, and housing. In the overall process of balancing the reductions and the increases in spending, I have been ever mindful of the necessity to reduce overall Federal expenditures.

This practice has been followed by the Congress. Last year Congress cut the President's budget requests by \$6.4 billion. While we increased expenditures for pollution control, education, food for the needy, and housing; we cut funds for foreign aid by over a billion dollars; we reduced military expenditures commensurate with our phased withdrawal from Vietnam; and we cut the budget for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce by \$100 million. To repeat, we reduced the President's budget requests for fiscal year 1970 by \$6.4 billion.

This year is no different—again, we will reduce the President's budget by millions of dollars. Thus far, the House of Representatives has passed all appropriations bills except for the \$70 billion defense appropriation. This year, we cut the President's request for foreign aid funds by \$655 million; we cut the Departments of State, Justice and Commerce budget requests by \$136.9 million; we cut funding for military construction by \$137.7 million. Overall, including the increase for education and housing, the House of Representatives has, thus far, reduced the President's budget by \$572 million.

Mr. Speaker, last year—fiscal 1970—the administration requested \$189.4 million for California schools. This was \$100 million less than California received in 1969. Who would pay for this extreme reduction? The answer is obvious—the local taxpaying property owner would absorb the difference.

Mr. Speaker, those of us from Los Angeles know the burden that is carried by the property owner—we know that he cannot pay higher taxes. We have worked to lighten his load. Thus, last year, we increased Federal expenditures for California schools from \$189 million to \$275 million.

This year, the administration again requested an inadequate sum for Cali-

fornia schools—\$194 million and, again, we fought for increased funding. With my support, the House raised this sum to \$282 million, and again, we find the education bill vetoed.

Mr. Speaker, today we are facing a financial crisis in education.

Nearly one in every four Americans is now attending elementary or secondary school. Last year, local educational agencies spent over \$34 billion. The cost of education rose by 13 percent, and total education costs are expected to double by the end of the decade.

Where is the money going to come from? Certainly not from property taxes. In California, local taxpayers already pay over 55 percent of the school budget—compared to the national average of 52 percent.

I believe that the Federal Government must assume a larger share of the school budget than the present 3 percent which it is paying in California—compared to the national average of 7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept a national priority which would rather send our money overseas in the form of foreign aid, than return the taxpayer's money to educate his children.

We must accept John Adams' challenge when he said:

The whole people must take upon themselves the education of the whole people and we must be willing to bear the expense of it.

Surely a Nation which pays an average of over \$1,400 a year in armaments for each South Vietnamese soldier can afford more than \$54 a year for each American schoolchild. Surely we can spend the funds necessary to put every child in a decent educational program.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I must vote to override the President's veto of the education appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, it is always unpleasant to vote against an appropriations bill which contains money for good and popular programs. Today is no exception. It is most unpleasant and distasteful.

I am not a disciple of doom nor a prophet of disaster. On the contrary, I am an optimist by nature but I think I can recognize certain danger signals when I see them.

The principal reason for high interest rates and a perilous economy seem to me to be the fact that we are not reconciling appropriations with revenues. As long as the Federal Treasury requires an increasingly larger share of the available money supply—interest rates will continue to rise and less and less money will be available for home construction and financing.

I shall vote to sustain both vetoes because in my judgment it is a tangible effort on my part to stabilize the economy. I am well aware that the \$1 billion that I am trying to save is not going to make the difference between a deficit and a surplus this year. I have no illusions about that. However, these two vetoes added to three or four possible future vetoes could total as much as \$6

billion, which is the estimated deficit for this year.

I approve of most of the proposals for which this \$1 billion would be spent. If we had the money I would vote to provide full funding for most of these programs and there would be no problem. I guess I am old fashioned enough to believe there is a difference between full funding out of a surplus and full funding with borrowed money.

I and my colleagues who shall vote to sustain may not be able to prevent an economic collapse, but if it does come, I want to be able to say with a clear conscience that I did my best to prevent it.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The President's surprise veto of the education appropriation and the independent offices and Housing and Urban Development appropriation for fiscal year 1971 appears to be little more than a calculated political stunt. By all the normal White House indicators it seemed clear that the President was going to sign these bills. Then, quite suddenly, the President vetoed them with a last-minute statement intended to make education appear inflationary.

This move, with obvious political motivation, was designed to lay the groundwork for an election year attack on Congress for what the President calls inflationary spending. But the President missed his mark. In one swift action, he simultaneously slammed the school doors in children's faces while kicking the crutches out from under our veterans.

I certainly share the President's concern over inflation and have been working to help bring it under control. However, I resent the administration's attempt to try to escape responsibility for its own inflationary policy by tagging the 91st Congress as the sole cause of inflation because we voted for a \$453 million increase for education and a \$541 million increase for housing, antipollution, water, and sewer grants and critically needed medical care for veterans.

I proudly stand on my own record of efforts to cut what I see as unwise and inflationary budget expenditures. However, I believe that an investment in our future through education is the least inflationary expenditure we can make, and in fact this is the better way to fight inflation by heading off increased costs for unemployment compensation and welfare which will continue to rise if we fail to educate and train people for gainful employment.

A recent chart from the Appropriations Committee sets forth the figures for action on appropriations bills as of August 11, 1970. I would strongly suggest that those who would try to "pass the buck" by labeling us as "Big Spenders" take a long, hard look at the figure on this chart which shows that the House has actually cut the President's budget requests by over \$2 billion—\$2,103,178,345.

The issue brought forth by the President's vetoes is not inflation per se—it is one of priorities. In his veto message the President said:

I urge the Congress to reconsider the spending course it has taken, and to place first priority on achieving our goal: a healthy economy, expanding through peacetime activities, with reasonable price stability.

Well, I have reconsidered. And I am even more firmly convinced that I and many of my colleagues have been doing just that—placing first priority on achieving the goal of a healthy economy, expanding through peacetime activities, with reasonable price stability.

I have voted for total cuts of \$7.7 billion from Federal spending this year. In light of that fact, my votes for \$453 million for education and \$541 million for such things as housing, badly needed water and sewer facilities, and better care for our disabled soldiers in veterans hospitals cannot be called inflationary.

What is inflationary are the items which the administration obviously has no intention of vetoing—items such as huge farm subsidies, the ABM system, the supersonic transport—SST—high interest rates for big banks, untested and unproven military hardware, foreign aid, tax loopholes for the rich, and the amounts sought by the administration to bail out the big bankers and financiers of the bankrupt Penn Central conglomerate. Yet, this administration seems eager to attack as inflationary our efforts to insure the future of our children, to provide decent care for our wounded soldiers and housing for many poor and elderly who would otherwise live in crowded, rat-infested places.

This veto of the education bill is cavalierly explained away by the President as "necessary to hold down the rising cost of living." The American people are far too intelligent to swallow that kind of argument. They know that the costs of running schools and constructing school buildings are rising at a fantastic rate.

Just to keep pace with what they had last year they have to spend far more money. School costs have been estimated to be rising as fast as 20 percent a year. If Federal money for school assistance is cut, this is not going to magically bring economic relief to the housewives and workers across this country.

They are going to be faced with the choice of either: First, closing down schools, putting more children on half days, and providing poorer quality education for their children or second, raising local property taxes once again to pay for the increased costs of keeping the communities' educational systems at the same level as last year.

President Nixon may think that the working people of this country are going to thank him for claiming to save them a little money by vetoing \$453 million for education nationwide; but I am quite sure they are too smart to fall for such a lawyer's trick. When they get their property tax bills this year and see how much the President's gesture takes from their own pocketbooks, they are going to know just how sincere the President really was in his pretended concern for "lower taxes."

For just one example, I would like to give a few figures for a community within the congressional district which I represent—Lincoln Park, Mich.

Voters in Lincoln Park, a city of nearly 60,000 persons, have turned down proposed millage increases four times in the

past 2 years. The most recent defeats came in March and June of this year, when voters rejected a proposed 10-mill increase—\$10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation.

Lincoln Park's last millage increase was approved 4 years ago. Rising costs during the past 4 years, and voter refusal to approve new increases, have forced local school officials to adopt an austerity budget which has reduced the educational program in Lincoln Park to a bare "three R's" approach.

The entire athletics program has been dropped, along with art, music, band, summer school, and driver training. Adult education has been eliminated, cafeterias have been closed, and physical education has been ended in the 10th and 11th grades.

The board of education has eliminated 130 teaching positions, and all elementary school students will go on half-day sessions when classes resume next month. Cutbacks will also be made in special education classes and in transportation for handicapped children.

Lincoln Park voters, I think, are typical of those throughout the Nation. They are telling us, loud and clear, that higher property taxation is not the answer to this Nation's growing educational crisis. The State of Michigan is financially unable to provide any additional help, and the only remaining source is the Federal Government. Lincoln Park's total school revenue from Federal funds has risen in the past 5 years from \$83,000 to \$253,000, representing about 3 percent of the district's total educational budget.

The children of Lincoln Park are already receiving less than a first-rate education, and the situation will obviously worsen in the coming year, as the austerity program continues. Only three of 10 graduates now attend college, and this ratio will obviously drop under the present circumstances. The only salvation for Lincoln Park is a massive infusion of Federal aid. Are we, instead, going to tell them that they must make further cutbacks in the name of fighting inflation?

Lincoln Park is only one example. The adverse effect which this would have will be widespread.

The administration has caused a bill to be introduced by the minority leader of the House and others which seeks \$1½ billion for school desegregation during this year and next year. In the President's veto message on the education appropriation, he commits himself to asking for an extra \$350 million for his school desegregation program.

If the President thinks that \$435 million just to keep our present educational system going is inflationary, then I am unable to understand how over \$1½ billion for his own school programs is not inflationary, too. I do not mean to say that it is wrong to spend money to fulfill the requirements of the law in achieving desegregation. What I do mean to say is that the President is not being consistent.

President Nixon criticized Congress for causing inflation, yet he has refused to use the anti-inflationary authority given to him by Congress. Last year, Congress passed H.R. 15091, providing tools for him

to fight inflation. Just last month, the House passed H.R. 17880, the Defense Production Act amendments, which included a provision giving the President the authority to order wage, price, and rent controls.

We should vote to override the President's two vetoes and reject his obviously political claim that these bills are inflationary.

Investing in education will provide an anti-inflationary effect in terms of future reductions in moneys spent on welfare, unemployment compensation, and other social services now necessary for those who lack the education and training to enter the job market. Increased assistance for veterans medical and hospital care will help alleviate our present medical shortage which creates ever-rising medical and hospital costs. Funds for housing and sewage and water facilities will provide more jobs for those who are now victims of high unemployment rates.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to override President Nixon's veto of the education appropriation, and to cast their votes also to override the veto of the independent offices appropriation.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have reluctantly decided to vote to override the President's vetoes of the Office of Education appropriation bill and the HUD-independent offices appropriation bill.

I say that my decision is a reluctant one, because I am in full agreement with President Nixon's priority on exercising control over Federal expenditures and keeping budget deficits as close to zero as possible. I believe the President is correct in saying again that unless we control the level of deficit spending, or eliminate it altogether, we can only prolong the day when the battle against higher prices and higher interest rates is won.

Unfortunately, the decisions we are asked to make on these veto messages is not limited to being for or against inflation or a balanced budget. We also must consider, as we did in passing these two appropriations measures, where we will place our priorities for Federal outlays in this and future fiscal years.

Some of our colleagues in Congress have taken the floor to lambast the President and accuse him of misplacing his budget priorities—of downgrading the need for programs which help our cities, our children, and our people. I do not think these accusations are fair or accurate. For some of these colleagues have voted to add funds to other spending bills which, I think, should be given far less priority. Having made no selections themselves, they have left the President no choice but to choose priorities for them.

I refer specifically to those who made it impossible to obtain rollcall votes on the amendments that were offered to make substantial cuts in the defense authorization and appropriations bills, and who voted for funds for the SST development and other postponable or unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, the President has a duty to manage the operations and expenses

of the Government. He must choose where he feels the line can be held.

This is also the duty of every responsible Member of Congress. I feel I have properly exercised my duty in this regard. Knowing full well that I preferred and would vote for modest increases over the administration budget requests for antipollution programs, veterans care, elementary and secondary education programs, higher education aid, housing and urban renewal, I studied carefully the amounts recommended in measures we considered for other programs.

I voted on several teller votes to eliminate weapons and military construction projects of low priority, some of which were passed without a request from the Department of Defense.

When no opportunity was afforded Members to record their votes on the proposed \$365 million expansion of the ABM system, I decided to record my feeling on that program by voting "no" on the Defense appropriation bill.

I also voted against allocating \$200 million in taxpayer funds to develop and produce the SST airplane, because I believe it presents serious environmental problems and I think it could be funded more efficiently through federally guaranteed bonds.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, when the time came to consider the proposal to increase construction grant funds for sewer and water facilities by \$350 million, I had already made my decisions on budget priorities and carried them out by subsequent votes. I come from a part of the country where pollution has reached staggering proportions, where smaller towns and communities desperately need to equip themselves with modern municipal water and sewer systems, and where both the State and localities are already doing more than their share to solve the problem. I did not feel we could let them down by appropriating only 30 percent of the authorized amount for this HUD program.

I faced the same situation with urban renewal, education, and veterans care programs. Just yesterday, the president of the Rochester, N.Y., Board of Education called me to say that the threat of a \$200,000 Federal grant expiring this year could mean a severe cutback in essential services to elementary school and high school students in our area.

Several urban renewal projects in my area are awaiting adequate Federal appropriations. While the Senate's addition of \$700 million for this program may be excessive, I do not believe the compromise figure arrived at is unreasonable.

Nor do I feel that the amounts included in the independent offices bill for veterans care are excessive. If anything, we have shortchanged the thousands of wounded men returning from Southeast Asia.

I am not able, in good conscience, to push these human needs aside in favor of a new airplane to overfly the oceans, or a costly antimissile system which may or may not be workable.

If I thought that it would help Congress as a whole to exercise greater responsibility in budget priority planning, I would vote to sustain the President's

reluctant vetoes of these bills. But, on the contrary, I believe that those of us in Congress who have made prudent and rational priority decisions with our votes, whether or not we always agree with the administration, should stand by our decisions and continue to vote for modest increases in higher priority domestic items, and against allocations for lesser priorities.

Only in this way will we establish any firm commitment to the people that we can exercise prudence in budgeting their tax dollars.

I do not fault the President for his choices. I know there is a possibility that he may have to hold back some of the funds in these and perhaps other programs.

Those of us who place genuine priorities on the antipollution, veterans, education, and renewal programs in dispute here must back up these judgments by voting consistently with our votes when these measures come before us earlier this year. In this way, perhaps the President can be influenced to make the necessary budget reductions in other, lower priority areas of the budget.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is incredible that we are again called upon to vote on education and housing funds of such vital importance to this Nation.

I cannot conceive of any way that the administration can justify to the American people its continuing opposition to urban renewal funds, low-rent housing aid, water and sewer grants, model cities, rent supplements, National Science Foundation programs, aid to educationally deprived children, education for the handicapped, aid to college students, college construction, vocational and adult education, and a range of other forward-looking programs through which we are attempting to reorder our priorities and improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss to understand why the domestic needs of the country are time and again made the scapegoat for inflation by a President who requests \$1.45 billion for an ABM system that will run into the tens of billions, more than \$1 billion for a MIRV, \$438.5 million for an F-111 whose ability to perform its mission is still in question, more than half a billion for the C-5A transport, \$290 million for a supersonic transport whose cost to the taxpayer may well go over \$3 billion 200 million to bail out an ineptly managed railroad, and a slush fund for Lockheed to cover its inefficient contract performance.

This is the same President who supported a giveaway of \$55,000 per farmer under the crop subsidy program, who refused to phase out the oil import program under the advice of his own committee that such a move would lower prices to the consumer, who refuses to fight inflation with the selective credit controls that the Congress has authorized, and who has announced that he will not use the wage-price-rent control authority that we are making available in the Defense Production Act amendments.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that inflation has become an excuse for regressive administration policies across the

board, and the President's own Cabinet members can no longer conceal their chagrin over this meat ax approach to domestic priorities. The unemployed of America are fighting inflation, but the Military Establishment is not. The low- and middle-income American is fighting inflation, but the highway builders are not. The blacks and the disadvantaged are battling inflation, but the wealthy farmer is not.

The clear and unequivocal support of high interest rates by this administration belies the pious sentiments of the veto messages coming up to Capitol Hill with increasing frequency. The refusal to employ economic controls which Congress and the people clearly want demonstrates something less than true concern about the state of the economy. There are many ways to cut the Federal budget without attacking priority programs, and it is obviously up to the Congress to accomplish what the administration is reluctant to do.

I call on my colleagues to show their commitment to the betterment of education and housing by overriding these ill-conceived vetoes. Our responsiveness to the people of America must be convincingly demonstrated here in this Chamber today.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I will vote to override the President's vetoes of the Office of Education appropriations bill and the Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies appropriations bill. The President seeks to place the blame for inflation on the Congress' expenditures for the human needs of this country. But, what in fact is the President taking exception to when he vetoed these bills?

The President takes exception to the \$453 million add-on appropriation which will be used to assist our education programs that are in great financial distress. I supported this increase when it came to the floor. It was right then and it is right now.

The President supports his veto of the Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies bill by claiming that the \$541.3 million contained in that bill over and above his request is inflationary. What is that amount for? The \$350 million is to help the cities and States upgrade their sewer facilities. The President talks a lot about dealing with our water pollution, but when it comes to funding his rhetoric we find him absent. Mr. Speaker, in the city of New York, because we do not have the funds to upgrade our sewage treatment plants, we are pouring into our rivers 300 million gallons of raw sewage every day. The rivers in the city of New York, Mr. Speaker, are dead rivers and our beaches are polluted. It was right to provide those moneys when I voted for that appropriation bill then and it is right now.

The people of this country ought to know that \$105 million of the funds added by the Congress to the HUD-independent agencies appropriations bill is to provide for the hospitalization and care of wounded servicemen. I went to the Veterans' Administration hospital in the Bronx and personally saw the outrageous conditions and lack of services

provided there. Those conditions arose because the prior administration and the Nixon administration have refused to request adequate moneys for these hospitals. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to the war in Vietnam, but I am just as firmly committed to providing the best medical care for our young men who have been sent to that war and who have returned home injured. I supported the increase in VA medical appropriation when it came to the floor. It was right then and it is right now.

Mr. Speaker, I contrast the President's attitude about human needs in this country which he has demonstrated by the vetoes in these two vital areas with his original request to this Congress that it bail out 70 banks involved in the Penn Central Railroad debacle. Fortunately, the Congress resisted his request and he withdrew it. More important, the President has endorsed unnecessary military expenditures far exceeding our security needs and their intrinsic worth. Last year, Mr. Speaker, this Congress, myself included, reduced the President's total budgetary requests by more than \$6 billion and we took it from the military side of his budget. If the President were interested in the people as opposed to a political ploy, he would not be vetoing an education budget, a Veterans' Administration hospital budget. No, he would be reducing his military budget.

Mr. Speaker, our gross national product is almost \$1 trillion. The President is concerned, as appears by his vetoes, about a relatively insignificant part of the economy, namely one-tenth of 1 percent of the gross national product when he should be directing his energies at changing our national priorities.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, after considerable study and evaluation of President Nixon's veto of the HUD and Office of Education appropriation bills, I have decided to vote in favor of sustaining both vetoes. Having previously voted in favor of these two appropriation bills, my decision has not been easy.

For that matter, I am sure that the President's decision to veto these two bills was not an easy one either.

But if we are to practice what so many of us seem to enjoy preaching, fiscal restraint and living within our income, some hard decisions are clearly called for. To put this matter in perspective, it must be remembered these two bills are the first major appropriation bills which the Congress has sent to the President this fiscal year. If he were to passively allow a billion-dollar increase over his budget with these two bills, it would obviously encourage Congress to increase the other appropriation bills which we will be sending him in the near future. We are already faced with a projected deficit for this fiscal year which is substantial.

In my opinion it would be irresponsible not to support the President in an action which after careful study he has decided is necessary to prevent inflation, higher interest rates and inevitably higher taxes.

Day after day on the floor of the House, I have heard Members of both sides of the aisle speak about the problems of in-

flation, higher interest rates, taxes and the slackening of business. These problems result from the enormous deficits accumulated during the sixties and also our shifting from a wartime toward a peacetime economy.

Having frequently spoken and voted against the deficits of the sixties and predicted their unfortunate results, I cannot in good conscience fail to support President Nixon in his efforts to act responsibly and exercise a measure of long overdue fiscal restraint.

If the President's vetoes are sustained new appropriation bills will be promptly drafted and promptly acted upon. Under the continuing resolution expenditures in the affected areas will continue. I want to make it clear and my record supports this statement that I am not against the programs funded by these appropriation bills. I do feel that some of these programs need to be reordered and reevaluated as they have clearly failed to meet expectations. I also feel that we are spending too much on some of the programs and too little on others. In all fairness, it is important to bear in mind that in the areas covered by these two bills, the President's requests were substantially in excess of the last budget requests of the previous administration.

In voting to sustain the President's vetoes, I am voting in the final analysis for the principles embodied in his veto messages. Some may choose to construe my votes wrongly and describe them as being against the specific programs funded by these two bills. I am confident that the people in my district will recognize my votes for what they really are, votes in support of the President of all of the people of America and this difficult decision on their behalf.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, for me it is an easy vote to override the President's veto of the Office of Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971.

I can make such a statement as to this veto without fear of being tagged as a big spender, because in my opinion, funds for education are not really an expenditure of our assets, but a sound investment in our country's future.

Today we are at a critical moment as far as schools are concerned because within the next 2 or 3 weeks, 52 million children will return to school across the land. It is not just a convenience, it is an absolute essential and a necessity that Federal funds provided in the 1971 Office of Education bill be available, at or near the time for the opening of school, notwithstanding the President's veto. Otherwise, the educational opportunity of million among our total of 52 million children, especially the disadvantaged and the handicapped, as well as those living in impacted districts, will be jeopardized. For those who say it is only a matter of a short delay fail to recognize that by the time another appropriations bill can be enacted, several months of the school year will have passed. In the meantime, those school districts that have counted on Federal funding will find they have to borrow funds from other sources. Such financing is not only wasteful, it is inflationary.

Moreover, if this veto is not overridden and there happens to be a reduction in

Federal funds for education, there will undoubtedly be an increase in local property taxes in those communities which find they are able to provide more local taxes. In those districts where the legal limits of expenditures have already been reached schools may have to close or go on part-time schedule if they had depended upon Federal funds to make up the difference between their total annual budgets over their maximum legal capacity to raise local revenues.

Further delay will hurt thousands of school districts and colleges. Not only the schools will be hurt, but the students will be hurt. A good illustration of the adverse consequences of delay is found in the instance of the HEW fiscal 1970 appropriations which was not finally enacted until March of this year. Such delay, protracted and compounded, was the reason the Office of Education bill was considered separately and as early as possible this year.

There are many important line items in this appropriations bill.

First there are the funds for aid to impacted areas. Many school districts in my congressional district could not open their doors except for this assistance because of the presence of children from two sizable airbases and one large Army ammunition plant. This year, in my opinion, we have made progress to improve the formula on impacted aid. There was an increase of \$126 million, but it was sorely needed.

In the area of elementary and secondary education, again there was an increase, but none of this money is spent by the Federal Government. It all goes to the States.

Then there are the funds for the handicapped or for the special programs under the Education of the Handicapped Act. Who can be against such a program? Even if someone was inclined for strange or unknown reasons to oppose such a program, then they should recognize that in a practical matter this program saves on future welfare costs.

Finally there is the item of vocational and adult education. Can anyone really be against the great number of new and wonderful community colleges that have sprung up across this country?

At the time the House passed this Office of Education bill, very few thought there was anything wrong with it. At that time there was no political aisle as there may be today. The House passed H.R. 16916 by a 357-to-30 vote.

Contained also in this veto is the line item of aid to colleges, or higher education. In this item there are loans to students including grants for college work-study programs.

There is money in this bill for the Library Services and Construction Act, as well as funds for the education professions development.

Returning to the higher education facilities loan fund, most of the money is for grants for construction of public community colleges and technical institutes under title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

Considering the present plight of our local school districts, it is my recollection that the Governors of those 40 States present this week that came to Lake of the Ozarks in my home State of

Missouri, adopted a resolution which unanimously set forth their conviction that a greater proportion for funding for education in the United States should be borne by the Federal Government. The President has said many times that he wants to help the States. He has said again and again that he is in favor of Federal revenue sharing with the States. How can it be then, that we in the Congress can fail to perform our obligation to shift some of this burden from the States to the Federal Government? The Federal Government is only paying about 8 percent of education's total cost today and the local school districts are paying the untold millions of dollars of the remainder. If this veto is sustained the result will be not a shifting of the burden from the States to the Federal Government but a step backward or a regression from the 8 percent of the total cost of education now paid for by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, because of all the worthwhile items enumerated in the foregoing paragraphs, I have no apology to vote to override the veto because I submit that education ranks very near the top among our national priorities.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I will cast my votes today to override the President's vetoes of the education and independent offices appropriations bills.

It is incredible that the President of the United States should have taken his veto action on these two critical pieces of legislation. Education is the first line of American defense. If we are to survive in this world and continue our leadership it will be because we have developed the talents of our young people to their highest capacity. There is no more important tool in the arsenal of democracy than an educated populace prepared to meet any challenge of our times.

Day after day I have become more disheartened and chagrined at the effects of cutbacks in educational expenditures by the Federal Government to great institutions in our community such as Case Western Reserve University, John Carroll University, Cleveland State University, Baldwin-Wallace College, Kent State University, Ursuline College, Notre Dame College, and Cuyahoga Community College.

These cutbacks have resulted in higher tuition charges and drastic reductions in allocations for educational assistance. The collapse of the fellowship program has created an adverse impact on the quality and the spirit of professional teaching staffs. Private educational institutions are threatened with financial collapse. Highly qualified students must defer plans for education because student loans are not available.

The Federal cutbacks in research have had a crippling effect in vital lifegiving programs. At Ohio State a breakthrough on cancer diagnosis by a Columbus, Ohio, team is suspended in middevelopment because of the cutback in Federal allocations for research. Whose life will be short-spanned because of this kind of economy?

The medical schools of America are most critically affected. In Washington, D.C., the medical and dental school of Georgetown University and the medical school of George Washington University

are currently seeking help from the government of the District of Columbia in order to continue the medical education of young doctors upon whom all of us must depend. The same crisis confronts the medical and dental schools of Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland.

The independent offices bill is of tremendous importance because of the extra funds that are provided for the care of our disabled veterans. If our Government has the authority to commit thousands of our young men in the military services to the crippling effects of distant conflicts, we certainly have an obligation to provide for their recovery and their rehabilitation. The independent offices appropriations bill would provide \$105 million additional for the care of disabled veterans. In addition, it would provide an increase of \$350 million for the rehabilitation of our cities which are also sick.

If these expenditures for human needs are inflationary, how can the President assume that it is not inflationary for him to recommend the establishment of a permanent tax bonanza for export-oriented corporations which will cost the Treasury \$640 million a year in lost revenues? How can the President say that it is more important and not inflationary when he requests extra billions for the construction of the supersonic transport, the billion dollar merchant marine subsidy, and the \$3 1/2 billion farm subsidy? Certainly these are the inflationary and deferrable requests.

Just 2 hours before the President vetoed these bills, the National Governors Conference meeting in Missouri passed a resolution asking the Federal Government to take on a larger share of the burden of financing education. We in Ohio have a greater awareness of this problem since we have more schools closed because of lack of funds than any other State in the Union. Since Ohio has an extraordinary number of private colleges, the threat of educational chaos becomes even more real.

The education, health, and housing increases provided by these two bills are considerably less than what we are spending in Vietnam in a single month. From newspaper reports, it appears that the administration has just reached a new secret agreement with Franco's dictatorship in Spain which will cost the American taxpayer \$400 million in the next several years. The administration is willing to spend hundreds of millions to support a dictator, but not the same amount for educational assistance. The front page of many of today's papers showed West German Chancellor Brandt and Soviet Premier Kosygin signing a nonaggression treaty in Moscow. Yet we continue to maintain 330,000 military and support personnel in Europe at a cost of more than \$3 billion. The signing of the German-Soviet Treaty should indicate that our force level in Europe can be reduced. If Nixon is worried about inflation, he should begin reconsidering our troop levels in Europe and our support of dictatorships around the world.

I happen to think that education and health of our people are our first line of defense. I also believe that the res-

toration of urban life cannot be put off another year. I therefore cast my vote to override.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. Mr. FLOOD, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were yeas 289, nays 114, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 278]

YEAS—289

- Abbitt
- Adair
- Adams
- Addabbo
- Albert
- Alexander
- Anderson
- Anderson, Calif.
- Anderson, Tenn.
- Andrews
- N. Dak.
- Annunzio
- Ashley
- Aspinall
- Ayres
- Baring
- Barrett
- Bell, Calif.
- Biaggi
- Blester
- Bingham
- Blanton
- Blatnik
- Boggs
- Boland
- Bolling
- Brademas
- Brascoe
- Brooks
- Broomfield
- Brown
- Brown, Calif.
- Brown, Ohio
- Broyhill, Va.
- Burke, Mass.
- Burlison, Tex.
- Burleson, Mo.
- Burton, Calif.
- Burton, Utah
- Bush
- Buttton
- Byrne, Pa.
- Cabell
- Carey
- Casey
- Celler
- Chappell
- Chisholm
- Clark
- Cohelan
- Conte
- Conyers
- Corbett
- Corman
- Cowger
- Culver
- Daddario
- Daniel, Va.
- Davis, Ga.
- de la Garza
- Delaney
- Dellenback
- Dent
- Diggs
- Dingell
- Donohue
- Dorn
- Dowdy
- Downing
- Dulski
- Duncan
- Dwyer
- Eckhardt
- Edmondson
- Edwards, Calif.
- Elliott
- Esch
- Evans, Colo.
- Evins, Tenn.
- Farbstein
- Fascell
- Feighan
- Fisher
- Flood
- Flowers
- Foley
- Ford
- William D. Ford
- Foreman
- Fountain
- Fraser
- Friedel
- Fulton, Pa.
- Fulton, Tenn.
- Fuqua
- Gallifanakis
- Gallagher
- Garmatz
- Gaydos
- Gettys
- Giaino
- Gibbons
- Gilbert
- Gonzalez
- Green, Oreg.
- Green, Pa.
- Griffin
- Griffiths
- Gubser
- Gude
- Hagan
- Halpern
- Hamilton
- Hanley
- Hanna
- Hansen, Idaho
- Harrington
- Hathaway
- Hawkins
- Hays
- Hechler, W. Va.
- Heckler, Mass.
- Helstoski
- Henderson
- Hicks
- Hogan
- Holifield
- Horton
- Howard
- Hungate
- Ichord
- Jacobs
- Johnson, Calif.
- Jones, Ala.
- Jones, N.C.
- Jones, Tenn.
- Karth
- Kastenmeier
- Kazen
- Kee
- Keith
- Kleppe
- Kluczynski
- Koeh
- Kyl
- Kyros
- Latta
- Leggett
- Lehnon
- Long, Md.
- Lowenstein
- McCarthy
- McClory
- McCloskey
- McDade
- McDonald
- Mich.
- McEwen
- McFall
- McKneally
- McMillan
- Macdonald, Mass.
- MacGregor
- Madden
- Mahon
- Mann
- Marsh
- Mathias
- Matsunaga
- Meeds
- Meicher
- Meskill
- Mikva
- Miller, Calif.
- Miller, Ohio
- Minish
- Mink
- Minshall
- Mize
- Molohan
- Monagan
- Moorhead
- Morgan
- Morse
- Moshier
- Moss
- Murphy, Ill.
- Murphy, N.Y.
- Natcher
- Nezid
- Nichols
- Nix
- Obey
- O'Hara
- O'Konski
- Olsen
- O'Neill, Mass.
- Ottenger
- Patman
- Patten
- Pepper
- Perkins
- Pettis
- Philbin
- Pickle
- Pike
- Pirnie
- Poage
- Podell
- Powell
- Preyer, N.C.
- Price, Ill.
- Pucinski
- Purecell
- Quie
- Quillen
- Railsback
- Randall
- Rees
- Reid, N.Y.
- Reuss
- Riegle
- Rivers
- Roberts
- Robison
- Rodino
- Roe
- Rogers, Colo.
- Rogers, Fla.
- Rooney, Pa.
- Rosenthal
- Rostenkowski
- Roth
- Roybal
- Ruppe
- St. Germain
- Sandman
- Satterfield
- Scheuer
- Schwengel

- Shipley
- Shriver
- Sikes
- Skubitz
- Slack
- Smith, Iowa
- Snyder
- Stafford
- Staggers
- Stanton
- Steed
- Steiger, Wis.
- Stevens
- Stokes
- Stratton
- Stubblefield
- Stuckey
- Sullivan
- Symington
- Taft
- Talbot
- Taylor
- Teague, Calif.
- Teague, Tex.
- Thompson, N.J.
- Tiernan
- Tunney
- Udall
- Van Deerlin
- Vanik
- Vigorito
- Waldie
- Watson
- Watts
- Weicker
- Whalen
- White
- Whitehurst
- Whitten
- Widnall
- Wilson
- Charles H. Wilson
- Wirth
- Wolf
- Wright
- Wyder
- Wyman
- Yates
- Yatron
- Young
- Zablocki
- Zwachs

NAYS—114

- Abernethy
- Anderson, Ill.
- Andrews, Ala.
- Arends
- Ashbrook
- Beall, Md.
- Belcher
- Bennett
- Berry
- Betts
- Blackburn
- Bow
- Brinkley
- Brock
- Brown, Mich.
- Broyhill, N.C.
- Buchanan
- Burke, Fla.
- Byrnes, Wis.
- Camp
- Carter
- Cederberg
- Chamberlain
- Clancy
- Clausen
- Don H.
- Clawson, Del.
- Cleveland
- Collier
- Collins
- Colmer
- Conable
- Coughlin
- Crane
- Davis, Wis.
- Denney
- Dennis
- Derwinski
- Devine
- Dickinson
- Edwards, Ala.
- Erlenborn
- Eshleman
- Findley
- Fish
- Flynt
- Ford, Gerald R.
- Frelinghuysen
- Frey
- Goldwater
- Goodling
- Gross
- Grover
- Haley
- Hall
- Hammer
- schmidt
- Harsha
- Harvey
- Hastings
- Hosmer
- Hunt
- Hutchinson
- Jarman
- Johnson, Pa.
- Jonas
- Kuykendall
- Landgrebe
- Landrum
- Langen
- Lloyd
- Lujan
- Lukens
- McClure
- Martin
- May
- Mayne
- Michel
- Mills
- Mizell
- Montgomery
- Morton
- Myers
- Nelsen
- Pelly
- Poff
- Price, Tex.
- Reid, Ill.
- Rhodes
- Roussell
- Ruth
- Saylor
- Schadeberg
- Scherle
- Schmitz
- Schneebell
- Scott
- Sebelius
- Smith, Calif.
- Smith, N.Y.
- Springer
- Steiger, Ariz.
- Thompson, Ga.
- Thomson, Wis.
- Ullman
- vander Jagt
- Waggonner
- Wampler
- Whalley
- Wiggins
- Williams
- Wilson, Bob
- Wold
- Wyatt
- Wylie
- Zion

NOT VOTING—26

- Bevill
- Bray
- Caffery
- Clay
- Cramer
- Cunningham
- Daniels, N.J.
- Dawson
- Edwards, La.
- Fallon
- Hansen, Wash.
- Hébert
- Hull
- King
- Long, La.
- McCulloch
- Mailliard
- O'Neal, Ga.
- Passman
- Pollock
- Pryor, Ark.
- Rarick
- Reifel
- Rooney, N.Y.
- Roudebush
- Ryan

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs: On this vote

- Mr. Rooney of New York and Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Cunningham against.
- Mr. Pollock and Mr. Daniels of New Jersey for, with Mr. Cramer against.
- Mr. Fallon and Mr. Bevill for, with Mr. Reifel against.

Until further notice:

- Mr. Passman with Mr. Bray.
- Mr. Rarick with Mr. King.
- Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. McCulloch.
- Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Roudebush.
- Mr. Caffery with Mr. Mailliard.
- Mr. Hull with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.
- Mr. Ryan with Mr. Clay.
- Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Dawson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

**INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES**

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) for 1 hour.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter on the veto message of the President on H.R. 17548.

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

There was no objection.

**GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND**

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on the veto message.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for 1971—which the President has vetoed—is an important bill—a reasoned bill.

This bill provides essential funding for many vital domestic programs—including medical care for our veterans, housing, and urban renewal for our cities, water and sewage grants for rural communities, and funds for some 22 independent agencies of the Government.

This bill is the product of the give-and-take of the legislative process.

It represents a bipartisan effort to respond to many of the crucial problems of our times.

I regret that a political veto, in an election year, has returned this bill to the Congress.

Let me summarize briefly the highlights of this bill:

The President's amended budget, submitted to the Congress, requested \$17,468,223,500.

The final conference action approved \$18,009,525,300—an increase of \$541,301,800.

This increase represents new obligatory authority which the President can release or withhold at his discretion.

There is no "mandatory direction" in the bill that the funds appropriated have to be spent. The President can withhold from spending any of the funds which he considers inflationary.

Therefore, the veto is entirely unnecessary.

As provided by the conference agreement, the bill provides additional funds over the budget for three critical programs—namely: medical care for our veterans, urban renewal, and water and sewage grants for cities and rural communities.

We provided \$105 million for veterans' medical care—for our returning Vietnam veterans and other veterans—some 115,000 veterans are now in veterans' hospitals.

Testimony is conclusive that these funds are desperately needed.

The second item to which objection is made is \$350 million for urban renewal. The Senate added \$700 million for urban renewal and in conference we reduced this amount to \$350 million. The mayors of our cities insist that these funds are desperately needed to combat blight and decay and to restore our cities.

The other item to which objection is made is \$350 million for water and sewer grants—which both the House and Senate approved in separate votes.

Water and sewer grant assistance is greatly needed in our small towns and rural areas, for basic water supply and to combat pollution.

The applications pending and demands are far greater than can be supplied.

The President, in his veto message, says he objects to "outlays and expenditures" which he says these items will provide.

The fact is that the total outlays in the bill, as approved by the Congress, is some \$24 million below the amount proposed in the President's budget for 1971.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the outlays—or expenditures provided by the education bill the House has just voted to enact over the President's veto are \$239,000,000 over the budget. The outlays for this bill—independent offices and housing—are actually estimated to be \$24,000,000 under the total in the budget of the President for 1971.

The reason for this is that many contracts will run over several years—particularly Federal building construction contracts. All the amounts made available for obligation will not be expended during the next fiscal year.

As we know, there is marked distinction between "appropriations" and "outlays or expenditures." Much of the new obligatory authority will not be used or expended for several years.

In other words, although we appropriated more on a long-range projection—we will be expending less, under this bill in fiscal 1971 than the President proposed in his budget.

The President's budget calls for outlays or expenditures—of \$17,542,214,000 for fiscal year 1971.

The bill, which the Congress approved, provides for outlays or expenditures for next year of \$17,515,214,000, or \$24 million less in projected expenditures for 1971 than provided in the President's budget.

Some have asserted that this bill is inflationary—that it contributes to inflation. This bill is to combat inflation—it provides for vital domestic needs in many ways.

While we are all concerned about inflation, we are more concerned about the recession that is occurring in some areas in our Nation.

As a matter of fact, the President, in one specific instance, requested that funds be approved for a large public building construction project in Seattle, Wash., to stimulate the economy in that depressed area.

This, because of the current high level of unemployment in that area.

We provided the funds for this project as requested.

So this bill gives the President flexibility to combat unemployment in many areas hard hit by recession, if he chooses to use it.

With the use of urban renewal and water and sewer grants, the President can stimulate local economies where needed.

However, the President can withhold funds if he so desires.

I want to point out further that this bill provides a number of cuts and reductions where the Congress thought reductions should be made.

We set some priorities.

For example, the Congress cut \$165 million from the President's request for interest subsidy payments to Federal home loan banks.

The President asked for \$250 million for this purpose—we allowed only \$85 million—making a cut in bank interest subsidies of \$165,000,000.

In this bill we cut and reduced the space program by \$65 million below the budget.

We cut and reduced various HUD programs by \$59,940,000.

Congress cut the independent agencies by \$16,329,000.

Overall, the Congress cut items in the President's budget by more than \$305 million—\$305,594,000.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the Congress in setting priorities cut more than \$305 million from the President's total budget requests for this bill, while at the same time increasing funding for critical needs of high priority.

These include: veterans' medical care, urban renewal, and water and sewer grants.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the need for these funds has been demonstrated.

Regretfully, the new Office of Management and Budget did not give the President all the facts—some advised a political veto in an election year.

Certainly politics motivated the veto action on this bill.

The funds provided in this bill are indeed modest, as compared to the need.

If the President is concerned about inflation—as he insists he is—he can withhold expenditure of any funds which he considers inflationary—or unnecessary.

As I have indicated—the actual outlays or expenditures provided in this bill are estimated to be less than the expenditures proposed in the President's budget for fiscal year 1971.

The amount of "outlays," which the Congress approved, for 1971 is \$24 million less than that proposed in the President's budget.

This is not an inflationary bill—this is a sound, reasoned bill which responds to many crucial needs of our time.

A vote to override will mean that you are voting for quality medical care for our veterans.

A vote against this bill is a vote against quality medical care for your veterans in your district.

A vote to override will mean that you support needed urban renewal for our cities.

A vote against this bill is a vote against the urgent demands for urban renewal, and many other programs, for our cities and towns.

A vote to override will mean that you approve of needed water and sewer facilities for your communities.

A vote against this bill is a vote against these needed water and sewer facilities for your communities.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, has been through the crucible of the legislative process.

This is a good bill.

The President's veto is ill-advised, and should be overridden.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Members override the veto.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority member of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS), 10 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, has just said that a vote to sustain this veto is a vote against quality medical care for veterans. I really do not see how he can say that because without the \$105 million add-on above the budget, there would have been provided under the budget for medical care for veterans the sum of \$1,752,000,000—and that is \$96,000,000 more than the 1970 appropriation. So the budget itself calls for a very substantial sum for the VA medical program and it was \$96,000,000 more than was provided last year.

A vote to sustain this veto is a vote to return to the rule of reason and for fiscal responsibility. It is a vote to protect the value of our dollars and to curb inflation. It is a vote to try to hold the line. It is not a vote to reduce programs. It is not a vote to cut back anything. It is a vote just to reduce the amount of the increases that Congress voted to impose upon the substantial increases that were already provided in the budget over the funding level voted by the Congress last year.

Let me just give you a few figures to prove that what I am saying is so. This bill now under consideration appropriates \$18,009,525,300. Comparable figures in the bill last year provided \$16,902,737,800—an increase in this one bill, in 1 year, of \$1,106,000,000.

Now there are some of us who think we cannot afford to increase these programs by that substantial amount in 1 year. I deny that this means that we are opposed to water and sewer grants or to the medical care programs for veterans or to the other programs under discussion. We are merely saying that an increase of more than \$1 billion in 1 year is more than we can afford—

if we mean to attack the inflation that is running the cost of living up and increasing the prices of groceries in the corner grocery store. Do not forget those figures—the bill that is now under consideration—the vetoed bill—is more than a billion dollars above the amount provided for the same programs last year.

Now how did this bill get \$1 billion above last year's level? It was done because this body did not support your own Appropriations Committee. We brought a bill in here from the Committee on Appropriations to operate these programs, which bill was substantially higher than last year's figures—but not \$1 billion higher.

Let me read you some figures. The House Committee on Appropriations considered a budget calling for \$17,216,823,500 for these programs. The committee recommended \$17,015,212,300. So if you had sustained your own Appropriations Committee, we would have cut the budget by \$201 million in this bill.

But the House repudiated—and maybe that is a hard word—but it failed to follow the recommendations of its own committee and so, instead of going over to the other body with a bill that was \$201 million below the budget, when that bill left this floor it was \$173 million above the budget.

The other body then considered some supplemental budget requests amounting to \$17,468,000,000, and increased those requests by \$1,186,000,000. That is where the increases above the budget came about—on this floor and on the floor of the other body. As I have already said, the conference action was \$18,009,525,300. That is \$541 million above the budget. It is \$619 million above the House-passed bill. It is \$994 million above the House committee.

I ask my colleagues in all seriousness, and without regard to politics and without regard to any capital that is going to be made out of this on one side or the other just in all fairness and as reasonable men and women, how can we justify, in this period of financial distress the country is in, with the prospect next year of another mammoth budget deficit coming on top of the substantial deficits piled up during the decade of the 1960's—increasing the budget by \$1 billion in just one bill?

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

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. That worries me, too, because the deficit is really much greater than the \$2.9 billion the President has announced.

Mr. JONAS. I do not agree with you on that. The President has stated the facts. But there are really two budgets; the Federal funds budget and the unified budget.

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

Mr. JONAS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. The Ways and Means Committee has just voted out today a tax relief measure. We will call it that. That is a rather civilized term to give it. One of the provisions in that bill recom-

mended by the President calls for a tax relief that is variously estimated to be between \$300 million and \$1 billion. That is highly inconsistent with the gentleman's position or with the President's position, if we are in such dire financial circumstances.

Mr. JONAS. Let me say to my friend from Florida, let us cross that bridge when we get that bill on the floor. We have a bill before us today on which we can strike a blow to bring the cost of groceries and interest charges down and increase the purchasing power of the dollar. That is the only bill that is before us. Let us not confuse the issue by talking about some other bill out of some other committee that is coming in September.

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

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GIBBONS. The gentleman is familiar with this trade bill, that has just been voted up, because I think the gentleman is a cointroducer of a similar textile bill. In this so-called trade bill there is a provision that helps oil companies maintain a price structure that costs the consumer \$5 to \$7 billion a year every year, a situation that the President's own Cabinet has said ought to be changed. How is that consistent?

Mr. JONAS. That was not in the bill I introduced, I will say to the gentleman. However, I am glad to answer the question. I am not making this argument on behalf of the President of the United States. I am making it on behalf of the taxpayers and the homemakers and housewives and the borrowers. Will not somebody please have mercy on them once in awhile? I am saying to you that here, in one bill, you are loading onto the taxpayers \$1 billion more than was spent on these same programs last year. I say that is moving too fast. We should show a little restraint and stop this deficit financing.

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

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

Mr. YATES. Is it not true that adding money to the programs in these bills would not increase the inflationary thrust if corresponding decreases are made in other programs?

Mr. JONAS. This is one of the first two bills that have gone to the President. We had better not wait on subsequent bills to do the work we ought to do on these bills. I think we ought to send this bill back to the committee because I think the committee, your own committee, can do a better job the next time than we did the first time.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are considering the second of two Presidential vetoes of two very important appropriations bills. The bill which we have just considered and this bill, taken together, probably touch the lives of more Americans than any other appropriations bills. We have overridden the veto of the education bill; in my judgment the inde-

pendent offices and housing appropriations veto must also be overridden.

The issue is not inflation, as the President would have the American people believe. The issue is not an overspending Congress. The issue is not how much is spent, but how it is spent. Congress is not spending "more." Congress is spending "more wisely."

On the independent offices and housing appropriation bill, the President stated, and I quote:

I am vetoing this bill because it would help drive up the cost of living, harming the people it was designed to help. This kind of excessive spending would also help cause the kind of huge deficits that drive up interest rates, which would make it impossible to speed the recovery of the housing industry.

The only correct statement in that paragraph is the implied notation that the housing industry needs to recover.

The housing industry is in a depression—not just a Nixon recession—but a serious depression.

As for the cost of living—it has increased sharply in recent months. For instance, the price index on the main dish foods—meat, poultry and fish—is up some 15.8 points since President Nixon assumed office—that is five times as fast as the last 18 months under President Johnson. However they may try, the administration spokesmen cannot change the facts. So they do the next best thing. They attempt to confuse the issue and distract concern from the real problems. If the President does, indeed, feel these measures are inflationary, then he can withhold spending funds. Other Presidents have done so. Indeed, President Nixon withheld some \$60 million in funds for improving and building VA medical facilities from last year's appropriations, if I remember correctly.

The inflation issue so far as these bills are concerned is obviously phony.

The real truth is that Congress in fiscal 1970, which ended just a few weeks ago, cut—yes, reduced President Nixon's total budget appropriations request by \$6.4 billion. To be more exact, the figure is \$6,370,945,390. This is never mentioned by the President, for the facts would interfere with his sales pitch.

As for fiscal 1971, I am quite sure that when the appropriating is all done this fall, we will see no great increase in total appropriations by Congress. The President knows this. He also knows that his party is in real trouble because of recession, unemployment and inflation.

I repeat that what is really happening is that Congress is not spending any more than the President wants; it is spending it more wisely, with emphasis on human needs. We want to provide more for education, for wounded and ill veterans, for housing for water and sewer grants so desperately needed by the cities and the rural communities all across the Nation. Just prior to the veto one of the ranking men in the Department of Housing, commenting on the possibility of such a veto, said he only wished the President knew how many good, sound requests are pending and how badly needed are the funds for water and sewage grants. The increase in the

independent agencies and HUD bill was only \$350 million for the grants, for a total of \$500 million. That \$500 million is only one-fifth, or 20 percent, of the requested funds from the cities and towns.

The President also opposed adequate funding for treatment of our veterans. Congress, after committees had investigated the deteriorating state of medical care at VA hospitals, added \$105 million to the President's requests for veterans' medical care. The committee, and the press including Life magazine and CBS, found that wounded Vietnam veterans were being returned to the United States, and were receiving less than adequate and in some instances, rather pathetic medical care. Fortunately, this is not the case everywhere but hospital directors have said it could become general unless they received more funds. Congress provided a little more—not enough—but additional funds to meet the desperate needs. Now, the President says it is inflationary. Are we to ask our young men to go fight our wars, to suffer wounds, and come home to inadequate medical care?

Another contrast in the administration's sense of values and its sense of priorities is demonstrated in the effort to bail out the big financiers of the Penn Central conglomerate. They sought, and quite illegally say many experts, to provide an immediate \$200 million to the big banks and then furnish another \$500 to \$600 million later. This was not to help the railroad, but to help the financiers who held the debts and stocks of the mismanaged conglomerate. Is almost \$1 billion for big banks less inflationary than a like amount for health, veterans, education, and housing?

As for accelerated inflation, we need only look at the record. The deficit in 1970 can be directly attributed to \$1 billion more in interest on the public debt, to \$1 billion less in income because of slow business and unemployed taxpayers and in payment of half a billion dollars more in unemployment compensation. If the President is interested in fighting the cost of living, instead of partisan political games, he ought to join with this concerned Congress. He ought to use the powers of his office against the price gougers rather than seeking to discredit the legislative body elected by the people.

The argument that we should let the President win this round to soften his issue is playing Mr. Nixon's brand of politics. Remember, his 1970 HEW veto was sustained—did that lessen his political propaganda directed at Congress? We should override the vetoes because it is the right thing to do—and that, I believe, is the best politics for both Democratic and Republican Congressmen.

I hope every Member joins me in voting to override the President's veto. The integrity of the Congress is at stake. The prerogatives of the Congress are at stake. We are the elected representatives of the people. We can do no less than to sustain the position of the people's branch of the Government.

I urge that the veto be overridden.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker,

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Minority Leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I request that the time be yielded, if it is available, to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think that this afternoon all of us feel a little indebted to our distinguished Speaker, who addressed us a little bit earlier on the other bill that was before the House, because I think in a very real sense he served to enliven not only the rhetoric of the debate that has surrounded these two issues but also served to point up a very fundamental difference in philosophy between those of us who today will vote to sustain the President of the United States on both of these issues and those of us who will vote to override.

I am sure that you will recall in that very vivid and colorful language which he employs so very skillfully—and JOHN McCORMACK, the political leader, was at his very best today in the well of the House—he referred to the inflation argument as a scarecrow argument. In other words, if I am interpreting him correctly, he was saying that this was an argument with shadow but without substance; that we are flaunting before the American people today when we talk about inflation as some kind of a ghostly apparition, something of which we really have no cause to be afraid.

I think there is a difference in the philosophies of the two parties on this very basic issue, because, Mr. Speaker, I would concede that we who represent the Republican Party in this Chamber are mortally afraid of what inflation can do to the economy and to the American people.

When I read the figures that were released a few days ago by the U.S. Savings and Loan League that if we had inflation at the rate that we had it in 1969 and if that inflation were to continue over the next three decades, a man who was earning \$10,000 in 1970 would need \$57,000 a year to maintain the same standards of living; that a bag of groceries that today cost that individual \$30 would cost him \$115; that a \$3,000 car that comes off the assembly line in Detroit would be costing him \$17,000, then I think we are dealing with more than a ghostly apparition. We are dealing with a very grim reality and one which concerns not just those of us within the range of my voice in this Chamber but 200 million Americans as well.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Of course. I will be pleased to yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to get the gentleman's record correct. What I said was that what we had just heard from

my distinguished friend is what is known as the scarecrow argument. The question of inflation is not honestly involved here in the two veto messages.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am pleased to know that the distinguished Speaker is as concerned, then, as I am about inflation and that the only difference is—

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Illinois is one of the most eloquent men I have ever heard. Without limitation I say that. But the gentleman, with all of his eloquence, I doubt has the ability to put into my mouth words I did not say.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I have no such intention, Mr. Speaker, but the fundamental difference between your position and the position which I espouse on this floor today is that you cannot, you cannot, in two bills out of 13 bills, spend more than \$1 billion over the budget and then send the Government into the money market to borrow the money that it does not have and say that that is not inflationary.

What we are ignoring today—and the gentleman's intention is clear—the chairman of the distinguished Committee on Appropriations tried to point out to members of his own party, but they are not listening—what we are ignoring is the revenue side of this whole argument. The actions taken in this House up to the 28th of July, up to the 28th of July of this year, on revenue proposals total \$708 million. That leaves a balance of exactly \$4,009 million of additional revenue increases that would be needed to meet the President's budget request for fiscal year 1971.

The Speaker said that he would be willing to stand before this Chamber and recommend the increases that would be needed to balance the budget. I say that the Democratic Party is in control of this House; they are in control of the Committee on Ways and Means; they are in control of every legislative committee. Where is the action? We have been in session in this 91st Congress for better than a year and a half. I do not see very much action on the revenue side of the equation that we are talking about.

Let me in the time that I have left address myself to specific questions on this bill—and some of you may think it is becoming a little bit repetitive, but they have to be reemphasized.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) pointed out that this bill is \$1 billion over the same bill for the same programs last year—\$995 million over the recommendations of our own House Committee on Appropriations. What we do today, Mr. Speaker, when we vote to sustain the President's veto, is not simply to help the hand of President Nixon, we are in effect, by sustaining that veto, giving a vote of confidence to our own distinguished Committee on Appropriations of this very Chamber.

Let me say that of all the bills that come before this House, there are none in which I feel a more profound interest and in which I feel a greater attachment than those that deal with the housing programs of our country.

As I said in April of 1968, the report of the Kerner Commission on Civil Disorders made clear that in 127 cities where we had civil disorders, there was very definite evidence, as one of the incidents that led to these disorders, of substandard housing.

Well, I believe I am as interested in providing decent housing for the people of this country as anyone could be, and yet when we had an opportunity in this very housing bill to advance the one program that held the most promise—the most promise to provide decent, low-cost housing—what did we do? We slashed it from \$55 million, which the administration had asked for, to \$30 million.

Now, why do I mention it? I think it is relevant to this point, because unfortunately my friends, while this was true this year, and it was true last year and it was true during the whole decade of the sixties when we rolled up deficiencies of more than \$60 billion, we have submitted every one of these programs to a quantitative analysis: If we are spending more money we must be doing better. That is what they told us.

The distinguished majority leader said it is not what we are spending more money but that we are spending it more wisely today than ever before. I challenge that statement. I dispute it. I do not believe that we have subjected these programs to the kind of qualitative analysis that we should have. Maybe it is because of the culture in which we live today where almost as a matter of course we think anything that is bigger must somehow be better.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you in this election year of 1970, and despite the efforts by some to foreclose the issue of politics, it is here on the floor this afternoon, make no mistake about it. And maybe the advice that I am about to give you is a little bit gratuitous when I suggest that the American people are not quite so convinced as they were a few years ago that big government is good government; that the more moneys we spend and the bigger programs that we set here in Washington as our goals, are necessarily going to give us what we want.

I believe it was Peter Drucker who said that what began as a private romance between the American people and big government has sort of dwindled away into just a tired, middle-aged liaison today.

I believe it is true that those who have said that we have not been sufficiently critical in our analysis of some of these programs are correct, and so, when we had a chance, as I pointed out in the Operation Breakthrough program, to really break ground—and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) is sitting here, and he supported my argument when we had this before us on the 16th of July, that we should not have cut the very kind of a program that might provide a welcome handle with which we might strike out at some of the problems on which solutions have eluded us for so long a time.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. I have listened to the gentleman expound on this political situation. As I understand, and has been stated here, there is nothing in this bill that requires the President to spend a nickel's worth of money. Why the veto?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. If I may conclude, I only have a half minute remaining. Let me use it to conclude on this point.

We need to change our priorities in this country. Make no mistake about it. I would suggest that we ought not just talk in broad brush fashion about changing priorities without looking at specific programs, like those that are embraced in this particular bill.

We have to see where we ought to be changing these priorities—where we ought to be maybe spending less and ought to be spending more.

It is only when we accept a self-imposed discipline and some fiscal restraint as in this bill that we are ever going to get around to the point where we make those kinds of decisions.

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

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS).

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, we are not spending more, we are spending more wisely. That is the truth.

I cannot understand the philosophy of an administration that says you can spend \$290 million for an SST, of questionable value, and that comes before the Commerce Committee and asks for \$750 million in urgent loan guarantees to bail out the principal creditors for the Penn. Central railway system—guarantees secured only by the accounts receivable—the most worthless assets that can be offered to any lender or guarantor, and then says that these actions are not inflationary. But, that same administration, in a veto message from the President, brands as highly inflationary the appropriation of \$350 million to improve sewerage treatment plants and water systems and \$350 million for urban renewal, which is desperately needed, and \$105 million to improve medical care for our veterans who are returning from serving their Nation in Vietnam, having sustained horrible injuries in many cases in the service of this country. Those are inflationary items? That is what the Nixon veto message would have the American people believe.

How shocking. What false economics. What duplicity—to tell the American people fables of that type!

Mr. Speaker, this is a disgraceful veto. This is a veto which has absolutely no merit. Sustain it and we will drive prices up. Sustain it and we will drive up the cost of local government at every level because these expenditures finally must be made, either from a narrow local tax base or from a broad Federal tax base.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. STEPHENS).

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I speak on this bill because I feel somewhat responsible for the veto, having sponsored an amendment to add \$350 million to the HUD appropriation bill for 50 percent help on water and sewer lines for small communities.

I am still glad I did so. But I am not glad the President vetoed the bill largely on this account. The veto is an error.

This is the most popular assistance that the U.S. Government gives to local governments.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has evidence before it that applications amount to about \$4 billion for this assistance. When the \$350 million was added, the Secretary of the Department of HUD said that he could not use the money.

Since that time, I have received from Secretary Romney the following letter which was dated July 28, 1970, and he says:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the application (PFL-Ga-160) submitted by the City of Sandersville under our Public Facility Loans Program.

I regret to advise you that we are unable to consider a loan application from the City in an amount greater than \$500,000. Unfortunately, because of the heavy backlog of applications on hand and limited program funds, we cannot provide the additional assistance requested.

In the President's veto message, he says in effect that he acted because the bill included \$350 million for water and sewer lines. He also said he had committed himself to ask the Congress for that exact same sum: \$350 million, to "fully fund the school desegregation program."

That is not economy—\$350 million equals \$350 million on either side. Some Members have said that they would vote to override a veto on the education bill but would vote to sustain the veto on the HUD bill. If you do so, this is what you will be approving: You will vote to take \$350 million from water and sewer lines and put \$350 million, in the President's words, "in the school desegregation program."

This reverses my priorities. I have already voted today to override the education bill veto and I will vote again today to override this veto.

If economy is wanted, it is not in the President's vetoes. It is in places of less priority, for example, in the "guaranteed income" program which will add more than \$4½ billion for the taxpayers to pay.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself to my distinguished friend from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON). Yes, we are concerned with inflation on this side, but to charge that the bills we consider today are causes for the inflation, is, as the Speaker says, "scarecrows." The huge deficit that the President says is impending, is in great measure attributable to the miscalculation by the President in the tax revenue which he estimated would accrue this year. Unfortunately, his economic policies have brought the mighty American industrial machine to a very severe slow-

down and between the lack of profits and resulting unemployment, the budget has been placed in severe unbalance.

Nevertheless, the President continues to blast the Congress for spending above his budget figures.

Yes, the Congress has voted increases above the President's budget in these two bills but they are necessary increases, and surely in the huge budget that the President has given to the Congress, there are programs that can be cut to offset these additional amounts. Certainly adding money to the programs in these bills will not increase the deficit if corresponding reductions are made in other budgeted programs. If the total budget remains the same, these increases do not contribute to any inflationary thrust.

The fundamental question is which programs deserve first crack at the limited amount of Federal dollars which are available this year.

Can there be any doubt that the education of our children deserves the highest priority?

Can there be any doubt that the plight of our cities—cities great and small—plagued with crime, suffering deterioration of their housing and neighborhoods, choking under air pollution—can there be any doubt that these, too, deserve highest priority?

Compare these with some specific programs that the President could reduce if he sees fit. There is Vietnam, for example. In the military construction bill recently passed by the House, \$170 million is allocated to build housing for Vietnamese troops. I do not know how many hundreds of million dollars have been spent to house American troops on our very elaborate bases and elsewhere, but I am informed that when our troops leave, the bases will be closed up. Why? Why cannot these be used by their Vietnamese forces and the \$70 million saved?

And Mr. Speaker, a dollar spent for Vietnamese troop housing is just as inflationary as one spent for housing in this country under this bill.

Second, I read recently that the United States will make available \$700 million to stabilize Vietnam's balance of payments and to reduce inflation. If inflation is such a powerful force that is being aggravated by budget expenditures, why cannot the President cut this amount in half to help fight inflation in the United States as well as Vietnam? Certainly, a dollar spent for this purpose is just as inflationary as one spent for veterans hospitals in this country.

Third, there are funds for expansion of the Safeguard ABM system, for which the total appropriation this year is \$1.450 billion. Of this amount \$1,046 billion is for continued development of our two Minuteman bases in Montana and North Dakota.

But \$404 million is for expansion of the ABM system through other parts of the country. If the expansion is deferred for 1 year, the program to protect our Minuteman sites will still go forward and the President will have saved over \$400 million.

Finally, the SST appropriation for this year is almost \$300 million. What is lost

if this expensive bauble is deferred for a year in the name of stopping inflation?

Mr. Speaker, these savings total over \$1 billion without touching the military budget except for an expanded ABM, \$1 billion the President could save to balance the appropriations in these bills which the President says are excessive.

Every city in the country—and non-urban communities as well—faces the problem of increasing budgets. Their policemen want salary increases and they are entitled to them.

Their firemen want salary increases and they are entitled to them.

Their teachers want salary increases and they are entitled to them.

They will receive their salary increases only if the Federal Government shares with them the burgeoning costs of local government.

These are good bills. These are bills that will help build America. These are programs that should be supported. The House should vote to override the veto.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, let us keep in mind what it means when we talk about the investment of \$350 million for water and sewer facilities and \$350 million for urban renewal projects.

First of all, for water and sewer facilities all of us know how desperate we are to provide our districts and within our districts towns, cities, and communities—with adequate water and sewer facilities. Right at this moment there are requests for \$5.5 billion of water and sewer applications pending at HUD and here we find ourselves funding a program at a pittance level of \$150 million a year. Remember, too, that for every thousand dollars worth of investment—so the officials of the Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us—in water and sewer and waste treatment disposal plants, we provide 222 man-hours of labor. Stated in another way, for every million dollars invested in public facilities, an additional 100 jobs a year are created—40 jobs at the construction site and 60 jobs in industry supplies, building materials, equipment, and services.

In other words, the \$350 million in dispute between the Congress and the President for water and sewer facilities if not provided by the action of this and the other body will mean a loss of 350,000 jobs per year.

Now, as regards to the urban renewal question, in testimony before the Appropriations Committee, HUD officials indicated that there was a backlog of pending and proposed urban renewal applications totaling more than \$3 billion. Before us is the question of whether or not the Congress will provide an additional \$350 million in urban renewal funds over and above the budget request. Let us see what this \$350 million means in terms of jobs and new housing units. It is reasonable to assume that of the \$350 million which the Congress has appropriated and which is in controversy here today, some two-thirds, or \$250

million, would be available for new projects—enough to fund 120 new urban renewal projects. Using HUD's own estimate, this amount of funds would provide an additional 57,000 new housing units and, again using HUD's own figures, it would create new jobs in the magnitude of 95,000.

But there is another matter of vital concern here. As we all know, in urban renewal funding, the local community must provide one-third of the funds for an urban renewal project. In most instances there is a cash equivalent funding to meet the local community's contribution which generally translates into the local community placing some of its own constructed public facilities as an equivalent for its local cash contribution. Significantly, however, under the law, these local public facilities cannot be more than 3 years old if they are to be counted as part of the local community's contribution. By delaying action here today, if the veto is not overridden, millions and millions of dollars in local community public facilities will no longer be eligible for use by the local community for its cash equivalent contribution to the urban renewal project.

As far as water and sewer assistance grants, we may look at any State. Take the great State of Michigan, for example, currently pending before HUD are applications for grants in the amount of \$331 million; for Texas \$55 million; for Georgia \$19 million; for Florida \$69 mil-

lion; for New York \$442 million; for Maine more than \$8 million.

Comparable figures pending in urban renewal applications for the various States are \$54 million for Alabama; \$67 million for Arkansas; \$342 million for California; \$26 million for Colorado; \$233 million for Connecticut; \$81 million for Georgia; \$45 million for Iowa; \$81 million for Maryland; \$182 million for Massachusetts; \$187 million for Michigan; \$33 million for Mississippi; \$191 million for New Jersey; \$356 million for New York; \$264 million for Ohio; \$72 million for Oklahoma; \$376 million for Pennsylvania; \$32 million for Rhode Island; \$4 million for South Carolina; \$98 million for Tennessee; and \$63 million for Texas.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT GRANT APPLICATIONS FOR WATER AND SEWER ASSISTANCE NOT FUNDED BY DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

State	Number of grant applications	Grant applications amount (millions)	Total project cost (millions)
Alabama	51	\$15.68	\$33.66
Alaska	15	7.27	17.15
Arizona	31	11.85	26.30
Arkansas	52	20.97	45.57
California	271	158.17	365.25
Colorado	73	19.71	48.62
Connecticut	95	59.82	155.36
Delaware	8	3.30	6.99
Florida	135	69.12	164.03
Georgia	43	19.64	46.39
Hawaii	19	5.78	14.12
Idaho	3	.69	1.39

State	Number of grant applications	Grant applications amount (millions)	Total project cost (millions)
Illinois	191	\$89.58	\$201.96
Indiana	77	48.57	131.00
Iowa	67	20.58	44.89
Kansas	60	13.60	28.89
Kentucky	28	55.89	136.54
Louisiana	107	70.17	158.16
Maine	48	8.31	18.58
Maryland	47	22.44	51.12
Massachusetts	225	93.23	227.23
Michigan	308	331.20	722.95
Minnesota	63	42.49	68.76
Mississippi	29	10.88	28.48
Missouri	104	34.06	80.56
Montana	14	2.47	4.89
Nebraska	45	16.80	48.64
Nevada	16	4.30	11.27
New Hampshire	27	11.84	27.00
New Jersey	163	92.55	209.20
New Mexico	13	2.61	6.83
New York	426	441.50	887.13
North Carolina	48	19.12	51.30
North Dakota	7	2.01	3.51
Ohio	255	204.45	420.62
Oklahoma	51	15.31	36.68
Oregon	47	26.18	65.68
Pennsylvania	317	158.68	343.72
Rhode Island	26	16.93	39.08
South Carolina	44	16.93	48.40
South Dakota	17	3.76	8.07
Tennessee	47	16.33	38.91
Texas	224	55.39	130.52
Utah	60	14.01	33.41
Vermont	33	7.41	16.89
Virginia	55	47.10	101.47
Washington	63	17.06	40.51
West Virginia	36	25.13	35.54
Wisconsin	85	37.79	84.74
Wyoming	5	5.78	13.81
Puerto Rico	25	5.78	13.81
Virgin Islands	1	.14	.29
National total	4,308	2,496.75	5,538.22

TABULATION OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED RENEWAL PROGRAMS BY STATE—3,000,000,000 TOTAL BACKLOG AS OF MAY 1970

State	Number of localities			Number of pending applications	Amount	
	Current	New	Total		Committed <sup>1</sup>	Pending and proposed <sup>2</sup>
Alabama	41	8	49	(39) 47	\$178,129,939	\$53,584,707
Alaska	9	4	13	(13) 4	44,366,149	48,469,382
Arizona	2	2	4	(4) 7	9,096,835	24,799,196
Arkansas	21	5	26	(31) 38	95,361,633	66,655,021
California	51	9	60	(62) 64	547,083,847	342,420,124
Colorado	5	3	8	(11) 14	62,019,623	25,911,336
Connecticut		2	40	(34) 40	436,566,252	232,612,143
Delaware	1	0	1	(1) 8	23,679,863	11,969,873
District of Columbia	1	0	1	1	152,995,930	9,065,916
Florida	12	4	16	(18) 12	101,386,113	23,386,981
Georgia	44	8	52	(52) 79	150,450,258	81,014,060

Footnotes at end of table.

TABULATION OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED RENEWAL PROGRAMS BY STATE—3,000,000,000 TOTAL BACKLOG AS OF MAY 1970—Continued

State	Number of localities	Number of pending applications	Amount Pending and proposed
Hawaii	3	0	\$21,794,993
Hilo, Honolulu, Honolulu County			
Idaho	3	0	\$5,555,600
Twin Falls, Boise, Idaho Falls			
Illinois	27	2	\$1,054,301
Aurora, Bloomington, Cairo, Carbondale, Champaign, Chester, Chicago, Chicago Heights, Danville, Decatur, DeKalb, East Chicago Heights, East St. Louis, Elgin, Galena, Galesburg, Jacksonville, Joliet, Kewanee, Maywood, North Chicago, Peoria, Robbins, Rock Falls, Rockford, Rock Island, Springfield, Urbana, Waukegan, West Frankfort, Herrin, Mount Vernon			
Indiana	21	2	\$3,541,971
Anderson, Batesville, Bloomington, Brazil, Charlestown, Columbus, Connersville, East Chicago, Elkhart, Evansville, Fort Wayne, Gary, Hammond, Indianapolis, Jeffersonville, Kingsford Heights, La Porte, Michigan City, Mishawaka, Richmond, South Bend, Terre Haute			
Iowa	4	0	\$45,327,846
Carroll, Cedar Rapids, Charles City, Council Bluffs, Des Moines, Dubuque, Evansdale, Fort Dodge, Iowa City, Keokuk, Muscatine, Ottumwa, Sioux City, Waterloo			
Kansas	14	0	\$50,338,938
Atchison, Bonner Springs, Coffeyville, Colby, Dodge City, Fort Scott, Galena, Garden City, Kansas City, Lawrence, Leavenworth, Lyons, Manhattan, Merriam, Olathe, Parsons, St. Paul, Salina, Wichita, Neodesha, Topeka			
Kentucky	25	4	\$58,009,721
Ashland, Bardstown, Bowling Green, Corbin, Covington, Danville, Frankfort, Fulton, Glasgow, Hazard, Hopkinsville, Jefferson County, Lebanon, Lexington, Louisville, Martin, Maysville, Middlesboro, Newport, Paducah, Paintsville, Paris, Pikeville, Pineville, Prestonsburg, Whitesburg, Williamsburg, Campbellsville, Harrodsburg, Hodgenville, Richmond			
Louisiana	0	0	\$47,633,237
Baton Rouge, Lake Charles, Monroe, New Orleans, Shreveport			
Maine	12	1	\$15,635,826
Auburn, Bangor, Cape Elizabeth, Caribou, Fort Fairfield, Lewiston, Orono, Portland, Presque Isle, Sanford, Waterville, Westbrook			
Maryland	12	1	\$81,013,943
Annapolis, Baltimore, Cambridge, College Park, Crisfield, Cumberland, Elkton, Essex, Glenarden, Montgomery County, Prince Georges County, Rockville, Salisbury, Colmar Manor			
Massachusetts	37	0	\$182,347,134
Adams, Beverly, Boston, Brockton, Brookline, Cambridge, Chelsea, Chicopee, Dedham, Fall River, Fitchburg, Framingham, Gloucester, Haverhill, Holyoke, Hull, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, Malden, Marlborough, Medford, New Bedford, Newburyport, Newton, North Adams, Peabody, Pittsfield, Plymouth, Quincy, Revere, Salem, Somerville, Springfield, Stoneham, Taunton, Waltham, Watertown, Woburn, Worcester			
Michigan	58	4	\$141,667,941
Albion, Algonac, Ains, Ann Arbor, Battle Creek, Bay City, Belding, Belleville, Benton Harbor, Big Rapids, Buchanan, Center Line, Clawson, Clinton Township, Coldwater, Dearborn, Dearborn Heights, Detroit, Ferndale, Flint, Garden City, Grand Rapids, Hamtramck, Hazel Park, Highland Park, Inkster, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Lansing, Lapeer, Lincoln Park, Madison Heights, Manistique, Marquette, Mount Clemens, Muskegon, Muskegon Heights, Niles, Plymouth, Pontiac, Port Huron, River Rouge, Riverview, Rochester, Rockwood, Rogers City, Romulus Township, Royal Oak Township, Saginaw, St. Clair, St. Clair Shores, St. Joseph, Sault Ste. Marie, Warren, Wayne, Wixom, Wyandotte, Wyoming, Ypsilanti, Holland			
Minnesota	18	0	\$89,944,991
Albert Lea, Chisholm, Crookston, Duluth, East Grand Forks, Hibbing, Hopkins, LeSueur, Mankato, Minneapolis, Montevideo, Moorhead, Pipestone, St. Cloud, St. Paul, South St. Paul, Willmar, Winona			
Mississippi	20	7	\$32,675,274
Aberdeen, Amory, Bay St. Louis, Biloxi, Cleveland, Corinth, Greenville, Gulfport, Holly Springs, Jackson, Kosciusko, Laurel, Long Beach, Louisville, McComb, Meridian, Oxford, Pascagoula, Pass Christian, Picayune, Pontotoc, Senatobia, Starkville, Tupelo, Vicksburg, Waveland, West Point, Yazoo City			
Missouri	17	21	\$58,600,845
Columbia, Diamond, Independence, Jefferson City, Joplin, Kansas City, Kinloch, Lees Summit, Mexico, Moberly, Noel, Oliveette, Richland, Rolla, St. Charles, St. Joseph, St. Louis, Smithville, Springfield, University City, Webster Groves, St. Louis County			
Montana	2	0	\$1,785,427
Anaconda, Butte, Havre, Helena			
Nebraska	1	0	\$204,666
Omaha			
Nevada	3	0	\$7,007,499
Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Reno			
New Hampshire	11	1	\$12,333,600
Berlin, Claremont, Concord, Dover, Laconia, Lebanon, Manchester, Nashua, Portsmouth, Rochester, Somersworth			
New Jersey	62	4	\$191,101,763
Asbury Park, Atlantic City, Barnegat Light, Bayonne, Belmar, Belvidere, Bloomfield, Boonton, Bordentown, Bridgeton, Burlington, Camden, Cape May, Carteret, Clementon, Clifton, Clinton, Dover, Dover Township, Dumont, East Brunswick Township, East Orange, Edison Township, Elizabeth, Englewood, Flemington, Glassboro, Gloucester City, Hackensack, Highlands, Hightstown, Hoboken, Irvington, Jersey City, Keansburg, Lakewood Township, Lodi, Long Branch, Maple Shade, Millville, Montclair, Morristown, Mt. Holly Township, Neptune Township, Newark, New Brunswick, Newton, Oceanport Borough, Orange, Passaic, Paterson, Perth Amboy, Phillipsburg, Plainfield, Pleastanville, Rahway, Salem, Scotch Plains Township, Sea Isle City, Somerville, South Plainfield, South River, Trenton, Union City, Vineland, Wayne Township, West New York, West Orange, Wildwood, Woodbridge Township			
New Mexico	5	5	\$30,426,573
Alamogordo, Albuquerque, Artesia, Carlsbad, Clovis, Gallup, Las Cruces, Roswell, Santa Fe, Tucumcari			
New York	82	0	\$956,497,958
Albany, Amsterdam, Auburn, Batavia, Beacon, Binghamton, Buffalo, Catskill, Corning, Dunkirk, East Rochester, Ellenville, Elmira, Elmira Heights, Fairport, Freeport, Fulton, Geneva, Glen Cove, Glens Falls, Gloversville, Gouverneur, Greenburgh, Hempstead, Hempstead Village, Hornell, Hudson, Huntington, Iliion, Islip Township, Ithaca, Jamestown, Kingston, Lackawanna, Lancaster, Lewisboro, Little Falls, Lockport, Long Beach, Mamaroneck, Mechanicville, Middletown, Monticello, Mount Kisco, Mount Vernon, Newark, Newburgh, New Rochelle, New York City, Niagara Falls, North Hempstead, North Tarrytown, Norwich, Nyack, Ogdensburg, Olean, Oneonta, Oswego, Palmyra, Peekskill, Penn Yan, Plattsburgh, Port Chester, Port Jervis, Potsdam, Poughkeepsie, Rensselaer, Rochester, Rockville Centre, Rome, Salamanca, Saratoga Springs, Schenectady, Syracuse, Tarrytown, Tonawanda, Troy, Tuckahoe, Utica, Watertown, Wateryliet, White Plains, Woodbridge, Yonkers, Yorktown, Ossining			

Footnotes at end of table.

Footnotes at end of table.

State	Number of localities	Number of pending applications		Amount Committed <sup>1</sup>	Pending and proposed <sup>2</sup>
		Total	Committed <sup>1</sup>		
North Carolina	10	41	(45)63	\$208,249,953	\$112,333,424
Asheville, Beaufort, Burlington, Chapel Hill, Charlotte, Clinton, Durham, Elizabeth City, Farmville, Fayetteville, Gastonia, Goldsboro, Greensboro, Greenville, Hendersonville, Hickory, High Point, Kings Mountain, Laurinburg, Lenoir, Lumberton, Monroe, Morganton, Mount Airy, New Bern, North Wilkesboro, Plymouth, Raleigh, Rockingham, Roxboro, Salisbury, Sanford, Selma, Shelby, Smithfield, Statesville, Tarboro, Washington, Williamston, Wilmington, Wilson, Winston-Salem.					
North Dakota	1	6	(7)4	9,573,290	11,248,051
Bismarck, Fargo, Grand Forks, Hillsboro, Minot, Ray, West Fargo.					
Ohio	3	45	(45)56	443,346,378	263,907,443
Akron, Amherst, Ashtabula, Athens, Barberton, Campbell, Canton, Chillicothe, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Crestline, Cuyahoga Falls, Dayton, Dover, East Cleveland, Elyria, Hamilton, Hamilton County, Huron, Ironton, Lincoln Heights, Lockland, Lorain, Lucas County, Mahoning County, Mansfield, Martins Ferry, Middletown, New Boston, Alliance, Norwood, Painesville, Portsmouth, St. Bernard, Springfield, Steubenville, Toledo, Van Wert, Warren, Wooster, Youngstown, Zanewille, Berea, Sandusky.					
Oklahoma	7	17	(15)19	118,007,503	72,305,341
Edmond, Elk City, Grandfield, Hugo, Lawton, McAlester, Miami, Muskogee, Norman, Oklahoma City, Sand Springs, Stillwater, Tahlequah, Tulsa, Wiburton, Yale.					
Oregon	0	8	(8)2	50,638,344	8,371,251
Cascade Locks, Coos Bay, Corvallis, Eugene, Portland, Reedsport, Salem, Springfield.					
Pennsylvania	11	126	(128)130	908,394,156	376,469,007
Alliquippa, Allentown, Altoona, Ambridge, Apollo, Archbald, Beaver Falls, Bethlehem, Blairsville, Blossburg, Boyertown, Brackentide, Bradwood, Bradford, Bridgewater, Bristol Borough, Bristol Township, Brownsville, Butler, Butler Township, California, Canonsburg, Cardonville, Carnegie, Chambersburg, Charleroi, Cheltenham Township, Chester, Clairton, Clairton, Colddale, Chester Township, Coatesville, Collier Township, Conshohocken, Cory, Danville, Darby Township, Dickson City, Donora, Downingtown, Dunmore, Duquesne, Easton, East Pittsburgh, East Stroudsburg, Edystone, Erie, Farrell, Franklin, Grove City, Hanover Township, Harrisburg, Hazleton, Homestead, Hughesstown, Indiana, Jermy, Johnstown, Kingston, Kittanning, Lancaster, Lansdale, Latrobe, Laurel Run, Lebanon, Lewistown, Lock Haven, Luzerne Borough, Mansfield, Masontown, McKeesport, McKees Rocks, Meadville, Media, Middletown Township, Milton, Monessen, Monongahela, Mosaic, Nanticoke, New Brighton, New Castle, New Kensington, Norristown, North Union Township, Oil City, Olyphant, Perkasie, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Pittston, Plymouth, Pottstown, Pottsville, Pottsville, Pottsville, Shamokin, Sharon, Sharpville, Steelton, Sunbury, Swatara Township, Tarentum, Taylor, Titusville, Towanda, Turtle Creek, Uniontown, Vandergrift, Warren, Washington, West Middlesex, Wilkes Barre, Wilkingsburg, Williamsport, Wilmerding, Windber, York, Morgantown.					
Rhode Island	1	5	(8)5	88,268,319	31,962,898
Bristol, East Providence, Narragansett, Newport, Pawtucket, Providence, Warwick, Woonsocket.					
South Carolina	1	6	(6)13	24,217,597	4,270,296
Charleston, Columbia, Fort Mill, Rock Hill, Spartanburg, Sumter.					
South Dakota	0	1	(3)1	7,634,000	4,400,110
Fort Pierre, Mitchell, Sioux Falls.					
Tennessee	11	52	(52)47	251,829,590	97,526,260
Athens, Bristol, Chattanooga, Clarksville, Cleveland, Clinton, Cookeville, Dayton, Dickson, Dyersburg, Elizabethton, Fayetteville, Franklin, Gallatin, Greenville, Harriman, Huntsville, Jackson, Jefferson City, Johnson City, Kingsport, Knoxville, La Follette, Lawrenceburg, Lebanon, Lewisburg, Livingston, Manchester, Maryville, McMinnville, Memphis, Morristown, Murfreesboro, Nashville, Newbern, Newport, Paris, Portland, Pulaski, Ridgely, Rogersville, Shelbyville, Smithville, South Pittsburg, Sparta, Springfield, Sweetwater, Tazewell, Tullahoma, Union City, Waverly, Winchester.					
Texas	31	31	(38)46	181,069,974	62,670,591
Alice, Arkansas Pass, Austin, Brenham, Cameron, Corpus Christi, Crockett, Crystal City, Dallas, Edinburg, El Paso, Fort Worth, Georgetown, Grand Prairie, Hearne, Los Fresnos, Lubbock, Marshall, Mercedes, Mission, Port Arthur, Port Isabel, San Antonio, San Marcos, Savoy, Schertz, Sinton, Stanton, Sundown, Texarkana, Waco, Whitesboro, White Settlement, Wink, Galveston, Holton City, Mineral Wells, Parkland and Uncertain.					
Utah	2	2	(2)0	625,117	0
Ogden, Salt Lake City.					
Vermont	0	3	(4)2	3,638,061	2,248,282
Burlington, Hartford, Montpelier, Winooski.					
Virginia	1	18	(18)23	175,699,870	160,882,111
Alexandria, Bristol, Charlottesville, Chesapeake, Danville, Franklin, Hampton, Harrisonburg, Hopewell, Lynchburg, Newport News, Norfolk, Petersburg, Portsmouth, Richmond, Roanoke, Staunton, Waynesboro.					
Washington	8	8	(9)11	36,706,203	25,692,492
Anacortes, Ellensburg, Hoquiam, Longview, Pasco, Seattle, Spokane, Tacoma, Vancouver.					
West Virginia	0	11	(11)11	38,745,743	7,341,023
Benwood, Bluefield, Charleston, Dunbar, Grafton, Huntington, Parkersburg, Spencer, Weirton, Wheeling, Williamson.					
Wisconsin	4	10	(13)19	73,432,911	64,259,793
Brillon, Green Bay, La Crosse, Madison, Manitowoc, Milwaukee, Monroe, Sheboygan, Stevens Point, Wausau, Wisconsin Rapids, Beloit, Fond Du Lac.					
Wyoming	0	2	(2)2	2,067,303	1,200,000
Casper, Cheyenne.					

<sup>1</sup> Committed figures based on HUD Report, Mar. 31, 1970.  
<sup>2</sup> Pending and proposed figures based primarily on HUD figures dated, Mar. 31, 1970, and special NAHRO survey June 30, 1970.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I might remind the gentleman from Illinois that he mentioned the fact that on July 16 he took a certain position. The record indicates that he voted for the conference report, which is exactly the same legislation we are working on today.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman means the gentleman from Illinois, (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. DENT. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) yes.

CKVI—1814—Part 21

I might remind the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) that he has talked about the taxpayers. Well, the whole amount of this bill divided up among the taxpayers and the citizens of the United States amounts to 2½ cigarettes a week, or 2½ sticks of chewing gum, or one-half bottle of soda pop. I am not so sure that that is so important as to deprive the veterans of this great Nation of ours, those who the VFW says, are veterans of previous wars who were wounded on the battlefield.

In their telegram they said:

Mr. Speaker, the following is a break down of the 1971 national health care program just compiled by the Veterans Administration, D.C.

The veto of the independent offices appropriations bill with its money to operate VA programs for 1971 has stunned the 1,600,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The failure of the President to indicate his approval of the additional funds, wisely added by the Congress, to overcome deteriorating conditions in VA hospitals has deeply disappointed our organization.

The VFW takes the position that Vietnam veterans and veterans of previous wars who were wounded on the battlefield contribute enough when they fight in the shooting war for medical care.

in the National interest and should not be expected to fight the inflation war at the expense of their health.

Every dime of the extra money in this bill for the VA will be spent to provide better medical care for the veterans of this Nation, which everyone agrees is urgently needed at the earliest possible time to prevent further deterioration of conditions in VA hospitals.

For these reasons, your vote to override the veto will be deeply appreciated by the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

RAY GALLAGHER,

National Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Again allow me to remind you that inflation while being serious is also a very useful political weapon in the hands of any political trickster.

Never in any economy has inflation developed when sufficient goods were available for the consumers to purchase.

The trouble with our economy is that the shelves are bulging with foreign-made goods that are produced by more consumers namely the foreign worker in an American plant overseas.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the veto on H.R. 17548 which makes 1971 appropriations for many independent Federal agencies including the Veterans' Administration. The plight of the VA medical program is well known to all members of this body. I have written to each of you periodically advising you of the findings of a 6-month long Veterans' Affairs Committee staff investigation which I requested last December. The results of the initial investigation disclosed serious funding deficiencies of over \$100 million for all of the 166 VA hospitals. These hospitals do not have enough funds for proper staffing—as a matter of fact, it appears that many hospital employees are having to do the work of two people as compared to private sector hospitals. The most recent survey made of the VA hospitals revealed that initial funding allocations for 1971, based on the administration's request for 1971, fall almost \$180 million short of the required needs to render prompt and proper service to the wounded, sick, and disabled veterans of America.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a breakdown of the 1971 nationwide deficiencies just compiled by the Veterans Affairs Committee:

Dental care for returning Vietnam veterans	\$20,409,707
Community nursing care program	7,524,798
Purchase of new equipment	11,644,159
Purchase of replacement equipment	14,667,774
Nonrecurring maintenance and repair	35,526,747
Recurring maintenance and repair	1,982,412
Recruitable medical personnel	83,495,450
Other categories—(that is, fees for medical consultants, contract hospitalization, outpa-	

tient fee medical, State home program grants, and so forth. \$5,259,253

Total 1971 VA hospital deficiencies ----- 180,510,300

Mr. Speaker, in view of the findings of our most recent survey, the \$155 million which the conferees agreed on for VA medical care in this bill is a most reasonable compromise. To keep faith with America's veterans we have a most solemn duty here today to see that no further delays occur in providing second-to-none hospital care in our veterans hospitals. This is one of the major reasons I intend to vote to override this veto. To do otherwise will needlessly delay the recruitment of much needed hospital personnel to care for our hospitalized veterans and to provide the equipment and facilities which are desperately needed now—today—to treat America's veterans who need medical care in our VA hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks communications which I have received from national officials of various organizations urging this body to override the veto of this bill which includes 1971 appropriations for the Veterans' Administration:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,  
Washington, D.C., August 5, 1970.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Now that the Congress has completed action on the Veterans' Administration appropriation for fiscal year 1971, I wanted to convey to you some personal observations relating to the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program which has been under consideration for the past several months.

At your direction, in December 1969, the Hospital Subcommittee initiated an investigation to determine whether the Veterans' Administration medical program was being properly funded and whether the hospital staffs were adequate to give prompt and proper care to veterans. On December 8, 1969, a special questionnaire was sent to the director of each hospital and independent outpatient clinic requesting detailed information about the hospitals' funding and staffing levels and information concerning deficiencies in equipment and maintenance and repair projects.

We also held extensive hearings in Washington and several hearings were held in other selected areas. The overall results of the investigation, which has been on-going for over 6 months, indicated that as of the end of December 1969, the VA medical program had fallen woefully behind in its ability to promptly and properly care for America's disabled veterans. While workloads in major medical care areas were rising sharply, personnel in the VA medical program were not increased to meet their higher workloads.

This staffing problem had its origin in the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968. The Veterans' Administration was one of the few agencies in the Federal Government which complied with the personnel ceiling provision imposed by this law and when it was repealed by Congress in July, 1969, it was difficult for VA to make immediate and significant employment gains because of increased hospital operating costs which had to be met before employment could be significantly increased. Our December 1969 survey of the hospitals indicated that about 4000 unfilled hospital positions,

which had been authorized, could not be filled because funds were insufficient at the various hospitals to fill them.

Tabulation and review of the December 1969 questionnaires from the hospitals and outpatient clinics disclosed well over \$100 million in funding deficiencies for fiscal year 1970.

Briefly the investigation indicated the following:

1. Private sector general medical and surgical hospitals have an average ratio of 2.72 employees for each patient while the Veterans' Administration has only 1.5 staff for each patient. Some university hospitals operated in connection with medical schools have staffing ratios of over 3 employees for each patient. On the basis of consultations with many hospital directors, deans of medical schools, who are members of the Veterans' Administrator's Special Medical Advisory Group, and a review of standards established within the Veterans Administration for its various hospital services, it appears that the national staffing ratio for most VA general and medical and surgical hospitals should be about two employees for each patient and a one for one ratio should exist in psychiatric hospitals. To achieve this ratio, about 28,000 additional employees were needed as of December 31, 1969, which would cost about \$240 million annually. According to the VA hospital directors, about 85% of these personnel could be recruited if funds were made available for their salaries. I believe that favorable action on H.R. 18252 will sufficiently improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery so that the 15% reported by the hospital directors as not being recruitable can be recruited. This bill has been favorably reported by the Hospital Subcommittee and I hope will soon receive full Committee action. It should be of great help in providing the necessary personnel to properly operate the VA medical program and truly give veterans "second to none" medical care. Favorable action by the Congress on H.R. 18252 should eliminate the problem we found in a number of hospitals where on night shifts and weekends one nurse plus an attendant was responsible for more than one ward with the result that during emergencies large numbers of patients went unmonitored for long periods of time.

2. In order to pay hospital salaries and buy drugs and medical supplies the December 1969 questionnaire disclosed that millions of dollars were being diverted from equipment purchases and maintenance and repair funds which was impairing the care of hospitalized veterans because new life-saving and life-prolonging equipment could not be purchased by many VA hospitals. Late in fiscal year 1970, Congress appropriated in the Second Supplemental Appropriations bill about \$7 million in additional funds which was allocated to the various hospitals to eliminate some of their most critical and urgent equipment deficiencies. However, our July 1970 survey indicated that the initial 1971 funding allocation leaves a funding deficiency of about \$63 million in equipment and maintenance and repair items in VA hospitals. Recent action by Congress to increase the 1971 appropriations should have a significant impact on this deficiency.

3. Education and training of medical personnel, serving veterans and the nation, was being seriously curtailed due to budgetary limitations.

4. Due to inadequate funding to provide necessary staffing of about 2700 employees, over \$20 million in specialized medical services, such as coronary care, kidney dialysis, pulmonary emphysema, pulmonary function, and other intensive care units were idle or so inadequately staffed that they could not fully perform the innovative care needed for many sick veterans. The staffing of many of these units has been increased since last December

but a great deal of this has been accomplished by transferring ward nursing personnel and other technicians from regular wards to the specialized medical services rather than through significant employment increases. This is borne out by a comparison of full time permanent personnel statistics furnished the Committee by the Veterans' Administration as of June 30, 1969 and June 30, 1970. On June 30, 1969, the Veterans' Administration reported to the Committee that there were 121,434 full time permanent "Medical Care" employees. As of June 30, 1970 the report showed a total of 121,868—an increase of only 434 throughout the VA system.

5. The 12-year long-range construction and modernization program has fallen woefully behind. This plan was devised in 1960 under a joint agreement with the Bureau of the Budget, the House Veterans Affairs Committee and the Appropriations Committee of Congress. The plan has been stretched out by several Administrations because of inadequate funding and it has now become a 20 year plan. There will be substantial obligation of funds, voted by previous Congresses, during fiscal year 1971 for construction and modernization of hospital facilities, and \$59 million in new obligational authority has been voted in the 1971 appropriation. Recent unfavorable public criticisms of the Bronx and Wadsworth VA hospitals are directly attributable to the inadequacy of construction funds over the past 10 years because the physical plants at both of these installations are most inadequate to render proper patient care. This public embarrassment of the VA medical program could have been avoided if the original long range plan for hospital replacement and modernization had been followed. There are still over 40 unairconditioned VA hospitals and/or domiciliarys which qualify for airconditioning, but no design funds have been sought to start the planning. These conditions are shameful and should be corrected without further delay. I do not believe that the VA construction program can endure very long on the hit-or-miss basis which it has experienced over the past 10 years. Many VA hospital plants are deteriorating at alarming rates and this may seriously lower the quality of patient care.

6. An intolerable dental backlog built up in fiscal year 1970 involving hundreds of thousands of returning Vietnam veterans who were having to wait from 4 to 8 months to have their teeth fixed because of inadequate funding. On April 2, 1970, the Administration requested from the Congress \$9.8 million which was supposed to substantially clear up this backlog; however, recent information obtained from the hospitals and outpatient clinics indicates that as of June 30, 1970, the end of the 1970 fiscal year, about 75,000 cases were still backlogged and that over \$3.8 million more was needed to clear this up. On July 1, 1970, the directors of hospitals and outpatient clinics estimated that they were over \$20 million short of fiscal year 1971 funds to meet their estimated dental needs. This situation must be carefully monitored in the future to be sure that the extra funds recently voted by the Congress are allocated to the hospitals on a timely basis to clear up existing backlogs and keep pace with new workloads.

7. The December 1969 questionnaire disclosed that funds were being denied many hospitals to provide community nursing care for eligible veterans who no longer needed expensive care in VA hospitals and could be transferred to community nursing homes at VA expense and be nearer their homes and relatives.

8. Drugs for patients on outpatient status were being curtailed because of lack of funds and needy veterans were being given prescriptions and told to have them filled at

their own expense. Mail order prescriptions filled by VA pharmacies were running weeks behind normal schedules because of lack of funds.

9. During fiscal 1970, the medical care program was forced to "absorb" \$26 million in unbudgeted costs, thus reducing patient care services to veterans. These "absorbed" costs included portions of pay hikes for personnel and new laws which the Congress enacted mostly to extend benefits to needy and sick disabled veterans. If Congress passes legislation which increases the cost of operating the VA medical program, the Administration should request and the Congress should appropriate the funds necessary to fully support the increased costs.

10. Old and chronically ill veterans were being denied needed hospitalization because staffing and funding problems at many hospitals made it desirable to attempt to treat the veteran on an outpatient basis at less cost rather than putting them into hospitals where they could receive more attention.

Some of these deficiencies have been corrected either administratively or by congressional action in appropriating additional funds; however, major problems still exist which I believe we must continue to closely monitor.

The most recent survey conducted earlier this month of the VA hospitals and outpatient clinics indicates that as of July 10, 1970, there existed over \$180 million in funding deficiencies. Congress has recently acted to add \$155 million to the original budget request of the Veterans' Administration medical care program for 1971 and the expenditure of these additional funds would correct a major portion of the most pressing deficiencies. Notwithstanding the Administrator's statement before the Appropriations Committee in the other body that the Veterans' Administration could not use additional funds over and above those requested in the amended 1971 budget, it is evident from our July 1970 survey of all VA hospitals and outpatient clinics that the additional funding is needed to meet the medical needs of our nation's veterans. I hope that we will not experience a reluctance on the part of the Bureau of the Budget to release these funds. Over the years the Bureau of the Budget has been largely responsible for not permitting the Veterans' Administration to seek adequate funds to keep the VA medical program on a par with private sector hospitals.

I am convinced the American people want its veterans to have the finest available medical care, and I believe that the Congress must be sure that it takes the action necessary to make veterans hospitals the nation's showcase of superb medical care.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HALEY,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Hospitals.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE  
UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., August 13, 1970.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Chairman, House Veterans Affairs Committee  
U.S. House of Representatives, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TEAGUE: The Presidential veto of the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill has stunned the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

First class medical care for veterans is the Number One Priority Goal of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The Congress has been most sympathetic to V.F.W. please for additional personnel and funds for VA hospitals. Unfortunately, and tragically, the Administration has turned a deaf ear to most of our requests for additional money and personnel which VA hospitals so desperately need. This veto is the crowning blow. Again, the V.F.W. is calling upon our friends in Congress to

help us in this grave situation with which VA hospitals are faced.

The evidence is overwhelming and beyond any doubt that the VA has to have more money right now if it is to carry out its mission of providing quality medical care to veterans. A few of these programs which are at the critical stage are: an intolerable backlog of applications for dental care by returning veterans; community nursing care for chronically ill elder veterans; purchasing of new and replacement of equipment; maintenance and repairs which have been postponed and deferred too long; more funds for the construction and modernization programs for hospitals such as the one at Bronx which graphically depicted shocking conditions in a VA hospital; and recruiting authorized medical personnel to man life saving services such as cardiac, intensive care, kidney and pulmonary units.

The additional \$155 million in this VA appropriation will be a giant step toward reducing some of these pressing deficiencies which VA hospital managers have reported as needing immediate attention. In fact, the 166 VA hospital managers have indicated there presently exists \$180 million in funding deficiencies. Sick and wounded Vietnam veterans being treated in VA hospitals need this VA appropriation now. They have made one sacrifice in the national interest by fighting on the battlefield in Vietnam. They should not be expected to fight the inflation war at the expense of their health. To postpone approval and prompt allocation of these funds for VA hospitals could be disastrous.

The Congress spoke when it approved the VA appropriation with its additional \$155 million for VA hospitals as authorized in the Independent Offices Bill. The V.F.W. strongly recommends that the Congress once again resolve any doubt in favor of veterans and first class medical care for veterans by voting to override the President's veto. The money is desperately needed today and a delay will further damage the VA hospital system to the detriment of thousands of wounded and disabled veterans.

The favorable consideration of these views by you and your House colleagues will be deeply appreciated by the 1,600,000 members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Sincerely,

RAY GALLAGHER,  
Commander in Chief.

AUGUST 12, 1970.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

The Disabled Veterans urges your vote to override veto of H.R. 17548. Veterans Administration funds desperately needed to improve quality of hospital care for wounded and sick returning from Vietnam and other veterans entitled to VA benefits.

CECIL W. STEVENSON,  
National Commander,  
Disabled American Veterans.

AUGUST 12, 1970.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Chairman, Committee on Veterans Affairs,  
Washington, D.C.

Paralyzed veterans are deeply disturbed over yesterday's presidential veto of the independent offices appropriations bill H.R. 17548. This great Nation cannot afford to lose any of its veterans to a degenerating and underfunded Veterans Administration. In light of your many and great efforts on behalf of the American veteran we urgently request that you do all within your power to insure that the VA appropriations as outlined in H.R. 17548 be speedily enacted.

PETER L. LASSEN,  
Executive Director,  
Paralyzed Veterans of America.

AMVETS, held  
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1970.  
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: AMVETS strongly urge you to vote to override the veto of H.R. 17458 which includes appropriations for FY 1971 for the Veterans Administration. Of particular concern is the immediate critical need for the additional \$105 million in medical care funds voted in the House-Senate Conference Report to prevent further deterioration of the V.A. Medical Program and its hospitals.

The President's veto message appears to be directed at large increases in "HUD" Urban Renewal Project Funds.

The V.A. Hospital Program cannot wait another quarter of the 1971 FY for desperately needed additional funds to care for America's wounded and disabled veterans. Your vote in favor of the motion to override this Presidential Veto is extremely important to AMVETS membership and indeed to all America's sick and disabled veterans.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT B. GOMULINSKI,  
National Commander.

ALEXANDRIA, VA.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Washington, D.C.:

In view of the mandates of our department conventions pertaining to conditions existing in the various hospitals throughout the country, I am sure the membership of our organization would approve my requests to you to use every influence to override the veto, for the VA medical appropriation.

EDGAR G. BURKHARDT,

National Commander, Veterans of World War I.

DALLAS, TEX.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Washington, D.C.:

Council of Veterans Organization of Greater Dallas urge you to vote to override the veto of the appropriation bill for education welfare and veterans benefits.

WENDELL A. MARIN.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,

Washington, D.C., August 13, 1970.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans Affairs, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN TEAGUE: The American Legion appreciates and strongly supports your effort in the House today concerning H.R. 17548 insofar as it affects funds for the Veterans Administration for Fiscal 1971.

As you have pointed out, for several years the Veterans' Administration has been caught in an impossible budget squeeze between higher medical and drug costs and rising workloads without receiving proportionately higher funds and staffing allocations. The new budget approved by the Congress, while not an overly generous one, contains additional funds in the amount of \$105 million above that recommended by the Administration. It is urgently needed if the VA's lagging medical program is to be brought back to reasonably accepted levels.

The first quarter of the 1971 Fiscal Year is now two-thirds over and until the new budget is approved the VA must continue to operate at last year's spending level. This is further delaying and retarding efforts to expand and improve VA services to needy war veterans, particularly its medical program, at a time when the demand for treatment is increasing as a result of the war in Vietnam.

Your assistance in providing these funds for the Veterans Administration at the earliest possible moment is appreciated by The American Legion.

Very truly yours,

J. MILTON PATRICK.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND), a valued member of the committee.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I join in the appeal to the Members of this House to override the President's veto on this bill. The independent offices bill is no less important than the education bill. I think in many respects it is more important.

Mr. Speaker, this appropriation bill was vetoed by the President because it is \$541,301,800 over the amount recommended in his budget. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), indicated that these programs in this bill have been based on quantity rather than quality. I submit that is not so.

The major amounts over the amended budget request are in the areas of Veterans' Administration medical care, urban renewal programs, basic water and sewer facilities grants and loans for housing for the elderly and the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, all the Members of this House are aware of the crisis in medical care in our Veterans' Administration hospitals. Conditions in these hospitals have been highlighted in the press—newspapers and magazines—on television and radio and before committees of this Congress. The able chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, has just expressed his concern as the veto of this bill affects medical care for veterans. His committee has done considerable work in this area and has concluded that this program needs more money if it is to serve properly and adequately the veteran population of this Nation and particularly, the returning veteran from Vietnam. All of the great veterans organizations—American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled Veterans, AMVETS, and a whole host of other veterans organizations have expressed their support for the action of the Congress in increasing medical care for veterans by \$105 million over the amount recommended by the administration. Who can say that this quantitative rather than qualitative? What we are talking about is quality care for those who have served their country in the armed services.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the areas in which the Congress has increased the figures in this bill are precisely those areas that carry the highest priorities. I need not tell the Members of this House what urban renewal programs have done in rebuilding the physical and social structures of our cities—big and small. No one needs to be reminded of the need for housing—the dire and urgent need for housing—to lift the hopes and aspirations of so many of the Nation's people who are ill-housed in the ghetto areas of this land. Everyone is talking about the environment and pollution but it cannot be dealt effectively unless added money is spent for basic water and sewer facilities. The added moneys in this bill to which the President objects will go giving better medical care for the veterans, to continue the fight against the decay, blight and rot of our cities, to provide needed housing

for the presently ill-housed and the elderly, and to increased activity in the fight to control pollution.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is just as important, if not more so, than the bill that was overridden a few moments ago by this House, and I trust the House will vote to override the President's veto of this bill.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the last remark of the gentleman from Massachusetts; that this bill is as important, if not more important than the other bill. I am for education and I believe in it, but what is the point in educating children if the air they breathe is not fit to breathe, and if the water they drink is not fit to drink?

This bill has money in it not only for the cities, as the gentleman said, but for the small towns and the villages across this country.

I think probably the most important thing that has been said is what the distinguished chairman said, that we require a great deal of lead time in these programs, and although more money is appropriated in this bill, actually less will be spent than in the preceding year. I think we cannot just put off forever starting to clean up the pollution in this country.

I think the people back home are going to ask a great many questions about it.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOGGS).

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts so well said a moment ago, this bill is every bit as important—if not more important—than the education appropriations bill we passed here a few minutes ago.

Let me, if I may, deal with this specious argument about inflation. First, let us take a look at the economy of this country. The gross national product today approaches a trillion dollars. A trillion dollars is a sum that is difficult to imagine.

I might say, incidentally, we have the lowest rate of growth now that we have had in the last 10 years. Nevertheless, we do have a gross national product nearing a trillion dollars. It is \$980 billion.

In an economy of a trillion dollars, a billion dollars, as much as it is, cannot possibly have any significant inflationary effect.

The inflation in this economy is easy to explain. It is not the result of Federal expenditures. The total impact of the whole Federal Establishment, including the trust funds such as social security, is about 10 percent of the gross national product. The impact of the 10 percent cannot possibly be the overriding consideration in inflation. It lies in the other 90 percent.

Let us see what has happened as a direct result of the policies of this administration. To begin with, the reason the President vetoed this bill is he is trying to put the inflation tag on Congress and take it off himself, where it belongs.

We have the highest interest rates in

the history of this country. The increased interest alone on the Federal debt amounts to \$2 billion per annum. That \$2 billion is a billion dollars more than is involved in both these bills we have been considering here today.

Let us take a look at what is happening with respect to Federal revenues. There is an outfall in Federal revenues in fiscal year 1970 of about \$1.5 billion. In fiscal year 1971 it is estimated it will be between \$4 billion and \$5 billion.

Now, why? It is because unemployed workers and unprofitable businesses do not pay taxes. Quite to the contrary, we have had to increase unemployment compensation payments by a billion dollars to meet the unemployment in this country today.

This unemployment figure of 5 percent is the highest we have had in the past 8 years, since 1961. And unemployment, unfortunately, continues to rise.

Somehow or other I have not seen the cost of living figures. There is something mysterious about that. Why have they not been related? I think the answer again is quite obvious; it is going up.

Here is where inflation is. It gets right back to trying to control the inflationary situation by using monetary policy alone, high interest rates and tight money.

And who has been affected by that? It has affected the small fellow trying to buy a home. It has affected the homebuilder. It has affected the materials supplier. It has affected small business.

It has even had a fantastic impact on Wall Street. The value of securities on Wall Street since Nixon became President of the United States has decreased by \$300 billion.

So now we have a message up here saying that we are creating inflation because we say we are going to do something about cleaning up the cities, about the veterans, and about all these other programs that are necessary.

Why, we have a backlog in this country of about \$5 billion in applications from every State in this Union for sewage projects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides practically nothing, if we really look at it in perspective.

We have a backlog of billions and billions of dollars for every manner of project, and this bill provides \$350 million additional for water and sewer grants. Now let us look at that. This money cannot be spent in fiscal year 1971. The best you could hope for would be commitments whereby the communities could have some assurance that they could start planning and awarding contracts.

To me this argument that \$1 billion in an economy of \$1 trillion would have a vital effect on inflation is so specious that it really should not command the respect of thoughtful people. What is involved here is an attack on education, on pollution, on health, on urban decay, and I want to take my stand for clean-

ing up the cities and cleaning up the rivers and helping the veterans and starting programs that are essential to the economy of this country.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable reluctance that I cast my vote today to override the vetoes of the HEW and HUD appropriation bills.

Needless to say, I share the President's concern about the need to control inflation. I share the President's view that Government spending must be kept in check if the battle against inflation is to be won.

When combined, the appropriation bills at issue today exceed the budget by about \$1 billion. It is my view that it is possible to cut \$1 billion at other points in the budget to make up the amount that these two bills exceed budget requests.

As you recall, Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I cosponsored an amendment to the military procurement authorization bill to reduce the authorization by 5 percent. In the \$20 billion authorization bill, \$1 billion could have been saved by the adoption of my amendment. This amendment has been called the "efficiency" amendment. It was designed to trim the waste from defense contracting programs. The adoption of the amendment would not jeopardize our Nation's defense, in fact, it would strengthen it and make it more efficient. The amendment will be offered again when the appropriation bill for military procurement comes before the house. The adoption of my amendment at that time would provide the \$1 billion in dispute today.

There are other considerations as well. Should the vetoes be sustained today, a delay of at least 8 weeks would result. With the school year about to begin, this delay would work a tremendous hardship on our school systems. It would mean additional weeks of uncertainty as to the levels of Federal funding and would prompt another increase in the cost of education.

A delay in approval of HUD funds would cause hardship and uncertainty for thousands of families waiting for word on when housing assistance will be available. A continuing resolution does not allow for long term commitments of funds. In addition, the HUD bill contains \$10 million for housing for the elderly and handicapped. Several first district communities, such as Fort Madison, have applications on file now for low-rent housing for the elderly projects with no funds available. The city of Keokuk benefited from this program last year. The first district population has a high percentage of residents who are 65 and older who need adequate housing. A delay in final approval for HUD funds would mean these people would have to wait longer for new housing.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I sincerely believe that we can save the \$1 billion which these two bills exceed the budget elsewhere and in view of the problems, lack of final action on the bills will bring about, I must cast my votes today to override the veto of the HEW and the veto of the HUD appropriation bills.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, after careful

study and much consideration, I have decided to support President Nixon's veto of the independent offices and HUD appropriations bill, but I am not able to support the veto of the Office of Education appropriations bill.

In reaching this decision, I have weighed the merits of two compelling positions. One is the necessity for the Congress to take strong and positive action to combat inflation and thus to strengthen and encourage our economy. The other was the crucial nature of the many areas of public responsibility in the programs which these bills would fund. Balancing these considerations led me to the conclusions that the independent offices-HUD appropriation veto should be sustained, but that on the Office of Education appropriation I must vote to override the veto.

I share the President's concern that we should be consistent in our program to halt inflation, since inflationary conditions adversely affect every program and service to people. The President has acted courageously to strengthen our economy, a task necessitated by the ill-advised monetary and fiscal policies followed by the Democrats in the 1960's. If we are to have economic stability in the 1970's, it is essential that the type of fiscal prudence which President Nixon has practiced continue to prevail. Therefore, for reasons of the economy and not in opposition to the particular programs which would have been funded—many of which I have strongly supported—I shall vote to sustain the veto of the independent offices-HUD appropriations bill. While the urban renewal program has been and must continue to be an effective help to our entire Nation, especially in providing new and rehabilitating old housing, there remains considerable funding and the increase of about \$350 million over the budget is inflationary and not justified at this time. No field of needed progress has been hurt more by inflation than housing. Responsibility in economic policy must be maintained if it is to prosper.

Similarly, there is drastic and immediate need to strengthen our steps against water pollution. However, the increase of almost \$350 million over the budget in this bill is inflationary and not aimed at the principal area of need, the building of secondary treatment facilities, which is being supported in greatly increased scope by other legislation. Rather, the increase in this bill would take over against federally borrowed funds, expansion of sewer facilities which in many cases could be financed by local charges on a pay as you go basis. The expansion of Federal support here would in effect penalize those communities which have done the job themselves. One program in the bill, although reduced, is still grossly excessive in my opinion. That is the space program. It could be reduced by \$1 billion and still be meaningful. That alone is enough reason to sustain the veto.

My decision not to support the veto of the Office of Education appropriations bill was a very difficult one for me to make. This is the first time that I have not voted to sustain the veto of a money bill by President Nixon. In spite of the fact that the amount appropriated ex-

ceeds the President's budget request by \$453 million, I feel that the funds for education are a must at this time. The opening of the school year is just around the corner, and I would not want to see many vital programs curtailed due to uncertainty as to the amount of Federal funding. In the area of vocational education, for example, there is much reliance placed upon the existence of Federal funds, and a veto at this time would be disruptive. It is important that programs, such as vocational education not be restricted, or perhaps canceled, due to a lack of certainty as to Federal funds.

While I reiterate my long standing conviction that inflation cannot be curbed without a reduction in Federal spending and that education has been greatly harmed by it, I feel that it is not right to jeopardize educational programs. Accordingly, I will vote to override the President's veto of the Office of Education appropriations bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I truly regret that the President has vetoed these two appropriations bills.

It strikes me as peculiar that the same people who cry inflation when we spend on sewer or water lines, or on hospitals or school kids, stand strangely silent when vast sums are appropriated for a space shuttle, the beginning of a man-on-Mars program, or for jet-set hardware like the SST.

This Nation of ours is a great one, but somehow the attention of its Government seems diverted from programs with long-range impact to flashy programs of immediate but temporary visibility. Despite this diversion, despite the Presidential fairy tale of a spendthrift Congress, the fact is that during President Nixon's first year in office the Congress cut his specific spending requests by \$6.4 billion.

So far this year the House has cut the President's budget in 10 places and increased it in three for a net decrease of \$572 million below his requests. It has cut his budgets for such things as foreign aid and military construction, transportation, and public works, and increased them in such unglamorous areas as hospital construction and water.

The upshot is that we are spending less for fancy space programs and less to support foreign dictators, and we are spending more on education, more on hospitals and health, and more to fight pollution—or so we thought we were.

In the process we intended to spend less overall, and what is wrong with that? It means an effort by Congress to get a better balance in what we spend our money for.

The President seems to be going the way of several former Presidents who believed they had an almost absolute authority to establish spending priorities with no advice from Congress.

The facts are that the Constitution gives Congress control of the Nation's purse strings, and that for the last 25 years, Congress has cut the budget requests of whatever party had control of the White House and reshuffled priorities in the process.

The country is bigger than one man,

and Congress has the Constitutional right to reshuffle expenditures. The Constitution did not design Congress to be a rubberstamp.

In my congressional district there are 91 small communities without water systems. There are 106 such communities without sewer systems. The President's action, if allowed to stand, will mean that communities like Plover and Shawano and Antigo and Cecil will be forced to wait months more for community services which they need now.

If Congress cannot reallocate a tiny percentage in a Federal budget of more than \$200 billion, then it might as well pack up and go home and allow the President to don a gold crown and rule by fiat.

If the President really wants to hold down spending intelligently, he can do it not by vetoing bills because they spend too much on water cleanup, hospitals and housing, but rather by vetoing bills because they spend too much on the space program, the SST, and subsidies for military dictatorships hidden under the guise of foreign aid.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, upon hearing of the President's decision to veto two needed appropriations bills, I stated in the House yesterday that I was absolutely appalled. Upon reflection and analysis of the circumstances of these vetoes, I cannot but express my disgust over the political motivations behind these vetoes.

It is well known that I have been very involved in both of these money matters. I led the fight for the increased funding of education and I also led the fight for the increased funding of urban renewal. Yesterday I commented on the education aspect of the veto; today I would like to comment on the housing and independent offices appropriations veto.

What a cruel fate, Mr. Speaker, for the people who live in our large and decaying cities. They are now to be saved from the raging fires of inflation by being allowed to live in less than adequate housing. What a consolation it must be to these citizens to know that their continued privation is the only bulwark against increased inflation. It might be hard for them to understand this, since they are probably in the 5 percent who are out of work.

I cannot wait for the President to meet with the mayors and the governors and offer them pallatives of the "New Federalism" or "returning responsibility to the local governments," and then slip them the hooker—finance it out of your dwindling property taxes because the Federal Government is fighting inflation.

What a cruel hoax. What a gross political act. I am sure that combat veterans who are in our VA hospitals will be consoled that they, too, are fighting inflation, by being provided with less than adequate medical facilities.

I can hardly wait for the latest White House Commission or Committee, is it Cabinet level post, on the environment to discover, or is it rediscover, that we have problems in water pollution and that something should be done about it.

Well something has been done about it. This Congress added money for water pollution control to the President's meager budget.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, these vetoes have little to do with the economy. They have everything to do with branding this Congress as "spendthrift." The Nixon administration desires to shift the burden of responsibility for the economic crisis we are in to the Congress. After responding with only the weakest of antiinflation moves that did not stem the course of inflation, the administration now desires to look for a scapegoat. I guess political reality dictates that the scapegoat should be the Congress but I think the President could have been more discerning in its choice of programs. Our Nation's children, our decaying cities, our polluted rivers, our scandalous VA hospitals—are these the way to cover an inadequate inflationary policy? I cannot believe this is the case.

We are in the process of trying to reorder our national priorities. This Congress has led the way in the direction of more adequate funding for education, urban renewal, by putting money into programs designed to eliminate the pollution of our waters. This Congress has demonstrated its leadership role and has sent viable legislative programs to the White House. Now, we have attempted to fund these programs—and they are being returned to us marked "inflationary"—It is painfully apparent that the ideology that pervades the White House is "speak loudly and passionately on the issues, but do not do a thing about them."

Let us look again, one more time. We had a budget of \$200.8 billion. By fine tuning early in the year, the administration determined that we would have a budget surplus of \$1.3 billion. And now because inflation has been allowed to continue, we find business is not as profitable, personal income is not as high as anticipated, and we are faced with a deficit. This economic condition has been going on for the past year and a half, and is now attributed to these two bills. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this type of thinking will not be unchallenged in this Congress and will not be accepted by the American people.

I earnestly hope that this body will hold to its original convictions and will act today to override both these vetoes. The needs in these areas are manifest, they must be met not only with pious statements but with adequate funds.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of the President regarding the dangers of inflation and intend to vote to sustain his veto.

It is interesting to note that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States also shares this concern. On the front page of its Washington Report of August 10 is an article entitled "Let's Shake the Inflation Habit, or Why Excessive Spending Is Not Good Politics." It is a well-reasoned discussion of inflation which concludes, "A candidate who has no regard for your tax dollar does not deserve your campaign dollar or your vote." Let me insert the entire article in the Record at this point:

**LET'S SHAKE THE INFLATION HABIT OR, WHY EXCESSIVE SPENDING IS NOT GOOD POLITICS**

Inflation erodes everybody's dollars. The spending that caused the enormous \$25-billion deficit in fiscal 1968 has since slashed the value of the dollar by 11%.

Last year inflation robbed Americans of \$60 billion of their savings in banks and life insurance.

The time has come to shake the habit of deficit government spending that feeds inflation, however painful it may be.

Some progress was made over the past two fiscal years: A small surplus, then a \$2.9 billion deficit.

But the way things are going now we may be heading into another inflationary binge unless we show more determination to hold the line against government expenditures that exceed revenues.

Already there has been a turn-around in the Administration's estimates for fiscal 1971 from an original \$1.3 billion surplus to a \$1.3 billion deficit—and even that is growing illusory. Some responsible sources are predicting much larger deficits.

This gloomy outlook stems from a combination of factors and sources.

Most significant is the readiness of too many members of Congress to spend money in the belief that it is both the handiest and best solution to our problems, and that it will win votes.

The problem is compounded by the reluctance of Congress in an election year to raise taxes. While Congress is ignoring President Nixon's requests for additional tax revenues, revisions in last year's tax bill have already cut revenues projected for this year by \$3 billion and those requested for fiscal 1972 by \$5 billion.

The Nixon Administration is not without fault either for its proposal of new or expanded federal programs at this time—witness the expensive welfare bill with its revolutionary concept of a guaranteed income for families with a fully employed father.

Many others must share the responsibility for the critical situation we face and change their ways.

The public must stop demanding government services for which it is not willing to pay in higher taxes, and stop electing big spenders to public office.

Organized labor must stop using its power to force wage increases that are not earned through higher productivity, thus putting upward pressure under prices through higher labor costs.

Business and labor must work together to increase productivity and the quality of goods in all sectors of our economy, which is one of the best ways to get economic growth without inflation.

States and local communities need to think of meeting more of their own responsibilities and learning to depend less on federal hand-outs.

Mr. Nixon is on sound ground when he threatens to veto or ignore some of the spending bills. We believe he is right when he says:

*"When the American people learn that the big spenders in Congress are primarily responsible for higher prices, and eventually even higher taxes, I think that the American people will turn on the big spenders politically."*

In a warning that taxpayers will not tolerate irresponsible spending, the President voiced this advice:

*"Congress should ask itself in every case: Will this new expenditure, when tied to all the others, require increased taxes or cause a deficit which would bring about an increase in price?"*

*"The Congress must examine with special care those spending programs which benefit some of the people but which really raise taxes and prices for all the people."*

If we are going to shake the habit of deficit spending—and brake inflation—the voter, and the businessman in particular, must ask all candidates who seek his vote in the coming elections whether they do or will apply the spending test suggested by Mr. Nixon, and judge them accordingly.

A candidate who has no regard for your tax dollar doesn't deserve your campaign dollar, or your vote.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, there are many who are better qualified to provide the advocacy for the special interests involved in this bill—some may know more precisely where the dollars are going to be used, but I want to suggest a few simple reasons why I believe the average taxpaying citizen would want us to sustain the President's veto.

All of us have talked about revising priorities—the priorities in this bill are out of balance with the needs and desires of the American people. Our bill aggravates the inequities of the priorities.

For instance, housing is one of the important needs and deficiencies of our citizenry—socially and economically. We appropriate only \$30 million for research and development for housing—maybe this is all we can afford at this time. I think it is inadequate.

Space research is beneficial but not essential to the immediate needs of our citizenry—especially when we are experiencing such a budget crisis and a fiscal deficit. Nonetheless the conference report added \$65 million to the already recommended sum of \$250 million for space research.

I am convinced that the American taxpayer would prefer that, if anything, these two priorities be reversed at this time and under present conditions. I do not suggest this complete reversal. But I do suggest that we sustain the President's veto and give our committee not only a chance to reduce the appropriation but to do better in allocating priorities.

The conferees added \$350 million for urban renewal. Now, urban renewal has been useful, but it does not provide economical housing, it is not popular among citizens. Some mayors enjoy the massive grants of Federal funds, but most citizens know that these funds are taxpayers' money. Neither the Congress nor the taxpayer would approve a tax increase equal to the increases suggested by the conferees who proposed the bill which the President vetoed.

I urged my colleagues to sustain the President's veto and give us a chance to present a bill more in keeping with the taxpayers' desires.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am voting today to sustain the President's veto of the appropriation bill. I do this, not because I am a Republican and our President is a Republican, I am supporting him because I believe he is right. I recognize that the shortage of housing is critical and may even get worse before it gets better, but the largest contributing factor is a shortage of private money and the high interest rate that prevails today. To continue to spend more money from the U.S. Treasury than is there will further aggravate these conditions. We must start to think seriously about

spending more than we have. This has caused the inflation that is the real problem with our economy today.

I have decided to vote to stop excessive spending only after assurance that the much needed care for our veterans will not be reduced nor the care affected by this action. This veteran's care money will not be reduced.

Today, we must vote for the hard-working taxpayers of the country. I am voting for the taxpayers by voting to sustain President Nixon's veto.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, as one who is extremely concerned about inflation, the fact that these two appropriation bills—independent offices and Office of Education—each run approximately half a billion dollars over the President's fiscal year 1971 budget has me concerned. However, when one takes a look at the increases, one realizes that the reasons for them are unique.

In regard to H.R. 16916, the Office of Education Appropriation, I intend to vote to override the veto. I want to commend the Appropriations Committee for its action in separating this measure from that containing other Health, Education, and Welfare funds. As we all remember, it was February of this year before the schools knew the amount of Federal funds they were eligible to receive for last year. Our schools need these funds badly and they need to know how much they will receive in advance so that adequate plans can be made. And, as I study the additions made by the Congress, I feel that, for the most part, they are in worthwhile programs such as bilingual education, dropout prevention and aid to deprived districts. Further, the increases come in areas where the budget requests were not substantially increased over the expenditures of the previous years.

However the independent offices appropriation is a horse of a different color and I intend to vote to sustain the President's veto in this instance. Let me make one point clear, I am in total support of the increase for veterans medical care. If this were the only reason for the veto, I would vote to override it. But, the increases in H.R. 17548 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development came in areas where the President had already significantly increased outlays. For example, the President's request for urban renewal, water and sewer grants and housing subsidies was double the outlays in the last fiscal year of the previous administration. At the time the appropriation agreed to by the conference committee came to the House floor I voted against these increases by voting for a motion to recommit the bill. I have not changed my mind that the spending in this bill is excessive and, therefore, will vote to sustain the veto.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I again must urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto of the independent offices and HUD appropriations bill. This veto, like that of the education bill just repassed by this body, is more a matter of grandstand politicking than a real concern for controlling inflation.

Why is it, I ask, that those measures which the Chief Executive sees as in-

flationary are those measures which are aimed at helping the vast majority of average, everyday taxpaying Americans, who form the backbone of the Nation? Yet those proposals such as the billion dollar SST which lines the pockets of a few corporate stockholders or the farm program which subsidizes a handful of wealthy nonfarmers to the tune of over \$3 billion, are not considered inflationary?

H.R. 17548 is clearly aimed at helping the vast majority of middle Americans—that so-called silent majority. One section of this bill increases the funds urgently needed to improve Veterans' Administration services. In New York City there is tremendous need for a new veterans hospital. The existing facility is old and overcrowded. Its services suffer from a lack of funds. Its depressing situation was recently spotlighted in a national magazine. Yet President Nixon considers it inflationary to spend money to build a new facility for the veterans of our Armed Forces.

Another section of the bill would provide funding for assistance to middle-income housing projects such as cooperatives. Our housing programs have completely ignored that vast group of Americans that neither qualify for public housing because of larger incomes nor satisfy the monetary requirements to purchase expensive new housing. This bill takes a large step toward providing help to this group. The high interest rates have already closed these people out of the market. The extra funds will help bring them back in.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly quote from the President's message:

Taken individually, there is much that can be said in favor of every spending bill, including the ones I have vetoed.

But a President is not elected to see any one bill in isolation. He must see them as part of a whole, because his constituency is 200 million Americans.

It appears that the President is taking a myopic view of the budgetary situation, rather than the broad overview of which he speaks. This body is as committed toward a balanced budget as is the Chief Executive. However, it is clear that Mr. Nixon's goals of spending billions for the benefit of a few cannot be condoned when millions of taxpaying Americans are in dire need of help and assistance from their Federal Government.

When the health and well-being of the people of this country is at stake—as I feel it is at this time—we cannot afford to quibble over a mere \$641 million. However, I can assure you that when the wealth and good-living of a limited few are the object of legislation, I will be among those registering the loudest "nay."

This measure greatly benefits a vast majority of Americans—taxpaying Americans who now deserve a fair shake from their Government. I strongly urge my colleagues to take the side of these millions of neglected citizens whose stoic silence must now be answered with action. I strongly urge that this body repass this measure despite the objections of the President.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, the vote taken today to sustain or to override the President's veto of the Office of Education appropriations bill, H.R. 16916, and the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill, H.R. 17548, does not represent an argument for or against any of the programs or elements funded by these two bills. The fact is together they obligate nearly \$1 billion more than the President's budget for the same programs.

Neither is there an argument in this case on the butter or guns issue or on the matter of redirection of priorities for Federal spending. We have already moved from guns to butter and toward a peacetime economy. Vast cuts have been made in defense spending. The annual cost of the Vietnam war has been reduced by \$14 billion. In fact, 800,000 people who were formerly employed directly or indirectly in the Defense Establishment have had to seek other work.

The original budget requests of the President for funds to pay for the programs in these two bills were, in fact, a large increase over the expenditures of the year before in the same areas, and in the case of education were nearly 30 percent higher than funds requested by the last budget of the Johnson administration.

In the area of independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development, the administration request actually about doubled previous spending in these areas; so there can be no realistic argument as to the redirection of priorities.

The whole matter gets down to raw politics. It gets down to the question whether you really want to control inflation or whether you do not. It gets down to whether you really want a very substantial increase in taxes or you do not. I have heard of no creditable economist who will argue that over-budget spending is not a key force which causes inflation.

Another fact is that a great deal of the money appropriated in both of these bills is nondiscretionary as far as the Executive is concerned. These funds will have to be spent and spent in the ensuing fiscal year. The result will be either a demand for a substantial increase in taxes or an excessive deficit for the year or a decided reduction in the application of funds in other areas.

Somewhere, something will have to give. If the arguments that have been made even by the Speaker himself are valid, then why not add another billion dollars or even another \$2 billion more to these programs. If the plan is to print money irresponsibly, then why not accept the large economy size.

There is much talk in these times about our responsibility to the young people of America, and I share a deep feeling of trusteeship for their welfare and for their future. There is nothing worse that we can do for the generation to follow than to spend our way into oblivion, to destroy the economic foundation on which this country was built or to tax the citizen to the point that he loses his motivation to improve him-

self or worse than this, his confidence in his country.

I, for one, voted to save the taxpayers a billion dollars. I believe the programs encompassed by these bills could have been effectively funded in accordance with the President's request.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, as the House considers the Presidential veto of the appropriations for independent offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues some of the worthwhile appropriations contained in this bill.

The Council on Environmental Quality is funded within this measure.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is contained within this measure. Included therein are programs for Government assisted housing such as urban renewal, model cities and diverse mortgage credit programs. As the urban crises in many cities worsens, we in the Congress must consider ourselves responsible for alleviating some of the bad conditions endured by urban residents. Moreover, to underfund these important programs is to guarantee their failure.

Funds for Veterans' Administration programs are contained in this measure, including veterans compensation and pensions, readjustment benefits, veterans insurance and indemnities, medical care and prosthetic research. I know personally that the East Orange Veterans Hospital facility, located within my Congressional district, has been making do with an inadequate level of funding for some time now. Although morale is high at this particular veterans installation, it would be unjust for those who have given so much for their country to receive so little in return.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, with as much reluctance as I am sure the President felt when he vetoed the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations, I will vote to sustain his veto.

It is a painful fact of life that there simply are not enough revenues to finance every individual worthwhile undertaking designed to meet the needs of a particular group or segment of our Nation.

Priorities must be set. While I respectfully differ with the President in the area of education funding, in fairness to him it must be pointed out that under his administration new priorities have emerged.

He has cut military and space spending drastically.

He has increased domestic spending by a large proportion.

His budget request for urban renewal, water and sewer programs, and housing was double that of the last year of the previous administration.

No less than any of us, I am sure that the President looks forward to the time when all of the vital needs of our citizens can be met.

In the meantime, he and all of us must exercise reasonable discretion.

On the question of the HUD veto, I believe he has done so.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to override the veto of this Housing and Urban Development and independent agencies appropriations bill of 1971.

Every Member of Congress is intensely concerned with the individual responsibility to prudently invest the taxpayers' money. I and every other Member present recognized that duty when we unanimously voiced our approval of the original bill, here in the House and so did the great majority in the Senate when they passed the original measure by a vote of 70 to 8. Our separate and non-partisan responsibility is not and should not be changed by any Presidential action.

The same basic question that we answered "yes" to when we acted on the original bill must be answered again today. That question is simply this, shall the immediate and urgent human needs for housing, our veterans needs for medical and rehabilitation treatments and programs, our communities needs for sewer systems and flood control facilities and our cities needs for urban renewal be placed above the need for expanding military operations and expenditures, excessive foreign aid, the SST, a man on Mars, ABM expansion and other very questionable and nonessential expanding proposals and projections. Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan question and its vital importance requires a nonpartisan response.

Whatever resultant response may be made to this question today, I deeply believe that the substance of this question very clearly and objectively emphasizes the absolute necessity of this administration to scrupulously and prudently review and reorder its recommendations and actions for the priority spending of the American taxpayers' money in the national interest and welfare. Certainly, a claim that the expenditure of \$994 million in the two vital areas of housing and education, reflects a very dangerous inflationary influence, in relation to a total national budget of some \$198 billion, imposes a great strain upon even the most prejudiced imagination.

Mr. Speaker, beyond the reasons I have already outlined, my conscientious answer to the question is based on the yardstick for legislative and executive action advocated by our late and revered President Eisenhower. His sole yardstick was, and I quote, "Is this good for all Americans?" On that standard of judgment, my answer is "Yes," this Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill for fiscal year 1971 is indeed good and of priority urgency for each American community and I hope the House will sustain its original judgment and resoundingly override the Presidential veto in the national interest.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wholeheartedly support the efforts of the leadership of this House today in once again overriding a most unfortunate act by the President. Previously, in instances where the President had seen fit to veto measures passed by the Congress for programs badly needed by the country, I differed with the President's reasoning on the basis of priorities. Today, Mr. Speaker, I take issue with the

President not only on his false sense of priorities but on his political judgment. The President vetoed the independent offices and the Office of Education appropriation bills last Tuesday, reportedly on the grounds that \$1 billion added for these vital programs by the Congress was inflationary.

I believe that the President's purpose in taking this grave and unfortunate action was sheer politics. It is apparent that the President believes that this issue can be used throughout the forthcoming campaign and he wishes to take such issues as education, housing and veterans care into the partisan arena of this year's congressional elections. Mr. Nixon is attempting to blame a Democratic Congress for fueling the flames of inflation but an examination of his record shows just the contrary. He has consistently refused to exercise his powers as President to hold down the cost of living and ruinous interest rates.

The Defense Production Act contains a section which authorizes the President to set wage and price guidelines and I submit this could be done and properly backed up by a President who was serious about inflation. But what has Mr. Nixon done? He has specifically stated that he will not use these powers to control the massive price and wage rises. Instead he has chosen to set up more committees, more advisory boards, more panels, which merely restate the problems which he refuses to take the proper means to solve. For the projected deficit that the administration has forecast, is in my opinion completely attributable to the Nixon administration's mismanagement of our economy.

The \$1 billion appropriation for badly needed education, housing, and veterans programs is not going to substantially contribute to the deficit. The Congress has repeatedly, this year, manifested its willingness to cut in other lower priority Government programs, such as space, defense, agriculture subsidies, and foreign aid. In these fields, the administration has been strangely silent. Schools for our young, care for the veterans, and housing are not partisan issues and I predict that the President will deeply regret his action in making these programs a matter of partisanship.

I also find it indeed strange that the President would take the action that he took on these two important bills at the very time that the National Governor's Conference was meeting in Missouri and passing resolutions calling for the Federal Government to assume a greater share of the educational burden of the country. Everyone in this Chamber knows the problems that our States are having with regard to coping with the educational responsibility that they carry. President Nixon's actions run contrary to the needs of the States as expressed by the Governors at their meeting this week. In my State of Maryland, the impact of Mr. Nixon's unfortunate act will be most grave. The school systems of Baltimore City and County need to know where they stand. And our veterans' hospitals need the increased funds that were provided for in the independent offices appropriation bill to make the

needed improvements in health care now being afforded.

Mr. Nixon's action in vetoing these two important measures is further difficult to understand when we reflect on what we have heard over the last year from the Nixon administration. What have we heard? Well, I recall hearing the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, and other prominent members of the administration consistently tell the public that the inflation that is robbing the savings and futures and income of millions of Americans was under control. We heard from the Nixon administration about how price increases were slackening but today, of course, prices continue to go up faster than ever, business is off and unemployment is rising, interest rates are higher than ever and we have witnessed over recent months one of the largest stock market slides in the history of our country. The administration's anti-inflation policies are simply not working. Mr. Nixon's tokenism in vetoing legislation for education, veterans, and housing is a sham. If we are to control inflation, we must take actions much more responsible, much more vital and much more significant than using these kinds of programs in a political manner.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that one of the items contained in the independent offices appropriation bill, which Mr. Nixon has seen fit to veto, was the \$105 million that many of us in the House worked for to provide the badly needed improvements for our veterans' hospitals. I think all of my colleagues will recall the shocking exposé that appeared in Life magazine with regard to conditions prevailing in some of the Nation's veterans' hospitals. When you vote today on this measure, please think deeply about whether it really is inflationary to provide adequate and decent care for those people who have given the country so much.

In conclusion, I would like to remind my colleagues that what the President neglected to tell the American people is that it was the Congress that cut his budget last year by \$6.4 billion and now he wants to quibble with us over a billion dollars for essential programs and make the American people think that the Congress is fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I voted to sustain the veto of the independent offices-HUD appropriations bill. That action is a sincere and honest effort to apply the yardstick of priority.

While it is true that I voted against the motion to recommit at the time of the conference report, there was only one vote taken. To vote for the motion to recommit could have been construed as a vote against all of the items contained in that conference report.

I am glad I had the foresight to enter my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the day of the vote on the conference report. At that time I pointed out the evil of having to act upon an appropriations measure which contained so many important and necessary items all bound up in the same package with some other items of very doubtful priority. Having to act on such a bundle containing many low priority items

along with some other very sorely needed increases, the membership of the House was put in an almost impossible dilemma.

Today as we talk about the need for congressional reorganization or congressional reform we should carefully consider the need for the addition of more than one motion to recommit with instructions. Of course we should continue to allow the minority side of the aisle its motion to recommit but many times one motion is not enough to pinpoint or ferret out the questionable or bad items that are all tied up together with the good or necessary things. If and when we get back to considering congressional reorganization I hope I may have the opportunity to offer such an amendment to our procedures in the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of the independent offices-HUD appropriations bill falls in a very different category from the veto of the education appropriations bill. First off, the education bill contains one subject matter, whereas the independent offices bill is a sort of catchall or canopy or a kind of big basket to carry appropriations ranging all the way from SEC to FTC, FCC, GSA, and others. True, the largest items are for Housing and Urban Development, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Veterans' Administration. I will address some comments to each of these largest items.

To say the HUD part of the bill has to do with housing in the sense that it concerns itself with funds to loan to home builders, is neither a fair nor accurate statement. The big addition, or the really significant increase in the HUD appropriations, has not been for home loans or to finance our hard-pressed home builders. You may recall the House made a valiant effort in that direction by trying to make available the resources of the various pension funds as a loan with guaranteed repayment by the Government.

The truth then, is that the \$350 million addition to the HUD appropriations has all been for urban renewal.

In lots of places across our country, the record of the administration of urban renewal funds has not been a source of pride. But to leave out the matter of administration of these funds, I am convinced the facts are that even with these increased amounts for urban renewal such could best be described, not as a cure for urban ills, but only a bandage applied to the wounds of our cities. It is almost impossible to estimate the total amount it would take to rebuild all the ghettos in America. Certainly, it is more than our present national resources can provide in the foreseeable future.

It is my conviction that more funds should be devoted to the concept of rural revitalization to attempt to arrest the trend of migration to the cities. Unless this is done, as surely as one ghetto is eliminated by urban renewal another one will spring up in some other part of the megalopolis. Moreover, it has been my observation that in many places the process of urban renewal has been only one of tearing down and cleaning up. The rebuilding process has not kept pace. This

means a loss of local tax base to the considerable headache of all municipal office holders.

In the conference report which has now been vetoed there were some increases which were most justified, needed, and acceptable to nearly every Member even though they happened to be intermingled and thus cast under a cloud by the huge urban renewal increase. I refer to the addition of Veterans' Administration appropriations for medical care and also to the increases for water and sewer facilities grants for towns of all sizes.

No one can say that any veto is ever welcomed. Perhaps it should not have happened, but one possible advantage is to give us a chance to make a better selection of priorities than was given us before. Even the severest critics of those of us who vote to sustain the veto know that today is not the end of the line for veterans appropriations. Both the House and the Senate will see to that. These same critics also know that today is not the end of the line for adequate appropriations for smalltown water and sewer systems. Once again both the House and the Senate will see to that. It is true that there may be some slight delay. But there is ample time remaining in this session for the Congress to work its will on these two high-priority and very meritorious items.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is one item bundled up in this vast bill about which comment must be made. It is well and good to talk about priorities. If we do nothing about priorities then the talk is rather useless. One such item in this appropriations bill that had not been accorded sufficient attention because of being buried beneath so many other items is the space appropriation. While the conference report figure did not greatly exceed the Nixon budget request, there should have been the opportunity for the House to work its separate will on such a large item as the space appropriation. The conference report for space was a higher figure than the House appropriation bill. Those of us who had opposed the authorization bill for space and the House appropriation bill for space should be entitled to an effective way to voice our views that the time has come to slow down on space. We are now far ahead in the space race. Since Sputnik, we have caught up and gone ahead of the Russians. But now is no time to talk about more men on the Moon, or going to Mars or making some kind of planetary excursion. If priorities really mean anything, the time has come to assign to this program a much lower priority than as it appears in this great big package we all had to vote up or down at the time of the conference report. By sustaining the veto the committee will have to take another look at this excessively large space appropriation.

Returning to the appropriations for our veterans, there will undoubtedly be heard the complaint that those who vote to sustain this veto have suddenly turned against our veteran population and are no longer in favor of good medical care

facilities in our veterans hospitals. Well, of course, such a charge is ridiculous. It would be true and apply only to those who have had a record in the past as being consistently against beneficial veterans legislation. The fact that the Veterans' Administration happens to be one of the independent offices included in this vast bill does not mean that the membership of the Congress has suddenly become oblivious to the needs of our veteran population. As a matter of information there was less than \$80 million added for the Veterans' Administration medical care, while there was an addition of over \$88 million for the space program alone. Surely, the needs of our veterans rate a higher priority than the space program and this veto will give us a chance to take another look at the relative priority of these two programs.

But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this Congress has not failed our veterans nor will it fail them in the remaining days of this session. Only yesterday, August 12, the President signed the veterans disability compensation rate increases bill into law. This is the bill which Congress had passed increasing the compensation and dependency allowances for all service-disabled veterans. These increases were, if you remember, retroactive to July 1, 1970. While they vary with the degree of disability, the average recipient will receive an increase of about 11 percent. This disability increase bill was far-ranging. It provided for former prisoners of war to obtain compensation for disabilities arising from their imprisonment.

The increases in veterans compensation in this bill alone will cost about \$218 million over the budget figure for the current fiscal year. The point I hope I may make is, that the Congress has, by this compensation increase, been at the task of fulfilling its responsibility for those who have done so much for all of us. The Congress has certainly not forgotten its 2 million disabled veterans nor will it forget good medical care in our veterans hospitals in the days that remain in this session.

Mr. Speaker, if the veto should be sustained, our Appropriations Subcommittee will then have another opportunity to pare down those items which had been given the biggest increase under the conference report. It will also give the committee another opportunity to take a look at those high-priority items which were not as carefully considered as they deserved to be at the time of the adoption of the conference report. We all hope the committee in its deliberations will carefully but strictly apply the yardstick of priority.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the President's veto of the independent offices-HUD appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much concern expressed today over the President's veto of the \$4.4 billion education appropriation bill. Yet I submit, and mark me well, that his veto of the independent offices-HUD bill is more untimely and more damaging to the people of this Nation.

Let us look closely at what the Presi-

dent is asking us to do, Mr. Speaker. By vetoing this bill, he wants us to cut by \$350 million the funds for the vital urban renewal program. We all know the pressing need for urban renewal, Mr. Speaker, in cities and towns throughout the United States. We all have seen the decay of our large cities. We all realize that something must be done to make our cities flourish again as centers of commerce, culture, and decent living. I maintain that our urban renewal efforts have begun to pay off. Are we willing to cripple this promising effort when so much more needs to be done?

By vetoing this bill, the President is asking us to eliminate funds for housing for the elderly and the handicapped under the section 202 program. At a time when our senior citizens and others living on fixed income are suffering the most from high prices and high interest rates, at a time when construction costs and rents are prohibitive for many middle- and low-income families, are we willing to ignore the critical need for housing for our senior citizens?

By vetoing this bill, the President is asking us to cut \$350 million from grants for basic water and sewer facilities. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, the same administration that called earlier this week for a massive antipollution effort in this Nation is today defending a cut of \$350 million in the budget for basic water and sewer facilities. The same administration that prides itself on suburban and rural political support is calling for a budget cut that will hinder construction and growth in these same areas. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the need for adequate water and sewer facilities is great throughout the country. Are we willing to forget this pressing need?

By vetoing this bill, the President is asking us to cut \$80 million from funds for medical care for our veterans. We all know the storm of protest that was raised by the Life magazine story about conditions in VA hospitals. We all know, regardless of the validity of that story, that the American people want the best possible medical care for veterans. I say that they deserve the very best. Are we willing to deprive them of it after they have sacrificed so much for all of us?

Let the record state, Mr. Speaker, that these are the real issues involved in this untimely veto. The fact is, regardless of administration efforts to create an economic smokescreen on this issue, that we are voting today for funds for urban renewal, senior citizens' housing, water and sewer facilities, and medical care for veterans. The fact is that in nearly every other area of this complex budget, the Congress has approved amounts that are the same or smaller than the President's budget requests. The fact is that the actual spending requirement in this bill for fiscal year 1971 is \$1.8 million less than the President requested.

Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker. Congress has lived up to its responsibility by providing the necessary funds for pressing needs while keeping the amounts in other areas below the budget request. Congress has not ignored the

crisis in housing. Congress has not ignored the need for medical care for our veterans. Congress has not forgotten the need for adequate water and sewer facilities throughout this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to continue to act in behalf of all Americans by overriding this tragic veto.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 204, nays 195, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 279]

YEAS—204

- |                 |                 |                |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Adams           | Gallagher       | O'Konski       |
| Addabbo         | Garmatz         | Olsen          |
| Albert          | Gaydos          | O'Neill, Mass. |
| Alexander       | Gettys          | Ottinger       |
| Anderson,       | Glaimo          | Patman         |
| Calif.          | Gibbons         | Patten         |
| Anderson,       | Gilbert         | Pepper         |
| Tenn.           | Gonzalez        | Perkins        |
| Andrews,        | Gray            | Philbin        |
| N. Dak.         | Green, Oreg.    | Pike           |
| Annunzio        | Green, Pa.      | Poage          |
| Ashley          | Gude            | Podell         |
| Aspinall        | Hagan           | Powell         |
| Ayres           | Haley           | Price, Ill.    |
| Baring          | Halpern         | Pucinski       |
| Barrett         | Hamilton        | Purell         |
| Blaggi          | Hanley          | Rees           |
| Bingham         | Hanna           | Reid, N.Y.     |
| Blanton         | Harrington      | Reuss          |
| Boggs           | Hathaway        | Riegle         |
| Boland          | Hawkins         | Rivers         |
| Bolling         | Hays            | Roberts        |
| Brademas        | Hechler, W. Va. | Rodino         |
| Brasco          | Helstoski       | Roe            |
| Brooks          | Hicks           | Rogers, Colo.  |
| Brown, Calif.   | Hollifield      | Rooney, Pa.    |
| Burke, Mass.    | Horton          | Rosenthal      |
| Burton, Calif.  | Howard          | Rostenkowski   |
| Button          | Hungate         | Roybal         |
| Byrne, Pa.      | Jacobs          | St Germain     |
| Cabell          | Johnson, Calif. | Scheuer        |
| Carey           | Jones, Ala.     | Schwengel      |
| Casey           | Jones, Tenn.    | Shibley        |
| Chisholm        | Karth           | Sikes          |
| Clark           | Kastenmeier     | Sisk           |
| Clausen,        | Kazen           | Slack          |
| Don H.          | Kee             | Smith, Iowa    |
| Cohelan         | Kluczynski      | Staggers       |
| Conyers         | Koch            | Stevens        |
| Corbett         | Kyros           | Stokes         |
| Corman          | Leggett         | Stratton       |
| Cowger          | Long, Md.       | Stubblefield   |
| Culver          | Lowenstein      | Stuckey        |
| Daddario        | McCarthy        | Sullivan       |
| Delaney         | McFall          | Symington      |
| Dent            | McKneally       | Teague, Tex.   |
| Diggs           | McMillan        | Thompson, N.J. |
| Dingell         | Macdonald,      | Tierna         |
| Donohue         | Mass.           | Tunney         |
| Dorn            | Madden          | Udall          |
| Dowdy           | Matsunaga       | Ullman         |
| Dulski          | Meeds           | Van Deerlin    |
| Eckhardt        | Meskill         | Vanik          |
| Edmondson       | Mikva           | Vigorito       |
| Edwards, Calif. | Miller, Calif.  | Waldie         |
| Eilberg         | Minish          | Watson         |
| Evans, Colo.    | Mink            | Watts          |
| Evins, Tenn.    | Minshall        | Welcker        |
| Farbstein       | Mollohan        | Whalen         |
| Fascell         | Monagan         | Whitehurst     |
| Feighan         | Moorhead        | Wildnall       |
| Flood           | Morgan          | Wilson,        |
| Flowers         | Mosher          | Charles H.     |
| Foley           | Moss            | Wolf           |
| Ford,           | Murphy, Ill.    | Wright         |
| William D.      | Murphy, N.Y.    | Yates          |
| Fraser          | Natcher         | Yatron         |
| Friedel         | Nedzi           | Young          |
| Fulton, Pa.     | Nix             | Zablocki       |
| Fulton, Tenn.   | Obey            |                |
| Galifianakis    | O'Hara          |                |

NAYS—195

- |                |                 |                |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abbutt         | Ford, Gerald R. | Myers          |
| Abernethy      | Foreman         | Nelsen         |
| Adair          | Fountain        | Nichols        |
| Anderson, Ill. | Frelinghuysen   | Pelly          |
| Andrews, Ala.  | Frey            | Pettis         |
| Arends         | Fuqua           | Pickle         |
| Ashbrook       | Goldwater       | Pirnie         |
| Beall, Md.     | Goodling        | Poff           |
| Belcher        | Griffin         | Freyer, N.C.   |
| Bell, Calif.   | Gross           | Price, Tex.    |
| Bennett        | Grover          | Quile          |
| Berry          | Gubser          | Quillen        |
| Betts          | Hall            | Rallsback      |
| Blester        | Hammer-         | Randall        |
| Blackburn      | schmidt         | Reid, Ill.     |
| Bow            | Hansen, Idaho   | Rhodes         |
| Brinkley       | Harsha          | Robison        |
| Brock          | Harvey          | Rogers, Fla.   |
| Broomfield     | Hastings        | Roth           |
| Brotzman       | Heckler, Mass.  | Rousselot      |
| Brown, Mich.   | Henderson       | Ruppe          |
| Brown, Ohio    | Hogan           | Ruth           |
| Broyhill, N.C. | Hosmer          | Sandman        |
| Broyhill, Va.  | Hunt            | Satterfield    |
| Buchanan       | Hutchinson      | Saylor         |
| Burke, Fla.    | Ichord          | Schadberg      |
| Burleson, Tex. | Jarman          | Scherle        |
| Burlison, Mo.  | Johnson, Pa.    | Schmitz        |
| Burton, Utah   | Jonas           | Schneebell     |
| Bush           | Jones, N.C.     | Scott          |
| Byrnes, Wis.   | Keith           | Sebellius      |
| Camp           | Kleppe          | Shriver        |
| Carter         | Kuykendall      | Skubitz        |
| Cederberg      | Kyl             | Smith, Calif.  |
| Chamberlain    | Landgrebe       | Smith, N.Y.    |
| Chappell       | Landrum         | Snyder         |
| Clancy         | Langen          | Springer       |
| Clawson, Del.  | Latta           | Stafford       |
| Cleveland      | Lennon          | Stanton        |
| Collier        | Lloyd           | Steed          |
| Collins        | Lujan           | Steiger, Ariz. |
| Colmer         | Lukens          | Steiger, Wis.  |
| Conable        | McClary         | Taft           |
| Conte          | McCloskey       | Talcott        |
| Coughlin       | McClure         | Taylor         |
| Crane          | McDade          | Teague, Calif. |
| Daniel, Va.    | McDonald,       | Thompson, Ga.  |
| Davis, Wis.    | Mich.           | Thomson, Wis.  |
| de la Garza    | McEwen          | Vander Jagt    |
| Dellenback     | MacGregor       | Waggoner       |
| Denney         | Mahon           | Wampler        |
| Dennis         | Mann            | Whalley        |
| Derwinski      | Marsh           | White          |
| Dickinson      | Martin          | Whitten        |
| Downing        | Mathias         | Wiggins        |
| Duncan         | May             | Williams       |
| Dwyer          | Mayne           | Wilson, Bob    |
| Edwards, Ala.  | Melcher         | Winn           |
| Erlenborn      | Michel          | Wold           |
| Esch           | Miller, Ohio    | Wyatt          |
| Eshleman       | Mills           | Wylder         |
| Findley        | Mize            | Wylie          |
| Fish           | Mizell          | Wyman          |
| Fisher         | Montgomery      | Zion           |
| Flynt          | Morse           | Zwach          |
|                | Morton          |                |

NOT VOTING—30

- |               |               |              |
|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| Bevill        | Dawson        | Mallard      |
| Blatnik       | Edwards, La.  | O'Neal, Ga.  |
| Bray          | Fallon        | Passman      |
| Caffery       | Griffiths     | Pollock      |
| Celler        | Hansen, Wash. | Pryor, Ark.  |
| Clay          | Hébert        | Rarick       |
| Cramer        | Hull          | Relief       |
| Cunningham    | King          | Rooney, N.Y. |
| Daniels, N.J. | Long, La.     | Roudebush    |
| Davis, Ga.    | McCulloch     | Ryan         |

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York and Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Mr. Daniels and Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Bevill and Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Reifel against.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas and Mr. Ryan for, with Mr. Pollock against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Roubidoux.  
 Mr. Rarick with Mrs. Hansen of Wash-  
 ington.  
 Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. King.  
 Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Caffery.  
 Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Clay.  
 Mr. Hull with Mr. Malliard.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

**POLITICAL BROADCASTING—CON-  
 FERENCE REPORT**

Mr. STAGGERS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3637) to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to equal time requirements for candidates for public office and for other purposes:

**CONFERENCE REPORT  
 (H. REPT. 91-1420)**

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3637) to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to equal time requirements for candidates for public office, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That (a) the first sentence of section 315 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(a)) is amended by inserting before the colon the following: "except that the foregoing requirement shall not apply to the use of a broadcasting station by a legally qualified candidate for the office of President or Vice President of the United States in a general election".

(b) Section 315(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The charges made for the use of any broadcasting station by any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office shall not exceed the lowest unit charge of the station for the same amount of time in the same time period."

Sec. 2. Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (f) and by inserting immediately before such subsection the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'major elective office' means the office of President, United States Senator or Representative, or Governor or Lieutenant Governor of a State.

"(2) (A) No legally qualified candidate in an election (other than a primary election) for a major elective office may spend for the use of broadcasting stations on behalf of his candidacy in such election a total amount in excess of—

"(1) 7 cents multiplied by the number of votes cast for all legally qualified candidates for such office in the last preceding general election for such office; or

"(ii) \$20,000, if greater than the amount determined under clause (1) (or if clause (1) is inapplicable);

"(B) In the case of a candidate for United States Senator in a State in which the total number of votes cast for all legally qualified candidates for Senator in the last preceding

election for Senator was less than the greatest total number of votes cast for all legally qualified candidates in any election (held after such preceding senatorial election) for a statewide office in such State, the amount determined under subparagraph (A) (1) shall be 7 cents multiplied by such greatest total number of votes for statewide office.

"(3) No legally qualified candidate in a primary election for nomination to a major elective office, other than President, may spend for the use of broadcasting stations on behalf of his candidacy in such election a total amount in excess of 50 per centum of the amount determined under paragraph (2) with respect to the general election for such office.

"(4) Amounts spent for the use of broadcasting stations on behalf of any legally qualified candidate for major elective office (or for nomination to such office) shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to have been spent by such candidate. Amounts spent for the use of broadcasting stations by or on behalf of any legally qualified candidate for the office of Vice President of the United States shall, for the purposes of this subsection, be deemed to have been spent by the candidate for the office of President of the United States with whom he is running.

"(5) No station licensee may make any charge for the use of such station by or on behalf of any candidate for major elective office (or for nomination to such office) unless such candidate, or a person specifically authorized by such candidate in writing to do so, certifies to such licensee in writing that the payment of such charge will not violate paragraph (2) or (3), whichever is applicable.

"(d) If the Commission determines that—

"(1) a State by law—  
 "(A) has provided that a primary or other election for any office of such State (other than Governor or Lieutenant Governor) or of a political subdivision thereof is subject to this subsection, and

"(B) has specified a limitation upon total expenditures for the use of broadcasting stations on behalf of the candidacy of each legally qualified candidate in such election, and

"(2) the amount of such limitation does not exceed the amount which would be determined for such election under subsection (c) had such election been an election for a major elective office, or nomination thereto,

then no station licensee may make any charge for the use of such station by or on behalf of any legally qualified candidate in such election unless such candidate, or a person specifically authorized by such candidate in writing to do so, certifies to such licensee in writing that the payment of such charge will not violate such limitation upon total expenditures.

"(e) For the purposes of this section, the term 'broadcasting station' includes a community antenna television system, and the terms 'licensee' and 'station licensee' when used with respect to a community antenna television system, mean the operator of such system."

Sec. 3. (a) The amendment made by subsection (b) of the first section of this Act shall take effect on the thirtieth day after the date of its enactment.

(b) (1) The amendments made by section 2 of this Act, insofar as they relate to primary elections, shall take effect on January 1, 1971. Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by section 2, insofar as they relate to general elections, shall apply with respect to amounts paid for broadcast time used after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) If the Federal Communications Commission determines that—

(A) on August 12, 1970, a person is a legally qualified candidate for major elective office (or nomination thereto).

(B) there are in effect on such date one or more written agreements with station licensees for the purchase of broadcast time to be used after such thirtieth day on behalf of his candidacy for such office (or nomination thereto), and

(C) such agreements specify amounts to be paid for the purchase of such time to be used after such thirtieth day which, in the aggregate, exceed the limitation imposed by section 315(c)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the general election for such office,

then such amendments shall not apply to any of the candidates for election to such office in an election held before January 1, 1971.

And the House agreed to the same. That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

HARLEY O. STAGGERS,  
 TORBERT H. MACDONALD,  
 LIONEL VAN DEERLIN,  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*  
 WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
 JOHN O. PASTORE,  
 VANCE HARTKE,  
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

**STATEMENT**

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3637) to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to equal-time requirements for candidates for public office, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The substitute agreed upon in conference is exactly the same as the bill passed by the House except for section 3, which established an effective date for the legislation. The effective date for the bill passed by the House was January 1, 1971.

The Senate passed bill had two effective dates. The first section, which repealed the equal-time provisions of section 315(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to presidential and vice-presidential candidates and made a broadcast station's lowest unit charge available to legally qualified candidates for public office, would have been effective on the date of enactment. Section 2, imposing limits on expenditures for the purchase of broadcast time by certain candidates for public office would have been effective 30 days after the date of enactment of the legislation.

Section 3 of the conference substitute establishes new effective dates for the legislation. Under it, section 1(b), which makes a broadcast station's lowest unit charge available to legally qualified candidates for public office, would take effect on the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of the legislation.

Section 2, imposing the broadcast expenditure limitations, would take effect as follows:

(1) The broadcast expenditure limitations for primary elections would not take effect until January 1, 1971.

(2) The broadcast expenditure limitations for general elections would apply only to amounts paid for broadcast time used after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of the legislation, except in election contests to which the rule described in paragraph (3), below, applies.

(3) The general election broadcast expenditure limitation would not apply to an election to a major elective office held before

January 1, 1971. If the Federal Communications Commission determined that—

(A) on August 12, 1970, a person is a legally qualified candidate for that office, or nomination thereto,

(B) there are in effect on August 12, 1970, one or more written agreements with station licensees for the purchase of broadcast time to be used after the thirtieth day after the enactment of the bill on behalf of his candidacy for such office, or nomination thereto, and

(C) these agreements specify amounts to be paid for the purchase of time to be used after such thirtieth day which, in the aggregate, exceed the limitation imposed by the legislation with respect to the general election for such office.

Although they accepted all other provisions of the legislation as passed by the House, the Managers on the part of the Senate were adamant in their refusal to accept the House effective date. The Managers on the part of the House reluctantly acceded believing that the legislation is much more important than the date it becomes effective. As already indicated, this will make available to legally qualified candidates for public office the lowest unit charges of broadcast stations on and after the thirtieth day after the date of enactment of the legislation. Thus, these charges should be available to candidates for at least a portion of the upcoming election campaign. Under the House passed legislation, of course, they would not have been available until January 1, 1971.

The limitation on expenditures by candidates for major elective office for use of broadcast stations would, in most cases, also take effect on the thirtieth day after the date of enactment. However, the conferees were concerned that some of these candidates already might have agreements for use of broadcast time calling for payments in excess of the limits provided in the legislation. The conferees were concerned that, if this legislation were imposed on those cases, it might have the effect of completely disrupting the campaigns of these candidates and wreak havoc with the program schedules of the broadcast stations with which those agreements were in effect. Therefore, the conference agreement makes the expenditure limitation inapplicable in those cases, if the agreements were in effect on August 12, 1970, and provide for payments for broadcast time which is to be used after the effective date of amounts in excess of the expenditure limitation which would otherwise be applicable. Of course, the limitation would also be inapplicable to any other candidate for the same office. Thus, whether or not the expenditure limitations apply with respect to candidates for any particular major elective office in the upcoming November general elections, all candidates for the same major elective office would be operating under the same groundrules insofar as this legislation is concerned. The date of August 12, 1970, was established as the date on which agreements had to be in effect in order to forestall the subsequent contracting for broadcast time to avoid the expenditure limitations for the upcoming general election campaign.

It is anticipated that in administering the provisions of section 3(b)(2), the FCC will give public notice of those provisions and set a date by which all candidates seeking to be exempted from the expenditure limitations must file proof of the necessary agreements. Then after determining the cases where the conditions set forth in section 3(b)(2)(A)—(C) are met the FCC would give public notice as to the major elective offices the candidates for which are exempted from the expenditure limitations for broadcast time for the forthcoming general election.

In closing, the Managers on the part of the House wish to emphasize that although the effective date provisions of the conference substitute are different than those in the legislation passed by the House they contain the hallmark of fairness in the House passed legislation, namely, that insofar as this legislation is concerned all candidates for the same office run under the same groundrules.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 3302, AMENDMENTS TO THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950**

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business now is the further consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 3302.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that on yesterday it was agreed that the conference report be considered as read, and that further proceedings thereon be postponed until today following disposition of the veto messages.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give us at least some faint idea of what happened in the conference, if anything? I presume this is the conference report on the infamous standby wage and price control bill?

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

The position of the House was maintained, and with some improvements—I will say that.

Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, August 6, the Senate and House conferees on S. 3302 met and agreed on a conference report. The Senate has now acted favorably on the report.

I believe that the statement of the managers on the part of the House fully explains the results of the conference. At this point I would simply like to stress one or two points.

First of all final action on this bill is a matter of some urgency. The Defense Production Act was to expire originally on June 30, 1970. The act received a temporary extension of 30 days, extending the act to July 30, 1970. On July 9, the Senate took final action on S. 3302. On July 27, the House committee reported its version of the Defense Production Act extension, and the House acted on July 31. On July 30, a 15-day extension was secured until this Friday, August 14. We must act now so that the basic defense production authorities found in the Defense Production Act, and that are so important to our country's national security, do not expire.

Second, it is important to point out that, while the conference report would permit the newly created Cost Accounting Standards Board to develop and promulgate cost accounting standards designed to achieve uniformity and consistency in cost accounting for defense

contractors and subcontractors in connection with negotiated contracts, two important safeguards are provided against arbitrary and overly cumbersome administration of these provisions.

One is that certain types of contracts, such as contracts of \$100,000 or less, contracts where prices are established on the basis of a catalog or market price for standard commercial items sold in substantial quantities to the general public and contracts for utility services the rates of which are established by law or regulation, are exempted from coverage of the act. In addition, the House conferees insisted that any proposed standards, rules, or regulations to be promulgated by the Board must be transmitted to Congress for 60 days of continuous session, during which Congress could, by concurrent resolution, block the proposed standards from taking effect.

It was felt by a majority of the conferees that this was a reasonable and workable compromise between the Senate and House versions of S. 3302 on the cost accounting standards issue.

It is also important to point out that Comptroller General STAAZ in a letter to Chairman SPARKMAN of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, a copy of which was forwarded to me by Mr. STAAZ, had several important objections to the House version of S. 3302. Among the most important were the following: the freezing of standards into statutory form would remove the flexibility needed by the Cost Accounting Standards Board to adjust standards promptly to changing procurement programs and policies, varying conditions in industry, and changing concepts in the cost accounting field; it is questionable whether the Congress would desire to become involved in the complexities of developing cost accounting standards which require a considerable amount of technical cost-accounting expertise and coordination with government, industry and the accounting field; a temporary board, limited in its functions as provided in the House bill would have little stature, and therefore it is questionable whether the services of individuals having the necessary qualifications could be obtained when its work would be subjected to a complete review through the entire legislative process prior to their becoming effective; the bill as passed by the House would not have adequate provision for enforcement of any standards adopted and would not provide for publication of proposed standards in the Federal Register, which would have given industry an opportunity to participate in the formulation of standards; the House version of S. 3302 would have required the Cost Accounting Standards Board to recommend standardized bid procedures and bid forms, a complex field involving the procurement process requiring expertise quite different from that needed for carrying out the functions of the Cost Accounting Standards Board; and the House bill does not authorize the appropriation of funds to finance the functions to be performed by the Cost Accounting Standards Board.

I would like to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the entire text of Comptroller General Staats' letter.

Finally, the House accepted an amendment added on the floor of the Senate by Senators BYRD of Virginia and PROXMIER to foreclose the use of Defense Production Act loan guarantees in the future in a way similar to that attempted by the administration in June to bail out the Penn Central Railroad Co. This provision would limit such guarantees to \$20 million unless Congress approved a higher limit, and would prohibit the use of the Defense Production Act loan guarantee program primarily to prevent insolvency or bankruptcy unless the President certifies in detail to Congress that such a business failure would have a direct and substantially adverse effect upon defense production and presents such a certification at least 10 days prior to the granting of the loan guarantee.

In addition, the Senate conferees agreed to accept the House provision giving the President standby authority to stabilize prices, wages, rents, and salaries. The House conferees agreed to drop from this provision the coverage of interest rates because the President was already provided with standby authority to control interest rates under Public Law 91-151 passed by the Congress in December 1969.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that the House should act on this very important piece of legislation immediately.

The letter referred to follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE  
UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1970.  
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request of August 3, 1970, for comments on the provisions of S. 3302 relating to cost-accounting standards for negotiated contracts as passed by the House of Representatives on July 31, 1970.

We have given careful consideration to the House-passed bill. Our conclusion is that the measure as passed by the House is unworkable and would not accomplish the objective of achieving cost-accounting standards for negotiated defense procurements. We reach this conclusion from the following principal considerations:

1. The freezing of standards into statutory form would remove the flexibility needed by the Cost-Accounting Standards Board to adopt standards promptly to changing procurement programs and policies varying conditions in industry, and changing concepts in the cost-accounting field. In our testimony, we stressed the importance of flexibility and the need to work closely with the accounting profession and industry to make certain that cost-accounting standards meet their intended objective without creating hardships or problems for the contractors. In our opinion the loss of this flexibility would be contrary to the interest of both Government and industry and would make it virtually impossible to develop meaningful standards under these circumstances.

2. The bill as passed by the House limits the Cost-Accounting Standards Board to developing recommendations for standards to be considered by the Congress. Each recommended standard would presumably go through the entire legislative process of

committee consideration, floor action, and Presidential approval before becoming effective. Aside from the likelihood that this would be a very time-consuming process in achieving a set of cost-accounting standards, we doubt whether the Congress would want to become involved in such details in an area which requires a considerable amount of technical cost-accounting expertise and coordination with Government, industry, and the accounting profession. Even assuming that Congress desired to legislate standards, such standards as are enacted could not be modified or amended without again going through the whole legislative process.

3. A temporary board, limited in its functions as provided in the House bill would have little stature. I question, therefore, whether it would be possible to obtain individuals with the necessary qualifications. The qualifications and stature of the Board are most important if its recommendations are to be accepted by the Congress, the accounting profession, and industry. It could be persuasively argued in fact that the Board would serve no real purpose if the standards had to be subjected to a complete review in the entire legislative process prior to their becoming effective.

In addition, we believe that there are other serious defects in the bill as passed by the House which are set forth below:

1. The bill as passed by the House has no provision requiring contractors and subcontractors to disclose to the Board in writing their current cost-accounting practices. Such disclosure is essential to the establishment of cost-accounting standards, since it provides a means for the Cost-Accounting Standards Board to determine cost-accounting practices currently followed in industry from which cost-accounting standards could be evolved and what effect proposed standards might have on existing practices. Without a provision of this nature, the cost-accounting standards to be recommended by the Board might fall to give adequate consideration to established industry practices.

2. The lack of a provision for examination of contractors' or subcontractors' records is a deficiency in the bill as passed by the House. Such authority is essential to the Cost-Accounting Standards Board in developing cost-accounting standards, particularly in developing criteria for use of cost-accounting alternatives. As we visualize the Board's operations, task forces composed of representatives from industry, Government, and the accounting profession, would study and propose cost-accounting standards in specific areas for consideration by the Board. As we understand both the House and Senate bills, the Cost-Accounting Standards Boards, although headed by the Comptroller General, would be an agency whose functions are separate and apart from the functions of the General Accounting Office. Therefore, the Board and its representatives would require specific authority to examine contractors' records for purposes of verification of contractors' practices and the development of criteria for cost-accounting standards.

3. Coupled with the absence of a provision on disclosure of contractors' cost-accounting practices is the absence of a provision for publication by the Board of proposed standards in the Federal Register, thus limiting, to a great extent, the opportunity for industry and others to cooperate or participate in the formulation of standards by submitting views and comments. While this might be accomplished administratively we believe that all interested parties should be given assurance in this regard.

4. The bill as passed by the House requires the Cost-Accounting Standards Board to recommend standardized bid procedures and bid forms to be used by contractors subject to the cost-accounting standards.

While we agree with the desirability of uniformity to the extent practicable in this area, the problems involved are extremely complex, pertain to the procurement process rather than cost-accounting, and would require expertise quite different from that needed for the functions of the Board. In our view, uniformity of bid procedures and bid forms are proper considerations for the contracting agencies and the Commission on Government Procurement rather than the Cost-Accounting Standards Board, and the related requirement in the bill should be stricken.

5. The bill as passed by the House fails to make any provision for the application and administration of cost-accounting standards after they have been recommended and enacted. Cost-accounting standards would be developed one at a time and it would take several years to develop a complete authoritative set of standards. While legislation relating to the application and administration could conceivably be considered after a standard has been developed and recommended, we believe it would be preferable to provide for them in legislation now. For one thing, it would facilitate the development of standards since the language of the standards would in large measure depend upon rules and procedures adopted for their implementation and administration.

6. Under the bill as passed by the House, the Cost-Accounting Standards Board would not be permanent, as in the case of the Senate bill, and would exist only until June 30, 1972, the expiration date of the Defense Production Act. The task of developing standards is a continuous one, and even after some standards are developed, there is no doubt that interpretations and revisions would be required on a continuous basis as circumstances change. This is true today with respect to the Armed Services Procurement Regulation Committee, which concerns itself with the Armed Services Procurement Regulation, and the Accounting Principles Board of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants which concerns itself with generally accepted accounting principles.

7. We also note that the bill as passed by the House does not authorize the appropriation of funds to finance the functions to be performed by the Cost-Accounting Standards Board.

As you know, I recommended strongly that the responsibility for the development of cost standards be placed in an executive branch board. The reasons for this position were set forth in testimony before both the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees. However, the bill as passed by the Senate is a workable approach and contains provisions which would overcome the objections which I have set forth above to the bill as passed by the House. I strongly urge, therefore, that the provisions of the Senate passed bill be adopted in conference.

A minor change which we would hope could be effected in the bill as passed by the Senate is to change the word "principles" in line 8, page 5 and in line 4, page 6 to the word "practices."

I would of course be happy to meet with you or any of the conferees if you wish.

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

ELMER B. STAATS.

Mr. Speaker, the House version of S. 3302 established a five-member Cost-Accounting Standards Board appointed and chaired by the Comptroller General, and made up of two members of the accounting profession—one

with knowledge of small business accounting practices—one representative of industry and one representative of a Government agency, all serving 4-year terms. The Board was given the power to recommend to the Congress by June 30, 1971, and each June 30 thereafter, cost accounting standards designed to achieve uniformity and consistency for use by defense contractors and subcontractors for negotiated contracts.

The version agreed to by the conferees would establish the same five-man Cost-Accounting Standards Board as created under the House version and would include the provision that one of the two professional accountants on the Board must have knowledge of small business accounting. The House conferees agreed to the Senate version that the Board would have the power to promulgate cost accounting standards designed to achieve uniformity and consistency for use by defense contractors and subcontractors for negotiated contracts, but these standards would not be applied to: First, contracts of \$100,000 or less; second, negotiated contracts where prices are established by catalog or market price of commercial items sold in substantial quantities to the general public; third, utility rates set by law or regulation; and, fourth, where the Board finds it is not necessary to apply the standards to certain classes of contractors because of the size of the contracts or otherwise.

In addition, the House conferees insisted that the Senate version be changed to require that any proposed standards, rules, or regulations to be promulgated by the Board be transmitted to Congress for 60 days of continuous session, during which Congress could by concurrent resolution block the proposed standards from taking effect.

However, minor and technical modifications in already promulgated standards, rules or regulations which do not in effect constitute the issuance of new standards, rules or regulations would not have to be submitted to Congress prior to promulgation.

The compromise version also contained various administrative and enforcement provisions concerning uniform accounting standards contained in the Senate version of S. 3302.

The House version of S. 3302 gave the President standby authority to stabilize prices, wages, salaries, rents, and interest rates at levels not less than those prevailing on May 25, 1970, but adjustments could be made to avoid inequities. This authority would expire February 28, 1971. The Senate conferees receded to the House on this entire provision except for the deletion of interest rates from the standby controls title. This amendment was accepted by the House conferees because the President was already given standby authority to control interest rates under Public Law 91-151 passed by the Congress in December 1969.

The House version of S. 3302 did not contain any amendments affecting the Defense Production Act loan guarantee program. The Senate version limited these loan guarantees to a maximum of

\$20 million per contractor, except with congressional approval. It also prohibits the use of the Defense Production Act loan guarantee program primarily to prevent insolvency or bankruptcy unless the President certifies in detail to Congress that such a business failure would have a direct and substantially adverse effect upon defense production and presents his certification at least 10 days prior to such loan guarantee. The House receded to the Senate version on this provision because of the need to prevent unwarranted use of DPA loan guarantees without adequate safeguards.

I must make one other statement, and that is that the Defense Production Act really expired June 30. Just before that time the House and Senate passed a resolution extending the time 30 days. That time is about to expire again. We passed a resolution providing for a 15-day extension, which will expire tomorrow. If we do not pass the conference report today, the Defense Production Act will expire, and that will cause many troublesome complications.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. So the date remains the same, May 25, 1970, as the date on which wage, salary, price, and rent controls could be put into effect, and that date was selected, strangely enough, if I remember correctly, because, and only because, it was the date the bill was introduced in Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. It was the week before the day of introduction. It is customary to fix a date prior to that time because it would otherwise permit some people to get under the line who are not entitled to do so.

Mr. GROSS. That is interesting. So with this conference report, and with the enactment of the credit control bill some 2 or 3 months ago, Congress has delegated to the President of the United States total authority to put into effect wage, price, rent, and interest controls—controls over all credit of the United States and that without the declaration of an emergency of any kind either prior to putting these controls into effect or concurrently with such action.

In all conscience, how much more power do you want to give to the President, any President of the United States?

Mr. PATMAN. The President must act quickly to be effective in the event inflation should become so bad that prices would be going out the roof. Time would be of the essence, and he must be enabled to act quickly and swiftly. That is what this measure will enable him to do. I do not contemplate that he would think about putting any of these price and wage controls in effect.

Mr. GROSS. Then why should this legislation be approved?

Mr. PATMAN. Unless it became very bad.

Mr. GROSS. Why should the President not declare an emergency?

Mr. PATMAN. He would probably do that. He would probably ask Congress to implement the powers given by furnishing personnel and money.

Mr. GROSS. Congress could not implement any power. It will have already been spinelessly given away.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not uneasy about it.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. What did the conferees do with the amendment that we adopted here to include interest rates among the items to be regulated by the President?

Mr. PATMAN. That was put in. I was for it, but after we discussed in the conference committee the fact that it would interfere with powers we had already given to the President in a bill that he had signed about 2 days before Christmas 1969, we decided otherwise. Furthermore, the conferees were unwilling to accept that date of May 25 as the date on which interest rates could not be lower, because at that time interest rates were at the top, and they did not want to have such high interest rates to fix a standard. That is the reason the conferees voted not to leave it in because we had plenty of protection without that.

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

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe the conferees did the House a disservice in accepting the Senate language and deleting the words "interest rates" from this bill. I am not at all persuaded by the argument that we have already given the President those powers, because they are not the same; nor am I at all persuaded by the argument that the May 25 cutoff has some magic. We heard less than an hour ago the distinguished minority leader of the House tell the House that it is entirely possible the national debt for 1972 may go as high as \$30 billion. If that should happen—heaven forbid—those interest rates are going to continue skyrocketing, and the language we voted here when we wrote "interest rates" in this bill would at least have kept those interest rates from not going beyond the May 25 cutoff date.

I believe it was a great disservice to this House. I just wonder why it is that we are willing to penalize the worker by putting a ceiling on his wages, and we are willing to penalize the businessman by fixing his prices, and we are willing to penalize the person who owns property by fixing his rents, but we are not willing to go to the source of all this inflation, the big international money-changers who charge these high interest rates, and are the principal cause of inflation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am as much against high interest rates as the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown).

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman tell me, are all the inadequacies of title II, the so-called wage and price measure, still in the bill,

no ceiling, no real price and no real value stabilization, no means to implement any kind of stabilization activity, and no time within which to do it? AMTAMTAM

Mr. PATMAN. They are not inadequate.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Let me pursue it.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman asked me a question, and I want to answer it. I want to answer that question. This is giving the power to the President to stabilize and anything that can be done that he wants to do and any money that is needed for personnel and establishment, he can ask for. Nothing will be done until the President expressly desires to use a part of these stabilization authorities or all of them and comes to the Congress, and the Congress will implement and supplement it by appropriating money and establishment to carry out what he wants to carry out.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. The gentleman knows I think it is totally irresponsible for this body to pass this kind of legislation.

Furthermore, this legislation has been sought on the basis that it leads to some stabilization, and the May 25 date has been referred to as the date which establishes a ceiling. Let me make it abundantly clear, because a tremendous facade has prevailed with respect to this legislation; we are not talking about a ceiling as to May 25. The bill says prices and wages may not be less than they were on May 25. Therefore, as far as doing something about stopping inflation, this does nothing, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. PATMAN. We have to be realistic. The May 25 wages and salaries levels will be mighty low if the President sees runaway inflation that he must stop, and this date will look mighty good to him at that time.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Would the gentleman not agree the President has no funds with which to do anything and no time in which to do it?

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss).

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, if the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Brown) brings before the gentleman's committee a bill to permit a greater rollback of prices than May 25, would this get consideration?

Mr. PATMAN. It would get early consideration.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. The gentleman from Texas knows I offered an amendment on this very point that permitted adjustment upward and downward of wages and prices. The gentleman also knows that the Members on his side of the aisle walked down the aisle in opposition to that amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman had his day in court.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this conference

report, and that all Members speaking may have the privilege of extending their remarks and including extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a statement as well as the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Widnall) for the purpose of making a statement only.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the three minority conferees on this bill. Of course, there was no problem at all with title I, which had to do with renewal of the act, and both the Senate and House bills contained 2-year provisions for extension of the Defense Production Act.

On title II, which had to do with cost accounting the House receded to the Senate.

On title III, the other one having to do with price controls and wage controls, the Senate receded to the House.

There was no change in the provisions of either the Senate version of title II or the House version of title III, with the exception of the addition of a man on the Board to represent small business and bring in findings with respect to cost accounting standards.

We did not sign the report, because we felt that the entire thing had been explored on the floor of the House.

The House has worked its will and shown very clearly that it wanted the position of the House with respect to cost accounting.

We also discovered the view of the House with respect to wage and price controls. We had a vote in the House, and an overwhelming vote against mandatory price controls. That is a matter of record. So title III is actually an exercise in futility, with only 6 months effectiveness, with no money for the hiring of staff, for the maintenance of staff or the other things that would go with the enforcement of a wage and price control act.

We did shift the monkey over to the President's back, and this is all a matter of record.

I personally am not going to support the conference report because I feel that it is not a good bill as drawn and that it should be defeated.

Mr. PATMAN. There was considerable testimony that it should not be longer than 6 months, to give the President an opportunity to make up his mind. If we put it into effect we would have to extend it and also implement it and furnish money for personnel and administration and all the other purposes. It just did not logically come into this bill, to let the President exercise an option.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I should like to have 3 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia for comments.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the conference and I will

vote against the conference report. I want to tell the Members that the reason why I will vote against the conference report is not because the House position on standby controls was upheld, because that was the House will expressed by the vote of the House. The reason why I oppose the conference report is because we permitted the Senate to tack on this uniform Cost Accounting Standards Board under conditions which were not asked for by the Comptroller General and under conditions which were expressly rejected by the Banking and Currency Committee, which took extensive testimony on the subject.

In fact, the vote before the Committee on Banking and Currency was a vote of 23 to 12, as I recall, almost a 2-to-1 vote. This vote reflected the views of members of both political parties and it reflected the views of Members of all shades of the political spectrum.

Those of us on the committee who heard the testimony recognize that this concept of uniform cost accounting standards has a superficial appeal, but testimony from the experts reveals that it is going to be impossible to implement. It will do great damage to our whole defense industry. In fact, we find it will run many of our defense contractors out of even bidding on defense contracts. I do not believe that is what we want to do.

Gentlemen, I do not believe we want to burden our defense industry with two accounting systems, one to satisfy the Government and one to satisfy the stockholders. The one to satisfy the Government will be paid for; I can assure the Members, and it will be paid for by the taxpayers of this country. So it is not going to cut the cost of our defense production. To the contrary, it is going to raise the cost of our defense production.

Furthermore, it will drive out of the defense industry many of the companies we need and upon which we depend to produce the hardware and the items we need in order to defend ourselves as a Nation.

I sincerely urge the Members of the House to reject this conference report and to reject it on the basis that the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, based on the testimony before the committee, voted almost 2 to 1 to reject the concept that was forced on us by the Senate.

I do not believe the House conferees adequately defended the position of this House. I do not believe they presented their case properly. I believe it is up to the Members of the House to take a very strong stand, if we are going to prevent needless expense to our taxpayers by imposing unnecessary burdens upon the defense industries of this country.

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. I believe the gentleman favored mandatory controls.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I believe I gave an opportunity to the Members to vote for it.

Mr. PATMAN. On a motion to recom-

mit. Mr. BLACKBURN. Yes, sir.

Mr. PATMAN. And make it mandatory right now.

Mr. BLACKBURN. That is exactly what I submitted to the Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. There is quite a difference between the two.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I do not think it has anything to do with my discussion of uniform cost accounting standards.

Mr. PATMAN. We looked into this and found it was very satisfactory.

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have had plenty of discussion on this subject and if the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) does not want more time...

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to see the gentleman from Texas yield some time to the gentleman from California (Mr. GUBSER).

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to yield to him for a question.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I happen to have an intense interest in this subject and make a considerable study of it.

Mr. PATMAN. No; they do not, because they are making a lot of money out of this thing.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, you would like to have him have 3 minutes on your side?

Mr. WIDNALL. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Fine. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. What I have to say will be largely a repetition of the points made by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN).

Let me tell you why. The substitute as the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BLACKBURN) said, this will require a duplicate set of books because accounting is a management tool.

Now let me tell you why this is a bill for the relief of the giant corporations in the military-industrial complex.

Today we have many hundreds of small firms who do, let us say, only 25 percent of their business with the Department of Defense.

tems for only 25 percent of their business. So they will get out of the defense business as many are already doing. This bill will restrict competition and narrow the base of expertise which is available to the Department of Defense.

We have accounting requirements now which are adequate for the Renegotiation Act; we have accounting now which is adequate for the Truth in Negotiations Act.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. We give the contractors and the subcontractors an opportunity to be heard all the time and to file statements before our committee.

Mr. GUBSER. Let me ask you if one subcontractor has favored the uniform cost accounting standards.

Mr. PATMAN. No; they do not, because they are making a lot of money out of this thing.

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

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

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. 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 217, nays 153, not voting 59 as follows: (Roll No. 280)

- YEAS—217
Abbutt, Blanton, Chappell
Abernethy, Blatnik, Chisholm
Adams, Boggs, Clark
Addabbo, Boland, Cobelan
Albert, Bolling, Colmer
Alexander, Brademas, Conyers
Anderson, Briscoe, Cornman
Call, Brinkley, Culver
Anderson, Brooks, Daddario
Tennin, Brozman, Delaney
Andrews, Ala., Brown, Calif., Dent
Annunzio, Broyhill, N.C., Diggs
Ashley, Burke, Mass., Dingell
Aspinall, Burdick, Mo., Donohue
Barrett, Burton, Calif., Dorn
Bennett, Burton, Utah, Dowdy
Blagot, Button, Dwyer
Blesser, Byrne, Pa., Edwards
Bingham, Casey, Edwards

- Edmondson, Kastenmeier, Freyer, N.C.
Edwards, Calif., Kazen, Price, Ill.
Elberg, Kee, Pucinski
Evans, Colo., Koch, Randall
Evins, Tenn., Kyros, Rees
Fascell, Latta, Reid, N.Y.
Feighan, Leggett, Reuss
Flood, Lennen, Riegle
Flowers, Long, Md., Roberts
Foley, Lujan, Rodino
Ford, Lujan, Roe
William D., McDade, Rogers, Colo.
Fountain, McFall, Rogers, Fla.
Friedel, Macdonald, Rooney, Pa.
Fulton, Pa., Mass., Rosenthal
Fulton, Tenn., Madden, Rostenkowski
Fuqua, Mahon, Roybal
Gallifanakis, Mann, St. Germain
Gallagher, Marsh, Satterfield
Garmatz, Mathias, Scheuer
Gaydos, Matsunaga, Shipley
Gettys, Meeds, Sikes
Gibbons, Melcher, Sisk
Gibson, Mikva, Slack
Gilbert, Miller, Calif., Smith, Iowa
Gonzalez, Mills, Staged
Gray, Minish, Stokes
Green, Oreg., Mink, Stratton
Green, Pa., Mollohan, Stubbs
Griffin, Monagan, Stubblefield
Hagan, Montgomery, Stuckey
Halpern, Moorhead, Sullivan
Hamilton, Morgan, Symington
Hanley, Morse, Taylor
Hanna, Moss, Teague, Tex.
Harrington, III, Murphy, Ill., Tierman
Harsha, Murphy, N.Y., Udall
Hathaway, Natcher, Ullman
Hechler, W. Va., Nedzi, Vanik
Heckler, Mass., Nichols, Viorito
Helstoski, Nix, Waggonner
Henderson, Obey, Waldie
Hicks, O'Hara, Watts
Hogan, O'Konski, Whalen
Holifield, Olsen, White
Howard, O'Neill, Mass., Whitten
Hungate, Ottinger, Williams
Ichord, Patman, Wilson
Jacobs, Patten, Charles H.
Johnson, Calif., Pepper, Wolff
Johnson, Pa., Perkins, Wright
Jones, Ala., Phillips, Wyatt
Jones, N.C., Pickle, Yates
Jones, Tenn., Pike, Yatron
Karth, Poage, Zablocki
NAYS—153
Anderson, Ill., Erlenborn, Mize
Andrews, Esch, Mizell
N. Dak., Eshleman, Morton
Arends, Findley, Mosher
Ashbrook, Fish, Myers
Ayres, Fisher, Nelsen
Belcher, Flynn, Pelly
Bell, Calif., Ford, Gerald R., Pettis
Blackburn, Frelinghuysen, Pinnine
Bow, Frey, Poff
Brock, Goldwater, Price, Tex.
Broomfield, Goodling, Quie
Brown, Mich., Gross, Quillen
Brown, Ohio, Grover, Railsback
Broyhill, Va., Gubser, Reid, Ill.
Buchanan, Gude, Rhodes
Burke, Fla., Haley, Rivers
Burluson, Tex., Hall, Robison
Bush, Hammer, Roth
Byrnes, Wis., Schmidt, Rousselot
Camp, Hansen, Idaho, Ruppe
Carter, Harvey, Rahn
Cederberg, Hastings, Sandman
Chamberlain, Hosmer, Saylor
Clancy, Hunt, Schadeberg
Clausen, Hutchinson, Scherer
Don H., Jarman, Schmitz
Clawson, Del., Jonas, Schneebeli
Cleveland, Kleppe, Schwengel
Collier, Kuykendall, Scott
Collins, Kyl, Sebelius
Conable, Landgrave, Shriver
Conte, Langan, Skubitz
Coughlin, Lloyd, Smith, Calif.
Cowger, Lukens, Smith, N.Y.
Crane, McCleary, Snyder
Daniel, Va., McCloskey, Stafford
Davis, Wis., McClure, Springer
de la Garza, McDonald, Stanton
Dellenback, Michel, Steiger, Ariz.
Denney, McEwen, Steiger, Wis.
Dennis, McNally, Tarr
Derwinski, Martin, Talbot
Devine, May, Teague, Calif.
Dickinson, Mayne, Thompson, Ga.
Downing, Michel, Thomson, Wis.
Duncan, Miller, Ohio, Vander Jagt
Edwards, Ala., Minshall, Wampler

Watson	Wilson, Bob	Wyman
Whalley	Winn	Zion
Whitehurst	Wold	Zwach
Widnall	Wydler	
Wiggins	Wylie	

## NOT VOTING—59

Adair	Farbstein	Meskill
Baring	Foreman	O'Neal, Ga.
Beall, Md.	Fraser	Passman
Berry	Griffiths	Podell
Betts	Hansen, Wash.	Pollock
Bevill	Hawkins	Powell
Bray	Hays	Pryor, Ark.
Cabell	Hébert	Purcell
Caffery	Horton	Rarick
Carey	Hull	Relfel
Celler	Keith	Rooney, N.Y.
Clay	King	Roudebush
Corbett	Kluczynski	Ryan
Cramer	Landrum	Stephens
Cunningham	Long, La.	Thompson, N.J.
Daniels, N.J.	McCarthy	Tunney
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Van Deerlin
Dawson	McMillan	Weicker
Edwards, La.	MacGregor	Young
Fallon	Mailliard	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney of New York for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Cunningham against.

Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Relfel against.

Mr. Daniels of New Jersey for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Betts against.

Mr. Bevill for, with Mr. Adair against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. King.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Hays with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Beall of Maryland.

Mr. Caffery with Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Rarick with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Hull with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Weicker.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Clay.

Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Podell with Mr. Hawkins.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Farbstein.

Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.

Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Young with Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Stephens.

Mr. Ryan with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Purcell with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Dawson.

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to keep the Members of the House advised as best I can, and while the distinguished minority leader is on the floor, as to the legislative program.

We are going on with the wage adjustment bill this evening.

We will not take up the Emergency Community Facilities Act before the recess.

We do have a conference report which will be called up presently by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) and we have another conference report that will be called up tomorrow on the political advertising bill.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO CONSTRUCT, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN THE NARROWS UNIT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, COLORADO

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 3547) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Narrows Unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colorado, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL)?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but I do so to ask the chairman of the committee, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, if he will explain just what is in the conference report.

Mr. ASPINALL. I shall do so, but I would like to have the reading of the statement taken care of first.

Mr. SAYLOR. If the gentleman is going to do that, then I withdraw, my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 12, 1970.)

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

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, there are three differences in the House and Senate versions of S. 3547. I will discuss them individually.

The first difference is in section 1 where the House bill contained a provision requiring that the Secretary of the Interior treat identifiable return flows of water from the project to abate pollution and enhance water quality. I believe that every one subscribes to the objective of this amendment, which was offered by our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR), in the interest of assuring that Federal programs are in the forefront of the fight to preserve and improve the environment. Thus, while agreeing with the objective and spirit of the Saylor amendment, the conferees had difficulty with the specific language. The committee of conference adopted substitute language to require that the project be operated so as not to cause the South Platte River to be in violation of applicable water quality standards.

Such standards have been promulgated and approved by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the Water Quality Act of 1965. They provide a statement of acceptable water quality conditions to which all interests must conform. The language adopted by the committee of conference provides the Secretary with precise guidelines to govern his operation of the Narrows unit. This would not have been the case under the original language in the House version.

The second difference in the two versions of the bill is language in the House bill that sets out with more clarity the repayment conditions of the Narrows unit. Based on present analysis, the water users can repay the irrigation costs in 40 years. This means that no assistance from power revenues is anticipated, although the bill does authorize such assistance, if required. The House language, which the conferees adopted, places a requirement on the Secretary to extend the contract term to a full 50 years, if necessary, to achieve irrigation payout, before reliance can be placed on power revenues.

The third difference deals with acreage limitation provisions. The Senate bill contained a section, which was adopted by the conference committee, that authorizes the same handling of acreage limitation matters as applies to the Colorado-Big Thompson project. Both the Colorado-Big Thompson project and the Narrows unit provide supplemental water service to presently irrigated lands within the Northeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District, and the same general conditions of altitude, growing season, and crop adaptability pertain to both land areas. The committee of conference believes it is reasonable to follow the precedent established with respect to the Colorado-Big Thompson project in development of the Narrows unit.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank my colleague for yielding.

The substitute amendment that was adopted in conference regarding the standards of water states that the Secretary of the Interior is required to see to it that the water quality standards of the State of Colorado will be maintained.

Mr. ASPINALL. Not only maintained, but it will be at least equal with the standards of the Federal Government.

Mr. SAYLOR. It is also our understanding that no State is permitted to adopt water quality standards which are lower than the Federal standards.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct as this legislation affects those States involved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. DERWINSKI. 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 337, nays 4, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

YEAS—337

Abbutt	Devine	Kazen
Abernethy	Dickinson	Kee
Adair	Dingell	Kleppe
Adams	Donohue	Koch
Addabbo	Dorn	Kuykendall
Albert	Downing	Kyl
Anderson,	Dulski	Kyros
Calif.	Duncan	Landgrebe
Anderson, Ill.	Dwyer	Langen
Anderson,	Eckhardt	Latta
Tenn.	Edmondson	Leggett
Andrews, Ala.	Edwards, Ala.	Long, Md.
Andrews,	Ellberg	Lowenstein
N. Dak.	Erlenborn	Lukens
Annunzio	Esch	McClory
Arends	Eshleman	McCloskey
Ashbrook	Evans, Colo.	McClure
Ashley	Evins, Tenn.	McDade
Aspinall	Fascell	McDonald,
Ayres	Findley	Mich.
Barrett	Fish	McEwen
Belcher	Flood	McFall
Bell, Calif.	Flowers	McKneally
Bennett	Foley	Macdonald,
Betts	Ford, Gerald R.	Mass.
Biaggi	Ford,	Madden
Blester	William D.	Mahon
Bingham	Fountain	Mann
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Marsh
Blanton	Frey	Martin
Blatnik	Friedel	Mathias
Boggs	Fulton, Pa.	Mayne
Boland	Fuqua	Meeds
Bolling	Gallifanakis	Melcher
Bow	Gallagher	Michel
Brademas	Garmatz	Miller, Calif.
Brasco	Gaydos	Miller, Ohio
Brinkley	Gettys	Mills
Brooks	Gialmo	Minish
Broomfield	Gibbons	Mink
Brotzman	Gilbert	Minshall
Brown, Calif.	Goldwater	Mize
Brown, Mich.	Gonzalez	Mizell
Brown, Ohio	Goodling	Monagan
Broyhill, N.C.	Gray	Montgomery
Broyhill, Va.	Green, Oreg.	Moorhead
Buchanan	Green, Pa.	Morgan
Burke, Fla.	Griffin	Morse
Burke, Mass.	Grover	Morton
Burlison, Mo.	Gubser	Mosher
Burton, Calif.	Gude	Moss
Burton, Utah	Hagan	Murphy, Ill.
Bush	Haley	Murphy, N.Y.
Button	Halpern	Myers
Byrne, Pa.	Hamilton	Natcher
Byrnes, Wis.	Hammer-	Nedzi
Camp	schmidt	Nelsen
Carter	Hanley	Nichols
Casey	Hanna	Nix
Cederberg	Hansen, Idaho	Obey
Chamberlain	Harrington	O'Konski
Chisholm	Harsha	Olsen
Clancy	Harvey	O'Neill, Mass.
Clausen,	Hastings	Ottinger
Don H.	Hathaway	Patman
Clawson, Del.	Hechler, W. Va.	Patten
Cleveland	Heckler, Mass.	Pelly
Cohelan	Heistoski	Pepper
Collier	Henderson	Perkins
Collins	Hicks	Pettis
Colmer	Hogan	Philbin
Conable	Hollfield	Pike
Conte	Hosmer	Pirnie
Conyers	Howard	Poff
Corman	Hungate	Preyer, N.C.
Coughlin	Hunt	Price, Ill.
Cowger	Hutchinson	Price, Tex.
Crane	Ichord	Pucinski
Culver	Jacobs	Quie
Daniel, Va.	Jarman	Quillen
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Rallsback
de la Garza	Johnson, Pa.	Randall
Delaney	Jones, Ala.	Rees
Dellenback	Jones, N.C.	Reid, Ill.
Denneny	Jones, Tenn.	Reid, N.Y.
Dent	Karth	Reuss
Derwinski	Kastenmeier	Rhodes

Riegle  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Rodino  
Roe  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Rousselot  
Roybal  
Ruppe  
Ruth  
St Germain  
Sandman  
Satterfield  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Scherla  
Scheuer  
Schneebell  
Schwengel  
Scott  
Sebelius  
Shively  
Shipley  
Sikes

Slak  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Springer  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Stanton  
Steed  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Stokes  
Stratton  
Stuckey  
Sullivan  
Symington  
Taft  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Thompson, Ga.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Tiernan  
Udall  
Ulman  
Vanik

Vigorito  
Waggoner  
Waldie  
Wampler  
Watson  
Watts  
Whalen  
Whalley  
White  
Whitehurst  
Widnall  
Wiggins  
Williams  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson,  
  Charles H.  
Winn  
Wolf  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Wydlar  
Wyllie  
Wyman  
Yates  
Yatron  
Zion  
Zwach

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Dennis.  
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Flynt.  
Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Purcell.  
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Ryan.  
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Podell with Mr. Clay.  
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Baring.  
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Farbstain with Mr. Fisher.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Fraser.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Carey.  
Mr. Matsunaga with Mr. McMillan.  
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Van Deerlin.  
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Tunney.  
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Burleson of Texas.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Molohan.  
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Whitten.

Mr. GROSS and Mr. HALL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAYS—4

Gross  
Hall

Jonas

Schmitz

NOT VOTING—88

Alexander  
Baring  
Beall, Md.  
Berry  
Bevill  
Bray  
Brock  
Burleson, Tex.  
Cabell  
Caffery  
Carey  
Celler  
Chappell  
Clark  
Clay  
Corbett  
Cramer  
Cunningham  
Daddario  
Daniels, N.J.  
Davis, Ga.  
Dawson  
Dennis  
Diggs  
Dowdy  
Edwards, Calif.  
Edwards, La.  
Fallon  
Farbstain  
Feighan

Fisher  
Flynt  
Foreman  
Fraser  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Griffiths  
Hansen, Wash.  
Hawkins  
Hays  
Hébert  
Horton  
Hull  
Keith  
King  
Kluczynski  
Landrum  
Lennon  
Lloyd  
Long, La.  
Lujan  
McCarthy  
McCulloch  
McMillan  
MacGregor  
Maillard  
Matsunaga  
May  
Meskill  
Mikva  
Molohan

O'Hara  
O'Neal, Ga.  
Passman  
Pickle  
Poage  
Podell  
Pollock  
Powell  
Pryor, Ark.  
Purcell  
Rarick  
Reifel  
Robison  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Roudebush  
Ryan  
Stephens  
Stubblefield  
Teague, Tex.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Tunney  
Van Deerlin  
Vander Jagt  
Weicker  
Whitten  
Wold  
Young  
Zablocki

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

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Mallard.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. King.  
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Lujan.  
Mr. Hays with Mr. Horton.  
Mr. Mikva with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.  
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Pollock.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Passman with Mr. Corbett.  
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Cramer.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cunningham.  
Mr. Hull with Mr. Weicker.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Reifel.  
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Roudebush.  
Mr. Pickle with Mr. MacGregor.  
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Foreman.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Beall of Maryland.  
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Berry.  
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Brock.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Lloyd.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Keith.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Robison.  
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Vander Jagt.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mrs. May.  
Mr. Young with Mr. Wold.

SLEEPING BEAR DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1198, Rept. No. 91-1429), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 1198

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18776) to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous questions shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ESTABLISHMENT OF GULF ISLANDS NATIONAL SEASHORE

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 1197, Rept. No. 91-1427), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. Res. 1197

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10874) to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on In-

terior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 17809, PREVAILING RATE PAY SYSTEMS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES**

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1182, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1182

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17809) to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1182 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate for consideration of H.R. 17809 to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government. The resolution also makes it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 17809 is to establish statutory policy for setting the pay of some 850,000 prevailing rate Government employees working in the several States and the District of Columbia, either as appropriated or nonappropriated fund employees. The employees affected are commonly known as wage board or blue collar workers and include laborers, craftsmen, tradesmen, and so forth.

The definition of "prevailing rate employee" is exemplified by H.R. 17809 to include approximately 143,000 employees of nonappropriated fund activities of the Armed Forces and of the Veterans' Canteen Service.

Through the years the blue collar workers' pay has been based on a survey of a sample of private industry in the local labor market area. This bill would provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting their rates of pay.

A Federal Prevailing Wage Advisory Committee would be established to replace the present 11-member advisory committee, which was established administratively to guide the coordinated Federal wage system. The newly established committee would also be composed of 11 members, one of whom would be a full-time chairman, not otherwise in the Federal service, appointed by the President for a 4-year term.

A five-step wage schedule would be provided instead of the present three steps, the third step of which is presently 104 percent of the prevailing wage. The proposed fifth step would be 112 percent.

Automatic step advancements would be provided after 26 weeks' work in step 1; 78 weeks in step 2; and 104 weeks in each of steps 3 and 4.

A 7.5-percent pay differential would be provided, nationwide, for scheduled non-overtime work during the second shift—3 p.m. to midnight—and 10 percent for the third shift—11 p.m. to 8 a.m.

"Saved pay" would be provided for 2 years for employees who are reduced in grade. GS employees now have this protection.

It is estimated that the annual cost of the legislation will be \$230 million.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that House Resolution 17809 may be considered.

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

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from Indiana, House Resolution 1182 provides for 2 hours of debate under an open rule, and makes in order the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

In the interest of saving time, I will simply add some things to the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana.

The purpose of the bill is to establish a statutory authority for the setting of wage rates for some 850,000 "prevailing rate employees" of the Federal Government and the District of Columbia, whether such employees are paid from appropriated or unappropriated funds.

Employees covered by the bill are the blue collar skilled and unskilled employees in all lines of work from carpenters and electricians to maids, bartenders, and barbers. They are employed throughout the Government in all branches and departments, within the United States and abroad.

The bill creates a Federal Prevailing Wage Advisory Committee with six management members and five employee members to advise the coordinated Federal wage system in setting wages for

this group of employees. The chairman, a full-time member of the committee, could not hold any other Federal office. He shall be appointed by the President for a 4-year term.

The bill also creates a five-step wage schedule instead of the current three-step system. Further, the bill provides for a 7.5-percent pay differential for employees working the second shift—3 p.m. to midnight—and a 10-percent differential for those on the third shift—midnight to 8 a.m.

The estimated cost of the bill is \$230 million annually broken down as follows: \$190 million for the additional fourth and fifth pay step inserted into the current three-step wage schedule; \$40 million for the premium pay for the second and third shifts.

The bill is opposed by the administration as evidenced by several letters from the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the Veterans' Administration, and the Department of Defense.

Minority views are filed by Mr. GROSS, Mr. DERWINSKI, and Mr. LUKENS. They oppose the legislation because of its restrictive provisions which will limit administrative flexibility. They do not approve adding two steps to the wage schedule now in effect nor the pay differential for night shift duty.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I take it to call attention to the announcement made by the distinguished majority leader only a few moments ago, in which he put over until after the so-called recess of the House of Representatives to September 9 a bill cited as the "Emergency Community Facilities Act of 1970"—an emergency bill. The language reads in part:

The Congress finds that a large number of municipalities and other entities of local government throughout the Nation are unable to finance construction of vital and urgently needed public facilities.

The Congress further finds that there is an immediate need for such facilities.

That emergency bill is being put over until September 9 or thereafter, yet we have here a bill for which there is no emergency.

Or can it be that there is a convention going on in Denver, Colo., and this bill must be passed tonight because of the convention? Could that be possible?

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

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

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

In the first place, a request was made to me from the committee not to call that bill up tomorrow or tonight; and, in the second place, from my own standpoint, this bill I believe is related to the veto override we had this afternoon. Three weeks of rest on the part of our Republican friends might enable them to see the necessity of this sort of legislation.

Mr. GROSS. It is now 6:30 in the evening. This is not in any sense an emergency measure. We have been here night after night, unable to get home to supper until 8 or 9 o'clock. Would the gentleman entertain a suggestion that we dispose of the rule and put this over until after September 9, as a nonemergency measure? The gentleman says someone beseeched him not to call up the other bill. I want to beseech him to put this bill over.

Mr. ALBERT. I could not make that kind of a commitment, let me say. I do not have authority to change the program without consulting other Members. But I will tell my friend that if our friends will let us take up the conference report on the political broadcasting bill by unanimous consent that we intend to take up tomorrow, we might be able to finish up everything tonight.

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

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I will yield the gentleman from Iowa such further time as he wishes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. It does seem to me highly incongruous that this bill would be called up tonight and an emergency bill be put over for 3 weeks to a month from now. I am unable to understand it.

Mr. ALBERT. After the gentleman goes home and has communion with his constituents he might have a little more understanding about the emergency nature of the bill that we will take up in September.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa will still be wondering why this programming of legislation. He will still be wondering why an emergency measure is not being brought up tonight instead of this. I can think of no other reason than that there is a convention in session somewhere and that this bill must be passed as an accommodation to that convention.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman if I have any time.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my observation that very often Members do not take time to stop and recognize the unusual background of individuals who engage in conversation. Of course, I refer to the gentleman from Iowa and the distinguished majority leader. I thought for a moment they had the basis for an agreement. It is my understanding that the gentleman from Oklahoma is a Rhodes scholar and, therefore, automatically a great diplomat. The gentleman from Iowa went overseas with Pershing in World War I.

Mr. GROSS. Let me interrupt the gentleman to say that on that trip through England in 1918 on the way to France, I did not stop for a diploma at whatever university sponsors Rhodes scholarships.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I realize that.

But the point I was about to make is the gentleman from Iowa is also a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and is a great diplomat.

I thought for a moment that he and the majority leader were reaching some agreement. I recognize agreements can best be worked out in a quieter and less conspicuous atmosphere than the floor itself.

Therefore, hopefully to provide for such time element I now make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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. 282]

- Anderson, Foreman
- Tenn., Fraser
- Ashley, Frey
- Barling, Fulton, Tenn.
- Barrett, Gilbert
- Beall, Md., Griffiths
- Berry, Gubser
- Betts, Hansen, Wash.
- Bevill, Harsha
- Bingham, Hastings
- Blackburn, Hawkins
- Boggs, Hays
- Bray, Hebert
- Brock, Horton
- Burleson, Tex., Hull
- Cabell, Jarman
- Caffery, Jones, Ala.
- Carey, Keith
- Cederberg, King
- Celler, Kluczynski
- Chappell, Landrum
- Clark, Leggett
- Clay, Lloyd
- Corbett, Long, La.
- Cramer, Lujan
- Culver, Lukens
- Cunningham, McCarthy
- Daddario, McCulloch
- Daniels, N.J., McMillan
- Davis, Ga., MacGregor
- Dawson, Mailliard
- Diggs, Martin
- Dingell, Melcher
- Dowdy, Meskill
- Dwyer, Mikva
- Edwards, La., Minish
- Evins, Tenn., Mink
- Fallon, Mollenham
- Farbstein, O'Hara
- Fisher, O'Neill, Ga.
- Ford, O'Neil, Mass.
- William D., Ottinger

The SPEAKER. On this rollo call 308 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 17809, PREVAILING RATE PAY SYSTEM FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DERWINSKI) there were—ayes 71, noes 53.

Mr. DERWINSKI. 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—ayes 236, noes 86, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

YEAS—236:

- Abbutt, Fountain
- Abernethy, Friedel
- Adams, Fulton, Pa.
- Addabbo, Fuqua
- Albert, Galianakis
- Alexander, Gallagher
- Anderson, Garmatz
- Andrews, Calif., Gaydos
- Andrews, Ala., Gettys
- Andrews, N. Dak., Gialmo
- Annunzio, Gibbons
- Ashley, Gilbert
- Aspinall, Gonzalez
- Bell, Calif., Gray
- Bennett, Green, Ore.
- Biaggi, Green, Pa.
- Blester, Griffn
- Bingham, Gubser
- Blanton, Gude
- Blatnik, Hagan
- Boland, Hamilton
- Bolling, Hanley
- Brademas, Harrington
- Brasco, Harsha
- Brinkley, Harvey
- Brooks, Hathaway
- Broomfield, Hawkins
- Brotzman, Hechler, W. Va.
- Brown, Calif., Helstoski
- Brown, Ohio, Henderson
- Broyhill, N.C., Hicks
- Broyhill, Va., Hollifield
- Buchanan, Hosmer
- Burke, Mass., Howard
- Burlison, Mo., Hungate
- Burton, Calif., Hutchinson
- Burton, Utah, Ichord
- Button, Jacobs
- Byrne, Pa., Jarman
- Byrnes, Wis., Johnson, Calif.
- Casey, Johnson, Pa.
- Cederberg, Jones, Ala.
- Chamberlain, Jones, N.C.
- Chisholm, Jones, Tenn.
- Clancy, Karth
- Clausen, Kastenmeier
- Don H., Kazen
- Cobelan, Kee
- Collier, Koch
- Colmer, Kyl
- Conte, Kyros
- Conyers, Lennon
- Corman, Long, Md.
- Culver, Lowenstein
- Daddario, McClory
- Daniel, Va., McDade
- de la Garza, McDonald
- Delaney, Mich.
- Dellenback, McFall
- Dent, Macdonald
- Devine, Mass., Ullman
- Dingell, Madden
- Donohue, Mahon
- Dorn, Mann
- Downing, Marsh
- Dulski, Martin
- Dwyer, Matsunaga
- Eckhardt, Meeds
- Edmondson, Melcher
- Edwards, Calif., Minish
- Eshleman, Mink
- Evans, Colo., Mize
- Fascell, Mizell
- Felghan, Monagan
- Findley, Montgomery
- Flood, Moorhead
- Flowers, Morgan
- Flynt, Moes
- Foley, Murphy, Ill.
- Ford, Murphy, N.Y.
- William D., Natcher
- Adair, Belcher
- Anderson, Ill., Betts
- Arends, Bow
- Ashbrook, Brown, Mich.
- Nedzi, Nichols
- Frey, Nix
- Goldwater, Obey
- Gooding, O'Konski
- Grover, Olsen
- Hall, Ottinger
- Haltper, Patman
- Hammer, Patten
- Schmidt, Pelly
- Pepper, Perkins
- Philbin, Pike
- Poff, Poyer, N.C.
- Price, Ill., Price
- Pucinski, Quie
- Randall, Rees
- Reid, N.Y., Reuss
- Rhodes, Rhodes
- Riegler, Rivers
- Robison, Robison
- Rodino, Rodino
- Roe, Roe
- Rogers, Colo., Rogers, Colo.
- Rogers, Fla., Rogers, Fla.
- Rooney, Pa., Rooney
- Rostenkowski, Rostenkowski
- Roth, Roth
- Roysal, Roysal
- Ruppe, Ruppe
- St Germain, St Germain
- Satterfield, Satterfield
- Scott, Scott
- ShIPLEY, Shipley
- Shriver, Shriver
- Sikes, Sikes
- Sisk, Sisk
- Smith, Iowa, Smith
- Smith, N.Y., Smith, N.Y.
- Springer, Springer
- Stafford, Stafford
- Stagers, Stagers
- Stanton, Stanton
- Steed, Steed
- Stokes, Stokes
- Stratton, Stratton
- Stubblefield, Stubblefield
- Stuckey, Stuckey
- Sullivan, Sullivan
- Talcott, Talcott
- Taylor, Taylor
- Teague, Tex., Teague
- Thompson, Ga., Thompson
- Udall, Udall
- Ullman, Ullman
- Vanik, Vanik
- Waggonner, Waggonner
- Waldie, Waldie
- Wampler, Wampler
- Watts, Watts
- Whalen, Whalen
- Whalley, Whalley
- White, White
- Whitehurst, Whitehurst
- Williams, Williams
- Wilson, Bob, Wilson
- Wilson, Charles H., Wilson
- Wright, Wright
- Yates, Yates
- Yatron, Yatron
- Zwach, Zwach

Cleveland  
Collins  
Conable  
Coughlin  
Cowger  
Crane  
Davis, Wis.  
Dennis  
Derwinski  
Dickinson  
Duncan  
Edwards, Ala.  
Erlenborn  
Esch  
Fish  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Frelinghuysen  
Frey  
Goldwater  
Goodling  
Gross  
Grover  
Hall  
Halpern  
Hammer-  
schmidt

Hansen, Idaho  
Hastings  
Heckler, Mass.  
Hogan  
Hunt  
Kleppe  
Kuykendall  
Landgrebe  
Langen  
McCloskey  
McClure  
McEwen  
McKneally  
Mathias  
May  
Michel  
Miller, Ohio  
Minshall  
Morse  
Morton  
Mosher  
Myers  
Nelsen  
Pettis  
Price, Tex.  
Quillen

Railsback  
Reid, Ill.  
Roussetot  
Ruth  
Saylor  
Schadeberg  
Scherle  
Schmitz  
Schneebeil  
Schwengel  
Sebellus  
Skubitz  
Steiger, Ariz.  
Steiger, Wis.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Vander Jagt  
Watson  
Wiggins  
Winn  
Wyatt  
Wyllie  
Wyman  
Zion

## NOT VOTING—107

Anderson, Tenn.  
Ayres  
Baring  
Barrett  
Beall, Md.  
Berry  
Bevill  
Blackburn  
Boggs  
Bray  
Brock  
Burke, Fla.  
Burlison, Tex.  
Cabell  
Caffery  
Carey  
Celler  
Chappell  
Clark  
Clay  
Corbett  
Cramer  
Cunningham  
Daniels, N.J.  
Davis, Ga.  
Dawson  
Denney  
Diggs  
Dowdy  
Edwards, La.  
Elberg  
Evens, Tenn.  
Fallon  
Farbsteln  
Fisher

Foreman  
Fraser  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Griffiths  
Haley  
Hanna  
Hansen, Wash.  
Hays  
Hébert  
Horton  
Hull  
Keith  
King  
Kluczynski  
Landrum  
Latta  
Leggett  
Lloyd  
Long, La.  
Lujan  
Lukens  
McCarthy  
McCulloch  
McMillan  
MacGregor  
Malliard  
Mayne  
Meskill  
Mikva  
Miller, Calif.  
Mills  
Mollohan  
O'Hara  
O'Neal, Ga.  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Passman

Pickle  
Pirnie  
Poage  
Podell  
Pollock  
Powell  
Pryor, Ark.  
Purcell  
Rarick  
Reifel  
Roberts  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Rosenthal  
Roudebush  
Ryan  
Sandman  
Scheuer  
Smith, Calif.  
Snyder  
Stephens  
Symington  
Taft  
Teague, Calif.  
Thompson, N.J.  
Tiernan  
Tunney  
Van Deerlin  
Vigorito  
Weicker  
Whitten  
Widnall  
Wold  
Wolff  
Wydler  
Young  
Zablocki

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Malliard.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. King.  
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Lujan.  
Mr. Hays with Mr. Horton.  
Mr. Mikva with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Meskill.  
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Pollock.  
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Bray.  
Mr. Passman with Mr. Corbett.  
Mr. Rarick with Mr. Cramer.  
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Cunningham.  
Mr. Hull with Mr. Weicker.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Reifel.  
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Roudebush.  
Mr. Pickle with Mr. MacGregor.  
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Foreman.  
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Beall of Maryland.  
Mr. Bevill with Mr. Berry.  
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Brock.  
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Lloyd.  
Mr. Stephens with Mr. Keith.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Ayres.  
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Blackburn.  
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Burke of Florida.  
Mr. Young with Mr. Wold.  
Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Denney.  
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Latta.  
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Purcell.  
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Ryan.

Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Diggs.  
Mr. Podell with Mr. Clay.  
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Baring.  
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Farbsteln with Mr. Fisher.  
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Fraser.  
Mr. Clark with Mr. Carey.  
Mr. Burlison of Texas with Mr. Lukens.  
Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Mayne.  
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Pirnie.  
Mr. Olsen with Mr. Sandman.  
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Smith of New York.  
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Snyder.  
Mr. Vigorito with Mr. Taft.  
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Teague of California.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Widnall.  
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Wylder.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Mills.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. McMillan.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Tunney.  
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Symington.  
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Haley.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Hanna.  
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. GUDE, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. WAMPLER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. SAYLOR. To propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Reorganization Act of 1946 states that the Congress shall adjourn on or before the 31st day of July each and every year, and it now being the 13th day of August, 1970, would a motion to adjourn sine die be in order at this time?

The SPEAKER. No. The provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act to which the gentleman refers is not applicable during a national emergency.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, and I have not been able to find out any emergency that has been declared by President Kennedy, President Johnson, President Eisenhower, or President Nixon.

Can the Chair tell us what this national emergency is under which we are continuing to do business?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already answered the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry.

## DR. CLAUDE L. FLY KIDNAPED IN URUGUAY

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, Americans of both hemispheres have been painfully distressed since July 31 when an American AID official Mr. Dan Mitrione was kidnaped in Uruguay. Later a Brazilian official was kidnaped and then on August 7, Dr. Claude L. Fly of Fort Collins, Colo., was also kidnaped by the same band of terrorists. Since then we have been shocked at the terrible killing of Mr. Mitrione. Señor Gomide of Brazil and Dr. Fly have not been released.

Dr. Fly and his wife, Miriam, most recently resided in my district when Dr. Fly served as agricultural administrator and research soil scientist, USDA Agricultural Research Service, Soil and Water Conservation—Research Division located at Fort Collins. Since 1963 he has worked as a private consultant and contractor in agricultural development of soil and water resources as president of Claude L. Fly & Associates.

Many Colorado friends of Dr. Fly and his family prayerfully hope for his safe release. I know my colleagues and all Americans join with the many friends of Dr. Fly and his family in waiting for his release.

As my distinguished colleague from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT), indicated in his remarks yesterday, many Arkansans join Coloradans in their concern for Dr. Fly. I join him for I too know of Dr. Fly's work of over 40 years as a scientist and public servant since receiving his Ph.D. in 1931 as an agronomist and soil expert. Dr. Fly has worked for numerous distinguished public and private organizations; he has been published over 60 times and his value as a consultant has taken him to nearly 20 countries on nearly every continent. His release means much to many people all over the world.

When he was kidnaped in Uruguay he was heading one of two teams in that nation under a soil and land development contract with International Development Services, Inc., and the Uruguayan Ministry of Livestock and Agriculture. It is financed from an AID agricultural sector loan signed in 1968.

Yesterday the Department of State disclosed two communications. These were found on August 11 in a downtown Montevideo theater after a local radio station received a tip as to the location. The local police believe them to be authentic.

Mr. Speaker, I include these two messages—one from the kidnapers and the other written by Dr. Fly to his wife, Miriam—in the RECORD as follows:

## Message from the kidnapers:

Señor Alysio Mares Dias Gomide and Dr. Claude Fly are well. Sentence still has not been passed on them. Our comrades who are guarding the detained diplomats have firm orders to pass judgment upon them if the repressive forces find them. The oligarchs of the Pacheco Government, the repressive forces and the American advisors will answer for the well-being of our arrested friends.

Message from Dr. Fly to his wife, Miriam:

DEAR MIRIAM: I have bathed and received clean underthings and shirt so I feel better. They have had a doctor examine my throat and chest and prescribed medicine. The food

is good—meat, potatoes, fruit and other things. We can only hope and pray that matters will work out—then wait. I want so much to be back at work and out if it can be arranged. I now have some reading material in English and am using some glasses here. They are trying to get my glasses fixed, when it will be so much better.

Write the kids and tell them I love them and not to worry. I know nothing but do feel many will worry about me. They have been kind to me so I am being a good boy.

May God bless you and keep you.

Love,

CLAUDE.

#### NATIONAL ELECTION HOLIDAY

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing with our colleagues, PETER W. RODINO, MORRIS K. UDALL, HAROLD D. DONOHUE, JOHN CONYERS, WILLIAM F. RYAN, and ABNER J. MIKVA, a bill to designate a public holiday on the day of national elections.

The voting record of our country is distressing. Voter turnout in our Nation is certainly not what it should be or could be in a democracy. For instance, in the presidential election of 1876, 81.8 percent of the electorate cast their votes to select the President of our growing Nation. Yet, 92 years later, in the presidential election of 1968, only 60.6 percent cast their ballots. What is worse is that 47 million people, eligible voters, neglected to vote for the Chief Executive at all. Forty-seven million is a greater figure than the number of people who voted for the winner in that election.

I say that this is a sad commentary on democracy in our country. It is also somewhat frightening to think that those who do not vote have the potential power to change the results of a presidential election, and it does not even have to be a close race at that.

Our Government has a real stake in seeing to it that voting is made easier for everyone. Steps should be taken to remedy the voter participation situation so that we can keep a viable democracy for the future of this country. A democracy should not just be based upon an elite who suffer little or no difficulty in voting at an inconvenient time or place, but we should assure that all people have a convenient time and place to cast their ballot. Congress has worked toward expanding the vote before—toward granting the franchise to women, toward assuring minorities the vote, and, most recently, toward allowing more young people an opportunity to vote. I feel that now we should strive to make voting a convenience.

We need sound and active suffrage in this Nation. No longer can arbitrary barriers interfere with voting in this land. No longer can we allow voting to be put aside as a secondary responsibility. It is now time, or perhaps past time, to revitalize the electorate in this country. The election of a President is the most important occasion for a citizen to exercise his obligations in a free society and that importance should be solemnized. By designating a national holiday on presidential election days, which

would fall, in the American tradition, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, we would assure our citizens the convenience and accessibility to the polling booth on election day. Such a holiday would, in my opinion, result in greater voter participation and would impress upon all of our citizens that the election of the highest official of our Nation is one of the most important pursuits that we are privileged to undertake.

I urge all of you not to ignore this significant step toward assuring a stable democracy for generations to come. I ask each and every one of you for your support of this needed legislation.

#### OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President signed a historic postal reform bill. Yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HENDERSON) and I sent to the President a letter expressing our concern over the important appointments he will soon make of five members to the Postal Rate Commission.

In our letter we urge that these appointments be most carefully made and that efforts be taken to insure that this agency become a model for other regulatory bodies.

So that our colleagues may share this letter, we insert it immediately following these remarks:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1970.

HON. RICHARD NIXON,  
President of the United States, The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned are proud to have played active roles in the long and difficult legislative battle to achieve passage of the Postal Reform Act of 1970. We have high hopes that this Act will in time bring savings, efficiency and better postal service to the American people. We are most anxious that this new postal service succeed and that it meet the expectations which led us to fight for its creation.

Our pleasure at the enactment of this legislation is tempered, however, by our realization that the approach taken toward operational aspects of the new postal service will largely determine whether the enterprise succeeds or fails. We write this letter to underline our joint concern about risks and pitfalls which need to be avoided as the transition is made to the new system. We believe that many features of that system will require close attention in the coming months, but our object in writing to you at this time is to discuss the new Postal Rate Commission.

Mr. President, we recognize the large and important role played in our society by independent regulatory commissions, some have earned the complete confidence of the public, while others have at times fallen short of this goal. While the Postal Rate Commission is not an independent regulatory agency and shares a large measure of its rate-setting procedures with the Board of Governors, there are certain similarities between the Commission and the independent regulatory agencies. These similarities are most apparent in the relationship of user groups to the Rate Commission.

These observations lead us to believe that the patterns and attitudes within and about an agency are often set in the early months and years of its existence. We urge you to employ your influence and prestige to insure that the new Postal Rate Commission becomes a model of what an independent regulatory commission ought to be. We think the decisions you make in the next few weeks and the leadership you exhibit in launching the new postal service can have far-reaching and permanent benefits that will help achieve the goals we all sought in advocating postal reform.

Our strong feelings about the Postal Rate Commission are built upon participation, as members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, in Congressional action on several postal rate bills in past years. We have learned that rate decisions involve hundreds of millions of dollars and are of great concern and interest to large organized groups of mail users. We have also learned that these decisions involve complex technical questions. The philosophy of the new Act is that Congress will lay down broad guidelines for policies governing postal rates, but that we will leave the task of applying those guidelines to the combined efforts of the Board of Governors and the Postal Rate Commission. There is a shared responsibility between the Postal Service and the Rate Commission in this effort in that the Service must make the initial recommendations which the Commission must act upon. After the final recommendation, the Board of Governors must place the final decision into effect. The Commissioners will have to be conscious of the heavy burden placed on the Board of Governors in recommending rate changes and should give great weight to the needs of this huge enterprise in their deliberations. Within this context, the Rate Commissioners and their professional staff should act in producing a rate structure consistent with Congressional policy.

Given the transfer of rate setting authority from the Congress to the Postal Service and Rate Commission, it is apparent to us that one of the potential dangers of the new arrangement is that the intensive, well-financed, and expert lobbying activities previously directed to Congress will be primarily focused on the five members of that commission. We do not suggest that the interested parties have in the past or will in the future resort to dishonest or dishonorable means. We recognize that there are legitimate business interests which have a large stake in decisions that are made. These groups have every right to be heard and should have every opportunity to make their case in an honorable way using accepted techniques of persuasion.

But if we are to have fair and just rate policies, if the public is to have confidence in the way rates are determined, and if the Post Office is to generate the revenues necessary to bring about the modernization and improvements we all seek—then it is vital that the Rate Commissioners not only be exceptionally well qualified and above reproach, but that the general public believes this is the case. As we have all learned over the years, the appearance of impropriety can be just as damaging to the public confidence as impropriety itself.

Much has been said in recent days, particularly by opponents of postal reform, about the inability of the new system to preserve requisite ethical standards. These comments reflect a cynicism about whether the new Postal Service can avoid politics as usual in its operations. Fears have been expressed that the Rate Commissioners and members of the Board of Governors will be individuals who are closely identified with large mail user groups. It has been contended that if Congress is removed as a buffer between special interests and the public, the

new Service will in time be heavily influenced and perhaps captured by user groups.

Mr. President, we believe that these potential problems can be largely if not entirely avoided if you take certain steps at the outset. Specifically, we solicit your consideration of several main points:

1. We urge that exceptional care be used in the search for talented individuals to serve as the first Postal Rate Commissioners. It is vital, in our judgment, that these individuals have no prior connections with or background in the commercial operations of the large mail users. We recognize the advantages that previous familiarity with postal matters would bring to the rate setting function. We believe, however, that rate decisions are not so complicated that a person of exceptional ability cannot quickly overcome a lack of prior experience, and that there would be a great deterioration of public confidence if the Commissioners were picked from the ranks of those who have been connected with or who have represented large mailer groups.

2. We urge that you meet with the first Rate Commissioners prior to their formal appointment, and that you indicate to them in the strongest possible terms that the hopes of all of us rest on their objectivity, complete impartiality and fidelity to the public trust.

3. We urge that you advise the new Commissioners of your strong desire that they initially and immediately establish administrative practices and procedures within the Commission designed to make it a model for other regulatory agencies in terms of complete impartiality and public confidence. We assume that Executive Order 11222 of May 8, 1965, will be applicable to the new Commission, but if it is not we think the Commissioners would want to adopt its terms by regulation to apply to themselves and to chief staff employees.

4. We hope you will urge the Rate Commissioners not only to adopt the standards of ethical conduct defined in Executive Order 11222, but to expand and to enlarge them as necessary in order to insure—

a. That all Rate Commissioners and key staff employees are annually required to disclose to the Civil Service Commission and/or the appropriate Congressional Committees the financial information referred to in Part IV of the Executive Order cited above;

b. That strict rules are adopted regarding informal or ex parte contacts with individuals, groups, or their representatives having business with the Commission. Such rules should require a public record to be made and kept of any such contacts including luncheons, informal gatherings or any occasion on which matters pending before the Commission are the subject of discussion;

c. That such regulations include strong prohibitions against the acceptance of honoraria, travel expenses, entertainment or the like in connection with attendance at conventions or gatherings of industrial groups.

Mr. President, if you should decide to take the actions we have outlined, we believe you will have done much to insure the initial success of the United States Postal Service. We think our ideas are shared by many members of Congress, and we hope for your favorable consideration of them.

Sincerely,

DAVID N. HENDERSON,  
MORRIS K. UDALL.

**INCREASING THE PRODUCTIVITY OF OUR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES**

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

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the President has recently stated that one of the fuels that fan the flames of inflation is the failure of productivity increases to keep pace with pay raises.

I certainly agree with the President; but, at the same time I believe that the Federal Government, with the biggest payroll in this country, over 2,900,000 civilian employees, should lead the way.

Our Government has been rather generous in raising the pay of its employees. For example, since January 1965, there have been six pay raises for the Classification Act's 1,300,000 employees, amounting to 31 percent. The 675,000 postal field service employees have had, also, six pay raises representing 28.2 percent. Likewise, the wage board employees, with their pay dependent on surveys of private industry in their respective labor market areas, have averaged better than 5 percent each year, for several years.

The Manpower and Civil Service Subcommittee for the past 15 years has worked with the departments and agencies of the Government in attempts to improve the utilization of manpower. After reviewing current manpower management policies, problems, and procedures throughout the Government, we feel it is now timely to re-emphasize employee productivity.

A principal factor in employee productivity revolves around the fact that there has been far too little emphasis over the past several years by management in general in the Government. Inquiries by our subcommittee have revealed fairly inconsequential actions by many of the departments and agencies. Yes, there have been some programs to save man-hours and materials. But, unfortunately, too many of these programs appear to have become, over the years, fads or frequently represented surface approaches to in-depth management problems.

I recognize that there have been obvious increases in productivity in the Federal Government where mechanization and automation have taken over. I refer specifically to such functional areas as social security payments, payroll activities, and internal revenue. Likewise, I recognize that there are many functions in the Federal Government that are not easily measured as to employee productivity.

However, in attempting to improve manpower utilization in the executive branch over the years, the subcommittee has identified factors contributing to lower productivity. These include unnecessary work, duplicate and overlapping functions, inefficient work procedures, top-heavy administrative overhead, and dual staffing—two people in a single job. I specifically brought this to the attention of the Secretary of Defense earlier this year in discussing ways to reduce labor costs and at the same time maintain high productivity.

The Department of Defense has now issued a set of guidelines to improve manpower utilization in the military departments. It is my understanding the services have begun to implement these guidelines.

With increased emphasis on saving tax dollars in face of yearly increases in hourly labor rates, the recent actions in the Department of Defense are certainly in the right direction. But there is need, Government-wide, for more interest by top management and certainly more positive and specific action programs, than we have noted to date, in most of the departments and agencies.

The subcommittee is initiating an accelerated action program to bring about improved manpower utilization of Federal employees. Therefore, just as soon as possible after the House recess I plan to ask several top Government officials, including Hon. George P. Shultz, Director of the Bureau of Management and Budget, to appear before the subcommittee to reveal current policies and programs in the Federal Government for improving Government employee productivity.

We must show the American taxpayer that the Federal Government itself is trying to control inflation.

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

Mr. HENDERSON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa who is a member of the subcommittee which I have the honor to chair.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I concur with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Manpower and Civil Service, my friend Dave Henderson, of North Carolina, in his statement concerning the need for the Federal Government to improve the utilization of its employees.

It has been my pleasure to serve on this subcommittee since it was organized in 1956, first under the Honorable James C. Davis of Georgia, and now Dave Henderson of North Carolina. I have worked with them trying to reduce the Government's labor dollar and yet preserve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Government for the people.

Our efforts have not resulted in all of the improvements which I would like to have seen, however, we have exercised our congressional oversight responsibility in a number of areas, which has had a positive impact in many of the departments and agencies.

Now, with our Federal Government's annual labor costs at \$28.9 billion, representing an increase of 54 percent in the past 5 years, I feel it is high time for the Congress to become more interested in getting increased productivity for our labor dollar. If we mean business in fighting inflation, let us start right here at home.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I strongly concur in Chairman Henderson's statement and will look forward to reviewing in September any plans that the executive branch has developed to control labor costs by improved manpower management.

I am sure there are many American taxpayers who likewise share my interests in now time or perhaps past time, revitalizing the electorate in this country.

**DISMANTLING OF CORNER MAILBOXES**

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, my constituents have been protesting the dismantling of corner mailboxes they have used for many, many years. The Post Office Department explains that its campaign to remove mailboxes is in the interest of economy. Well, we all encourage economy. However, the Post Office has missed the point. What my constituents have found most deplorable is not the motive, but the method, of the Post Office.

One afternoon a mailbox will be standing on a familiar corner, where it has stood for a quarter of a century. The next morning a neighborhood resident will go to that corner to mail a letter and the mailbox will have disappeared.

No explanation. No mailbox. The Post Office Department declares that it carefully studies the collection pattern of a neighborhood before removing a mailbox. If the Department takes the care it claims, I demand to know why it also cannot make some attempt to consult the community. Certainly it would be an easy matter for inquiries to be placed in the mailboxes of neighborhood residents by the postman on his daily rounds.

And finally as a simple courtesy the Post Office could certainly post notice on the mailbox to be removed that such action is either being considered or is imminent. That the Post Office has refused to take either of these simple steps reveals to me a certain arrogance toward the people it is mandated to serve. We will now have a postal corporation, the U.S. Postal Service, and I hope that it remembers that it exists only to serve the American people, not to do them disservice.

#### STATE BENEFITS TO PENNSYLVANIA BLACK LUNG VICTIMS

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

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to address the House in order to give the Members a chance to see the letter President Boyle, United Mine Workers, has sent to Mr. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security.

Following is the text of letter from W. A. "Tony" Boyle, president, United Mine Workers of America, to Robert M. Ball, Commissioner of Social Security, challenging the administration's decision cutting off payments of \$100 per month in State benefits to Pennsylvania black lung victims:

JULY 31, 1970.

DEAR MR. BALL: The State of Pennsylvania has just enacted legislation ending payment from its general funds of \$100 per month to mine workers disabled by pneumoconiosis, the dread black lung disease. State action was taken because of an interpretation of the Federal Coal Mine Health & Safety Act by the Social Security Administration which flies in the face of the meaning of the law as intended by the United States Congress.

The Joint House-Senate Conference Committee clearly stated that where state benefit payments are made from state general revenues, they are not deductible from federal

payments. The conference intent is made clear by the following language:

"Benefit payments under state programs funded by general revenues are not included in the maintenance of effort in the House amendment for the reason that they are not considered to be workmen's compensation, unemployment compensation or disability insurance as such programs are generally understood within the context of this benefit program."

The Social Security Administration has chosen to ignore this language although the House amendment was included in the act as signed by the President. The Administration instead informed the State of Pennsylvania that it would deduct \$100 of the \$144 federal black lung payment due under the law if state payments continued. Pennsylvania has obliged by amending its law and depriving miners permanently disabled and unable to work of state benefits.

"Black lung victims can barely subsist on the \$144 federal benefit, and the Social Security Administration ruling condemns some 27,000 victims in Pennsylvania to abject poverty. This bureaucratic ruling is an inhuman interpretation of the intent and meaning of that section of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act dealing with black lung benefits.

"In rescinding its state law, the Pennsylvania legislature (Senate bill 1478) noted that it was acting because of 'federal administrative interpretation,' and that 'state amending legislation must be so written to protect the recipient's right to receive both state and federal payments in the event that any future action of Congress, federal executive departments or the courts should change the administrative interpretation.' The legislature further stated that 'it is also the purpose and intent of this act to protect the continued and future eligibility of present recipients of state payments under the Pennsylvania Occupational Disease laws.'

"As written, Pennsylvania law now makes it mandatory to reinstitute state benefits at any time federal law is changed by Congress, court rulings or administrative interpretation. As a matter of justice and humanity to 27,000 Pennsylvania miners who now suffer the living death of black lung, the United Mine Workers of America calls upon you to reinterpret the law in a manner consistent with the clear intent of the Congress.

"The UMW intends to fight this matter all the way, as a matter of principle and justice. It is our intent further to seek legislation in all coal states to permit both federal and state benefits for coal miners suffering from black lung.

"We urge an immediate answer regarding your intentions in this matter. We are sending copies of this letter to the leadership in Congress and releasing its contents to the press."

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE,  
President,

United Mine Workers of America.

#### OUR U.N. HUMAN RIGHTS REPRESENTATIVE SHOULD BE ASKED TO RESIGN

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

Mr. WAGGONER. I don't know who appointed Rita E. Hauser as the U.S. representative to the United Nations Human Rights Commission but her selection was an embarrassing mistake and I suggest that the President ask for her resignation.

In a speech delivered in St. Louis the

other day, she assailed existing laws which call for married couples to be of opposite sexes. This, she says, is no longer reasonable or consistent with fact. It is also, she says, causing the birth of children and this does not wash with the social goal of limiting the population.

Now, this woman has the right to her own social philosophy and she can subscribe to any queer notion she wants as a private citizen. But she is not a representative of any meaningful portion of the population of this country. Surely the President can find someone a little saner than this to represent us, even at a worthless organization like the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

A news report which appeared in the Post of August 10 tells of her speech: U.S. AIDE AT U.N. ASSAILS BISEXUAL MARRIAGE LAWS

ST. LOUIS.—Rita E. Hauser argued today that state laws requiring prospective marriage parties to be of different sexes are unconstitutional.

The U.S. representative to the United Nations Human Rights Commission said "such a requirement predicates reproduction as the legal consideration of marriage and that view, I submit, is no longer reasonable or consistent with fact."

In a speech on "Women's Liberation and the Constitution" prepared for delivery at an American Bar Association program, she said:

"Indeed, one can argue that limiting reproduction has become the social goal, and I know no better way of accomplishing that than marriage between the same sexes.

"I am not urging this as a social policy; rather, I am arguing that the right to marry, right guaranteed by law, cannot be premised on sex distinctions which serve to deny equal protection of the law to all persons, whatever their tastes in life may be."

#### CONCERNING EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

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

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in light of the overwhelming vote in this Chamber earlier in the week with respect to the so-called equal rights amendment, I find it a little difficult to understand the vehement exception that the gentleman from Louisiana made here just a moment ago to an expression by one of the gentle ladies that there ought not be any discrimination based upon sex as to who should be permitted to live together.

#### MORE PASSPORT ASSISTANCE FOR CONNECTICUT

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the announcement by the Department of State that 93 Probate Courts in Connecticut will commence accepting passport applications this month. I congratulate these courts on this public-spirited decision.

For years I have tried, both through legislative action and cooperation with the State Department, to remedy the an-

nual passport logjam experienced by Connecticut travelers and those in other States. This problem had reached serious proportions. Increased travel in recent years had strained inadequate passport procedures to the point where many citizens justifiably felt frustration and resentment over their travel treatment.

In the past, legislative proposals have failed to resolve the problem. At a May 12 hearing of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Financial Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I made the suggestion to the Department of State that probate courts in Connecticut accept passport applications as a way of smoothing the passport procedure. I am now pleased to include here the text of the letter from Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, David Abshire, announcing the acceptance of this suggestion.

This action by the State Department represents another effective solution to the passport problem.

In July, through the combined efforts of the State Department, the Post Office Department, and the Congress eight Connecticut post offices started accepting applications for passports. This action has been effective and will continue. The Probate Courts will supplement the services of the post office and the U.S. district courts. It also marks the culmination of successful cooperation between myself, the State Department, and such capable people as Judge Jay E. Rubinow, judge of the Connecticut Superior Court and probate administrator; Judge Neil F. Murphy, president of the Probate Assembly; and Judge Robert M. Dowling, executive secretary of the Probate Assembly.

The text of Mr. Abshire's letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., August 11, 1970.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: Knowing of your long and continuing interest in resolving the difficulties Connecticut residents have experienced in applying for U.S. passports, I am happy to inform you that beginning on or about August 12 Probate Courts in Connecticut will commence accepting passport applications. As of now, ninety-three of the one-hundred and twenty-five Probate Judges in Connecticut have indicated their intention to accept applications.

We proposed to the Probate Assembly that Probate Courts in Connecticut accept passport applications as a result of the suggestion that you made at the May 12 hearing of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Financial Operations of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Agreement by the Probate Assembly followed several meetings between representatives of the State Department and Judge Jay E. Rubinow, Judge of the Superior Court and Probate Administrator, Judge Neil F. Murphy, President of the Probate Assembly, and Judge Robert M. Dowling, Executive Secretary of the Probate Assembly. Through the efforts of these Judges the necessary steps were taken, including approval by the Judicial Department of Connecticut, for the participation by Probate Courts in the passport application process.

Acceptance of passport applications by the

Probate Courts of Connecticut will supplement the existing arrangements whereby Connecticut residents may apply for passports at Post Offices in Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, Waterbury, Stamford, Greenwich, New London, and Willimantic, and at the Federal District Courts at Hartford, New Haven and Bridgeport.

We appreciate your efforts in resolving this problem and, particularly, your suggestion regarding the Probate Courts that has resulted in this significant improvement in passport facilities for the residents of your State.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,  
Assistant Secretary for Congressional  
Relations.

#### BILL TO ESTABLISH HEALTH STANDARDS FOR EMPLOYEES OF FOOD SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to protect the health and well-being of Congressmen, Government employees, and citizens of the District of Columbia by the establishment of health standards for employees of food service establishments in the District. The bill follows delving research and is partially in reaction to the six-plus cases of tuberculosis on Capitol Hill that first came to light last June.

The bill brings the District health code in line with the codes of other major cities in the Nation.

The District code now contains a law stating that no person afflicted with any communicable disease can work "with food." But no law or regulation requires current congressional food handling employees or such applicants anywhere in the District of Columbia area to take a physical examination of any sort. Moreover, the District law is not enforceable at the Capitol, having been specifically excluded, paradoxically.

In essence, the Hall bill requires that no person can be employed by any food establishment in the District of Columbia unless he meets such health standards prescribed by the District of Columbia Council in pursuance to the tests outlined in the bill. The bill calls for annual examination which include a tuberculin test, X-ray, of the chest—uncovered—a serological test, and examination of hands, skin, nose and throat and body orifices—including a culture where appropriate. These standards would provide sufficient protection against further outbreaks of communicable diseases such as tuberculosis, and other common and rare diseases ordinarily associated with food handling and preparation.

These requirements would be administratively and budgetarily feasible. Tuberculin tests are not costly. Up to 1957 the District of Columbia had an annual physical examination and health permit requirement for restaurant workers. The point is, we cannot afford to do without them. The marvel is that an en-

tire Capitol Hill force has escaped so long.

Tuberculosis is a highly contagious bacterial disease usually associated with poverty, stress, overworked, and social problems. The average active case of tuberculosis will be the source for the infection of 15 persons before it is detected. The TB victim can begin infecting others well before his own symptoms force him to seek medical advice. Therefore, people constantly in contact with the public should meet such minimal health requirements as I have outlined above in order to prevent outbreaks similar to that of Capitol Hill.

It may surprise you to know, the District of Columbia ranks fifth in the incidence of active new tuberculosis cases among the more than 50 cities in the Nation with a population of 250,000 or more. New case rates are nearly three times the national average and the death rate more than triple that of the rest of the Nation, according to H. Michael Cannon, director of the District of Columbia's Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association.

Public apathy is one of the greatest problems now confronting those involved in controlling tuberculosis. Given the record of the District of Columbia, I feel that it is time that the Congress set an example for the rest of the Nation in the field of public health. As one of the "doctors in the house," I am sure of it.

President Nixon began larger efforts to control crime in the Nation's Capital upon taking office. The President realized the importance of cleaning our "home shop" in order to provide a model for the rest of the Nation. It is time we make like efforts in public health. This bill is designed to do just that. I commend it to you and have been assured of early consideration.

#### SICKNESS THAT PERVADES PARTS OF GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, some apparently have misunderstood my criticism of the fact that convicted rioter Rennie Davis was allowed to address a group of HEW employees at HEW.

While I believe he should have been stopped, the fact that he was allowed to speak is only a part of the problem.

Rennie Davis is only one symptom of the sickness that pervades in parts of Government.

That sickness is in the minds of some civil servants, and some middle-level policymakers who have forgotten that it is their duty to serve the Government, not to foster revolution.

Civil service was set up to afford job protection to Government employees on a nonpolitical basis. In return they were supposed to bring to their jobs a nonpolitical professionalism and dedication.

Somewhere along the line, some have forgotten that they are servants of all

people, not agents of the new left or of a particular political party.

If HEW is unable to cope with those employees who refuse to separate their political ideologies from their nonpolitical, safeguarded jobs as public servants, then I would suggest that the hierarchy of HEW take whatever action is needed to weed out this small group of malcontents and ideological misfits.

Within the National Institute of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health—subdivisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—a group of malicious maligners, some hiding behind the protective cloak of civil service, publish a despicable newsletter entitled "Rainbow Sign."

This vicious rag is distributed throughout the Government offices and halls of the National Institutes of Health complex. It prints extremely repugnant personal attacks against President Nixon, as well as criticism of his domestic and foreign policies. Pictured on the front page of a recent issue of this propaganda pamphlet, was a photograph of an obnoxious poster reading "Pull out Nixon—Like Your Father Should Have Done" and "Strike Nixon Out!" The vile newsletter also purports to rate President Nixon on an HEW performance appraisal sheet. Not surprisingly, these ingrates rate the Chief Executive of the United States in the lowest possible categories of personal evaluation.

The masthead of a recent edition of this hate sheet lists the following Government employees as staff members:

Marty Blumsack, Public Health analyst, NIH, \$11,905.

Bob Dworkin, microbiologist, NIH, \$8,638.

Bob Lesser, Public Health Commissioned officer, NIH, \$10,725.

Mike Mage, Public Health Commissioned officer, NIH, \$13,991.

Kathy L. Moore, secretary/steno, NIH, \$8,752.

Phil Ross, research chemist, NIH, \$20,953.

Bob Ryder, Chief of Section of Family Development, NIMH, \$20,000.

Dorothy Stewart, secretary/typist, NIH, \$7,340.

When contacted by my office, the above-named individuals or their supervisors confirmed that these Government employees were engaged in this publication. Two of them, a Dr. Lesser and a Dr. Mage, are commissioned officers in the Health Service and, therefore, not subject to civil service regulations.

Similar information has also been made available to me concerning the activities of other employees in a separate agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, at the request of top echelon HEW officials, this information and evidence has been turned over to them for immediate appropriate action. If these officials do not honor their pledge then I am determined to seek a congressional investigation.

The right to dissent from official Government policy is a cornerstone of democracy. However, civil service employees who are dedicated to subverting and

sabotaging Government programs are hereby placed on notice that the American taxpayer will no longer tolerate such contemptible conduct. The citizens they are supposed to serve demand their full cooperation and loyalty in the discharge of their official duties. This obligation cannot be fulfilled by engaging in personal attacks against the President of the United States, or the administration.

#### LUXURY UNLIMITED

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, at my request the General Accounting Office has investigated the lavish refurbishing of his office by Interior Secretary Walter Hickel and has just reported its findings.

I was shocked to learn that at a time when the taxpayers of this Nation are facing ruinous inflation on all fronts, Mr. Hickel is now sitting at what the GAO describes as "a Dunbar custom—special—desk" priced at \$1,795 and walking on carpeting that cost \$56.25 a square yard.

All told, Mr. Hickel spent nearly \$40,000 to refurbish his office.

He flew in from Seattle, Wash., an interior designer and his staff and paid them \$7,800 for their services—which were obtained under an oral contract, a procedure that caused more than one raised eye at the General Accounting Office.

Arthur Morgan Designers then proceeded to specify \$27,000 worth of luxurious furnishings and the Interior Department blithely ordered them without so much as a nod in the direction of the General Services Administration.

As Comptroller General Staats points out, this is clearly beyond the legal authority of the Department.

I am pleased to note that the General Accounting Office has told the Interior Department either to return the furniture and obtain a refund or face action by the Comptroller General against the responsible fiscal officers of the Department.

I would hope this would serve notice on Mr. Hickel as well as on other officials of the Government that they have absolutely no business spending the public's money in this fashion, and especially when this Nation is in such dire financial straits.

Mr. Speaker, I include for insertion in the RECORD at this point the GAO report to me:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, D.C., August 12, 1970.

B-169502.  
Hon. H. R. Gross,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. GROSS: This letter is in further response to your letter of March 31, 1970, in which you requested our Office to inquire into the refurbishing of the offices of the Secretary of the Interior.

In September 1969, the Department of the Interior initiated action to refurbish the suite of offices of the Secretary of the In-

terior. The Department engaged a firm of interior designers, Arthur Morgan Designers, Inc., to provide a proposal for the redecoration of the offices, and subsequently issued purchase orders for the furniture and furnishings as set forth in the designer's specifications. The cost of refurbishing the Secretary's offices totaled about \$39,400 at August 3, 1970, consisting of about \$7,800 for design services, \$27,000 for furniture and furnishings, and \$4,600 for repairs and alterations.

We conclude that the Department of the Interior had authority to obtain the design services from outside sources and, therefore, there is an obligation to pay for the reasonable value of these services.

As to the procurement of the furniture and furnishings for the refurbishing of the Secretary's suite of offices, we conclude that the purchases were not made in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Federal Property Management Regulations and the Federal Procurement Regulations.

The Department has suggested the possibility of returning the items that have been delivered and that have a counterpart under Federal Supply Schedule contracts. We would see no objection to such action provided that full refund is made to the Government for any payments which have been made for the items returned and provided also that no costs to the Government are incurred. Alternatively for each item which could have been purchased from the Federal Supply Schedules, we intend to take exception in the accounts of the responsible fiscal officers to the portion of the payments under the several purchase orders involved which are in excess of the General Services Administration's maximum prices.

Our detailed comments which are set forth in the enclosure to this letter give recognition to the statements of officials of the Department of the Interior involved in the refurbishing of the Secretary's offices.

The enclosure is being sent to other interested members and committees of the Congress. The enclosure is also being sent to officials of the Department of the Interior and the General Services Administration.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,

Comptroller General of the United States.

#### GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REVIEW OF THE REFRUBISHING OF OFFICES OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

In September 1969, the Department of the Interior initiated action to refurbish the suite of offices of the Secretary of the Interior. The Department engaged a firm of interior designers, Arthur Morgan Designers, Inc. (Morgan), of Seattle, Washington, to provide a proposal for the redecoration of the Secretary's suite of offices, and subsequently issued purchase orders for the furniture and furnishings as set forth in the designer's specifications.

At August 3, 1970, the cost of refurbishing the Secretary's suite of offices totaled about \$39,400 consisting of about \$7,800 for design services; \$27,000 for furniture and furnishings, and \$4,600 for repairs and alterations.

#### DESIGN SERVICES

The Secretary of the Interior and his staff negotiated an oral contract with Morgan for the redecoration of a substantial portion of the Secretary's suite of offices. The Director, Office of Management Operations, Department of the Interior, told us that the contract and the negotiation of the contract was not documented.

At August 3, 1970, the invoices received from Morgan for design services, travel, and other costs, totaled \$7,790, of which \$6,585 had been paid. The costs of the design services were based on a rate of \$35 an hour for

the principal designer and of \$20 an hour for other designers.

The initial invoice from Morgan for \$1,629.70, dated October 31, 1969, covered design services for September and October 1969, and included travel and other expenses of \$329.70. The second invoice from Morgan for \$3,795, dated November 30, 1969, covered design services for November 1969. On December 12, 1969, the Chief, Division of Fiscal Services, Department of the Interior, commented on this invoice in a memorandum to the Chief of the Department's Division of General Services, stating:

"We do not have authority to incur obligations in this office and a contract or purchase order signed by an authorized contracting officer is necessary.

"I would suggest that a purchase order be issued to cover these design services. This does present some problems from the standpoint of either the limitation on purchases for contracts without advertising, or the restrictions on strictly personal services without complying with Department regulations on such, but guess we have no choice at this point."

On December 15, 1969, the Department's Supply Branch issued purchase order A-1402 to Morgan in the amount of \$3,795. The purchase order contained a notation that services had been completed per the vendor's invoice dated November 30, 1969.

On December 30, 1969, the Supply Branch canceled purchase order A-1402 by issuing two purchase orders—A-1421 for \$2,450, and A-1422 for \$1,345. These orders were for a total of \$3,795, the amount of the canceled purchase order A-1402, and were based on Morgan's invoices dated November 15, 1969, for \$2,450 and November 30, 1969, for \$1,345. The latter invoice was numbered and dated the same as the invoice upon which purchase order A-1402 was based. The Director, Office of Management Operations, told us that he did not know who instructed Morgan to submit these two invoices that totaled the amount of the original November 30, 1969, invoice. The Director stated that there were many telephone contacts between Department personnel and Morgan's staff and that probably during one of the telephone calls, a suggestion was made to submit revised invoices.

Morgan submitted three additional invoices, one for \$1,160.43 for services during December 1969, one for \$1,125 for services during January and February 1970, and one for \$80 for services during the period March through May 1970. The two most recent invoices had not been paid at August 3, 1970.

At hearings before the Subcommittee on Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, House Committee on Appropriations, on April 10, 1970, the Assistant Secretary for Administration stated that the regulation, 41 CFR 1-3.204, specifically authorizes the negotiation of contracts for professional services, and that such contracts were exempt from the requirement for competitive bidding and were not subject to the \$2,500 limitation. Although the regulation cited does permit negotiation of contracts in excess of \$2,500 for professional services without formal advertising, we do not believe that the negotiation requirements of the regulation were complied with in obtaining Morgan's services.

Section 1-3.101(c) of the Federal Procurement Regulations (FPR) provides that:

"Whenever property or services are to be procured by negotiation, proposals shall be solicited from the maximum number of qualified sources, including small business concerns (see § 1-1.702(b)(3)), consistent with the nature of and requirements for the supplies or services to be procured, in accordance with the basic policies set forth in

this Part 1-3, to the end that the procurement will be made to the best advantage of the Government, price and other factors considered. \* \* \*

Paragraph (d) of the same section of FPR provides that:

"Negotiated procurement shall be on a competitive basis to the maximum practical extent. When a proposed procurement appears to be noncompetitive, the procuring activity is responsible \* \* \* for assuring that competitive procurement is not feasible \* \* \*."

As stated previously, the work done by Morgan was on the basis of an oral contract. During our review, we found no indication that proposals were solicited from other sources and the Department did not furnish information to us to demonstrate that Morgan was the only qualified source and that competitive procurement was not feasible.

In addition, the Federal Supply Service (FSS), General Services Administration (GSA), has a staff of designers to assist Federal agencies in interior planning and design activities as provided for in section 101-26.506 of the Federal Property Management Regulations (FPMR) which states that:

"The Federal Supply Service, through facilities at GSA Central Office and regional office locations, will provide advice and assistance on various phases of interior planning and design to interested Federal agencies and, to the extent necessary, will provide for these services either directly or through commercial sources (for services involving interior office design or space layout see § 101-20.404)."

Section 101-20.404 states that:

"No Federal agency shall, without the written approval of GSA, enter into a contract for interior office design or space layout, with any non-Federal firm or individual. When it is determined that a contract is required, GSA, with the advice of the agency, will enter into the contract and supervise the contractor's performance. The contract will be completely reimbursable by the requesting agency."

Section 101-20 of the FPMR, which is a part of subchapter D, Public Buildings and Works, prescribes the policies and procedures relative to the assignment and utilization of space in Government buildings, the responsibility for which is vested in the Public Buildings Service (PBS). Section 101-20.4 outlines the methods for planning and layout of space assignments and prescribes the conditions governing GSA-agency coordination. Section 101-2.401 defines "space planning" as a study to determine the placement of an agency's operations within a building and the space layout of its furniture, and defines "space layout" as the specific placement of work stations, furniture, and equipment, to provide maximum efficiency of an agency operation. Neither the term "interior office design" used in section 101-20.404, nor the term "interior planning and design" used in section 101-26.506, is defined.

Section 101-26 of the FPMR which sets forth policies and procedures regarding the procurement of personal property and non-personal services from or through Federal agencies and from non-Federal agencies established as sources of supply, is a part of subchapter E, Supply and Procurement. Section 101-26.5 prescribes policies and procedures relating to GSA procurement programs other than the GSA supply depot and Federal Supply Schedule programs.

We discussed the applicability of sections 101-26.506 and 101-20.404 of FPMR to contracts, such as the oral contract entered into between the Department of the Interior and Morgan, with personnel of the FSS Procurement Policy Area and the PBS Design and

Construction Area. Some of the personnel expressed the opinion that the term "interior office design" as used in section 101-20.404 is broad and comprehensive and would include the refurbishing or redecorating of a Government official's office. These persons stated their belief that such services should not, according to section 101-20.404 be contracted for with non-Federal entities without GSA's written approval. Others, however, stated that section 101-20.404 is in the subchapter of FPMR which deals with the assignment and utilization of space and therefore would not be applicable to interior design services which are furnished by GSA under authority of section 101-26.506 in the Supply and Procurement subchapter of FPMR.

The Acting Assistant Commissioner, Procurement, FSS, stated that interior design is a service that would be furnished other Federal agencies if they requested it. However, in his opinion, it was not the intent of GSA to consider interior design as a service that could not be contracted for without GSA approval. This view was concurred in by the Deputy Assistant Commissioner, Office of Space Management, PBS. The General Counsel of GSA has advised us that he agrees with this view, which may be regarded as GSA's official interpretation of the referred to regulations.

#### CONCLUSION

Under the circumstances described above, we believe that the services actually provided by Morgan appear to be the "interior planning and design" services as described in section 101-26.506 rather than "space planning" or "space layout" services as defined in 101-20.401, and that the specific prohibition contained in section 101-20.404 is not applicable to the Morgan contract. Therefore, we conclude that the Department of the Interior had authority to obtain such services from an outside source.

With respect to the procedures followed in obtaining the services of Morgan, we believe that the noncompetitive procurement of such services was not sufficiently justified by the facts contained in the record. However, the services provided by Morgan at the request of the Department, and the acceptance of the services, as evidenced or ratified by the issuance of purchase orders for the furniture and furnishings gave rise to an obligation on the part of the Government to pay for the reasonable value of the services. We doubt that the Government could successfully contest the reasonableness of the rates of compensation paid to Morgan according to commercial standards.

#### PURCHASE OF FURNITURE

Of the purchases for the refurbishing of the Secretary's suite of offices, all but a desk and credenza costing \$2,235 had been received as of July 10, 1970.

At the hearings held on April 10, 1970, before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, Department officials in a statement pointed out that Morgan, the interior designer, had specified furniture and furnishings from designated manufacturers that generally were not available from Federal supply sources; and that for the Department to have procured items other than those specified would have negated the benefits and wasted the cost of the designer's services.

Since the interior designer had specified furniture and furnishings from suppliers who were not listed in the Federal Supply Schedules for executive type office furniture, the items specified were not available from Federal supply sources. However, we question whether it was necessary for the interior designer to specify such furniture or furnishings for use in the Secretary's offices. FSS issues schedules listing executive type furni-

ture, the use of which is generally limited to personnel in grade GS-18 and above. Our review indicated that executive type furniture listed in Federal Supply Schedules had been used in offices of other cabinet officials.

Section 101-26.401-3 of FPMR provides that agencies obtain needed items under the Federal Supply Schedule contracts, instead of procuring similar items from other sources, when the FSS item will adequately serve the required functional purpose. When an agency determines that an FSS item will not serve the required functional end-use purpose, a waiver of these requirements must be obtained from GSA.

More specifically, with respect to office and household furniture and furnishings, section 101-26.505-3 of the FPMR requires that:

"Where an agency determines that office and household furniture and furnishings obtainable from GSA supply depots or Federal Supply Schedule contracts, when required to use these sources, will not serve the required functional end use, requests to procure similar items from other than GSA sources shall be submitted to the Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, as prescribed in §§ 101-26.301-1 and 101-26.401-3, respectively."

Although in our opinion, many of the items specified by Morgan appear to have the same functional purpose as items that were available under the Federal Supply Schedule contracts, the Department purchased the items from the sources specified by Morgan and did not request waivers from GSA for these purchases. Items such as a Dunbar custom (special) desk priced at \$1,795 and carpeting, some of which was priced at \$56.25 a square yard would appear to be in this category. In this regard, we noted that under the Federal Supply Schedule contracts the most expensive desk available was \$463 and the most expensive FSS carpeting was \$9.63 a square yard.

#### AGENCY COMMENTS

In a letter received by us on July 10, 1970, the Solicitor, Department of the Interior, stated that the furniture items were part of a design and motif developed by Morgan and were not FSS items. He added that therefore the purchases of the furniture items were legal and proper because:

"(a) the items were not Federal Supply Schedule items, since being a part of an overall decorator development causes the items to include design, decor, and motif features.

"(b) only non-listed furniture items which are sufficiently similar to items on the Federal Supply Schedule require a waiver from General Services Administration; and Interior did not believe the items were sufficiently similar and did not ask for waivers, because the items were so much a part of the decorator's over-all development for the suite of offices."

#### CONCLUSION

The FPMR requires that Federal agencies either obtain needed items under FSS contracts when FSS items will serve the required functional purpose, or request waivers from GSA when it is determined that FSS items will not serve the functional end-use purpose. As noted previously, in our opinion, many of the items purchased from non-FSS sources served the same functional end-use purpose as items that could have been acquired under FSS contracts. However, the Department did not request waivers from GSA as required by the FPMR.

Moreover, even if the Department had been granted waivers, the method of contracting for the specified items was clearly unauthorized. Section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of June 30, 1949, as amended (41 U.S.C. 252), requires that all purchases and contracts for property and

services shall be made by advertising, except that negotiation is authorized in 15 specifically enumerated instances. In the absence of a real emergency, 41 U.S.C. 252(c)(10) might have been considered as the negotiating authority applicable to these purchases. Under this provision, an agency may acquire property or services through noncompetitive negotiation when it is "impracticable to secure competition."

Federal Procurement Regulations (FPR) 1-3.210, implementing the statutory negotiating authority, cites the following as an illustration of circumstances permitting use of the authority—"when property or services can be obtained from only one person or firm (sole source of supply)." However, FPR 1-3.210 also requires that every contract negotiated under this exception shall be supported by a determination and findings prepared and signed by the contracting officer justifying use of the authority.

Determination and findings to support sole source negotiation for the furniture and furnishings in question would, in our opinion, have to set forth facts and circumstances illustrating why a product having features which are peculiar to the product of one manufacturer, producer, or distributor are essential to the Government's requirements and that similar products of other companies lacking those features would not meet the minimum requirements for the item. The Department has not furnished us with a sufficient basis to justify these purchases on a noncompetitive basis.

Since it appears that the purchases in question were not made in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Federal Property Management Regulations, and were made without waivers by GSA of any of such provisions, and that issuance of the purchase orders violated the cited provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act and the Federal Procurement Regulations promulgated in implementation thereof, we conclude that such purchases were beyond the legal authority of the Department of the Interior.

Representatives of the Department of the Interior have suggested that one possible course of action would be to return the items which have been delivered and which have a counterpart under Federal Supply Schedule contracts. The General Accounting Office would see no objection to taking such action provided full refund is made to the Government for any payments which have been made for the items returned and provided also that no costs to the Government are incurred.

Alternatively, we are requesting that the Department prepare a detailed description of all items purchased, following the requirements set forth in FPMR 101-26.301 and 101-26.401, which we will submit to GSA with a request that we be advised as to the maximum prices for similar items which could have been purchased in accordance with GSA regulations. For each item which GSA determines could have been purchased from the Federal Supply Schedules, we intend to take exception in the accounts of the responsible fiscal officers to the portion of the payments under the several purchase orders involved which are in excess of GSA's maximum prices.

#### THE COURTROOM TRAGEDY IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, the recent courtroom tragedy in California,

resulting in the merciless slaying of Judge Harold J. Haley of the Marin County Superior Court, and two others, makes clear the types of crime which can be perpetrated by the use of handguns.

The investigation of this case indicates that the gun used in the slaying of the judge was registered in 1968 by Angela Davis, a controversial person who has been barred from her teaching position at the University of California.

The significance of this disclosure is that the investigators of this heinous crime have been able to trace the acquisition of the guns used by the alleged perpetrators to Angela Davis. This is, indeed, an essential element in the total investigation and the ultimate apprehension of all of those responsible for these brutal slayings.

In the last Congress, I sponsored an amendment to the omnibus crime bill which would have required Federal licensing of all handguns. Since most crimes of violence are committed with handguns, the wisdom of such a Federal statute should be apparent. Certainly, the California gun registration law has been useful in identifying the alleged purchaser in 1968 of the gun which was used to set off the multiple slayings which occurred last Friday. With the mobility of today's population, the need for such a Federal small gun registration or licensing law is greater than ever.

The political beliefs of Angela Davis are of no concern to me in this context, but her identity as the apparent purchaser of the gun in question and the valuable use to which this information may be put cannot be questioned.

Mr. Speaker, I am reintroducing the measure for Federal licensing of handguns. It is my hope that this measure will receive an early hearing by the House Judiciary Committee, as well as overwhelming passage by this House.

#### LEAA CORRECTIONAL PROGRAM

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1970, the House acted favorably on amendments to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act providing for improvements in and a continuation of the law Enforcement Assistance Administration. These amendments were most significant in that for the first time funds will be directed to the correctional facilities of this Nation. It is also highly significant that Congress has led the way in this area, an area that has been neglected for decades.

Last Saturday I visited the Riker's Island correctional facility in New York City. I liken my observations there to similar such observations that the gentleman from California (Mr. HAWKINS), my esteemed colleague, made concerning the Con Son prison facility in South Vietnam.

There is one section of the Rickers Island facility where 2,150 boys are locked up two to a cell that measure 6½

by 8 feet. These boys have not been convicted of any crime, yet some have been there almost 18 months. I was shocked at the size of those cells and the confinement of two to each small area.

Moreover, there is little or nothing for the boys to do. The lack of mental activities has no doubt been responsible for several attempted and successful suicides. The shelter has a public school, but its eight teachers can handle only 200 students or less than 10 percent of the detainees.

I also saw several fully equipped, but unused vocational training shops for machinery work, metal fabricating, wood-working, furniture finishing, printing, and trades. Yet these boys who are presumed to be innocent under law are not able to use the facilities.

It is incomprehensible to me that with a surplus of teachers we cannot expand the public school program at the island facility. Moreover, it is simply faulty logic for a \$2.5 million vocational training center to be established and then go unused due to lack of adequate funding.

This week New York experienced an outburst at another correctional facility, the Tombs in Manhattan. A facility for males charged with crimes ranging from murder on down, it was originally designed to hold 932 persons. Today it holds nearly 2,000.

The inmates cried, "We are not animals." Yet the attention paid to this facility was worse than that given to the Bronx Zoo.

The prisoners in the Tombs are not going to take inhuman treatment. The New York City prison system is one big, boiling, seething cauldron similar to the Tombs and Rikers Island.

So now this body has passed the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration amendments. This bill provides \$3.1 billion over the next 3 fiscal years to establish new programs for construction, acquisition, and renovation of correctional facilities at all levels of government, as well as for other law-enforcement activities.

A minimum of one quarter of the total appropriation or \$1.09 billion, is to be expended for grants to States and localities for the improvement of correctional facilities, rehabilitation programs and practices.

These funds are desperately needed to expand the correctional facilities in New York City and elsewhere. Experts have testified time and time again that the one area with great possibilities for reducing crime in the streets is in rehabilitating the first offenders so as to cut down recidivism to the lowest possible rate.

Rikers Island has an \$18.4 million plan for improvement. But twice that much will have to be spent if the facility is to adequately serve the needs of those incarcerated behind its walls.

All the words of rhetoric that filled the pages of the RECORD during the Senate debate recently on the District of Columbia crime bill will not help those people outside of the District of Columbia.

The Senate must act, and it must act now to pass the LEAA amendments.

How many outbursts like those in New York City during the last few days will this country have to experience before its elected officials take corrective action? How many more presumably innocent minds will be destroyed in overcrowded detention centers awaiting trial? How many more youths will be prepared for a life of crime instead of a life of productivity and happiness working within his society? What is necessary in this area of correctional facilities and proper training and rehabilitation programing is a massive commitment at all levels of government. We in this House have shown the way. Let us hope the Senate acts quickly toward ultimate enactment of this important legislation.

#### MILITARY ASSIGNMENTS

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues have joined with me today to introduce a bill which would require that maximum effort be made to assign a serviceman as close to his home as possible for the completion of his duty, when he returns from a combat zone.

We have all known, directly or indirectly, the hardships and anxiety suffered by both servicemen and their families while these men are fulfilling their military obligation in Southeast Asia. All too often, however, the joy and relief at the return of many of these combat veterans is overshadowed by the fact that they must once again, frequently on their final tour of duty, be separated from family and friends by many hundreds of miles at a military post far from their homes. Apart from a short period of leave, they have no opportunity to renew and strengthen long-missed bonds with friends and loved ones.

This situation should and can be greatly improved. While I realize that it may not always be possible to assign every combat veteran to an appropriate installation near his home, I believe it is our duty and responsibility to make every effort to prevent unnecessary or unwarranted separations. The legal requirement, encompassed in this bill, of maximum entitlement for such an assignment for combat veterans will go a long way in improving this situation by helping to insure that a serviceman's preferences will be properly considered. Not only is such treatment fair, but it will also, I feel, help to improve morale at home and abroad and to alleviate the anxiety that such separations have already caused so many American families.

I include at this time a list of the cosponsors and the full text of this proposal:

#### COSPONSORS

Mr. Flowers, Mr. Hansen of Idaho, Mr. Jones of North Carolina, Mr. Brinkley, Mr. Tunney, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Poage, Mr. Wampler, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Rosenthal,

Mr. Scott, Mr. McDade, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Smith of New York, Mr. Brasco, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Nix, Mr. Kyros, Mr. Obey, Mr. Harrington, Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts, Mr. Friedel, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. Pike, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Whitehurst, Mr. Roe, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Corman, Mr. Moss, Mr. Button, Mr. Yatron, Mr. Byrne, Mr. Anderson of Tennessee, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Kazen, Mr. Fish, Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hanley, Mr. Biester, Mr. Anderson of Illinois, Mr. Wolff, Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Matsunaga, Mrs. Chisholm, Mr. Carter, Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina, Mr. McKneally, Mrs. Heckler, Mr. Green of Pennsylvania, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Bingham, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Wyman, Mr. Kuykendall, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Van Deerlin, Mr. Pelly, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Gude, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Tiernan.

#### A BILL TO AMEND TITLE 10 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE TO PROVIDE THAT MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES BE ASSIGNED TO DUTY STATIONS NEAR THEIR HOMES AFTER SERVING IN COMBAT ZONES

That (a) chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 1041. Duty station assignment after combat zone duty.

"Any member of a uniformed service is entitled, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with the needs of the service, to be assigned to a tour of duty at a station or post near the location designated in the member's military records as his legal residence if the immediately preceding tour of duty of the member was in a combat zone. The Secretaries concerned shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 53 is amended by inserting

"1041. Duty station assignment after combat zone duty."

immediately after  
"1040. Replacement of certificate of discharge."

#### TRIBUTES TO THE LATE HONORABLE G. ROBERT WATKINS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this special time in order that Members who wish to do so may pay their respects to my very good friend and your very good friend, BOB WATKINS. At this time I would be happy to yield to any Member who desires recognition.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I am happy to yield to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The other day, following the death of our dear friend, BOB WATKINS, I had an opportunity to make some comments concerning him and his record. On this occasion I would like to amplify those expressions of feeling and repeat my deep, deep sympathy for his wife and family in this hour of tragedy.

I did not know BOB WATKINS as I have known a good many Members in the House of Representatives with whom I serve. But in the short period that we were friends, I developed a great affection and admiration for him. I,

among many others, will miss him a very, very great deal. He was a person who wore well. He was a person who had the courage of a lion, and yet he had the manner of a perfect gentleman.

I will never forget the place that he occupied in this Chamber, because if we needed help on any legislative matter, we knew where he was, and if he possibly could, he would rise to the occasion and vote to help either the President or those of us on this side of the aisle. If he thought it was in the national interest, he would vote his conscience under any and all circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion we have lost a fine legislator and a good friend. I extend again to his lovely wife and to his family our deepest condolences.

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

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

It has been my sincere privilege to be able to serve on the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with the late distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. I say this with the utmost humility. If ever I have seen a man who was a man's man, BOB WATKINS was a man's man. He stood head and shoulders, he stood solid when he made his commitment, his word was his bond, he was a sound man, he was an honest man, and he was a straightforward man—no varnish, but straightforward. Sincere is a very inadequate word to describe him.

I extend my condolences to his family. Just last week he was talking with me about his sons and his business. It was always a pleasure for me to discuss with him our friends and our families whenever we had the time and whenever the occasion would permit. We have fought for the same purposes many times in our subcommittee and the same bills, and I have always known Bob would be there, solid, well prepared, and very effective.

Again I extend to the family my sincerest and deepest regrets. It is a great loss to me and to this body.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of personal loss that I join my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) in commenting on the service and life of our departed friend, who has left this Chamber and this earth.

BOB WATKINS was a good man in every sense of the word. He was a big man physically, but even more than that he was a big man mentally and morally. When he made up his mind, he had always thought over the problem carefully, and then there was not any doubt in anybody's mind as to what his decision was, because he would let people know.

He was a man who will be missed, not

only by the Members of this House, but also by the constituents of his district and the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Even more than that he will be missed by the people of this country who rely so much on the statesmanship of the Members of this House, who will miss BOB WATKINS as the years go by, because he was a great statesman and a man who had deep convictions and the ability to set forth those convictions.

On top of that—and I think this may be about as important a comment as can be made—he was a blithe spirit. Because of his being here, we all felt better, and because of the work he did, we all were better.

It is with a deep sense of sorrow and a personal sense of loss that I join my colleagues in extending my personal sympathy to his family and extend to them the condolences which come from a true faith in the Almighty and the assurance that here was a great man whose life they shared and whose life we shared and whose passing is mourned by many people throughout the United States.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT).

Mr. HUNT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

I want to tell the Members this evening a little bit about the man, BOB WATKINS, as I knew him. I believe I have known him as well as anyone in this House.

I met BOB WATKINS back in the middle 1930's. I knew him as a fine, hardworking businessman, as a sheriff of his county, later as a legislator in Harrisburg, and as a commissioner in his county, and later as a Member of the House of Representatives.

At no time during by acquaintance-ship with BOB WATKINS did I ever have any reason to doubt his sincerity, his honesty, or his utmost devotion to his family and to his country. I have never heard a man have a bad word for BOB WATKINS.

Those Members of the House who knew him must realize now that the gentleman who sat in the far corner on the right-hand side of this Chamber—a portion of this Chamber referred to by some Members, in jocularly, as the hard corner—will recognize the fact that the man in himself was one we can never replace. A man like BOB WATKINS comes along once in a lifetime.

He was a true friend, and he was steadfast in his convictions. In the last few months of his earthly life BOB WATKINS was extremely happy. He had celebrated his 50th wedding anniversary with his lovely wife Hilda Jane and their family. He had been a speaker at the congressional prayer breakfast in this very House. He had been engaged in a political fight which had been satisfactorily resolved. He had made a speech to a ladies' group in his home district and had completed a successful and very enjoyable evening by making the speech. Then suddenly he was stricken and removed from our midst.

I knew him as a God-fearing man. I

realize now what people mean when they say that some persons are ready to meet their maker. I know that GEORGE ROBERT WATKINS was ready to meet his maker.

But the pathetic part of it is that we were not ready to lose him. I know my grief and my sorrow are shared by many people, not only those in the House of Representatives but also the people who work in and about the Capitol here and the people in his district, the people he met wherever he met them, in Harrisburg or in many farflung places. All recognized the fact that BOB WATKINS was unto himself a monumental descriptive man. It will be a long time before another man of his caliber comes along in this House. We sorely miss him.

Many of the fellows whom one might think are sort of light hearted today are really heavy at heart. Yesterday I was one of those privileged to attend the funeral, with 52 Congressmen from the House who journeyed to Chester to pay their respects.

There is nothing much more that can be said, I know, except to say this in finality: I know that ROBERT WATKINS is looking at us today. I know he smiled down yesterday and said, "I knew you would be there, my friends."

I knew him not only as a Congressman and a man in the business world but as my steadfast friend of many, many years. I can only say that we have suffered a tremendous loss, of a man we cannot replace.

I only hope that this House will remember the tremendous contribution he made not just to the Members and to the legislative body but also to those little people on the outside to whom he meant so much. This world never know of the many deeds GEORGE ROBERT WATKINS performed on the outside.

I want to extend my condolences to his lovely wife and to their family and, to my good friend BOB WATKINS, "Good night."

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MYERS).

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MYERS) Mr. BRAY was allowed to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, this House is saddened today by the loss of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, ROBERT WATKINS.

It is always with great regret that we in the Congress receive news of the passing of one among us. When that colleague has been a great personal friend as well, we are doubly sorrowed.

BOB WATKINS was a personal friend of mine. We had worked together, relaxed together, laughed, and grumbled together. BOB WATKINS was an extraordinary individual, a man with rare personal warmth and charm.

I need not reiterate Bob's record of service for the people, not only of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania but Americans everywhere. These facts are well established, and his deep dedication and devotion to his responsibilities were above question.

I mourn the loss of BOB WATKINS. I mourn his loss from public life, a calling he had accepted for himself many years ago. I mourn his loss from the House of Representatives, where he served so effectively the people of the Ninth District of Pennsylvania. But greater than these is the personal grief I hold at the loss of a cherished friend. I mourn the loss of our rapport, the great harmony in our relationship.

I pass to his family my deepest and most heartfelt sympathy. I pray that God will grant them serenity in these days.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I rise with many other friends of BOB WATKINS not to idolize BOB or to try to raise him above the point that he raised himself to but with a sense of love.

BOB was a Member of this body for almost 6 years. I am confident that many Members never really learned to know him, but I must honestly say I never saw anyone here who did not have a deep affection and respect for BOB. As has been said before, many Members, including myself, sought out BOB for his advice, because we knew it would be sound and it would be wise and would take into consideration what was best for America.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why many Members did not know BOB was because he was not one of those Members who speak often but was, rather, one who listened and reasoned soundly from his great experience.

BOB was a self-made man. He rose himself from humble parentage and worked and developed himself into one of the leaders of this Nation.

About a month ago I asked BOB WATKINS to be our speaker at prayer breakfast. Some of his friends said, "You will never get BOB to accept an invitation to speak at prayer breakfast." Well, when I asked him, BOB did not hesitate. When he accepted he said, "Sure. I would love to." The morning he spoke he came to me and told me that this was one of the most inspirational experiences, one of the highlights of his life. He gave a most inspirational address. He said that he enjoyed it as much as the experience of serving the Nation in this body.

Mr. Speaker, America is a better place to live in this evening and to raise our children in and this body is a better body and each of us is a better Member because BOB lived and served with us here. So we direct our prayers for his soul and that his family shall be consoled at this time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

There are many times in our lives when we feel at a loss for words. I certainly do at this time. I wish I had the ability and the eloquence that so many of my colleagues have shown time and time again on this floor.

I do not think this House, in my humble opinion, in the short time I have

been here, ever had a man with the character and integrity of BOB WATKINS. I do not think anyone could ever fill his shoes or fill the place of BOB WATKINS. Never was there a man here who had such an impact on this House, as far as I am concerned. He was real, kind, gentle, and generous. BOB WATKINS never intentionally ever hurt anyone's feelings. I have seen him go out of his way to help some whom he thought had their feelings hurt or injured at some time.

BOB was a remarkable man. He stood tall. Everything he did seemed to be right. He was an inspiration to every one of us. He was a man of humble beginnings and never at any time was he ever pretentious although we all know he had every right to be. He was a success in business, a success in politics, and a success as far as life itself is concerned. Everyone liked BOB WATKINS.

I have never known a man in the Chamber who did not have a kind thing to say about BOB WATKINS. He had friends on both sides of the aisle, and everyone enjoyed his company. We would go out and have dinner, and we did this a number of times, and I was so grateful of having the opportunity of being associated in his presence.

As I look over there now in that hard corner, that hard core, as many call that right side of the Chamber, BOB WATKINS will always be there as long as I am in this House. I think the inspiration and the dedication that this man gave to this body will never leave this House.

He left a wonderful family, and a wonderful wife. At this time I would like to express my deep sorrow and offer my condolences, and say to his family that as far as I am concerned there is no one whom I will miss more than BOB, and I will remember BOB WATKINS as long as I live.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

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

Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult indeed in words to adequately describe the life of our beloved friend, BOB WATKINS. He sounded no trumpets before him, and yet he accomplished much, and his quiet strength was an inspiration to us all. He loved his country, his colleagues, and the people it was his privilege to represent. He was a man of conviction who believed in something and stood for something. His success in business and in politics was based on the sound foundation of hard work, perseverance, and honest service to the people. His unflinching sense of humor was a source of joy to those around him. He was a man of unimpeachable integrity, of courage, and of genuine humility. BOB WATKINS was a part of the strength of this House, and of our country. He was a man of honest stature, and a public servant fully worthy of the public trust.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who were privileged to know him as a friend knew too of his great faith, a faith that

sustained him throughout the long years of his life, throughout hard times and throughout good times, and these years in the House were good times for him. I am supremely confident that that faith was not in vain; that the faith which sustained him in his life here has sustained him in the life beyond. It has been a privilege to know him and to work with him. The House was made richer by his presence, and poorer by his passing. He shall be greatly missed. We, therefore, join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to his loved ones, and share their loss.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER).

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I must confess some stunned sadness over the loss of one of my favorite colleagues, BOB WATKINS. I am sure that those who knew him longer than I and knew him better than I have suffered a very great loss, but I think that certainly all of us have felt a loss that is rather unique in this body.

His family indeed deserves and receives the sympathy of the Members of the House, and all of the people who knew BOB WATKINS here and in his district also deserve sympathy, because I know that they will find it difficult to choose a successor equal in any way to his accomplishments. I know further that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will also find it difficult to replace a man who, when others were swaying reeds, was a mighty oak who stood fast in his convictions and who at the same time never altered his principles.

Mr. Speaker, I have to confess as well that I feel in remembering BOB WATKINS that I must remember him with a smile throughout the weighty decisions and the crises and the challenges that we feel in this body on so many occasions, and especially today with the great problems our Nation faces. Nevertheless there are the human touches that lighten the burden, that make the load of every moment more pleasurable, more enjoyable and more memorable, and BOB WATKINS certainly performed this function for me, and for countless others.

How well I recall intruding in his discussions with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT) and intruding when he insisted that Congressman HUNT was outdoing him, and asked me to back him against JOHN. And it was at those moments when we were perhaps off the track that I got to enjoy and appreciate a truly superb human being, a really genuine person whose spirit exceeded indeed his expansive size.

It will be hard for those who carry on here to fulfill the responsibilities of that one chair which he so frequently occupied. I wonder who will dare to presume to sit there, to occupy the chair of a man who gave so much solace to all of us.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I join my col-

leagues to express my great sadness today I also have to confess to his family and to all the Members of the House that I feel very fortunate to have enjoyed the privilege of his friendship, for however brief a time it was, and to say that it has indeed enriched my life.

Perhaps this will be of some consolation to those who have suffered this most grievous loss, especially to his wife who undoubtedly will realize that while he will be missing from us all, he will still be present in that spirit and example and the enrichment that he offered to every human being in this life.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of all those who have spoken and who knew BOB WATKINS so well and who will miss him.

A few of us came to the Congress together in 1965 which was a bad year for Republicans as I remember. There were about 20 new Republicans elected in 1964, and we came in together in 1965 and associated ourselves in the 89 Club, the 20 Republicans who came in in that year, which is an organization which still limps along from time to time every Monday night.

There was a long period, because BOB WATKINS lives within commuting distance of this Capitol, when he did not appear at the 89 Club meetings on Monday night. There was a long period of time before anybody in our new group had really met BOB. So he became known after a while, before we met him, as the "ghost" because we really did not believe he existed.

Well, finally, of course, we did meet BOB and got to know him and to love him. We found that far from being a ghost, he was solid all the way through—in his beliefs, in character, and in all of the things that he did. We will miss him. He has been a good servant—a good servant to his family—a good servant to his country and to his district and a good servant to his country and to his God.

I know that he has left a splendid heritage to his family of whom he was so proud. They, I am sure, are proud to have had a husband and a dad such as BOB.

We are proud to have had him as one of our colleagues. We shall miss him, but we shall remember him with great affection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I too want to express my appreciation for having known and for having gained a deep affection for BOB WATKINS in the 6 years that he served here among us.

Like so many of rather crusty exterior and a very effective sense of humor, BOB WATKINS beneath it all was a man with a very warm heart, a deep sense of duty and patriotism and love for his country.

I suppose it could be said that those of us who knew him for such a short time in the span of his years cannot appreciate the part that he played in his

home community and among the family of which he was so proud. But I think all of us have been enriched for having known BOB WATKINS, for having gained a deep affection and a deep appreciation for the service which he performed here and which he performed for his country. He loved his country with a passion, and was willing to perform his duty as he saw it in order to enhance the interests of his country.

I know that you of the Pennsylvania delegation will miss him, perhaps more than any of the rest of us can assert that we shall miss him. But in these short 6 years he has indeed made a deep impression upon the House of Representatives. He has served his country well, and I know that the number of us here tonight, in the lateness of the hour, testifies to the deep affection that we held for him, and I hope that somehow these less than ample words that we say now will help to ease the grief of his family and his constituents in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, 52 Members of the Congress attended yesterday's funeral services in Chester, Pa., for our late colleague, the Honorable G. ROBERT WATKINS.

Such representation at such a critical moment in this session of the Congress was, in itself, a most significant indication of the high regard with which BOB WATKINS was held by his peers and colleagues.

It might well be said, in fact, that such representation constituted the most eloquent of the myriad of eulogies to which voice was given within this body.

I would note, however, that the Reverend John S. Nichols, in final eulogy, revealed that, in planning for death even as BOB WATKINS planned his life, he wrote his own epitaph.

It was simple, it was direct and, as BOB saw it, quite obviously, it summed up his most active, diversified, and successful life of personal achievement and public service. Said BOB WATKINS in his own epitaph:

I lived life as I saw it. I accepted others as they were.

In consideration of those words which, more than any others, gave insight into the mind, heart, and philosophy of BOB WATKINS, it might well be said that, even in death, he gives us much to contemplate most seriously:

I lived life as I saw it. I accepted others as they were.

I have been asked by the clerks of this U.S. House of Representatives at the desk to express their deep sympathy to BOB's wife, Jane, and to his family.

Thank you.

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WAMPLER).

Mr. WAMPLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved

to learn of the passing of our beloved friend and colleague, BOB WATKINS. BOB WATKINS and I had a lot in common. My name immediately preceded his on the call of the roll of the Members of the House of Representatives. Our respective congressional districts were both numbered 9. Our voting records, and particularly on the great issues of the day, were almost identical.

Although BOB WATKINS lived most of his life in the great State of Pennsylvania, he was a native of my State of Virginia, and I know BOB WATKINS was proud of the State of his native heath, and certainly we in Virginia are proud to call him one of our illustrious sons.

Mr. Speaker, BOB WATKINS was truly a Virginia gentleman in the noblest sense of the word. A wise man once said that we never forget a person in our hearts unless we forget his greatness. If this be true, then surely those of us who were privileged to know BOB WATKINS will never forget him. I do not know how long I will be privileged to serve in the House of Representatives, but it will never be quite the same to me without the presence of BOB WATKINS.

So, Mr. Speaker, I extend my sincere condolences to his lovely wife and to his sons and to the other members of his family and say that I truly loved BOB WATKINS and I shall never forget him.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GROVER).

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

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to serve on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries with BOB WATKINS during the year he was here. It is difficult to add to the accolades and the beautiful eulogies which have been presented here in his memory tonight, but I must say in serving with BOB on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in these years and in these times when we were attempting to develop legislation which will be far reaching and preserve the human ecology and the human environment and during these days in which we have been struggling to and have finally come up with a broad, new maritime program, BOB was very effective on that committee in bringing about the new legislation. He was most effective and zealous in his work in ecology and environment.

BOB would sit in the hearings and listen to some of the senior Members question people who were before us in the hearing room. When his turn came, his questions were concise and sharp and effective and they elicited points which had not been brought out before and which, indeed, should have been brought out. He took great pride in his work and was most dedicated to that committee on which I served with him.

But Mr. Speaker, I remember BOB even more for something else, and it was something alluded to by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE) when he pointed to the corner of the room where BOB most times would sit during the

quorum calls or rollcalls, where we would find a sort of unofficial caucus in that corner of the room—and they were not there because someone else was there, but they were there because Bob was there. The conversation during those slack periods during the rollcalls would be very light—and the attraction was the subtle but warm charisma of Bob, who had a wonderful humor which just sort of captivated us all. In the more serious moments of debate we would also find a caucus over there of people waiting for the words of wisdom from Bob's many years of experience.

Mr. Speaker, Bob is gone from this Chamber, but as others have said, he will live in our memory, and he will not be forgotten, because his memory will stay with us. It is as if the Lord would send unannounced a disciple into our midst to set examples of brotherhood and human understanding. Bob certainly did that.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in extending my condolences to his family.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the small band of Republican Members, that a previous Speaker referred to, who first came to this House in the 89th Congress. Bob WATKINS is the first of that group to depart from our scene for the world hereafter. All of us in that group, and the others who have spoken here this evening, as we got to know Bob, found that he grew in our esteem and in our affection.

A prior speaker said that although Bob had a somewhat crusty exterior, or an appearance of a crusty exterior, he was a warm and wonderful and understanding human being. Firm in his convictions, he was free to express them. But he was tolerant, and understanding, and appreciative of the fact that not everyone was of his point of view and conviction on all matters.

He was a man who took pride, and properly so, in what he had accomplished. He believed, as he personified in his own accomplishments, in the virtue of work and attention to his duties.

He was a man who was beloved by all of us; he will be sorely missed. I know, for myself, that I shall never walk by that one corner of this Chamber except I shall think of Bob WATKINS, as he sat there, always with some word of humor or valued comment to make, whenever, one stopped to speak to him.

To Mrs. Watkins and the members of his family, I express my deepest sympathy and most sincere condolences.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor to be permitted to participate in this eulogy to Bob WATKINS. As one who usually sits on the other side of the aisle from Bob, I am one who enjoyed many visits with him over yonder in the southwest corner. They call it the hard corner, or the hard core corner.

Through our mutual friends the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROUDEBUSH), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CLANCY), and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUNT), it was my privilege to engage in many conversations. I can assure the Members that I enjoyed every one of them.

Bob prided himself on being a breeder of thoroughbred horses. I shall never forget him saying at one time that a horse can be a better friend than a lot of men.

Once I told him of a visit to Delaware County, and how I had a run into a herd of red cattle, a sort of velvet red, a new breed. He took time to explain the pedigree of those cattle to me, and he told me how this ranch, not far from Philadelphia, incidentally, was owned by some people from the King Ranch of Texas. He went on and remarked about it. He said, "Wasn't that a beautiful sight?" He said, "You know, BILL, there is nothing like being on a ranch like that. It makes you feel like you are closer to God when you are out in the country that way."

While I am not a member of the prayer breakfast, Bob was. I am reliably advised he recently spoke to that breakfast, and my informant tells me his talk was one of the finest ever presented. I believe the reason was because of his deep sincerity and his deep and inspired belief in the Supreme Being.

One characteristic that I shall never forget about Bob was his great sense of humor. No matter how unpleasant the day, or no matter the hour—like some of the days we have put in recently—he would always say to me, "Things just cannot be that bad. Think it over and you will realize things are just not quite as bad as they seem."

I have thought about that a lot. If only more of us had that same attitude we would all be better off.

I am richer for having known Bob. I know that is true for all of us who knew him and loved him.

The fact that 52 Members from both sides of the aisle made the trip to Pennsylvania attested to something more than what we call popularity, to the great respect and high regard we all had for him.

There was a great outpouring of the entire community up there that morning to pay tribute not so much to one who was their Congressman but to one who was their friend.

We will all miss Bob. We will never forget him because he was a friend to us all, because he followed the creed that to have friends one must conduct himself in a way to be a friend.

We all extend our condolences and sympathy to his good widow and his two fine sons, of whom he was so proud.

May his good soul be at peace and at rest.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), for yielding.

The U.S. House of Representatives has suffered a serious loss.

His sense of humor, his directness, his friendship for one and all was a capacity that few have in this body and which none have equaled.

He will be deeply missed both for the soundness of his judgment and the fine character of his person.

Bob WATKINS was a humble man. He stood for the best in America. He always had a kind and friendly word for everyone. His humility was shown by his concern for everyone in this body and above all what he believed in for this Nation and for the world we live in. This body is a better place for his life. Our country is a better country for his living.

To those of us who were privileged to call him friend we will always keep him close to our hearts. While he is physically not present in the House of Representatives, his spirit will always be here as an inspiration to this body and to his countless friends.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer my deepest sympathy to his wife, his two sons, his family, the Pennsylvania delegation, his constituency, and the State and Nation which he served so ably and so thoughtfully.

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

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as it happens, I came to the Congress with our departed friend, the Honorable ROBERT WATKINS.

He was one of the finest men I have ever known. He was quite a conservative. As we learned, he was born in poverty. He had a very difficult time in his younger years, but by hard work and by intelligence he became an extremely successful man. He was a strict Christian. Bob WATKINS was a great believer in the Christian religion. He tried to live it and he did live it. On the 23d of July he spoke to the prayer group. His remarks at that time were well received, most impressive.

Certainly we wish to console his widow and his sons, of whom he was so proud.

Bob WATKINS will certainly be missed by the Members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I have never seen a finer tribute to any man than that which we have just witnessed here. I think it is most significant that after a hard day of legislative work and at this late hour so many Members have remained to pay tribute to a friend of all of us, Bob WATKINS.

Mr. Speaker, I have already paid my respects to this very great friend of mine, and I again thank all the Members who have joined with me today.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Chester, Pa., a personification of the American dream was laid to rest. It was at once a sad duty and a great honor for me to attend the funeral of our departed colleague, Bob WATKINS.

Bob's story is well known to all of us. Born of humble beginnings in the seaport town of Hampton, Va., he resolved early in life to rise to business prominence by his own hard work and dedi-

cation. At the age of 9, he was selling newspapers to the crews of ships anchored in Hampton Roads. Later, he became a shipfitter in Newport News.

But in America, a newsboy or a shipfitter can rise to greater heights, if he has the will to do so. BOB WATKINS proved that. He migrated to Chester, where he began his own stevedoring firm.

From the docks of Philadelphia, it was a short step to the highways of America. With technological progress, the truck replaced the horse-drawn dray, and BOB WATKINS became a small trucker.

He built the Blue Line Transfer Co. into a thriving trucking business and began at a time when other men had despaired, the depression year of 1932. As another Member of this body who has built a trucking business from scratch, I know firsthand the difficulties, the heartaches, the joys and rewards of such a struggle.

In America, a man's success is limited only by the limitations of his own initiative, ambition, and diligence. In only a few nations of this world could the dramatic success story of BOB WATKINS be recorded.

The unlimited opportunities of America produced in BOB WATKINS a deep sense of gratitude. It was, therefore, inevitable that, being the kind of man he was, he would want to do something for America in return.

Once established as both a trucking magnate and a breeder of thoroughbred horses, BOB WATKINS began to pay his debt to America's bounty through service in the political arena. This service began at the county and State level—as Delaware County sheriff, as Pennsylvania State senator, and as Delaware County commissioner. It culminated here, in our Nation's Capital.

First elected in 1964, and it was typical of the man that, like the game fish, he swam upstream. Year 1964 was not the best year for a Republican to seek his first term in Congress. But a man who begins a business in 1932 has little to fear from a landslide of the opposition in 1964. He won election and repeated his triumphs by even greater margins in 1966 and 1968.

Drawing on his experience in land and sea transport, BOB WATKINS served as one of the most qualified and respected members of the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Now that he is gone, his expertise will be sorely missed.

My wife, Helen, and I extend to BOB's widow and family our heartfelt sympathies.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing my sincere sorrow at the passing of a personal friend, BOB WATKINS.

BOB has served his country well during his many years of service as a county sheriff, a State senator, a county commissioner, and finally as a Member of the House of Representatives. Along with all of his accomplishments and his distinguished service as a leader and loyal American, we will always remember

him for his interest, perseverance, and dedication. He served with distinction on both the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. I will always value my association with BOB in these two groups and will continue to remember his many contributions to committee work.

BOB WATKINS' worth never was measured by narrow or partisan standards. He served always as a statesman and not as a politician, thinking the most important thing to consider was the interests of the Nation.

We will miss him in this Chamber and I know the people of the Ninth District of Pennsylvania will miss his leadership.

My wife and I both offer our sympathy in this hour to his wife, Hilda Jane, and his two sons, G. Robert, Jr., and Dwain.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to pay final respects to BOB WATKINS, an esteemed colleague and great American. The House will long remember the contribution of Representative WATKINS to this Chamber, and will long feel the loss of his presence.

A man close to the grassroots from which he came, he brought the experience of a local political leader and businessman to the ongoing national process. His time served as a county sheriff and State senator from 1949 to 1961 prior to his election to the House in 1964 made him a true representative of the people in the Ninth District of Pennsylvania. His entrepreneurial spirit and keen business sense enhanced his position in the workings of the Chamber, especially in the day to day work of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Such loyalty to both his constituents and fellow legislators will be a great loss and a dual devotion which will be very hard to match. To his family, his wife, Jane, and their two sons and six grandchildren, I can only express my deepest sympathy and sadness, and to his constituents, I can only hope they will find another representative of equal ability.

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding. One of my great pleasures in this body was to get acquainted with BOB WATKINS. I sat next to him in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and was impressed by his dedication, his sincerity, and his ability. Even more I appreciated his sparkling sense of humor which he often asserted at some tense moment in committee proceedings. Mrs. Brotzman and I extend our deep sympathy to Mrs. Watkins and the family.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, BOB WATKINS was not a Member of this body long. But I know of no one who made a greater personal impact in that time on his fellow Members.

BOB was a genuine person. He was a real person. There was no pretense about him. His relationship and dealings with his fellow Members was al-

ways in a straightforward manner. His opinions were always briefly and concisely stated.

BOB was a good friend to me and to many more. He always had a friendly word of welcome when you saw him in the House Chamber or in committee.

He was a man of courage. He always thought of his country first—not himself or his party—but his country, of which he was justly proud. His country which gave him such unparalleled opportunity to succeed. He was a man of firm conviction and dedicated service.

I was proud to call him my friend.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I join the Members of the House in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable G. ROBERT WATKINS of Pennsylvania.

BOB was a truly dedicated public servant who ably represented the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, having formerly been a county sheriff and commissioner, and a Pennsylvania State senator for three terms. In addition, he brought firsthand knowledge to his committee assignments—on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee—having had experience in both the shipping and trucking industry before becoming an elected official. Indeed, BOB was a dear, warm, personal friend whose dry wit and gentlemanly nature was appreciated by us all and he will certainly be long missed as an individual.

Mrs. Derwinski joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife and sons.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the death of a great friend and colleague, BOB WATKINS, is indeed a loss to each of us. He was truly a man who lived the American dream. From his humble beginnings, his hard work, ambition, and enthusiasm brought him to the high ranks of Government.

BOB WATKINS' friendliness was extended to every Member of Congress. He knew each Member by name and was a friend to people of all political philosophies. His warmth and good will infused us all with hope and optimism.

BOB and I often voted on opposite sides of issues, but we had great respect for each other.

The Congressman from Pennsylvania was truly a dedicated public servant. He represented his district faithfully and well. His unrelenting efforts to serve his constituency, and his dedication to principle marked his service in the House. He was a diligent worker in committee, and an untiring advocate of that in which he believed.

We will miss BOB WATKINS in the House of Representatives. I am sure that he will long be remembered here for his many contributions. My sympathy is extended to his family.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, with the untimely passing of BOB WATKINS, a number of us lost a close friend; the House and the Nation lost a truly dedicated American. He was a man of great

ability, deeply committed to serving his country.

We were most fortunate to know Bob. We had the greatest admiration for him as a man, as an American, and as a leader. He was a warm and humorous man who enjoyed a rapport with virtually everyone who knew him. Bob was a great man, but more importantly, he was a good man. He was truly devoted to his fine family. Bob not only brought honor to the State he represented but to all of us who had the pleasure of serving with him in the Congress of the United States.

His passing leaves a great empty space in my life and in the lives of his loved ones and friends. A thousand cherished memories will help to ease this loss and fill the void his absence brings. We are all truly fortunate that we will have the recollection of these happy experiences shared with Bob. We were always proud and delighted to partake in his wonderful friendship.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that each one of us here today joins in extending heartfelt sympathy to his beloved wife and family.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the entire back row was unoccupied on the Republican side of the aisle during the first quorum call of the House of Representatives on Monday, August 10, 1970.

Not only for the first time was Bob WATKINS' name omitted from the call, but the vacant seat of his favorite place on the House floor visibly dramatized his absence and the tragic loss of our beloved colleague. "Honest Bob WATKINS," the third-person, self-reference he enjoyed using, leaves an irreplaceable void in the Congress. Congressman WATKINS "built his house upon a rock" and the foundation of his love of home, community, and country never failed. His deep-seated faith in America frequently surfaced in his private and public discussions. The successes achieved in his own life were revealed as humble examples of the opportunities available to every man in this land of liberty. "Self-made" is truly descriptive of this friend of mankind. One of Bob's humorous expressions about the lack of so-called intellectual achievement was that he was a "high school put out," recognizing again the "self-made" description of his life. In serious reflections Bob WATKINS humbly voiced appreciation for the association in the Congress of his colleagues, often "wondering" out loud why the Good Lord had blessed him with this honor. At times he was openly emotional in his patriotic praise for the United States and condemnation for her detractors. It was only necessary to point to his own life to support his argument that America offers unlimited opportunity for success to any individual who is willing to make the necessary effort. Friendships were valuable to Bob and easily made if loyally given. His generosity was exceeded only by his great heart and love of fellowmen. Many in all walks of life, the high and the lowly, have been the beneficiaries of his beneficence.

A noble American, a friend and colleague, has left us, but his memory will

endure and our soft-toned references will recall the pleasant associations and occasions spent with Bob.

May his wife and family find solace in the spiritual values held by their husband and father and in the efforts of all of us in sharing their loss. We pray that a Divine Providence will bless and console them in this period of bereavement. Their loss is our loss.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania has lost a dedicated and faithful public servant; the House of Representatives has lost a hard working and effective Member; and I have lost a deep, warm, personal friend with the death of G. ROBERT WATKINS.

I was shocked to hear of Bob's sudden death last Friday. It was only a day since seeing him on the floor of this body.

I had known Bob since 1934 and had the privilege of serving with him in the Pennsylvania Legislature and for more than 5 years in the Congress.

I feel qualified to say he was a dedicated public servant throughout his entire public career—as sheriff of Delaware County, Pa., for 4 years; as a State senator for 12 years; as Delaware County commissioner for 4 years; in addition to his three terms in the House of Representatives.

In his private life, Bob was an example of what a determined man can do. Born in poverty, Bob worked long and strenuously to make himself a wealthy man and a respected citizen.

Yet Bob was an extremely charitable man. He never expected others to make the same sacrifices he himself had made. I never heard Bob speak ill of anyone, and I think you will agree this is quite an accomplishment for a man in political life.

Let those inclined to speak disdainfully of "politicians" look to Bob WATKINS. Bob's word was his bond, and his word was never doubted by anyone. So few people in this world can lay claim to this trust.

My wife, Virginia, joins me in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Bob's beloved wife, Hilda Jane, and his sons, Robert G. and Dwain Joseph.

It is my earnest prayer the good Lord will reward Bob for his many good deeds performed while here on earth.

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, like all of his colleagues, I was shocked and deeply saddened by the death of my Pennsylvania neighbor, G. ROBERT WATKINS.

Our loss of Bob WATKINS was a special one for me. I first served with him in the Pennsylvania General Assembly. There I knew him to be a conscientious public servant, an impression which was reinforced when we became colleagues again in the 90th Congress. Throughout these periods of mutual service, I valued his friendship and often his counsel.

The American dream certainly applies to Bob WATKINS' record as a successful businessman and a respected public official. He was 9 years old when he started selling newspapers in Newport News, Va., and still in high school when he became an apprentice shipfitter. It was also during his youth that he excelled as an ath-

lete, pitching semipro baseball for \$10 a game. In 1936, after several previous business associations, he organized the Blue Line Transfer Co., which today operates hundreds of trucks throughout the eastern portion of the Nation.

Bob WATKINS' distinguished service as Congressman from Pennsylvania's Ninth District was the culmination of a long dedication to public service.

In the public arena, his career began 29 years ago when he was appointed to the Delaware County Prison Board in Pennsylvania. His first elective office was Delaware County sheriff. Later he was elected county commissioner, State senator, and finally U.S. Representative.

Our country benefitted from Bob WATKINS' love of it and his service to it. We mourn his passing and extend to his wife and his family our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the sudden death of Representative G. ROBERT WATKINS, who was a Member of Congress since 1964 and of my committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

During his three terms in the Congress, Bob won our admiration and respect and held a warm spot in the hearts of all his colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, only recently he celebrated his 50th wedding anniversary and when I congratulated him he said it was the happiest day of his life. He said he had married the most wonderful girl he had ever known and was the luckiest man alive.

Bob had many friends and I was fortunate to be one of them. He will be greatly missed and I know that those of us who knew him are grateful that we did. No one who was his friend will ever forget his cheerful ways and great sense of humor, nor will his contribution in the Congress be forgotten.

I extend my deep sympathy to his widow and loved ones.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with other Members of the House in paying my respects to the memory of our colleague Bob WATKINS.

He was a likeable individual, kind, and considerate, and yet a person who did not hesitate to take a position he considered to be in the best interest of his constituents and his country.

Certainly, we will miss him in the House and I know all of us want to extend our sympathy to his widow and family. He was dedicated to what was best for America and men of his caliber are needed in the Congress. We mourn the loss of this great and good man.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of deep loss and sorrow that I join my colleagues in eulogizing the memory of a great American, Bob WATKINS.

In the relatively short time that Bob WATKINS spent in this Chamber and in the Halls of Congress, he made many friends on both sides of the aisle. He always seemed to carry about with him an air of cheerfulness which invited friendship.

Bob WATKINS will be missed sorely by his colleagues, by his constituents, his

State, and Nation, all of whom he served so well. He leaves behind him a record of accomplishments of which his family can rightfully be proud, and which will serve as an inspiration to those who will follow him.

While I realize that the grief over the sudden and unexpected loss of one so dear must be almost unbearable, if not unbelievable, I do hope that his beloved widow and other members of his family will find some solace in the fact that there are many who share in their great loss and deep sorrow.

As one who was privileged to gain his friendship, I extend my deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences to his surviving widow and family. May the blessings of the Almighty be upon them in their bereavement.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to a man whom I greatly respected, the late Honorable G. ROBERT WATKINS.

I was very sorry to learn of the death of our colleague last Friday and my prayers and condolences go with his widow and children.

Bob came to Congress the same year as I and somehow there is always a greater bond between those who entered in the same "class." He was a wonderful person to me, a very kind man, and a gentleman respected and loved by all who knew him.

Not only was Bob a hard-working legislator, but he was successful in all endeavors which he tackled. He was a very successful businessman, a community leader, a family man, and a kind servant of the public.

We will miss him greatly, yet he has left us with fond memories and with good examples to follow.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal sadness that I pause to pay tribute to my late esteemed colleague, Congressman G. ROBERT WATKINS, of Pennsylvania.

I have observed this reserved and conscientious gentleman during the years that we have served together in the House of Representatives. In addition, I have been aware of the broad background of experience which preceded his conscientious and useful service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to hear Congressman BOB WATKINS speak at a meeting of our congressional prayer group. It would not be appropriate to discuss the subject of his remarks. However, I want to say in all sincerity that Congressman BOB WATKINS revealed a great sense of spiritual faith and understanding. The genuine goodness of BOB WATKINS came through as he spoke with full candor and humility—and his remarks touched deeply all who had the privilege of hearing him.

I know that BOB WATKINS' home has always been an abode of love and devotion. His pride in his wife and children are characteristic of one so richly endowed with spiritual as well as material blessings.

Mrs. McClory joins me in extending

deepest sympathy to Mrs. Watkins and to other members of the family.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, it came as a shock and complete surprise to learn of the death of BOB WATKINS. When I came back to Washington, I learned that Bob had died suddenly over the weekend.

Last week Bob was with us on the House floor. He had his usual dynamic spirit and definite ideas on every issue that came on the floor.

To lose a friend so quickly brings in sharp the realities of this world. Bob was a fine man. He was honest, sincere, and straightforward.

BOB WATKINS was a man of strong courage and conviction. If the issue was rough and the political implications were heavy, he never hesitated. He voted right and he never equivocated. The U.S. Congress lost a great man when BOB WATKINS passed away.

From the bottom of my heart, I extend sincerest sympathy to the entire Watkins family.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, many of us view the sometimes uncertain and bleakly appearing future with a humorless demeanor. When the problems of our world are weighed against the prospects for solution, the assessment is often disconcerting. BOB WATKINS showed us that problems still were solvable when approached in an atmosphere that combined a generous mix of humor and friendliness with the solemnity of the cloakroom and the committee room.

Perhaps BOB WATKINS learned this easy going approach to difficult problems while he developed his own stevedore operation while in his twenties, or while he built a successful trucking company during the depression.

He was a very productive and respected Member. He earned this reputation with a low key, good humored manner that made him not feared but beloved.

His gentleness may have been honed from caring for thoroughbred horses these past three decades, or leading employees in two prosperous business ventures. At any rate, BOB WATKINS knew how to treat people well, to make them feel comfortable and best of all, to lift spirits when they were down. He is a model to all people, showing that one need not be feisty and disagreeable to be a success.

We will very much miss the wit and ease of BOB WATKINS. To his wife and sons, I wish to extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer my deepest condolences to the family of Congressman G. ROBERT WATKINS whose passing is mourned by his colleagues in the House.

There are too many things in the life of a man to sum up in a few words and this is especially so for a man such as BOB WATKINS. I will remember him for many things, but one thing in particular always will remind me of BOB WATKINS.

In the busy world of the Congress, too often the predominant theme for a younger Member of the House seems to be the discouraging word. BOB WATKINS,

a man with a long and successful career in politics and business, indeed was the marked exception to the discouraging word.

Because with BOB WATKINS, it was the encouraging word.

I valued his friendship and admired his empathy in going out of his way to say a kind word, an encouraging word about what I was doing or how I was voting. This to me typified BOB WATKINS so that he truly stood as a big man in the finest sense of that description.

In his life, BOB WATKINS demonstrated that he lived what he believed America to be. From humble beginnings, he worked starting as a teenager and by dint of his industriousness and ability acquired material success in the business world.

But his vision was far beyond this. BOB WATKINS accepted the challenge of public service and soon matched his success in the business world with an outstanding political career.

BOB WATKINS served as a county sheriff, a county commissioner, a State senator, and a U.S. Representative. His life was filled with the activities of a dedicated public official, yet he never neglected his family or his pursuits as a sportsman.

Whether as a young baseball player or a breeder of thoroughbred horses, BOB WATKINS possessed a zest for these pursuits that was so much in evidence in the way he lived.

BOB WATKINS lived a full and active life up until the very moment he died. We can find solace in this even though we are so saddened and distressed by his sudden passing.

But, perhaps even more than the monumental legacy he leaves in the political and business world, is the very personal legacy that he bequeaths us.

For BOB WATKINS demonstrated as he went through life that the basic attributes of man's best nature are the ones that long will be remembered when the achievements of the material world are consigned to newspaper files and warehouse records:

A generous heart. A bubbling sense of humor. A warm and engaging personality. A compassion for others. A sense of sincere camaraderie. A cheerfulness and friendliness. All these finest traits and more are the legacy that BOB WATKINS leaves us.

"His life was gentle, and the elements So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up And say to all the world, 'This was a Man!'"  
—Shakespeare.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives once again has been shocked by the sudden death of one of our colleagues. The passing of the Honorable G. ROBERT WATKINS is a tragic loss to our Nation and has deeply saddened those of us who worked with him in this Congress.

Congressman WATKINS began life in humble surroundings and rose to positions of leadership in the field of business. His experience in the shipfitting and interstate trucking businesses pre-

pared him well for service in the House of Representatives on the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In both of these fields, he was an expert by interest and experience.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress will truly miss not only the expertise, but also the great personal warmth of G. ROBERT WATKINS.

My wife joins me in extending to Mrs. Watkins and their sons our deepest sympathy in this time of sorrow.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the late gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable G. ROBERT WATKINS. The House has lost a sincere, friendly and capable Member whose service and dedication to duty has been recognized as outstanding. I greatly value my association with BOB WATKINS in the House of Representatives and I have always admired his friendly, happy and courteous manner. BOB WATKINS was a man of genuine character and stature. We regret his untimely passing and our prayerful sympathy goes out to his wife and family in this hour of darkness and sorrow.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sense of loss at the sudden death of ROBERT WATKINS of Pennsylvania. The fact that he died while actively engaged in the work he has loved for the last 6 years is indicative of the kind of man he was.

His philosophy was one of service. His first business enterprise at age 9 was selling newspapers. In his later years he established a trucking business that eventually operated hundreds of trucks in all parts of the Eastern United States.

While in this body, his aid and assistance could always be counted upon by the people around him. It has been a personal privilege for me, especially as a newcomer, to work with him on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and in Congress.

I am sure his death will be a great loss not only to his family and his constituency, but also to his country.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the death of our colleague, the Honorable G. ROBERT WATKINS from Pennsylvania.

Representative WATKINS was a man who devoted the majority of his lifetime to public service. He began his career as sheriff of Delaware County, Pa., then served as a State senator for 12 years and county commissioner before coming to the House of Representatives in 1965. During his three terms in the House, his personality and his work earned him the respect and admiration of his colleagues. The dedicated and conscientious manner with which he served the House and the people of the Ninth District of Pennsylvania will be greatly missed by those of us who knew and worked with him.

Mrs. Murphy joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his wife and two sons. We hope that their sorrow may be

eased by the knowledge that he lived a successful and fulfilling life.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the passing of the Honorable G. ROBERT WATKINS came as a severe shock to us all because we knew him as such a warm human being. He was a man of great integrity and honor and though we voted differently on many phases of legislation, I had nothing but the deepest admiration and respect for him. He loved life and lived it fully and by doing so made life for those around him that much better.

Life was not always easy for Bob, perhaps that is why he savored it so much. He started earning his way at 9, selling newspapers aboard ships tied up in his then hometown of Newport News. He went on to form his own longshoring and trucking company. He entered politics and in time was sheriff, State senator, county commissioner, and finally U.S. Representative in Congress. Bob was a hard-working and productive Member of the House and we shall all miss his presence. To his wife and family I extend my deepest sympathy in their sad bereavement.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to insert their remarks in the RECORD concerning our late colleague, the Honorable G. ROBERT WATKINS.

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

There was no objection.

#### SOUTH AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, and in deference to that fact I will truncate my remarks.

But it seems to me it would be entirely inappropriate for this House not to take notice before the recess of a number of events involving South Africa.

I want to bring these events to the attention of this body on behalf of not only myself but on behalf of many other Members who had hoped to be here, and would have been here, had we arrived at this point in our agenda earlier. I think there are upward of 30 Members who have asked to be identified with the remarks I will make today, and many of them want to put their remarks in the RECORD.

On August 24 in the Old Synagogue, Pretoria, the trial of Mrs. Winnie Mandela, and of several well-known African journalists, trade unionists, and students, will begin. Accused No. 1 is a newcomer: Mr. Benjamin Ramotse, who was held in solitary confinement for 702 days before he was charged. It will be 67 weeks since

Mrs. Mandela and most of the others were arrested. A brief description of what they have endured is given in the testimony to the United Nations Special Committee on Apartheid, June 8, 1970. I will insert in the RECORD that testimony at the end of these remarks.

There are now 19 of the original 22 on trial, with Mr. Ramotse making 20 accused. And, after being originally detained under the Terrorism Act, only to be charged, tried, and found not guilty under the Suppression of Communism Act, they are now charged again under the Terrorism Act. And the charges, which in that earlier trial during December covered a period from October 1967 to June 1969, now extend from June 1962 to May 1970. In other words, they are charged for things that have happened while they were in jail, and also possibly for things that were legal at the time, but which the retrospective powers of the Terrorism Act now make a crime.

Three men among the original 22 are no longer accused. One of them, Mr. Paulus Matshaba, has emerged from 43 days in a mental hospital and has no recollection of being taken there by the police from prison. It appears the security police have succeeded in persuading the other two to become state witnesses—at any rate, the responsible minister and other senior officials show a singular ignorance about the circumstances surrounding the release of these men.

I insert in the RECORD at this point a statement by Miss Mary Benson, a South African writer and one of those rare and beautiful people whose presence on earth attests to the fact that we can still produce courageous souls who will dedicate their lives to the cause of freedom and to the well-being of other people, even at great sacrifice to themselves:

STATEMENT BY MISS MARY BENSON, WRITER, BEFORE THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON APARTHEID, JUNE 8, 1970

(NOTE.—Miss Benson, South African born writer and journalist, has appeared as a petitioner before the Special Committee on several occasions. In 1966, she was issued with severe banning and house arrest orders which prohibited her *inter alia* from taking any part in, or transmitting, any publication. She left South Africa later in the year and now lives in London. Her works include: *Tshededi Khama* (1960); *Chief Albert Lutuli* (1963); *South Africa: The Struggle for a Birthright* (1966); *At the Still Point* (1969).)

In 1963 the phrase "torture by mind-breaking" was coined by Mr. Hamilton Russell, former Member of Parliament and a leader of the Progressive Party in South Africa. He was describing the new law introduced by the then Minister of Justice, John Balthazar Vorster: detention without charge or trial for 90 days, renewable. In 1965 the period was doubled to 180 days, renewable. And in 1967 under the Terrorism Act—the Act of Terror as it has been called—*indefinite* detention without charge or trial was enacted.

"Torture by mind-breaking" and other less subtle forms of torture have become a custom in South Africa, and over the years more and more people have suffered; some have suffered even unto death. In 1963 one man died while detained in solitary confinement. In 1964, two. In 1966, two. All those five were allegedly suicides. In 1967 two

died—one an alleged suicide, the other “an unknown man who died on an unknown dated of cause unknown”. In 1968 one died, allegedly suicide. And last year, in 1969, seven men died.

As Dr. Barend van Niekerk, a senior lecturer in law at the University of the Witwatersrand, told the Council of Churches in Johannesburg on May 26:

“In the short life of the Terrorism Act there have been more than a dozen known deaths of detainees which, in view of the small numbers involved, must surely represent the highest death rate for a single group of prisoners in the Western world.”

He spoke of the Terrorism Act as an “institutionalization of cruelty”. Others have described it as a license to torture.

Of the fifteen known deaths since 1963 we have little detail—you have on record as much as has been published. For instance, that James Lenkoe, on whose toe there was evidence of an electric thermal burn, was found by the magistrate to have committed suicide by hanging by a belt. A belt which, so his widow said at the inquest, was not his; he had left his only belt at home when he was arrested. Nicodimus Kgoathe, according to Security Police, died of a fall while taking a shower, and Solomon Modipane slipped on a piece of soap, with the magistrate finding that his death was due to “natural causes”.

The one thing we do know for certain is that all these men died while their lives were under the absolute control of the Security Police. And the Minister of Justice, Petrus Pelsler, according to *Reuters* on May 28, said: “I can assure the public that I am at all times kept informed of all the circumstances concerning a person’s detention under the Terrorism Act”.

When I testified before the Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts of the Commission on Human Rights in February, I accused the South African Government through its hired interrogators, of murdering the men who died in detention. I particularly singled out Major Theunis Jacobus Swanepoel, who heads the team of interrogators and whose name recurs again and again in affidavits about the sadistic methods of the police. Not unexpectedly, the South African Ambassador here was quoted in the press as saying that my accusation was nonsensical, a big lie. Apparently the Ambassador does not understand the implications when men choose the terrible anguish and annihilation of violently ending their own lives, rather than endure continued torture—whether mental or physical—from their interrogators. Have they hanged themselves? Have they enraged, possibly frustrated, interrogators hanged them? Did one man jump from a window? Or was he pushed? We shall never know. Just as we do not know how many men and women the Security Police have chosen to imprison under the Terrorism Act.

We know there are some Namibians. Who? How many? How long have they been imprisoned and where? We presume there must be freedom fighters captured in Rhodesia. Who? How many? How long . . . ? And we know that the State has had scores of witnesses “at its disposal”—sinister words—in the case of twenty-two men and women who have been held under the Act. Exactly how many are still held and who are they? Most vital question of all: How are they?

It does not matter whether the State suspects someone, or thinks it has a possible witness to prove those suspicions: Not only the potential accused but prospective witnesses for the State are victims of the Security Police.

What is meant by “the State”? Normally one thinks of the President, the Prime Min-

ister and Cabinet, or the Attorney General and then, if the matter comes to court, the State Prosecutor. But in South Africa under the Terrorism and “BOSS” Acts, none of these need be directly involved, they are simply rubber stamps for the Security Police. It is the Security Police who decide who to arrest, who shall be accused and who a witness; for months they work on these individuals to build up a case, and then they escort their witnesses to court, sit watching them as they give evidence, and escort them back to jail.

During the seven years since “torture by mind-breaking” was enacted, one particular building has become notorious because it is there that most of the interrogations take place: Compol, an abbreviation for Commissioner of Police, a cream-painted Colonial-styled building in Pretoria, a stone’s throw from Church Square where President Kruger’s statue looks down on symbolic Boers, and a block from the Headquarters of the Security Police.

#### THE CASE OF THE TWENTY-TWO AND THE TWO WITNESSES WHO SAID “NO”

It is fifty-six weeks since that day in May 1969 when seventeen men and five women and an unknown number of prospective witnesses were imprisoned by the Security Police in a case which has become of international concern. It took a year for any substantial protests to be made inside South Africa but at last the Black Sash women’s protests of the past few months and international censure have been greatly augmented throughout South Africa, with students, church leaders, and professors of law—including Afrikaner Nationalists—joining in condemnation of the Terrorism Act and the continuing detention without charge of the twenty-two.

Among other mothers in the case are Mrs. Winnie Mandela—wife of Nelson Mandela, the African National Congress leader who is serving a life sentence on Robben Island—and Joyce Sikakhane, a young journalist. In age the twenty-two range from a 19-year-old schoolboy to a 73-year-old pensioner, Mr. Mvemve. And of very great significance are the two women who, when called as witnesses by the State, despite the standing torture and threats, and despite certain prison sentences if they defied the State, yet refused to give evidence against their friends. They are Shanti Naidoo, whose late father was Gandhi’s adopted son, and Mrs. Nkala (or Mankhala).

The twenty-two and these two women have now been imprisoned for 393 days: 393 days locked in a small cell, with only a mat and a slop bucket. Most of that time in solitary: No access to lawyers, family or friends.

In the course of that period, in December, when the twenty-two were brought to trial, though arrested under the Terrorism Act, they were charged under the Suppression of Communism Act for furthering the aims of the banned African National Congress. The evidence produced by the State was remarkable for its triviality—indeed some of it was ludicrous. Yet much of this evidence was extracted through threats and assaults. For instance, one State witness, Philip Golding, who was comparatively privileged because he was white and British, with the British Government putting pressure on the South Africans on his behalf, was nevertheless so terrified of his interrogators that when brought to court (where, incidentally, his evidence was innocuous); he would not talk about their assaults; the defence had to drag from him some mention; not until he was back in England did he dare describe what he’d been through. And he then also said he felt he had perjured himself in court.

As you know, in February the Attorney

General announced that the State withdrew the charges against the twenty-two and the Judge found them all “not guilty”. The Security Police promptly stepped in and re-arrested them under the Terrorism Act. Shanti Naidoo and Mrs. Nkala were also—like the others—again at the mercy of their frustrated interrogators. As I said earlier, the Attorney General is one of the rubber stamps for the Security Police. In April he said the case was out of his hands, then on May 24 he said no further charges were yet preferred and, as far as he knew, no charges were being considered. (Report in Johannesburg *Sunday Times*). Yet four days later on May 28, Minister of Justice Pelsler—clearly as a result of the outcry in South Africa—announced that police investigations were nearly completed and that the Attorney General would soon give a decision.

The *New York Times* commented on February 25, at the time of the arbitrary re-arrests:

“The prosecution’s strategy seems clear: It will simply hold the defendants under the Terrorism Act until more ‘evidence’ can be obtained or concocted by the bestial methods that have become a hallmark of South African ‘justice’.”

Since February, what has been happening to the twenty-four? We have no idea. Their attorney, Joel Carlson, has tried to get information. The Security Police do not reply. A desperate attempt by fifteen relatives to get a court order restraining the police from assault and torture, failed. The Judge ruled that the matter was not urgent. This despite the fact that three men connected with the case had died in detention! Despite the affidavits from seventeen of the twenty-two concerning police cruelty.

#### TORTURE OF DETAINEES

Major Swanepoel and his team have become experts at the statue torture—forcing the victim to stand in one place, to stay awake, for days on end—an almost infallible technique for breaking people in such a way that no mark is left on them. But in the Compol building the team has added a refinement: the victim is now forced to balance on bricks. In his affidavit, David Motau, a 47-year-old truck driver, described this and how, after being then beaten and punched, he was hung by the neck with his toes just touching the bricks.

Mrs. Rita Ndzanga, whose husband is also one of the twenty-two—they have four children—describes the third occasion on which she was interrogated. A white Security man hit her and she fell and began to scream, then:

“They closed the windows. I continued screaming. They dragged me to another room, hitting me with their open hands all the time . . . They ordered me to take off my shoes and stand on three bricks. I refused . . . One of (them) climbed on a chair and pulled me by my hair, dropped me on the bricks. I fell down and hit a gas pipe. The same man pulled me up by my hair again, jerked me, and I again fell on the metal gas pipe. They threw water on my face. The man who pulled me by my hair had his hands full of my hair. He washed his hands in the basin. I managed to stand up and then they said: ‘On the bricks!’ I stood on the bricks and they hit me again . . . I fell. They again poured water on me. I was very tired. I could not stand the assault any longer. I asked to see Major Swanepoel.”

Mr. Mvemve, the 73-year-old man, was unable to balance on the bricks so they handcuffed him and tied a rope through the handcuffs and to a grating above his head, his feet touching the bricks. After three days and nights he told them he accepted every word they said. A statement was slowly com-

piled. "But I didn't sign it," the old man said afterwards.

The youngest, Joseph Sikalala, was made to catch and kill cockroaches with his hands; then the "grey, wobbling bricks", kicks, blows, a sjambok beating knees, feet, genitals, threats: "Kaffe . . . jy sal doodgaan" (Kafir you will die), sleeplessness, fatigue, the blurring, hopelessness.

And for Mrs. Mandela, who was allowed to sit through her five days and nights of interrogation because of a heart condition and oedema, the time when Swanepoel sent for her, and asked abruptly who was Thembi Mandela. She replied, "My eldest stepson" and he then said, "He is dead." He had been killed in a car accident. She was too shocked for control, she broke down and wept.

#### DEATHS IN DETENTION

As I mentioned, three men concerned in this case of the twenty-two died in detention. Of one, Michael Shivute, we know only that he is alleged to have committed suicide on the first night.

Caleb Mayekiso A.N.C. leader and trade union organizer since the 1940's, whose most recent term of imprisonment for political activity had been served on Robben Island, was quite fit, his wife said, when the Security Police took him away on May 14 last year. In two weeks' time he was dead. That is all we know.

And then, the Imam Abdullah Haron: We know far more about his death because in Cape Town a number of prominent white people made a fuss about it. If only the fuss could have been made ten months earlier, when he was detained without charge!

Twenty thousand people attended his funeral—he was a greatly loved and respected leader of the Muslim community, and utterly opposed to *apartheid*.

On May 28 last year, he was detained. Aged 43, he was, so his widow says, in excellent health. Four months later, on September 27, he was pronounced dead. An inquest was not held until five months later. Police evidence was that in July the Imam complained of pain over his ribs, he was twice seen by doctors and was given pain-killing tablets. There was no indication of heart trouble.

Between July 2 and 11, he had been interrogated by Sgt. van Wyk and as a result reluctantly made a statement. (Van Wyk is the man who assaulted two white detainees in 1964—Stephanie Kemp and Alan Brooks, both now in London—cases in which the Government made out-of-court settlements with his victims.) Police testified further that on the night of September 19 the Imam fell down some stairs and suffered injuries. (Though these injuries included a broken rib, no doctor was called.) The police treated him with pain-killing tablets. During the next eight days he did not walk around. He usually sat or stood in the sun, and sometimes he did not leave his cell. On September 27 he died.

The post-mortem next day disclosed twenty-six bruises on the body, haematoma, blood clots in the chest wall, a narrowing of the artery and clots in the deep veins of the calves. The seventh right rib was broken. One bruise was twenty by eight centimetres. Some bruises were possibly seven to ten days old, but others were fresher. Two parallel bruises were similar to injuries seen on those hit by an instrument such as a stick. At the inquest five months later, the Magistrate accepted police evidence, said a substantial part of the trauma, contributing to death by myocardial ischemia, was caused by an accidental fall down a flight of stone stairs. He was unable to determine how the balance of the trauma was caused.

The evidence and the finding aroused wide

disquiet in South Africa and provoked demands for a judicial inquiry. No such inquiry has been held. In April the Imam's widow sued the Ministers of Police and Justice, but there has been no subsequent report as far as I can ascertain.

Meanwhile relatives of all those detained wait and wonder. Mrs. Naidoo has said she is haunted by these deaths. Shanti is frail and delicate. She herself is old and ill and fears she will never see her daughter again. (Her one son, tortured in 1964, shot at the time of his arrest, is serving a twelve-year sentence for sabotage.) Her appeal to the authorities that Shanti be charged or released met with silence.

#### A BRUTALIZED SOCIETY

There is something peculiarly obscene about Major Swanepoel and his team. It is not as if they are dealing with great leaders, with militants or freedom fighters. The case of the twenty-two centers on a small group who through leaflets, through trying to gather clothes and cash for families of political prisoners, were desperately struggling to keep a spark of protest and of humanity alive. But with "BOSS," with the Terrorism Act, the Security Police have to justify their existence.

And their unknown number of victims are but one aspect of the "brutalized society" which connives with a brutal regime in applying brutal measures against the non-white people of South Africa. Those are not my words. I am quoting a *Rand Daily Mail* report of the words of Mrs. Jean Sinclair, President of the Black Sash women in South Africa. She was describing the destruction of lives, of families and of homes that are all facts of life there. Her words also remind us that along with the many who suffer, there do remain the tiny handful who never cease to protest, right inside South Africa.

#### KEEP UP THE PRESSURE

Among them: Joel Carlson, attorney for the twenty-two and so many others. In a speech to students in Johannesburg in April, he said that inaction and silence are tantamount to condoning and approval. To know that the evil exists and to do nothing is soul-destroying. "Change will not come about by people wishing for it, but if we persist, with courage, we shall overcome," he told the students.

One hopes that the students and all the others now protesting in South Africa will not be intimidated, nor deceived by false assurances. That when the twenty-two are released or charged, they will continue and make ever more penetrating their demands on behalf of the others, helpless, silenced, in solitary confinement; and here it is vital that you and your Committee, keep up the pressure, that as long as there is a single political prisoner in South Africa, a single person suffering under *apartheid*, you will make known the abhorrence of the outside world.

I will also include in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the *Rand Daily Mail* of June 24, 1970, on the question of his trial and a document from the United Nations Unit on Apartheid.

This covers three subjects which are of great concern to the American people and to people anywhere on earth who care about freedom.

The first has to do with the problem of deaths under mysterious circumstances of persons in detention in South Africa, of which there are now a substantial number, including a 15th, Mr. J. Iyitya, whose death, by hanging in a cell in Port Elizabeth occurred after the U.N. compilation.

The second is a report on the fate of the late Imam Abdullah Haron.

The third is a poem by one of the great authors of our time, Alan Paton, who, though now denied a passport by the South African Government, is still carrying on the effort to speak for those who have been silenced by that peculiarly repressive government.

The material follows:

[From the *Rand Daily Mail*, June 24, 1970]

#### WHERE ARE THEY?

A detainee whose "release from detention" was announced by the Minister of Justice six days ago was discharged from Weskoppies Mental Hospital yesterday. He had been there, he thinks, for 44 days. Two other detainees have also been "released from detention". Where are they?

In administering any law, the authorities have a duty to keep the public informed of their activities. In administering the Terrorism Act—Section Six of which arms the police with extraordinary powers—the onus is far greater. Section Six allows for a great deal of official secrecy. The police have authority to arrest people and keep them in indefinite solitary confinement—secretly. Once a month they are required to tell the Minister of Justice why they are doing so. No one else need know. Thus it was possible to produce a man in court last week who claimed to have been held incommunicado for 23 months, and about whom no further information was offered.

But wherever the law does not specifically require secrecy, the authorities have a special obligation to keep the public informed of how they are using their vast powers. The matter of the 22 is a case in point. Their situation was revealed because they appeared in court, were found not guilty and then were redetained in circumstances which made it impossible to conceal this fact. The case caused considerable concern and finally even the Government took note of the weight of critical opinion. The Minister of Justice promised that the Attorney-General would give the matter his "immediate attention".

Four hundred days after the 22 were first held the State acted. Nineteen were brought to court. Three were "released from detention". The further fate of these three is of obvious public interest. But the authorities have still not told us the whole truth about them.

On June 17, and for a number of days before that, the Attorney-General told the "Rand Daily Mail" that he had not come to a decision about the 22 detainees. He apparently did not know that one of them was in a mental home.

On June 18, the Minister of Justice announced that three detainees were "free". They were not, to his knowledge, being held as witnesses. He apparently did not have all the facts. Yet the Commissioner of Police is required by law to explain to him once a month "why any detainee should not be released". The Minister has the right to order a release at any time. He surely ought to have been told that one detainee was in a mental home. Was he?

Since then officials who might be expected to know have refused to be drawn on the possible whereabouts of the "freed" detainees. The Attorney-General said he did not know if the men had actually been released, "doubted" that the prosecutor in the case would know, and parried a question about whether it was possible they were being held in terms of the 180-day law by saying: "You can't question me like that." The acting Commissioner of Police has been quoted as saying that he could not make a statement because the records were not too

handy and, later, that one detainee had been released on June 11 and the other on June 18. The Commissioner of Prisons said it was "the business of the police" and a security police spokesman said yesterday that the men had been released—and refused to answer further questions.

There are a number of things the public is entitled to know. Why was the announcement of the first release apparently delayed for more than a week? Was this the man in the mental home? Why have the families not been informed of what is happening? Why have two of the men not so far appeared in their old haunts? Why does the State insist that it does not know where these two men are, when it is confirmed that they are going to be State witnesses?

Such things happen in countries like Russia. Have we really come to that here?

[United Nations Unit on Apartheid, Report of May 1970, No. 18/70]

#### DEATHS IN DETENTION

In issue No. 12/69 of "Notes and Documents", the Unit of Apartheid published particulars on eleven persons who had died in detention in South Africa since 1963. The list has now grown to fourteen, as follows:

#### NAME AND DATE OF DEATH

"Looksmart" Solwandle Ngudle: September 5, 1963.

Sullman Saloojee: September 9, 1964.

J. Jyitya: found hanged in cell, Port Elizabeth, 1964.

James Hamakwayo: date unknown, 1966.

Leong Yum Pin: November 19, 1966.

Unknown: date unknown (death disclosed in Parliament on January 28, 1967, without detail, in reply to a question).

Ah Yan: January 5, 1967.

J. B. Tubakwe: September 11, 1968.

Nicodimus Kogathe: February 2, 1969.

Solomon Modipane: about February 28, 1969.

James Lenkoe: March 10, 1969.

Caleb Mayekiso: June 1, 1969.

Michael Shivute: June 16-17, 1969.

Jacob Monakgotla: September 9, 1969.

Imam Abdullah Haron: September 27, 1969.

These detainees had been held incommunicado so that only the prison warders and the Security Police knew of the treatment they had endured in prison. Nevertheless, in a number of inquest proceedings, medical evidence became available that the detainees had been subjected to brutal assaults during interrogation, including burns by electric shock torture.

Brief particulars on the recent deaths in detention are given below.

#### MR. NICODIMUS (NICK) KGOATHE

Mr. Kgoathe, 57, a furniture worker, was detained on November 7, 1968, and died on February 2, 1969.

The Security Police claimed that he had fallen while taking a shower. The post-mortem showed that he had died of bronchopneumonia, possibly as a complication of a minor head injury.

It was disclosed at the inquest, however, that he had spent two weeks in hospital before his death. The doctor who had him admitted to hospital said that he had found various injuries which he thought were the result of assault. A police sergeant testified that Mr. Kgoathe had complained of assault by Security Police during interrogation. But the magistrate found that he was unable to conclude that any person was to blame for the death.

#### MR. SOLOMON MODIPANE

Mr. Modipane, a Bakwena tribesman, died in prison about February 28, 1969, three days after his arrest.

Police spokesmen claimed that he had slipped on a piece of soap. A magistrate endorsed a post-mortem report that death was due to natural causes. No inquest was held.

#### MR. JAMES LENKOE

Mr. Lenkoe, 35, a Lesotho national, and railway worker, died in prison on March 10, 1969, five days after being detained. The Government claimed that he had committed suicide.

It was revealed at the inquest that traces of copper had been found in a wound on his toe. Four pathologists, including a renowned American expert, Dr. Alan R. Moritz, testified that the wound was caused by an electric burn, a few hours before his death, and could have been caused by electric shock torture. The Magistrate, however, accepted the Security Branch version of suicide.

#### MR. CALEB MAYEKISO

A prominent trade union leader and a leader of the African National Congress, Mr. Mayekiso was detained on May 14, 1969 and died on June 1, 1969.

The Government claimed that he had died of "natural causes".

#### MR. MICHAEL SHIVUTE

Mr. Shivute was detained on June 16, 1969, and died during the night of June 16/17. The Government claimed he had committed suicide.

#### MR. JACOB MONAKGOTLA

One of several members of the Bakubung tribe, arrested in a tribal dispute and held in detention under the Terrorism Act, Mr. Monakgotla died on September 9, 1969, the day before the trial was to begin. The district surgeon found that he had died from thrombosis. No inquest was held.

#### IMAM ABDULLAH HARON

Imam Haron, a prominent Moslem leader, was detained on May 28, 1969, and died on September 27, 1969. (see separate note in this issue).

#### TRIALS UNDER THE TERRORISM ACT

The detentions and trials which have so far taken place under the Terrorism Act have disclosed, in addition to violations of the most fundamental principles of justice, gross abuse of the Act for holding people incommunicado in cases where no charge of "terrorism" was involved. In one case, seventeen Africans involved in a tribal dispute were detained under the Act, but were not charged under the Act. In another case, thirty-eight Africans were detained under the Act, but only ten were charged under the Act and these charges were not pressed. As noted earlier, Mrs. Mandela and her colleagues were also detained under the Act, but were charged under another statute.

In most of these cases, brutal torture of the detainees (accused and witnesses) was alleged.

The trial of Mrs. Mandela and twenty-one others has been reviewed in this issue. Earlier trials are briefly reviewed here.

#### TRIAL OF 37 NAMIBIANS 1967-68

Immediately after its enactment in June 1967, the Terrorism Act, with its retroactive provisions, was used against thirty-seven of an unknown number of Namibians who had then been in detention, some for more than a year.

The illegal trial of these Namibians led to widespread international protests and condemnation—including condemnation by the United Nations organs concerned (the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Commission on Human Rights, the Council for Namibia, the Special Committee of Twenty-four).

Of the thirty-seven accused, fifteen were eventually sentenced to life imprisonment

and sixteen to terms of imprisonment ranging from five to twenty years. Three were sentenced to five years each under alternative charges under the Suppression of Communism Act, rather than the Terrorism Act. Two were acquitted and one died in prison during the trial.

During the course of this trial, in December 1967, an urgent application was made for a court order to protect Mr. Gabriel Mbindi, a Namibian detainee, from cruel and brutal assaults, including electric shock torture. Affidavits in support of his application were filed by some of the accused who also alleged torture. Mr. Mbindi was released two months after, before the court was to hear oral evidence. An agreement was reached between the parties in terms of which the State paid 3,000 rand (\$4,200) to Mr. Mbindi toward the costs of the application, though without admitting the truth of the allegations.

#### TRIAL OF 12 AFRICANS IN PIETERMARITZBURG IN FEBRUARY-MARCH 1969

Of the twelve accused, adherents of the African National Congress, eleven (ten men and one woman) were sentenced on March 26, 1969, to terms of imprisonment ranging from five to twenty years. One was acquitted.

One of the State witnesses in the trial, Mr. Desmond Francis, told the Court that he had been arrested in Southern Rhodesia and handed over to the South African Police who had kept him in solitary confinement for over 400 days and had subjected him to brutal torture. (An account of his experience in prison and a review of this trial were published in "Notes and Documents" No. 8/69).

#### Windhoek trial, July-August 1969

Eight Namibians were tried under the Terrorism Act in Windhoek in July-August 1969. A number of other detainees were produced as State witnesses.

On August 22, 1969, the Court sentenced five of the accused to life imprisonment and one to 18 years. Two others were acquitted.

#### Trial of Bakwena tribesmen, August 1969

Following the burning down of a Bakwena tribal sub-chief's home near Hebron in October 1968, and reports of dissatisfaction with Chief Lerothidi II for imposing collective fines, the police arrested seventeen Bakwena tribesmen between October 1968 and February 1970.

These detentions received public attention only in March 1969 when two of the tribesmen died in detention.

Mr. Nick Kgoathe, arrested in November 1968, died in prison early in February 1969. Mr. Solomon Modipane, arrested on February 25, 1969, died in prison three days later. They were both married with children. The Security Police claimed that they had died of "natural causes". The inquest on the death of Mr. Kgoathe, at which the family was represented by counsel, disclosed police brutality. No inquest was held on the death of Mr. Modipane.

Only six of the Africans were eventually charged on June 24, 1969. The others were released after many months in detention. The charges were not under the Terrorism Act, but of sabotage, alternatively attempted murder, alternatively arson. In August, the Pretoria Supreme Court acquitted them of all the charges, finding the evidence against them conflicting and valueless.

#### Trial of Bakubung tribesmen, September 1969

Several members of the Bakubung tribe in the Rustenburg district were detained in April 1968 and subsequently charged with attempting to murder Katherina Monakgotla, chieftainess of the tribe.

On January 21, 1969, one of them, Mr. Marks Monakgotla, 50, appeared in the Rus-

tenburg magistrate's court on an application for bail. He told the court that he had been shocked unconscious by an electric machine and beaten by policemen in an attempt to get him to make a statement. He opened his shirt and showed a red mark of about five inches in diameter on the right side of his chest. Two days later, the Pretoria Supreme Court granted an interim order, restraining any member of the police from interviewing him.

The next day, the State withdrew the charge of attempted murder against the nine prisoners so that the bail application of Mr. Marks Monakgotla could not be considered. However, before the Africans could leave the court, they were arrested under the Terrorism Act and transferred to Pretoria. On 29 January 1969, the Court refused to extend the interim order against the police, on the State's submission that the courts had no jurisdiction over the prisoner now that he had been detained under the Terrorism Act. Between January 29 and March 17, thirty-eight other tribesmen were detained under the Terrorism Act.

Mr. James Lenkoe, one of the detainees, died in prison on March 10, 1969. The inquest revealed evidence of electric shock torture, though the magistrate accepted the police version that Mr. Lenkoe had committed suicide.

Ten of the prisoners were charged on August 4, 1969 with terrorism, alternatively with intent to commit murder. One of them, Mr. Jacob Monakgotla, died of "natural causes" on 9 September, a day before the trial began. Three were discharged on 11 September and the State withdrew the main charge of terrorism when the six others pleaded guilty to attempted murder. (Strangely, Major Swanepoel, chief interrogation officer of the Security Branch, gave evidence in mitigation).

Mr. Justice Theron said he had sympathy for the reasons the six accused had attempted to murder the chieftainess. He sentenced them to three years' imprisonment each, two years of which was suspended.

#### *Trial of Mr. Mathangela, December 1969*

Mr. Donald Sifiso Mathangela, 26, a Malawi national, was sentenced to seven years' imprisonment under the Terrorism Act in Pietermaritzburg in December 1969.

#### THE LATE IMAM ABDULLAH HARON<sup>1</sup>

Imam Abdullah Haron, a prominent Moslem leader of Cape Town, was detained under the Terrorism Act on May 28, 1969, and died in prison on September 27, 1969, after four months in solitary confinement. The Government claimed that he had died of a heart ailment, but this story was widely questioned. As the Reverend Canon L. John Collins wrote to the Special Committee on Apartheid:

"He was a loved and respected religious leader in the Cape and utterly opposed to the doctrine of apartheid. He aided the victims of the system by giving solace and support to the wives and families of political prisoners and by educating their children, irrespective of their religious beliefs or political persuasions.

"As no charges were brought against him, and as he was not brought to trial, one is entitled to assume that he was detained because of this work among the dependants of political prisoners. He is the twelfth man to have died in detention in South Africa, and the fifth this year while kept incommunicado in solitary confinement in terms of the Terrorism Act.

"The South African authorities have given the cause of his death as heart failure. He

was in excellent health before his arrest and we also have evidence that he was still well and his spirit unbroken at the end of July after he had been in detention and under police interrogation for fifty-eight days.

"The death of the Imam, which has brought grief not only to his family and to the Moslem community, but also to all who have known and revered him, gives the lie to any claims made by the South African Government that its apartheid regime is humane and stable, a bastion of Western and Christian civilization. We believe him to be another martyr to the cause of freedom from racial tyranny in South Africa."

The Imam's funeral was attended by 30,000 people who walked several miles from his home to the burial ground. "It was not just a funeral. It was a political demonstration."

The Special Committee on Apartheid in a communique on October 7, 1969, protested vigorously at the Imam's death and expressed its belief "he was victimized for his anti-racialist views and his belief in the brotherhood of mankind and equality of all men."

The South African Government did not accede to widespread demands for an impartial inquiry, but held an inquest after a delay of several months. It was then disclosed that the Imam had twenty-six bruises on his body covering 560 square centimetres and a haematoma on his back; his seventh right rib was broken.

Sergeant J.F.P. Van Wyck of the Security Police testified that Imam Haron had been taken out of the Cape Peninsula between September 17 and 19, 1969, in the exclusive custody of the Security Police. He stated that on the night of September 19, he had fallen down some stairs and had suffered injuries.

Sergeant Van Wyck and Major Dirk Genis, Security Branch detectives, claimed that the Imam had been held on suspicion of contacts with the Pan Africanist Congress, of receiving money from the Anti-Apartheid Movement and the Defence and Aid Fund and of taking money out of South Africa for use by exiles.

The following facts were brought out during the inquest:

(a) Sergeant Van Wyck was the officer who had assaulted Miss Stephanie Kemp and Mr. Alan Brooks in 1964. The Government made out-of-court settlements in those cases and allowed the victims to leave the country.

(b) Imam Haron had been interrogated by Sergeant Van Wyck between July 2 and 11, 1969, and had reluctantly made a statement. During that period, the Imam, who had no complaint before, had twice been seen by doctors. He had complained of pain over his ribs and was given pain-killing tablets. There was no indication of heart trouble. After September 20, however, though the Imam had a broken rib, no doctor had been called. The Security Branch had "treated" him with pain-killing tablets.

(c) During the last ten days, the Imam did not walk around. He usually stood or sat in the sun, and sometimes did not leave his cell.

(d) The first mention of the alleged fall was on the afternoon of September 28 when Major Dirk Genis had seen the body and noticed the bruises.

(e) According to Dr. T. G. Schwar, the former senior State pathologist in Cape Town who had conducted the post-mortem on September 28, there were twenty-six bruises on the body, a haematoma, various blood clots in the chest wall, a narrowing of the artery and clots in the deep veins of the calves. The seventh right rib was broken. One of the bruises was large, twenty by eight centimetres. Some of the bruises were possibly seven to ten days old, but others were fresher. Two parallel bruises were sim-

ilar to injuries seen on those who had been hit by an instrument such as a stick.

(f) According to Dr. Percy Helman, a prominent specialist surgeon, all the bruises on the Imam's body could not have been caused by a fall down stairs.

The inquest magistrate, however, accepted police evidence and declared that the cause of death was myocardial ischemia: a likely contributing cause being trauma (injury) superimposed on a severe narrowing of a coronary artery. A substantial part of the trauma he said, was caused by an accidental fall down a flight of stone stairs. "On the available evidence I am unable to determine how the balance thereof was caused."

The evidence at the inquest and the finding caused wide disquiet and provoked demands for a thorough judicial inquiry.

On March 15, Mrs. Catherine Taylor, United Party Member of Parliament, called for a top-level inquiry into the death of Imam Haron in view of the fact that the evidence led at the inquest cast "ugly doubts" on the treatment of prisoners in detention, especially those "held incommunicado under the Terrorism Act".

Professor Hansi P. Pollak, chairman of the Cape Western Region of South African Institute of Race Relations, wrote in a letter to *Cape Times* (March 19, 1970):

"We . . . strongly support the growing demand for a judicial commission of inquiry into this whole grave matter, more particularly into the treatment meted out to the Imam while in detention.

"The aspect of this case which makes it the special concern of my committee is that a full inquiry and report by a manifestly impartial commission is surely required in the interests of harmonious race relations.

"The late Imam was a public figure and important religious leader among Cape Moslems. The circumstances of his death while in official hands and the many disquieting aspects of the inquest evidence can surely, if left unexplained, potentially have great repercussions on their relations with Europeans in general and the authorities in particular.

"The inquest can be no substitute for the kind of inquiry now being sought. For there, the sole relevant issue was the cause of death . . .

"But the issues requiring investigation by a judicial commission are obviously not thus limited. They would include, for instance, precisely why the evidence placed before the magistrate was so scanty, especially since the Imam was being held incommunicado. Hence the cause of any injuries he may have sustained must, prima facie, be within the exclusive knowledge of his official custodians (presumably other than those who testified at the inquest).

"Again, the inquiry would not be limited to the cause of death but would include the question whether or not, independently of such cause, the detainee was the victim of unlawful violence."

The Reverend C. S. Sergel, Mrs. C. Sergel, the Reverend J. A. Stewart and Mrs. Mary Schurr of Bellville wrote in a joint letter to *Cape Times* (March 19, 1970):

"May we express publicly our real concern and extend our sympathy to the family of Imam Haron and to the Moslem community. They must have felt sickened with horror at the facts disclosed at the inquest . . .

"This tragic event, with so much else in this land, gives such cause for sorrow that we hope, as the *Cape Times* said in an excellent leading article, there will be 'profound disquiet by members of the public of all political convictions'.

"Every thinking person in South Africa, and far beyond her borders, will be waiting anxiously to hear what the Government will say and do about this matter. In the mean-

<sup>1</sup> See also "Notes and Documents," No. 16/69 and No. 20/69.

time we, as members of the Christian community, would like to say we do care, very much indeed."

DEATH OF A PRIEST<sup>1</sup>

(A poem by Alan Paton)

Most Honourable I knock at your door  
I knock there by day and by night  
My knuckles are raw with blood.  
I hope it does not offend you  
To have these marks on your door.

I know you are there Most Honourable  
I know that you hear my knocking  
But you do not answer me  
Pity my impotence I cannot reach your power  
I cannot bring you my tale of sorrow  
You may die and never know  
What you have done or you may fall  
And leave no chance of its undoing.

Most Honourable the sorrow is not my own  
It is of a man who has no hands to knock  
No voice to cry. A sorrow so deep  
That if you had it for your own  
You would cry out in unbelieving anguish  
That such a thing could be.

Most Honourable do not bestir yourself  
The man is dead  
He fell down the stairs and died  
And all his wounds can be explained  
Except the holes in his hands and feet  
And the long deep thrust in his side.

I also must discuss a recent announcement made by the new government of Great Britain at the very moment when these events are transpiring in South Africa.

In connection with this announcement of Her Majesty's government, I want to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of Resolution 282, of the 1970 United Nations Security Council, adopted by the Security Council on July 24, 1970, which calls upon all states to observe strictly the arms embargo against South Africa and to assist effectively in the implementation of the embargo.

RESOLUTION 282 (1970)

(Adopted by the Security Council at its 1549th meeting on July 23, 1970)

The Security Council,

Having considered the question of race conflict in South Africa resulting from the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa as submitted by forty Member States,

Reiterating its condemnation of the evil and abhorrent policies of apartheid and the measures being taken by the Government of South Africa to enforce and extend those policies beyond its borders,

Recognizing the legitimacy of the struggle of the oppressed people of South Africa in pursuit of their human and political rights as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Gravely concerned by the persistent refusal of the Government of South Africa to abandon its racist policies and to abide by the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly on this question and others relating to southern Africa,

Gravely concerned with the situation arising from violations of the arms embargo called for in its resolutions 181 (1963) of 7 August 1963, 182 (1963) of 4 December 1963 and 191 (1964) of 18 June 1964,

Convinced of the need to strengthen the arms embargo called for in the above resolutions.

<sup>1</sup> This poem was first published in the *Sunday Times*, Johannesburg, on March 22, 1970.

Convinced further that the situation resulting from the continued application of the policies of apartheid and the constant build-up of the South African military and police forces made possible by the continued acquisition of arms, military vehicles and other equipment and of spare parts for military equipment from a number of Member States and by local manufacture of arms and ammunition under licenses granted by some Member States constitutes a potential threat to international peace and security.

Recognizing that the extensive arms build-up of the military forces of South Africa poses a real threat to the security and sovereignty of independent African States opposed to the racial policies of the Government of South Africa, in particular the neighboring States,

1. Reiterates its total opposition to the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa;

2. Reaffirms its resolutions 181 (1963), 182 (1963) and 191 (1964);

3. Condemns the violations of the arms embargo called for in resolutions 181 (1963), 182 (1963), and 191 (1964);

4. Calls upon all States to strengthen the arms embargo

(a) by implementing fully the arms embargo against South Africa unconditionally and without reservations whatsoever;

(b) by withholding supply of all vehicles and equipment for use of the armed forces and paramilitary organizations of South Africa;

(c) by ceasing supply of spare parts for all vehicles and military equipment used by the armed forces and paramilitary organizations of South Africa;

(d) by revoking all licenses and military patents granted to the South African Government or to South African companies for the manufacture of arms and ammunition, aircraft and naval craft or other military vehicles and by refraining from further granting such licences and patents;

(e) by prohibiting investment in or technical assistance for the manufacture of arms and ammunition, aircraft, naval craft, or other military vehicles;

(f) by ceasing provision of military training for members of the South African armed forces and all other forms of military co-operation with South Africa;

(g) by undertaking the appropriate action to give effect to the above measures;

5. Requests the Secretary-General to follow closely the implementation of the present resolution and report to the Security Council from time to time; and

6. Calls upon all States to observe strictly the arms embargo against South Africa and to assist effectively in the implementation of this resolution.

I wish also to insert in the RECORD an article from the *Sunday Times*, of July 19, 1970, which analyzes the reasons given by the British Government for its decision to reconsider its position on arms sales to South Africa. This article contains a knowledgeable and careful statement of facts relating to the British Government's statements about potential threats to western security involving the sea route around the Cape of Good Hope:

THE MYTHS OF SIMONSTOWN

"I would not be too impressed by what soldiers tell you about the strategic importance of these places. If they were allowed full scope they would insist on the importance of garrisoning the moon in order to protect us from Mars."—Goschen to the Duke of Devonshire, 6 September, 1895

"I cannot think who Alec has been talking to," said one baffled Labour ex-minister last week. "He really does still believe in 1951,

and global confrontation." It was, naturally, a partisan comment on the attitude of the Conservative Foreign Secretary. But it illustrates the point that in the current debate about Simonstown and the supply of arms to South Africa, both sides have tended to take up positions based more on faith than logic.

On the one hand, there is the belief that if Britain has an interest in an area, warships must be there to defend it. Against this is the belief that Britain should no longer try to patrol the world.

Yet, essentially, the argument boils down to two specific questions. Can the weapons on South Africa's shopping list be used to enforce apartheid? and is there a genuine Russian threat in the Indian Ocean which these weapons would counter? In the past week Insight has talked to politicians and defence strategists—both in and out of the Government—to military officers, and to African guerrillas.

Their answers suggest, first, that for the weapons most commonly named as being on the South African shopping list, no dividing line can be drawn between an "external" and an "internal" role. Second, it is doubtful whether the West can counter what Russian threat there is in the Indian Ocean without a massive increase in sea power—committing Britain to a costlier naval policy than either side in the debate has yet publicly admitted.

The Buccaneer's appeal is its load-carrying capacity; it will carry as much as the Canberra—the RAF's aging medium bomber—for more than 1,000 miles. And, supersonic in a shallow dive, it is maneuverable enough to perform formation aerobatics.

Essentially the Buccaneer is a strike aircraft. The Fleet Air Arm, for which it was developed, wanted it to bombard shore installations—bridges, dams, railway yards and the like—from an offshore carrier. However, it is not an antisubmarine weapon. Although over water its radar can pinpoint a surface vessel about 150 miles away, it cannot detect submerged craft.

The latest land version of the Buccaneer—as adapted for the RAF—can carry almost half as much again as the naval plane. This makes it especially useful in carrying the latest anti-personnel weapons. Being almost solid steel, these are particularly heavy. Most of them are designed to explode just above ground level showering anything from razor-like slivers of steel to bomblets which themselves explode.

"They're intended to destroy any soft-skinned target within about 100 yards of the explosion said a Buccaneer expert. "The advantage of these over, say, 30mm cannon is that you don't have to actually hit the enemy to destroy him."

Our source had no doubts about the Buccaneer's superlative fitness for these anti-personnel tasks: "It carries an observer which is a tremendous help. It flies down to 200 knots. And it will dive-bomb—which makes time error less critical in bomb release. Forget the argument about the Buccaneer being too sophisticated, or too expensive. Each pilot needs a bare minimum of 15 hours a month flying just to keep in training. You've got to keep the aircraft flying, too. If you're going to be flying, anyway, why not use it for whatever crops up?"

This possible function had clearly occurred to the British Government in 1965, when a dozen South African pilots attended a training course at Lossiemouth, the Royal Naval air station in Scotland. They were taught everything about the plane, but were denied any bombing practice. Another pilot who had been on the same course said. "We just assumed they went straight home and got their bombing practice there."

They appear to have been right. Since delivery the Cape Coast Defence Force has been

operating out of four airfields along South Africa's northern border with Angola, Botswana, Rhodesia and Zambia—as far from the Cape coast as it is possible to get in the country.

The only targets the force has seen have been guerrillas crossing this border. Reports from the area claim that, in January, 1968, Buccaneers attacked around Andara, after guerrillas had blown the Okavango river bridge at that point—one of the key border crossings. Six months later Buccaneers, armed mainly with rockets, strafed 100 miles of the Zambezi valley from Katima Mulilo to Victoria Falls.

Between October and December last year widespread and systematic bombing by Buccaneers of the Caprivi Strip—the critical central point of this northern border—effectively drove 2,000 refugees over into Zambia. Finally in mid-January this year Buccaneers moved into Rhodesia to retaliate against guerrilla attacks on Victoria Falls airport.

These reports, although circumstantial, are difficult to confirm: details of South Africa's counter-insurgency operations are classified. But the lack of a fixed target for the Buccaneers is common to all of them. They were straightforward anti-guerrilla operations.

So far, it needs to be said, the evidence is that South Africa has used Buccaneers only in defence of her borders. The point is that the techniques would serve equally well against any insurgent section of her own population.

The South African thinking on this role for the Buccaneer was most clearly pointed up a year ago in Northern Transvaal. A full scale army/air-force exercise—Operation Sibasa—was mounted in open scrubland. Its object, South Africa House reluctantly confirmed last week, was training in counter-insurgency. Buccaneer aircraft played a key part. "It was just an everyday exercise," said the spokesman.

The other aircraft on South Africa's shopping list is the Nimrod, the RAF's replacement for the old Shackletons. Based on the design of the Comet, the Nimrod is generally acknowledged as the finest maritime reconnaissance aircraft in production today. Besides being crammed with radar and electronic equipment, its galley and rest quarters for the crew of 12 men that the Nimrod can loiter on station for long periods without the crew becoming exhausted. It can carry bombs, mines, depth charges and torpedoes in addition to various types of sonar-buoys—listening devices dropped into the water in the search for submarines. It can also take air-to-ground missiles, and even carry 45 troops. It flies at just under the speed of sound.

As a weapon to track Russian nuclear submarines off the Cape it would be unsurpassed. The trouble is that the Nimrod is more versatile still. There is, to start with, no reason why search and attack roles should not be carried out over land, in the same way that Shackletons were used for bombing in the Aden Protectorates.

But the central value of the Nimrod in an "internal" capacity lies in the fact that its electronic capabilities would make it ideal as a flying operations room. A logical force in a counter-insurgency operation would consist of half a dozen low-flying light aircraft acting as forward air controllers, reporting target positions to a circling Nimrod. The Nimrod, using its enormous communications range, could then call in Buccaneers from up to 1,000 miles away—effectively from anywhere in South Africa. "In fact," one expert said last week, "if I wanted to put together a highly mobile and very powerful counter-insurgency force, I'd have a couple of Nimrods and a handful of Buccaneers."

The ships on the South African shopping

list are the Leander class, the latest British frigates. They are an improved version of the old Whitby class, three of which South Africa already possesses under the terms of the Simonstown agreement.

Teamed with the Nimrod, the Leander is undoubtedly the most effective anti-submarine weapon available to South Africa as long as the American embargo continues. (Its French rival lacks the maneuverability provided by the Leander's twin rudders, and the French weapons and detection equipment are held by NATO assessment to be inferior.) There is a possibility, however, that the Japanese could produce a comparable vessel for the South Africans were the Leander denied them.

The problem, as with the Nimrod, is that the "Leander" is not confined to a maritime role. For the edge that the class has over its fore-runners is its long-range air warning radar, more sophisticated detection equipment, "Seacat" anti-aircraft missiles, a Wasp helicopter which carries homing torpedoes, and, crucially in this context, the ability to carry out an air-direction role.

The "Leander" would, as a result, have increased value as a counter-weapon, for instance, an ability to come inshore for coastal bombardment directed by its helicopter, or to guide ground-attack aircraft. As Lord Carrington, the present Defense Secretary, said in 1963: "The Government cannot guarantee that no weapon could ever in any circumstances be used for this purpose (enforcing apartheid) . . . even naval weapons could at a pinch be used to bombard a land target."

Lord Carrington's forecast is borne out by the evidence of a former gunner in the South African navy. Desmond Macallister, who now lives in London claims that his gunnery training was conducted, not on the assumption of a Russian naval threat, but on the need for shore bombardment. "It was never specified," he told us last week, "whether we would be shelling black countries or black people in South Africa."

Macallister also highlighted the ambiguous nature of South Africa's quite genuine concern about submarines. "We always understood," he said, "that our peacetime role was to patrol the coast and prevent the landing of guerrillas from yachts, trawlers and submarines. No mention was ever made of a possible Soviet blockade of the Cape route or of South African ports."

Macallister's story is supported by a recent South African treason trial. The defendants were alleged, among other things, to have been engaged in seeking out possible spots for submarine landings in the heavily forested Knysna area of Cape Province.

Guerrilla landings are clearly a threat to South Africa. But is there a Russian presence in the Indian Ocean which constitutes a serious threat to us?

Two study groups, both secret, considered Simonstown and the related problems while the Conservatives were in opposition: a working party under the backbencher Sir Frederic Bennett, and a policy group under the Shadow Defence Minister, Geoffrey Rippon. Both groups included outside advisers.

The conclusions of Bennett's study were the more dramatic. "To avert historic tragedies which . . . may well otherwise be inevitable," urgent action was necessary to bolster the security of the Cape—including a regional defence pact, a reactivating of Simonstown, and the maintenance in the area of an aircraft carrier and "one or more nuclear-powered submarines in support of the South African Navy." There is no mention of the protecting ships the carrier would need.

The threat that these vastly expensive proposals are designed to counter was spelled

out by the other study group whose conclusions were incorporated by Rippon into a study of "South Africa and Naval Strategy." "The enormous increase in (Russian) naval activity, in all oceans of the world, which has developed since the end of the last war, cannot be regarded as anything but ominous. Her concentration on building an offensive rather than a defensive naval capability . . . should have woken the West up to the enormous potential threat which faces it."

Bennett's proposals are logical however—and indicate the scale of British commitment necessary—if there is really this Russian threat.

The major Russian force in the area known to NATO intelligence consists of two nuclear-powered hunter-killer submarines; though for much of the last year there has been only one. Another five Russian hunter-killers are known to have left their Baltic bases in the last year and traveled round the Cape to reinforce Russia's main submarine fleet based around Vladivostok and operating in the eastern Pacific.

In the last two years, four groups of Russian surface warships have operated in the Indian Ocean: two on show-the-flag visits, one mainly to the Persian Gulf, another to East Africa. The other two groups were a task force in December 1968 and another early this year, both composed largely of technical vessels picking up tests of long-range missiles fired from eastern Russia.

Military sources in London also reckon that Russia's missile programme explains the two other major signs of her presence in the area. These are mooring buoys off the Seychelles—and an agreement the Russians have just signed with Mauritius. This nominally covers the establishment of a Russian fishery force. But clauses in it, according to sources in London, allow Russia unlimited wireless traffic from the island and equally unlimited use of the local airstrip—neither an obvious requirement for a fishery force, but explicable in terms of a missile testing range.

As Lawrence Martin, Professor of War Studies at King's College, London, has said: "Judged by the standards of the West, these operations are still on a modest scale. But they demonstrate the importance Russia now attaches to impressing others with her naval power, and they must be expected to continue to grow, especially if the Suez Canal is reopened."

But the Russian Navy, though formidable, consists primarily of submarines and missile ships operating under cover of land-based aircraft. Its normal sphere of operations is largely sub-oceanic waters—the Mediterranean, the Baltic, the North Sea—around the Russian mainland. It does not—a crucial point—have a general capacity to operate on an ocean, without air cover. Nor is there evidence that Russia is making the major changes in her naval thinking necessary to develop this oceanic capability. The Russian presence in the Indian Ocean may therefore grow, but it is unlikely to change much in kind.

But if the Russian presence, as it stands now, is a "threat to the Cape route," combating it would entail a massive buildup of Western naval strength in the area—most probably of nuclear hunter-killer submarine supported by carrier based aircraft. (To counter the "prestige" element of the Russian presence would of course necessitate a surface fleet of our own. And since Simonstown can only take two frigates at a time, new bases around the ocean would immediately be needed—possibly Singapore once again.)

Whether any Western Power except the Americans could afford to produce that scale

of commitment is doubtful, in the view of the experts we consulted. And even if Britain had the money, whether we could man any Indian Ocean fleet without a reintroduction of conscription is apparently even more doubtful. For the past five years, British defence planners have rejected any such course—simply because they do not believe that the Russian presence does in fact pose any credible threat to the Cape Route (except in terms of a general conflict, in which case we would not be in a position to worry about the Cape).

We have excellent authority for thinking that in the last five years the British Chiefs of Staff have not once pressed for the defence of the Cape Route as a British priority in consequence of Russian expansion in the Indian Ocean.

On the contrary they have consistently said that Simonstown is "useful but not essential." They have advised that the only real value of giving such sophisticated instruments of war as Nimrod, Buccaneer or Leander to South Africa, would be to increase marginally Nato's knowledge of Russian submarine movements. And it is on that basis that most of the experts we have questioned feel the wisdom of supplying arms to South Africa should be evaluated.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) for taking this initiative. There is no question but that the conditions evidenced by the terrorism acts in South Africa have deteriorated, that the light of freedom burns with more difficulty in that country all the time. And yet there are voices speaking out continually for freedom there, in the Progressive Party or in other parties or amongst the students of the National Union of South African Students. I think the fact that South Africa is a signatory to the Human Rights Convention for the United Nations should serve as a daily reminder to the world that the government of that land has not wholly upheld the provisions of that document, that human rights are in jeopardy not only in southern South Africa, but are jeopardized daily.

More than that, the gentleman has discussed the possible decision of the United Kingdom relative to a change of policy which would permit the sale of arms to South Africa. The gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN) joined today with 46 Members of this House and of the other body, including seven Members of the other body, in a letter to the Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers, as well as in a statement by Members of Congress on the proposed sale of arms to South Africa. I would like to make several points about that.

First, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point the text of that statement and of the letter to Secretary Rogers with the signatures of those who joined in the letter and in the statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter and statement are as follows:

LETTER TO SECRETARY OF STATE ROGERS ON PROPOSED BRITISH ARMS SALE TO SOUTH AFRICA

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,  
Secretary of State,  
Department of State.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We are writing to express our deep concern about the proposed decision of the new British Government to sell arms to South Africa, in implementation of the Simonstown Agreement of 1955.

In our view, an affirmative decision of this character would have the gravest international repercussions. Not only would the continued existence of the Commonwealth as a multi-racial organization be seriously in doubt, but the sale of arms may well be viewed as an invitation to increased militancy by the black African states.

The sale of arms to South Africa by any nation is in direct violation of a 1963 Security Council embargo. Moreover, any future arms deal with the Vorster government will plainly flout a new and tightened embargo voted unanimously by the Security Council on July 23 of this year. We applaud the U.S. reaffirmation in March of our own embargo on such sales, but surely respect for the rule of law will not be enhanced by disregard of these two forthright United Nations resolutions. While there is no question but that the Soviet Union is attempting to outflank NATO, to strengthen its position in the Near East, and to focus on the Persian Gulf, the response to this should not be further arming of South Africa.

Our chief concern, however, is that while the arms are intended solely for maritime defense, no paper promises will insure that the weapons will not be used to uphold white supremacist regimes at the expense of majority rule that must come to all of southern Africa. The sale of arms to the Vorster regime by Great Britain or any other nation, regardless of the safe guards attached thereto, will regrettably enhance the diplomatic stature of the South African Government.

Consistent with the strong endorsement you and the President have given the Lusaka Manifesto, we would hope that the United States will take a strong stand on this issue at the United Nations. Further, we are sure that appropriate representations will be made to Her Majesty's Government to indicate the United States' view and to emphasize that the proposed British action could be widely misinterpreted throughout the world. At the very least, any British arms sale to South Africa may well dash the hopes held by many that peaceful change to independence and majority rule can prevail in that continent and throughout the underdeveloped nations of the world.

With best regards,  
Sincerely yours,

STATEMENT BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ON PROPOSED BRITISH ARMS SALE TO SOUTH AFRICA

As Members of the House and Senate who have long been concerned about Africa, we deplore the announced intention of the new British Government to resume the sale of arms to South Africa, in implementation of the Simonstown Agreement of 1955, providing for British-South African cooperation in the defense of the sea lanes around the Cape of Good Hope. While there is no question but that the Soviet Union is attempting to outflank NATO, strengthen its position in the Near East, and obviously focusing on the Persian Gulf, the response to this should not be further arming of South Africa.

The British Government has proposed to supply arms to a racist and repressive regime. While the arms are intended solely for maritime defense, no paper promises will insure

that the weapons will not be used to uphold white supremacist regimes at the expense of majority rule that must come to all of southern Africa. The sale of arms to the Vorster regime by Great Britain or any other nation, regardless of the safeguards attached thereto, will regrettably enhance the diplomatic stature of the South African government.

Tanzania and Uganda have already indicated that they would withdraw from the Commonwealth if this plan were carried through; indeed, the viability, if not the very existence, of the Commonwealth as a multi-racial organization is at stake. Moreover, the provision of arms to South Africa by Great Britain may well be an invitation to increased militancy by the black nations of the continent. Surely, a call to arms anywhere in Africa will not encourage the growth of non-racism or peaceful change to independence and majority rule that are crucial to the future of the continent.

The sale of arms to South Africa by any nation is in direct violation of a 1963 Security Council embargo. Moreover, any future arms deal with the Vorster government will plainly flout a new and tightened embargo voted unanimously by the Security Council on July 23 of this year. This newest resolution calls for the embargo to be carried out "unconditionally and without reservations whatsoever."

As Members of Congress, we urge Members of Parliament, and the British Government to debate this issue fully and forthrightly, and to reverse the Government's intention before a tragic decision is taken.

Members of the House and Senate who signed letter to Secretary of State William P. Rogers:

CONGRESSMEN

Reid, Ogden (R-NY).  
Bingham, Jonathan (D-NY).  
Brademas, John (D-Ind.).  
Brown, George, Jr. (D-Calif.).  
Burton, Phillip (D-Calif.).  
Chisholm, Shirley (D-NY).  
Conyers, John, Jr. (D-Mich.).  
Corman, James C. (D-Calif.).  
Culver, John C. (D-Iowa).  
Diggs, Charles C., Jr. (D-Mich.).  
Edwards, Don (D-Calif.).  
Fraser, Donald M. (D-Minn.).  
Gude, Gilbert (R-Md.).  
Halpern, Seymour (R-NY).  
Harrington, Michael (D-Mass.).  
Hawkins, Augustus F. (D-Calif.).  
Helstoski, Henry (D-NJ).  
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr. (D-Ind.).  
Kastenmeier, Robert W. (D-Wis.).  
Koch, Edward I. (D-NY).  
Lowenstein, Allard K. (D-NY).  
McCarthy, Richard D. (D-NY).  
Mikva, Abner J. (D-Ill.).  
Moorhead, William S. (D-Pa.).  
Morse, F. Bradford (R-Mass.).  
Moss, John E. (D-Calif.).  
Nix, Robert N. C. (D-Pa.).  
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr. (D-Mass.).  
Ottinger, Richard L. (D-NY).  
Reuss, Henry S. (D-Wis.).  
Rosenthal, Benjamin S. (D-NY).  
Roybal, Edward R. (D-Calif.).  
Ryan, William F. (D-NY).  
Scheuer, James H. (D-NY).  
Stokes, Louis (D-Ohio).  
Thompson, Frank, Jr. (D-NJ).  
Whalen, Charles W., Jr. (R-Ohio).  
Tunney, John V. (D-Calif.).  
Wolf, Lester L. (D-NY).

SENATORS

Brooke, Edward W. (R-Mass.).  
Cranston, Alan (D-Calif.).  
Goodell, Charles (R-NY).  
Javits, Jacob K. (R-NY).  
Kennedy, Edward M. (D-Mass.).  
Moss, Frank E. (D-Utah).  
Packwood, Robert (R-Oreg.).

Mr. REID of New York. Specifically I would like to state very simply that not only would the proposed action now under consideration in the United Kingdom be a backward step—which could well result in several members of the Commonwealth withdrawing from it—but more important, it would flash a signal around the world that the opportunities for peaceful change in Southern Africa were dimmer.

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State have given their strong endorsement to the Lusaka Manifesto, that puts the United States strongly on the side of majority rule and independence for all nations. To provide arms to South Africa is not only a clear violation of the U.N. Security Council Resolution of July 23, but, more than this, would set the stage for further repressive actions by South Africa.

There is no question in my judgment that in Southern Africa there will be change. There is no question in my mind that the words of Luthuli and others will ultimately prevail. The only question, I think, that is before us is whether this change will be soon or later, and more particularly, whether the change will be violent or peaceful.

Those governments that are white, that are in the minority, and that would seek to shut out the majority and seek to live by repression, to live by fear, not only destroy human dignity but also fly in the face of history and in the face of mankind.

I would deeply hope that our colleagues in the House of Commons will have an opportunity to thoughtfully consider this action and that the British Government would decide not to provide arms to South Africa. Indeed, I would hope we could see progress in an affirmative direction with Portugal and others, so that it will be possible in the foreseeable future for steps to be taken to negotiate with Portugal and Mozambique and Angola and Guinea Bissau for independence and majority rule.

I hope majority rule will one day come to all the countries of Southern Africa, to Rhodesia, and that the principles of human rights will apply in all South Africa. This is not now the case. But I would hope that those who live in those countries will realize the conditions under which they live do not go unnoticed in this body, that their courage is admired, and that wherever men fight for freedom, there will be voices raised in this body to sustain their spirit and their effort.

I thank the gentleman most warmly for the action he has taken in calling these several matters to the attention of the House.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New York. We are fortunate to have Members like him in this House who concern themselves about human liberty, even in places where ordinary political considerations would not elicit much interest from American politicians.

Americans are preoccupied today with difficulties involving our own country,

and it is easy—and understandable—to forget problems that seem remote elsewhere in the world. Specifically for that reason, it is important to reassert from time to time how deeply troubled we are about the plight of Africans, Indians, people of mixed ancestry, and any white people who speak out against oppression in southern Africa.

The constant reminder that the doctrine of white supremacy continues to rule an enormous part of Africa—of all places—is a cancer poisoning relations between men of different races all over the world. It jeopardizes us all. Commonsense as well as simple justice demand that this situation be ended. At the very least, governments based on race and sustained by force ought not be abetted in their misbehavior by people concerned about freedom and hoping for a time of peace on this tired and bruised planet.

For that reason if no other, I hope the Government of the United Kingdom will not reverse its ban on the sale of arms to South Africa. The decent opinion of mankind, expressed not only in resolutions of the Security Council, but also in outpourings of concern from men of goodwill all over the world—the decent opinion of mankind will not easily forgive a government for helping to furnish weapons to make this Pariah government more secure.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

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

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL INDIAN DAYS SCHEDULED IN NORTH CAROLINA AND ELSEWHERE SEPTEMBER 4 AND 5

(Mr. HENDERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this last day we will be in session before September 4 and 5 to remind the Members of various celebrations which will take place throughout the country on those dates in observance of National Indian Day.

In my congressional district, the Eastern North Carolina Indian Association will sponsor special ceremonies and festivities in connection with the celebration and I look forward to an opportunity to participate.

Many people have the impression that all of our country's Indians live on reservations in the Western and Plains States and are not aware of the large number of Indians in Eastern States like North Carolina who are, and for a long time have been, totally and completely a part of the local communities in which they live side by side with all other citizens and residents.

It is highly appropriate, however, in my opinion, for occasions such as this one which call attention to the history and the rich heritage of the North American Indians. In the case of the Eastern North Carolina Indian Association, the festivities will include a rodeo, wagon train parade, two nights of entertainment, and many exhibits, displays, contests, and games.

I want to urge all of my colleagues to join their Indian constituents in their celebration of National Indian Days, and for any who may not be so fortunate as to have Indian constituents, "Chief" James Brewington and I will welcome you to join us in Clinton, N.C. on Friday and Saturday, September 4 and 5.

#### THE PAST PRIMARY IN THE 18TH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. POWELL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of history I am putting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the facts concerning the fraud, corruption, and the thievery in the past program of the 18th Congressional District.

This matter is before several courts; but regardless of the final outcome, I desire the history record the corruption and fraud in the election of 1970 in the city of New York.

The material follows:

[In the Supreme Court, New York County]

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ADAM C. POWELL, PETITIONER v. MAURICE J. O'ROURK, ET AL., RESPONDENTS

Henry R. Williams, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. That he is an Attorney at Law maintaining offices at 271 West 125 Street, New York City, New York.

2. That on this 6th day of July, 1970, he attended at the Board of Elections of the City of New York, for the purpose of continuing an investigation of the election returns of the 18th Congressional District of the City of New York.

3. That as a result if the aforesaid examination of election returns deponent discovered that there were only public counter cards for ten of the fifty four election districts in the 72 Assembly District of the State of New York. The aforesaid 18th Congressional District has therein 211 election districts covering seven Assembly Districts.

#### FINDINGS

##### No public counter cards

Assembly district:	Election districts
67	11 ED's
68	1 ED
69	19 ED's
70	32 ED's
72	44 ED's
74	54 ED's

#### UNAUTHORIZED VOTES ON VOTING MACHINE

93 E.D. of the 66 A.D.: 14 more votes on machine than signatures on Buff Cards.

27 E.D. of the 70 A.D.: 41 more votes on machine than signatures on Buff Cards.

#### INELIGIBLE VOTES

Republicans	616
Liberals	233
Conservatives	11
Void, missing, blanks	417

## TAMPERING WITH VOTING MACHINES

70 A.D.: 3 voting levers found on window ledge, 131 East 104 Street. Voting machines abandoned by Police after close of Polls.

72 A.D.: Russworm Public School, 3 voting machines unguarded on June 26, 1970.

74 A.D.: 805 St. Nicholas Avenue, New York City, Police left voting machine in lobby of building for at least two days, unguarded and unprotected.

18th Congressional District of New York voting machines were never impounded by

Police even though Commissioner O'Rourke announced on June 24, 1970 that they had been.

Affirmed under penalties of perjury this 6th day of July, 1970.

## BY CHESTER BAGLEY

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
93	66	Louise Pierre, 165 East 96th St.	Republican	
93	66	Virginia Pagan, 179 East 96th St.	Conservative	
93	66	Gion Rios, 1265 Park Ave.	No party	
93	66	Maria Ramos, 1496 Lexington Ave.	do	Registered Feb. 2, 1970.
93	66	Eve Spillman, 1259 Park Ave.	Democratic	Last voted November 1968.
93	66	Robert Sherzer, 154 East 97th St.	No party	
93	66	Tecla Selnick, 162 East 97th St.	Liberal	

## BY PEARL SWANGIN

25	67	Martin Reinach, 711 Amsterdam Ave.		Blank.
25	67	Virginia E. Smit, 711 Amsterdam Ave.	Liberal	
25	67	Frank A. Vitals, 150 West 95 St.	Missing	
25	67	Barbara K. Wirth, 106 West 96 St.	Liberal	
25	67	Mirion Jaeger, 110 West 96 St.	Republican	
25	67	Bernard Keiser, 160 West 96 St.	Missing	
25	67	Angel Fuentes Jr., 160 West 97 St.	Liberal	
25	67	Felicita Ponceca, 160 West 97 St.	Republican	
25	67	Eliisa Fuentes, 160 West 97 St.	No party	

## BY LOUIS UPSHUR

26	67	Elneita Beasley, 70 West 95 St.	Republican	
26	67	Sharon Blocker, 21 West 94 St.	Liberal	
26	67	Dorothy Buckner, 350 Central Park West.	Republican	
26	67	Anna Fuchs, 25 West 95 St.	do	
26	67	Helen Ganz, 70 West 95 St.	No party	
26	67	Winifred Gallant, 21 West 94 St.	do	
26	67	Thelma Harris, 70 West 95 St.	Liberal	
26	67	Merill Kaplan, 70 West 95 St.	Republican	
27	67	Emma Bernson, 12 West 96 St.	No party	
27	67	Doris Getzler, 10 West 96 St.	Party missing	

## BY CHESTER BAGLEY

27	67	Leah Tobin, 19 West 96 St.	Blank	
27	67	Joseph Zoncshine, 50 West 97 St.	No party	

## BY LOUIS UPSHUR

27	67	Elixabeth Bennett, 120 West 97 St.	Republican	
27	67	Sterling Bough, 129 West 97 St.	Missing	
27	67	Walter Benthis, 120 West 97 St.	Republican	
27	67	James Hill, 120 West 97 St.	Liberal	
27	67	Clara W. Donahue, 127 West 96 St.	Missing	
27	67	Lillian Eicheron, 160 West 97 St.	do	

## BY OLIVIA WILLIAMS

29	67	Lillian T. Phillips, 120 West 97 St.	Liberal	
29	67	Charles Phillips, 120 West 97 St.	do	
29	67	John K. Zachlerle, 125 West 96 St.	do	
29	67	Luz Minerva Hernandez, 153 East 118 St.	do	
29	67	Jaun Morales, 185 East 117 St.	Republican	
29	67	Eusibio G. Rodriguez, 2135-3d Ave.	do	
29	67	Hugh Prestley, 53 East 132 St.	No party	Void.
29	67	Bessie White, 2174 Lexington Ave.	Republican	
29	67	Eva Stratton, 50 Manhattan Ave.	do	
29	67	Jacob Rosenblum, 160 West 97 St.	No party	
29	67	Marina Calcano, 177 East 117 St.	do	
29	67	Catherine Williams		Void.

## BY LOUIS UPSHUR

30	67	Permet Morgan, 765 Amsterdam Ave.	Liberal	
30	67	Valerie Martin, 784 Columbus Ave.	Republican	
30	67	Mildred Martin, 784 Columbus Ave.	do	
30	67	Terence Murphy, 382 Central Park West.	No party	
30	67	James Nabors, 382 Central Park West.	do	
30	67	Anneatha Nabors, 382 Central Park West.	Liberal	
30	67	Joseph Westman, 784 Columbus Ave.	No party	
30	67	Barbara Aubrey, 382 Central Park West.	do	
30	67	Suzanne Abeloff, 382 Central Park West.	do	
30	67	Ruth Berger, 382 Central Park West.	do	
30	67	Mary Beit-Halachmy, 382 Central Park West.	do	
30	67	Mary Bowman, 784 Columbus Ave.	Liberal	
30	67	Luis Cintron, 765 Amsterdam Ave.	No party	
30	67	Dorothy Dembry, 784 Columbus Ave.	do	
30	67	Gerard DuVillier, 382 Central Park West.	Liberal	
30	67	Lavnetter Finkel, 784 Columbus Ave.	No party	
30	67	David Levenson, 784 Columbus Ave.	do	

BY PEARL SWANGIN

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
31	67	M. Peter Leifert, 372 Central Park West	Missing	
31	67	Marguerite L. Priolou, 372 Central Park West	No party	
32	67	Joyce A. Reibe, 400 Central Park West	Republican	
32	67	Eugene Svare, 400 Central Park West	do	
32	67	Smith L. Starling, 300 Central Park West	do	
33	67	Beatrice N. Gottlieb, 392 Central Park West	No enrollment	
33	67	Nina K. Heckt, 392 Central Park West	Missing	
33	67	Anna R. F. Hopkins, 392 Central Park West	Republican	
33	67	Eleanor R. Herman, 392 Central Park West	Missing	
33	67	Lee A. Matthews, 392 Central Park West	do	
33	67	Mary V. Morse, 392 Central Park West	do	
33	67	Clara Peters, 792 Columbus Ave	Republican	
33	67	Anthony J. Tejoda, 792 Columbus Ave	Blank enroll	
33	67	Theresa M. Van Putten, 392 Central Park West	Missing	

BY LILLIE BELLE BROWN

4	68	William Gonzalez, 221 East 96 St	Missing	
4	68	Ramoneta Gonzalez, 221 East 96 St	do	
4	68	Clarivel Velez, 202 East 97 St	Republican	

BY GRAHAM

6	68	Sarah Harvin, 1902 2d Ave	Republican	
6	68	Gladys Soto, 1905 2d Ave	do	
6	68	William Vestal, 1905 2d Ave	do	

BY WILLIAM S. EPPS

8	68	Gregoria Cruz, 210 East 102 St	Party missing	No signature tampering. Do.
8	68	Lillie Mabry, 220 East 102 St	Conservative	
8	68	Norman Meyer, 1809 3d Ave		
8	68	Peter Roux, 220 East 102 St		
8	68	Janie Reddick, 210 East 102 St	Conservative	
8	68	Leslie Tyler, 1955 2d Ave	Republican	

BY ESTHER McCALL

11	68	Jose D. Perez, 1875 3d Ave	Republican	
11	68	Carmen Diaz, 1851 3d Ave	do	

BY MRS. GRAHAM BAGLEY

18	68	Mosser Wascott, 225 East 106 St	Republican	
18	68	Emory Bythwood, 2075 2d Ave	Liberal	
18	68	Myrtle Christopher, 1941 3d Ave	Republican	
18	68	Irene Giles, 1941 3d Ave	do	
18	68	Emily Hill, 1941 3d Ave	do	
18	68	Carolyn Jacobs, 1941 3d Ave	do	
18	68	Lucia Morales, 221 East 106 St	do	
18	68	Sarah Silber, 221 East 106 St	No party	
18	68	Benjamin Sheppard, 1941 3d Ave	Missing	
18	68	Vila Ramon, 1941 3d Ave	Republican	

BY MRS. E. McCALL

21	68	Carmen A. Lebron, 207 East 111 St	Blank	Scratched out and Democrats written no date. Voting.
21	68	Luis C. Novarro, 210 East 112 St	Miss	
21	68	Teardis Vines, 258 East 112 St	No date	

BY ANNA ENGLISH

32	68	Rosa Soto, 212 East 119 St	Republican	
32	68	Petrona Valcarcel, 201 East 118 St	do	
32	68	Luis Comacho, 208 East 118 St	Liberal	
32	68	Luiz Perez, 216 East 118 St	do	
32	68	Manuel Cruz, 251 East 119 St	Missing	
32	68	Victoria Galloway, 240 East 119 St	do	

BY WILLIAM S. EPPS

34	68	Lloyd Addison, 100 East 123 St	Liberal	
34	68	Julia Couvertier, 104 East 120 St	do	
34	68	Carmen Couvertier, 104 East 120 St	do	
34	68	Beulah Dye, 104 East 124 St	Republican	
34	68	Catherine Foy, 120 East 123 St	Liberal	
34	68	Petronila Gracia, 132 East St	Missing	
34	68	Edwina Gracia, 132 East 123 St	do	
34	68	Pedro Lopez, 116 East 123 St	do	
34	68	Angel Lopez, 137 East 122 St	Liberal	
34	68	Luis Mocete, 2026 Lex Ave	No party	
34	68	Susie Williams, 108 East St	Missing	
34	68	Justo Soto, 102 East 121 St	do	

## BY GRAHAM

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
35	68	Ambrosia Rivera, 58 East 120 St.	Missing	
35	68	Flora Rivera, 58 East 120 St.	do	
35	68	Yvonne Robinson, 1710 Park Ave.	do	
35	68	Miguel Rivera, 58 East 120 St.	do	
35	68	Annie Williams, 71 East 119 St.	do	
35	68	George Fong, 58 East 120 St.	do	
35	68	Daisy Kennedy, 68 East 120 St.	do	
35	68	Alice Allanby, 63 East 121 St.	Republican	
35	68	Janice Berry, 75 East 119 St.	Missing	
35	68	Isabelino Delgado, 58 East 120 St.	do	
35	68	Arnold Hector, 63 East 121 St.	Liberal	
35	68	Jessie Mae Jones, 56 East 120 St.	Void	
35	68	Margaret Rose, 68 East 120 St.	Missing	
35	68	Junior Tucker, 16 East 120 St.	Void	

## BY ELAINE PARKER

39	68	Rafalla Lopez, 2353, 2 Lexington Ave.	Missing	
39	68	Israel Lopez, 206 East 123 St.	Liberal	
39	68	Blanca Marchese, 163 East 122 St.	Republican	
39	68	John Newton, 2011 Lexington Ave.	Liberal	
39	68	Lucila Peredo, 215 East 120 St.	No party	
39	68	Petroni Morales Ramos, 254 East 122 St.	Republican	
39	68	Luisa Ramos, 229 East 121 St.	No party	

## BY PEARL SWANGIN

47	68	Bertha Allen, 1980 Park Ave.	Liberal	
47	68	David L. Blockman, 1980 Park Ave.	do	
47	68	James Patterson, 2101 Madison Ave.	do	
47	68	Hawkins Plummer, 1980 Park Ave.	do	
47	68	Caleb Ricks, 1960 Park Ave.	Republican	

## BY OLIVIA WILLIAMS

7	69	Rosalee Bethea, 850 Columbus Ave.	Void	
8	69	Alejo Abad, 825 Columbus Ave.	do	
8	69	Andres Cancel, 845 Columbus Ave.	Republican	
8	69	Paul Jones, 845 Columbus Ave.	do	
8	66	Addie Jones, 845 Columbus Ave.	do	
8	69	Eliezer Megron, 845 Columbus Ave.	do	

## BY GRAHAM

9	69	Edwin Clifton, 418 Central Park West.	Liberal	
9	69	Delores Resto, 10 Manhattan Ave.	Republican	
9	69	Rachel Vixman, 415 Central Park West.	Liberal	
10	69	Eva Stratton, 50 Manhattan Ave.	Republican	
10	69	Alfonso Vidal, 10 West 104 St.	Liberal	
10	69	Catherine Williams, 14 West 103d St.	Void	

## BY WILLIAM S. EPPS

11	69	Louis Galenson, 444 Central Park West.	No party	
11	69	Libby Galenson, 444 Central Park West.	Liberal	
11	69	Hattie Garner, 142 Manh Ave.	No party	
11	69	Frank Lum, 40 West 106 St.	Republican	
11	69	Jacinto Lopez, 15 West 106 St.	do	
11	69	Eula Walker, 465 Central Park West.	No party	

## BY ELAINE PARKER

12	69	Mary Lopez E., 67 West 104 St.	Liberal	
12	69	Juan Pedrosa, 69 West 109 St.	Blank	
12	69	Richard Payne, 50 West 106 St.	Liberal	
12	69	Steve M. Tipton, 56 West 105 St.	Blank	
12	69	Burney Whitaker, 50 West 106 St.	Republican	
12	69	Ronald N. Prudden, 77 West 104 St.	Blank	

## BY J. NELSON

13	69	Louise J. Cooper, 870 Columbus Ave.	Republican	
13	69	John Mikulskis, 60 West 104 St.	do	

## BY EULA HODGE

13	69	Julita Rosado, 60 West 104 St.		
13	69	Fred Wilson, 875 Col. Ave.	Republican	
13	69	Agnes Wilson, 875 Col. Ave.	do	
13	69	Evelyn Bieber, 875 Col. Ave.	Liberal	
13	69	Elizabeth Smith, 875 Col. Ave.	do	

BY E. McCALL

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
14	69	Catherine Brennan, 135 West 104 St.	Liberal	
14	69	Helen K. Baum, 865 Amsterdam Ave.	Republican	
14	69	Consuela Forusia, 140 West 104 St.	Blank	
14	69	Joseph Hernandez, 140 West 104 St.	Missing	
14	69	Fannie D. Harris, 865 Amsterdam Ave.	Blank	
14	69	Margaret Quarles, 140 West 104 St.	Republican	
14	69	Angel Rios, 140 West 104 St.	Missing	
14	69	Juan Rodriguez, 101 West 104 St.	Republican	

BY MARY WARWICK

26	69	Florence Perry, 64 West 108 St.	Republican	
26	69	Albert Sicilia, 70 West 108 St.	do	
26	69	Ophelia Sylvester, 475 Central Park West	do	
26	69	Eunice Agee, 480 Central Park West	do	
26	69	Jacob Brydie, 4 West 108 St.	do	
26	69	Angelica Celebia, 196 Manhattan Ave.	do	
26	69	Lillie Dennon, 64 West 108 St.	do	
26	69	Ralph Greenhut, 157 Manhattan Ave.	do	
26	69	John Kennedy, 70 West 108 St.	do	

BY J. NELSON

29	69	Ana Esmurrias, 69 West 108 St.	Republican	
29	69	Fior Garcia, 62 West 109 St.	Blank	
29	69	Ires Maldonado, 58 West 109 St.	do	
29	69	Gloria Rivera, 104 West 109 St.	Republican	
29	69	James Reid, 122 West 109 St.	Liberal	
29	69	Janny Zambrana, 73 West 108 St.	Republican	

BY E. McCALL

44	69	Maurice Butler, 44 Morningside		No date.
46	69	Lawrence S Vivion, 400 West 119 St.	Void	
47	69	Thomas S. Seligson, 414 West 121 St.	Republican	
47	69	Florian Stubes, 415 West 120 St.		Incorrect date.

BY E. PARKER

1	70	Consuelo Alvarez, 1511 Lexington Ave.	Republican	
1	70	Kavork Atamain, 167 East 99 St.	do	
1	70	Harvey Ballou, 1539 Lexington Ave.	do	
1	70	Seymour Hinkson, 154 East 100 St.	do	
1	70	Marine Limason, 110 East 99 St.	do	
1	70	Vincent Marrero, 1539 Lexington Ave.	Liberal	
1	70	Andres Marino, 1515 Lexington Ave.	Republican	
1	70	Felix Ortiz Ceballo, 1509 Lexington Ave.	do	
1	70	Aaron Prileau, 183 East 98 St.	do	
1	70	Reggie Utley, 1539 Lexington Ave.	do	
1	70	Velma Williams, 1155 Lexington Ave.	do	

BY J. NELSON

2	70	Rose Mary Griffiths		
---	----	---------------------	--	--

BY W. S. EPPS

6	70	Carrie Tully, 60 East 102 St.	Republican	
6	70	Dorothy Fraser, 1465 Amsterdam Ave.	do	
6	70	Louise Gayles, 1351 Madison Ave.	do	
6	70	Lillian Jones, 1465 Madison Ave.	No party	
6	70	Lionel Morris, 1355 Park Ave.	Liberal	
6	70	Victor Otero, 50 East 102 St.	Republican	
6	70	Yvonne Poussaint, 112 East 101 St.	do	
6	70	Evelyn Wilkes, 50 East 102 St.	do	

BY P. SWANGIN

5	70	Joseph Bellini, 57 East 98 St.	Republican	
5	70	Felicia Baez, 65 East 99 St.	do	
5	70	Edna M. Partalatin, 65 East 99 St.	Missing	
5	70	James C. Smith, 65 East 99 St.	Republican	

BY R. TUGGLE

7	70	Angel Venero, 1569 Lexington Ave.		Incorrect date.
7	70	Cristina Ayala, 173 East 101 St.	Republican	
7	70	Carlos Hernandez, 1511 Lexington Ave.		Do.
7	70	Carmen Livigne, 1575 Lexington Ave.		Do.
7	70	Rosario Sanchez, 193 East 100 St.		Signature diff.
7	70	Zoraida Saavedra, 122 East 102 St.	Conservative	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
8	70	Juanita Arroyo, 60 East 106 St.	Republican	
8	70	Jessie Cameron, 50 East 106 St.	do	
8	70	Houston Cameron, 50 East 106 St.	do	
8	70	Stephen Gilliard, 60 East 104 St.	do	
8	70	Louis Gonzales, 60 East 104 St.	do	
8	70	Ishmael Hernandez, 60 East 104 St.	No party	
8	70	Frederick Griffith, 55 East 102 St.	Liberal	
8	70	Harry Padillo, 60 East 106 St.	Republican	
8	70	Emma Royal, 55 East 102 St.	do	
8	70	Yolanda Silver, 55 East 102 St.	Liberal	

BY E. HARRIS

9	70	Ramonia Cirilo, 107 East 102 St.	Republican	
9	70	Elviro Diaz, 1405 Park Ave.	do	
9	70	Florie Davis, 170 East 106 St.	No party	
9	70	Henry Dandy, 1626 Lexington Ave.	Void	
9	70	Ramon Espino, 122 East 104 St.	Republican	
9	70	Joaquin Ramos, 1405 Park Ave.	do	
9	70	Juan Fontanes, 126 East 103 St.	do	
9	70	Federico Leon, 124 East 103 St.	Void	
9	70	Senen Luciano, 124 East 107 St.	No party	
9	70	George Maldonado, 126 East 103 St.	do	
9	70	Hector Morales, 1405 Park Ave.	Republican	
9	70	Francisco Ortiz, 105 East 102 St.	do	
9	70	Antonia Rivera, 126 East 103 St.	do	
9	70	Luz Serrano, 126 East 103 St.	No party	
9	70	Jorge Serrano, 124 East 103 St.	Republican	
9	70	Manuel Segerra, 108 East 104 St.	No party	
9	70	Raymond Vargo, 130 East 104 St.	Liberal	
9	70	Petro Soto, 1405 Park Ave.	No party	
9	70	Felipe Torregrosa, 108 East 103 St.	Republican	

BY CHESTER BAGLEY

9	70	Catherine Avery, 2256 7th Ave.	Republican	
9	70	Maude Bell, 281 West 132 St.	do	
9	70	Reginald Bean, 218 West 133 St.	do	
9	70	Beatrice Garraway, 237 West 132 St.	do	
9	70	Daisy Graves, 2246 7th Ave.	do	
9	70	Frank Green, 255 West 132 St.	do	
9	70	George Jones, 455 Lenox Ave.	do	

BY LILLIE BELLE BROWN

10	70	Maria Martinez, 176 East 103 St.	Republican	
10	70	Anacleto Mendina, 168 East 104 St.	Liberal	
10	70	Gloria Ortiz, 159 East 103 St.	Republican	
10	70	Juan Orta, 1641 Lexington Ave.	Missing	
10	70	Petra Pena, 1677 Lexington Ave.	Republican	Dec. 1, 1965.
10	70	Jose M. Quinones, 156 East 103 St.	Liberal	
10	70	Eitter Rodriguez, 163 East 104 St.	Republican	
10	70	Miguel A. Rivera, 1679 Lexington Ave.	Missing	
10	70	Michael Rivera, 166 East 105 St.	Republican	
10	70	Eddie Sanchez, 155 East 103 St.	Liberal	
10	70	Maria Castro, 1677 Lexington Ave.	Republican	
10	70	Grabiell A. Canales, 164 East 104 St.	Liberal	
10	70	Carmen D. Canales, 164 East 104 St.	do	
10	70	Carmen Calderon, 170 East 105 St.	Missing	
10	70	Juan B. Gardel, 163 East 104 St.	Republican	
10	70	Consuelo Garcia, 160 East 103 St.	do	
10	70	Juana Kosmoglow, 175 East 105 St.	No party last date Dec. 12, 1966.	
10	70	Bianca L. Laguez, 157 East 104 St.	Republican	
10	70	Alejandro Laguer, 157 East 104 St.	do	
10	70	Floisa Lugo, 163 East 104 St.	do	

BY GRAHAM

11	70	Raimundo Ortis, 1703 Lexington Ave.	Liberal	
11	70	Hector Castonia, 170 East 107 St.	do	
11	70	Eugenia Gomez, 159 East 106 St.	Republican	
11	70	Angela Martinez, 124 East 108 St.	do	
11	70	Jeffrey Richman, 153 East 107 St.	Liberal	
11	70	Asuncion Ortiz, 157 East 106 St.	No party	

BY W. E. EPPS

12	70	Gabriel Amaro, 70 East 108 St.	No party	
12	70	Alice D. Acevero, 70 East 108 St.	do	
12	70	Henry Boyd, 1595 Madison Ave.	do	
12	70	Annie Bailey, 70 East 108 St.	Republican	
12	70	Linda A. Corcelles, 21 East 104 St.		Check for party.
12	70	Janie L. Cooper, 70 East 108 St.	Republican	
12	70	Ana Delia DeJesus, 1595 Madison Ave.	No party	
12	70	Edwin Martinez, 1548 Madison Ave.	Liberal	
12	70	Maria Machin, 21 East 104 St.		No signature.
12	70	Ramon Padilla, 70 East 108 St.		Check party.
12	70	Euliojo Medina, 25 East 104 St.		No signature.
12	70	Roberto Rivera, 1595 Madison Ave.	No party	
12	70	Cleofe Vazquez, 70-72 East 108 St.	Blank	
12	70	Alexander Whitaker, 70-72 East 108 St.	No party	
12	70	Olivia Walker, 1595 Madison Ave.	do	
12	70	Carrie Walker, 1595 Madison Ave.	do	

BY E. M. CALL

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
13	70	Pedro Oquendo, 10-12 East 108 St.		No date.
13	70	Ana Maria Rios, 1-3 East 107 St.		Do.
13	70	Richard J. Radna, 1270 5th Ave.		Do.
13	70	Peter Rivera, 6 East 108 St.	Liberal	
13	70	Vidal Santos, 17-19 East 107 St.	Republican	
13	70	Paulette C. Suber, 1274 5th Ave.	Liberal	
13	70	Martha D. Trowbridge, 1270 5th Ave.		No date.
13	70	Augustus Trowbridge, 1270 5th Ave.		Do.
13	70	Leo A. Trowbridge, 1270 5th Ave.		Do.
13	70	Winifred D. Barnes, 1270 5th Ave.		Blank enrollment.
13	70	Deliah J. Boyden, 1270 5th Ave.	Republican	
13	70	Rodell A. Cole, 1274 5th Ave.	Liberal	
13	70	Miguel Gonzales, 1600 Madison Ave.		No date.
13	70	Joanna Hinton, 1270 5th Ave.		Blank enrollment
13	70	Helen E. Harden, 1270 5th Ave.		Incorrect date.
13	70	Louis Leanusa, 19 East 108 St.		No date.
13	70	Ellen E. Murphy, 1274 5th Ave.		Blank enrollment.
13	70	Alfred A. Munoz, 13 East 107 St.		Do.
13	70	Jonge Negron, 22 East 108 St.	Republican	
13	70	Hilda Ortiz, 6-8 East 108 St.		No date.

BY D. JOHNSON

14	70	Candita Correa, 3-5 East 109 St.	Blank	
14	70	Asuncion Castoine, 1644 Madison Ave.	Republican	
14	70	Mary Dorman, 1622 Madison Ave.	Void	
14	70	Hector Quinones	Republican	
14	70	Hector Rivera, 1641 Madison Ave.	do	
14	70	Migdalia Velazquez, 1626 Madison Ave.	do	
14	70	America Ramo, 80 East 110 St.		
14	70	Odell White, 80-82 East 110 St.	Void	

BY R. TUGGLE

17	70	Murphy Montford, 1830 Lexington Ave.	Republican	
17	70	Gelacio Negrono, 158 East 112 St.	do	
17	70	Jennie Partz, 69 East 111 St.	Void	
17	70	Pablo Paris Cortijo, 1695 Madison Ave.	Republican	
17	70	Petra Perez, 1791 Lexington Ave.	Void	
17	70	Carmen Sierra, 1810 Lexington Ave.	Liberal	
17	70	Julia Torrado, 1683 Madison Ave.	do	
17	70	Maria Vargas, 132 East 112 St.	Republican	
17	70	Geraldine Wanzer, 172 East 112 St.	Liberal	
17	70	Basilio Alicea, 1681 Madison Ave.	Void	
17	70	Vicente Carvaial, 1830 Lexington Ave.		Incorrect date.
17	70	Carmen Carrillo, 1546 Park Ave.	Missing	
17	70	Julia Cruz, 69 East 111 St.	Republican	
17	70	Jesus Delgado, 158 East 112 St.	Void	
17	70	Felipe Gonzalez, 158 East 112 St.	do	
17	70	Gilberto Laboy, 123 East 112 St.	do	

BY O. WILLIAMS

15	70	Luisa Diaz, 1760 Lexington Ave.	Missing	
15	70	David Melendez, 1738 Lexington Ave.	Republican	
15	70	Eusebio Ruiz, 1738 Lexington Ave.	Liberal	
15	70	Antonio Torres, 1738 Lexington Ave.	Blank	
16	70	Ana Serrano, 180 East 111 St.	No party	
16	70	Conchita Caraballo, 179 East 110 St.	Missing	
16	70	Alyandro Dondrade, 122 East 111 St.	Republican	
16	70	Victor Feliciano, 107 East 110 St.	Blank	
16	70	Blanca Hernandez, 135 East 110 St.	Missing	
16	70	George L. Sierra, 233 East 111 St.	Republican	
16	70	Paul Torres, 154 East 111 St.	do	
16	70	Hazel Brown, 20 West 115 St.	do	
16	70	Nelsie P. Brown, 70 West 115 St.	Liberal	
16	70	Ricky Coleman, 70 Lenox Ave.	do	
16	70	Reuben Eady, 40 West 115 St.	do	
16	70	Victor Hemphill, 70 Lenox Ave.	do	
16	70	James C. Isaac, 70 Lenox Ave.	Void	

BY J. NELSON

18	70	Allan Sealy, 103 West 115 St.	Missing	
18	70	Harold Spooner, 1840 Lexington Ave.	do	
18	70	Lucille Spooner, 1840 Lexington Ave.	do	
18	70	Edith Stancil, 1840 Lexington Ave.	Republican	
18	70	Juan Rosario, 1840 Lexington Ave.	do	
18	70	Francisco Rajas, 1591 Park Ave.	Missing	
18	70	Felicita Reyes, 1840 Lexington Ave.	do	
18	70	Constance Rivera, 1840 Lexington Ave.	Blank	
18	70	Eduar Otero, 1591 Park Ave.	Liberal	
18	70	Paquita Ortiz, 130 East 115 St.	Missing	
18	70	Mercado Perdo, 1611 Park Ave.	Republican	
18	70	Oliva Harris, 1591 Park Ave.	Void	
18	70	Victor Allende, 1840 Lexington Ave.	Blank	

BY ELAINE PARKER

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
19	70	Juan B. Alicia, 152 East 116 St.	No party	
19	70	Carmen Fuentes, 171 East 115 St.	Liberal	
19	70	Jimmie Jeffrey, 2060 3d Ave.	Blank	
19	70	James Gilbert, 2070 3d Ave.	Republican	
19	70	Alvin Jackson, 2070 3d Ave.	Liberal	
19	70	Cruz Lizard, 2060 3d Ave.	Republican	
19	70	Rosa Mendoza, 2070 3d Ave.	do	
19	70	Isabel Mendez, 165 East 112 St.	Liberal	
19	70	Angelo Melendez, 155 East 115 St.	do	
19	70	Juan Padiilo, 165 East 112 St.	Republican	
19	70	Jose Pacheca, 1829 Lexington Ave.	do	
19	70	Aurara Pacheco, 1829 Lexington Ave.	do	
19	70	Carmen Rexach, 175 East 112 St.	Blank	
19	70	Luis Ramos, 165 East 112 St.	Liberal	
19	70	Bienvenida Ramos, 1829 Lexington Ave.	do	
19	70	Carmen Sanzana, 171 East 115 St.	Blank	
19	70	James Scott, 171 East 115 St.	Void	No signature.
19	70	Mary Torres, 2060 3d Ave.	Republican	
19	70	Gloria Wilson, 2070 3d Ave.	Liberal	

BY LILLIAN UPSHUR

20	70	Veronica Sands, 123 East 116 St.	Republican	Voted but scratched out.
20	70	Gladys Semedel, 115 East 116 St.	do	
20	70	Crus Santes, 110 East 116 St.	Missing	(In pencil and date but voted.)
20	70	Elena Rosa, 108 East 116 St.	do	(Scratched out, replaced by Democratic enrollment.)
20	70	Miguel Rodriguez, 153 East 116 St.	do	But voted.
20	70	Jaunita Rodriguez, 135 East 115 St.	Void	Do.
20	70	Jaun Rodriguez, 106 East 116 St.	do	No enrollment number—buff.
20	70	America Perez, 125 East 117 St.	Missing	In pencil and enrollment date.
20	70	Barbara Rodriguez, 101 East 116 St.	do	No enrollment number.
20	70	Israel Ramiry, 156 East 117 St.	do	No enrollment number on buff.
20	70	Luz Arenas, 115 East 116 St.	do	No enrollment number.
20	70	Angelina Amed, 165 East 116 St.	do	No enrollment number or date on bottom of buff card.
20	70	Juan Burgos, 105 East 116 St.	Republican	
20	70	Juan Bermdez, 182 East 117 St.	do	No enrollment number on buff bottom.
20	70	Cuntres Guillerio, 110 East 116 St.	do	No enrollment number on buff.
20	70	Felicita Flores, 2134 3d Ave.	do	No enrollment number.
20	70	Manuel Feliciano, 187 East 116 St.	do	No enrollment number on buff.
20	70	Jacob Grodnik, 101 East 116 St.	Void	
20	70	Adelina Jacobs, 156 East 117 St.	Missing	Written in pencil and initialed in pencil.

BY ORA MOBLEY

21	70	Marcano Hermogenes, 1665 Park Ave.	Republican	
21	70	Ortiz, Pagan Rafael, 105 East 117 St.	No party	
21	70	Rivera, Rafael, 1928 Lexington Ave.	do	
21	70	Soto, Anibal, 1689 Park Ave.	Republican	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

22	70	Patricial Davis, 57 East 118 St.	Republican	
22	70	Curley Floyd, 1668 Park Ave.	Liberal	
22	70	Maria Petersen, 59 East 117 St.	Republican	

BY ESTELLA HARRIS

23	70	Rossie Earhart, 18 East 117 St.	Republican	
23	70	Isidora Gonzales, 18 East 117 St.	do	
23	70	Orien Johnson, 10 East 116 St.	do	
23	70	Noel R. Mangome, 91 East 116 St.	do	Incorrect date.
23	70	James A. Pore, 3 East 116 St.	Republican	
23	70	Beatrice White, 24 East 116 St.	Liberal	
23	70	Nellie Pearson, 1403 5th Ave.	do	
23	70	Bertha Richardson, 1774 Madison Ave.	do	
23	70	Phyllis C. St. John, 3 East 116 St.	do	
23	70	Arline Thomas, 1780 Madison Ave.	Republican	
23	70	Alfredo Verdejo, 1648 Park Ave.	do	
23	70	Barbara White, 1771 Madison Ave.	Liberal	

BY LILLIE B. BROWN

24	70	Daniel Corbett, 70 East 115 St.	Liberal	
24	70	Vincent Evans, 70 East 115 St.	Republican	
24	70	Doris Ford, 65 East 112 St.	Liberal	
24	70	Wilson Mendez, 65 East 112 St.	Republican	
24	70	Ruth McCrea, 65 East 112 St.	Void	
24	70	Irene Reid, 1735 Madison Ave.	Republican	
24	70	Pedro M. Rivera, 65 East 112 St.	Missing	
24	70	Juan Santiago, 1735 Madison Ave.	No party	Party stamped on book June 30, 1970.
24	70	Estella Smith, 70 East 115 St.	Void	Oct. 8, 1963.
24	70	Charles Smith, 65 East 121 St.	Liberal	
24	70	Juan Texidor, 70 East 115 St.	Republican	
24	70	Oscar Watson, 65 East 112 St.	do	

BY GRAHAM

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
25	70	Avelina Barbosa, 1345-5th Ave.	Liberal	
25	70	Wilhelmina Bailey, 1694 Madison Ave.	do	
25	70	Wilbert Brown, 1694 Madison Ave.	Republican	
25	70	Antonia Dalman, 1694 Madison Ave.	do	
25	70	Rosa Frazier, 1365-5th Ave.	do	
25	70	Rosa Gonzalez, 1385-5th Ave.	Missing	
25	70	Alfred Helwig, 1365-5th Ave.	do	
25	70	Lillie Bailey, 1385-5th Ave.	Democrat	
25	70	Joaquin Betancourt, 1345-5th Ave.	do	No machine, no signature. No machine No voted Lydia Betancourt serial No. 1274851.
25	70	Kenneth Miller, 1385-5th Ave.	Void	
25	70	Joaquin Negron, 1734 Madison Ave.	Republican	
25	70	Edwardo Ortiz, 1694 Madison Ave.	Liberal	
25	70	Rosa Riveea, 1345-5th Ave.	do	
25	70	Juana Rivera, 1694 Madison Ave.	Republican	
25	70	Robert West, 1365-5th Ave.	Liberal	

BY SELIKA S. DeLAIGLE

26	70	Charles Bass, 27 East 110 St.	Republican	
26	70	Cabrera Donato, 22 East 112 St.	do	
26	70	Harold D. King, 1331-5 Ave.	do	
26	70	Carmen Lopez, 20 East 112 St.	No Party	
26	70	Robert Nugent, 35 East 110 St.	Republican	
26	70	Carmen A. Rodriguez, 35 East 110 St.	do	
26	70	Arcadia Romero, 2 East 111 St.	No Party	
26	70	Raymond Trigo, 1682 Madison Ave.	Liberal	
26	70	Ramon Velez, 63 East 112 St.	do	

BY J. NELSON

27	70	John Williams, 55 West 110 St.	Republican	
27	70	Pearl V. Watkins, 19 West 110 St.	do	
27	70	Lillian Vanderbilt, 45 West 110 St.	do	
27	70	Lola Vaughn, 55 West 110 St.	Missing	
27	70	Harry T. Tyner, 55 West 111 St.	Liberal	
27	70	Ocie Steinberger, 35 West 110 St.	do	
27	70	Claudette J. Sally, 32-36 111 St.	Republican	
27	70	Raymond Sally, 32-36 111 St.	do	
27	70	Mary Queen, 35 West 110 St.	Void	
27	70	Cecelia Pagan, 32-36 111 St.	Liberal	
27	70	James Landeau, 45 West 110 St.	Republican	
27	70	Beatrice Kelly, 35 West 110 St.	do	
27	70	Frank Jones, 32 West 111 St.	Liberal	
27	70	Guadalupe Demartinez, 2 West 111 St.	Republican	
27	70	John Bryant, 52 West 111 St.	Liberal	
27	70	Susie Boyd, 46 West 111 St.	do	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

28	70	Calvin Dickens, 2 West 111 St.	No party	
28	70	Julia Daniels, 50 West 112 St.	Liberal	
28	70	Olive Gonzonie, 55 West 113 St.	Republican	
28	70	James Godfred, 57 West 111 St.	No party	
28	70	Alden Gibson, 1332 5 Ave.	Republican	
28	70	Dora Miller, 24 Lenox Ave.	No party	
28	70	Alfred Page, 57 West 111 St.	Republican	
28	70	Joella Thomas, 3 West 111 St.	do	

BY ORA W. MOBLEY

29	70	Zenobia Alezuin, 21 West 112 St.	Republican	
29	70	Roosevelt Adams, 71 West 112 St.	Void	
29	70	Isabel Burgis, 41 West 112 St.	Republican	
29	70	Jacqueline, Durham, 1370 5 Ave.	do	
29	70	Rudy Edwards, 21 West 112 St.	do	
29	70	Carrie Gaylord, 1370 5 Ave.	Void	
29	70	John Gibbs, 1370 5 Ave.	do	
29	70	Thomas Harvey, 71 West 112 St.	Republican	
29	70	Elizabeth Meyers, 1370 5 Ave.	Void	
29	70	Viola Norris, 21 W 112 St.	Republican	
29	70	Joan Russell, 1370 5 Ave.	Liberal	
29	70	Eddie Valentin, 41 West 112 St.	Republican	

BY PEARL SWANGIN

30	70	Rosalie Jenkins, 20 West 115 St.	Blank	
30	70	O. Bed Jones, 40 West 115 St.	Republican	
30	70	Lewis Liverpool, 20 West 115 St.	do	
30	70	Carmen Negron, 40 West 115 St.	do	
30	70	Evarista Padilla, 70 West 115 St.	Blank	
30	70	Jessie M. Peppers, 1390 5 Ave.	do	
30	70	Virginia Rich, 70 Lenox Ave.	Missing	
30	70	Julia Swarez, 70 Lenox Ave.	do	
30	70	Mabel Thompson, 70 West 115 St.	Republican	

BY ANN ENGLISH

31	70	Daniel Abrahamson, 28 West 116 St.	Republican	
31	70	Robert Sutton, 1410 5 Ave.	do	
31	70	Frances Caldwell, 42 West 116 St.	Missing	
31	70	Osborne Edwards, 10 West 116 St.	do	
31	70	Mildred Harville, 42 West 116 St.	do	
31	70	Thelma McNeill, 34 West 116 St.	do	
31	70	Gertrude Liberty, 61 West 115 St.	Liberal	

BY O. WILLIAMS

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
32	70	Alexander Gumbo, 3 West 116 St.	Republican	
32	70	Mary McCutchen, 58 West 117 St.	Liberal	
32	70	Harold Owens, 36 West 117 St.	Republican	
32	70	Cindy Rivers, 71 West 116 St.	Liberal	
32	70	Mabel Ramsey, 2 West 117 St.	Republican	
32	70	Simon Simmons, 73 West 116 St.	do	
32	70	Jeannie Simmons, 18-20 West 117 St.	Missing	
32	70	Curtis Simmons, 18-20 West 117 St.	No party	
32	70	Minnie B. Smith, 1420 5th Ave.	do	
32	70	Herman E. Smiley, 7 West 116 St.	Republican	
32	70	Evelyn Watson, 71 West 116 St.	do	

BY E. HARRIS

33	70	Elias Alston, 120 West 117 St.	Republican	
33	70	Eula Dalton, 140 West 117 St.	No party	
33	70	Seaphus Grant, 146 West 117 St.	Liberal	
33	70	Jerome Moore, 144 West 117 St.	Republican	
33	70	Samuel T. Patterson, 100 West 117 St.	do	
33	70	Cornelius Sherrrod, 1925 7th Ave.	do	

BY R. TUGGLE

34	70	Clayton L. Bailey, 278 West 117 St.	Republican	
34	70	Leona Barzey, 1902 7th Ave.	Liberal	
34	70	Veterlean Bower, 131 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	
34	70	Abraham Brown, 216 West 116 St.	No party	
34	70	Geovcia M. Brown, 215 West 116 St.	Liberal	
34	70	Lilymae Edgecombe, 235 West 116 St.	Void	
34	70	Leonard F. Edmonds, 222 West 116 St.	Republican	
34	70	Beatrice Gilchrist, 215 West 116 St.	Liberal	
34	70	Lealor Medlin, 235 West 116 St.	Void	
34	70	Gladys Miranda, 230 West 116 St.	Liberal	
34	70	Abraham Nelson, 222 West 116 St.	No party	
34	70	Mamie Rivers, 235 West 116 St.	Void	
34	70	Ernesta Young, 245 West 116 St.	Republican	
34	70	Herbert Young, 245 West 116 St.	do	
35	70	Willie Call, 1919 7th Ave.	do	
35	70	Alan Coleman, 136 West 116 St.	do	
35	70	Howard Ellis, 143 West 116 St.	do	
35	70	Isabel Halsey, 100 St. Nicholas Ave.	No party	
35	70	Joseph Houston, 136 West 116 St.	Republican	
35	70	Dorothy Merridy, 125 West 115 St.	do	
35	70	Elaine McCarrol, 135 West 115 St.	do	
35	70	Mae McKinney, 138 West 116 St.	do	
35	70	William North, 129 West 116 St.	No party	Missing.
35	70	Eric Robertson, 143 West 116 St.	Republican	
35	70	Lena Yancey, 123 West 115 St.	No party	

BY EULA HODGE

36	70	Irvin M. Allison, 122 West 114 St.	Liberal	
36	70	Estelle Clark, 122 West 115 St.	do	
36	70	Wilmer Cooper, 110 West 114 St.	Republican	
36	70	Thomas W. Edwards, 89 Lenox Ave.	do	
36	70	Fleta Wilkes, 112 West 114 St.	do	
36	70	Lemuel Challenger, 265 West 113 St.	do	
36	70	Paige Edwards, 216 West 114 St.	No party	
36	70	Elsie Hawkins, 226 West 114 St.	Republican	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

36	70	Archibald Donabelle, 128 West 115 St.	No party	
36	70	Katherine Lee, 106 West 114 St.	do	

BY W. S. EPPS

37	70	Marcel Armand, 1890 7 Ave.	No party	
37	70	Frances Durham, 1886 7 Ave.	do	Voted twice—1st Joseph Draper 2d Frances.
37	70	John T. Ellison, 273 West 114 St.	Republican	
37	70	Kendall Feurtado, 257 West 114 St.	No party	
37	70	John W. Gibson, 231 West 115 St.	Republican	
37	70	William Harris, 2116 8 Ave.	Liberal	
37	70	Carnies Hawthorne, 241 West 115 St.	No party	
37	70	Robert Johnson, 1890 7 Ave.	do	
37	70	Leroy Jones, 1886 7 Ave.	Republican	
37	70	Mabel Lane, 269 West 114 St.	Liberal	
37	70	Katherine Pinkney, 207 West 115 St.	Republican	
37	70	Martha Smith, 257 West 114 St.	No party	
37	70	Samuel S. Winston, 225 West 115 St.	Republican	
37	70	Catherine Taylor, 272 West 115 St.	do	

BY E. PARKER

38	70	Carolyn Allen, 1855 7 Ave.	Republican	
38	70	Florie Bean, 1871 7 Ave.	do	
38	70	Gladstone Hinds, 113 West 113 St.	do	
38	70	Maybelle Middlebrooks, 133 West 113 St.	Liberal	
38	70	Estella Poole, 1855 7 Ave.	Republican	
38	70	Dorothy Shaw, 1855 7th Ave.	do	
38	70	Corrine Wilson, 101 West 113th St.	do	
38	70	John W. Shaw, 1855 7th Ave.	Conservative	
38	70	Charles Stewart, 1867 7th Ave.	Republican	
38	70	Pauline Stubbs, 67 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	
38	70	Charles Woods, 1845 7th Ave.	Liberal	

BY E. HODGE

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
39	70	June Lundy, 35 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	
39	70	George Harvey, 8 St. Nicholas Ave.	Missing	

BY D. JOHNSON

39	70	Foster Babo 51 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	
39	70	Keither Bailey, 1925 St. Nicholas Ave.	Liberal	
39	70	Many Cherry, 15 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	
39	70	Allen Hillman, 56 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	

BY ANN ENGLISH

40	70	Bluies Robinson, 137 West 110 St.	Republican	
40	70	Ida L. Smith, 109 West 111 St.	Missing	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

41	70	Augustus Vanterpool, 234 West 111 St.	No party	
41	70	Mabel D. Flores, 200 West 111 St.	Liberal	

BY ORA MOBLEY

43	70	Inetta Barnwell, 2055 8th Ave.	Republican	
43	70	George Denmark, 254 Manhattan Ave.	do	
43	70	John Morton, 316 West 111 St.	do	
43	70	Rudolf Schack, 272 Manhattan Ave.	Blank	
43	70	Ivan Sloan, 250 Manhattan Ave.	Liberal	

BY E. HARRIS

43	70	Thelma L. Pleasant, 255 West 111 St.	Republican	
43	70	Margaret Richardson, 1842 7th Ave.	Democrat	No signature.
43	70	James Royster, 247 West 111 St.	Liberal	
43	70	Georgia Samuels, 200 West 112 St.	Republican	
43	70	Wilbert Smith, 257 West 111 St.	do	
43	70	Mabel Smith, 241 West 111 St.	Democrat	Incorrect date.
43	70	Kathleen Smith, 255 West 111 St.	do	No signature.
43	70	Delorese Stanton, 241 West 111 St.	Republican	Do.
43	70	Ruby Walker, 237 West 111 St.	do	

BY LILLIE B. BROWN

44	70	Harry Allen, 223 West 112 St.	Republican	
44	70	Lovey A. Burton, 282 W. 113 St.	Liberal	
44	70	Irma Booth, 200 West 113 St.	Republican	
44	70	Mabel Hobbs, 205 West 112 St.	do	
44	70	Dennis R. Jones, 200 West 113 St.	do	
44	70	Edward Johnson, 280 West 113 St.	Blank	
44	70	Irma Keyes, 205 West 112 St.	do	
44	70	Ida Lee Reid, 200 West 112 St.	Republican	
44	70	Norris Turner, 227 West 112 St.	do	

BY EULA HODGE

45	70	Gilbert Paschall, 232 West 114 St.	No party	
45	70	Evelyn Sullivan, 1878-7 Ave.	Republican	
45	70	Clinton Sullivan, 1878-7 Ave.	do	
45	70	Ruby Turner, 246 West 114 St.	do	

BY R. TUGGLE

46	70	Sanford Fox, 312 West 114 St.	Void	Blank.
46	70	William Phillips, 310 West 113 St.	Liberal	
46	70	Robert Walker, 300 West 114 St.	do	
46	70	Mary E. Watts, 312 Manhattan Ave.	Republican	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

47	70	Wilhelminia Brown, 352 West 115 St.	No Party	
47	70	Melvin Dunn, 347 Manhahan Ave.	Liberal	
47	70	Loretta Francis, 310 West 116 St.	do	
47	70	Samuel Pulliams, 350 Manhahan Ave.	Republican	
47	70	Charles Sutton, 316 West 116 St.	Liberal	
47	70	Lindon Young, 302 West 116 St.	No party	

BY O. WILLIAMS

48	70	Algernon W. Smith, 397 Manhattan Ave.	Liberal	
48	70	Lavenia A. Sallmon, 22 Morningside Ave.	Republican	
48	70	Ella Vesha, 375 Manhattan Ave.	do	
48	70	Charles S. White, 16 Morningside Ave.	do	
48	70	Ronald Boutelle, 364 West 116 St.	Void	
48	70	Richard C. Deveaux, 14 Morningside Ave.	do	
48	70	Charles M. Friend, 352 West 117 St.	Republican	
48	70	James C. Mossley, 20 Morningside Ave.	do	
48	70	Gaston L. Owens, 359 West 116 St.	do	
48	70	Edward L. Rivers, 375 Manhattan Ave.	Liberal	
48	70	Annie L. Rivers, 375 Manhattan Ave.	Republican	

BY LILLIE B. BROWN

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
49	70	Carolina Bethea, 300 West 119 St.	Republican	
49	70	George Baxter, 400 Manhattan Ave.	do	
49	70	Frezell Bailey, 444 Manhattan Ave.	do	
49	70	Eugene L. Chinn, Sr., 304 West 118 St.	do	
49	70	Josephine Gurley, 348 Manhattan Ave.	Missing	
49	70	Benjamin Gurley, 348 Manhattan Ave.	do	

BY E. McCALL

49	70	Ernest L. Simmons, 315 West 116 St.	Republican	
49	70	Aldine Sellers, 303 West 117 St.	do	
49	70	John Summers, 400 Manhattan Ave.	Signature different	
49	70	Arthur Wand, 436 Manhattan Ave.	Void	
49	70	Clemente Wright, 408 Manhattan Ave.	Blank	
49	70	Clyde Woodruffe, 304 West 119 St.	Missing	
49	70	William Wilson, 408 Manhattan Ave.	Republican	
49	70	Ravannah C. Wilson, 408 Manhattan Ave.	do	

BY E. HARRIS

1	72	Lee B. Boyde, 34 East 119 St.	Conservative	Voted.
1	72	Lucille S. Bonilla, 11 1/2 East 117 St.	Republican	Do.
1	72	Ruth Brisby, 9 East 118 St.	do	Do.
1	72	James W. Brown, 60 East 123 St.	do	Do.
1	72	Elias Francis, 1469 5th Ave.	do	Do.
1	72	Anna Walcott, 1790 Madison Ave.	do	Do.
1	72	Samuel Innis, 5 East 118 St.	Liberal	Do.
1	72	Maggie Jackson, 60 East 118 St.	Republican	Do.
1	72	Joseph Luke, 2 East 119 St.	No party	Do.
1	72	Gene Morris, 1816 Madison Ave.	do	Do.
1	72	William Pitts, 1443 5th Ave.	Republican	Do.

BY ANNA ENGLISH

3	72	Clarence Hill, 1 East 128 St.	Republican	Voted.
3	72	Richard H. Watkins, 2 East 127 St.	do	Do.
3	72	Jenny Lee, 17 East 124 St.	Liberal	Do.
3	72	James P. Marshall, 2 East 128 St.	Void	Do.
3	72	Marun Randolph, 15 East 127 St.	Liberal	Do.

BY LILLIAN UPSHUR

4	72	Mark Riley, 2109 5th Ave.		No enrollment.
4	72	Mamie Reeves, 30 East 130 St.		Signature questionable.
4	72	Jeffie Smith, 5 East 131 St.	Republican	
4	72	Marion Walker, 10 East 132 St.		No enrollment.
4	72	Edward Wage, 11 East 129 St.	No party	Do.
4	72	Henry Wynn, 20 East 129 St.	Liberal	No enrollment, miss in pencil, voted.
4	72	Frances Bruhur, 2090 Madison Ave.	Missing	Voted.
4	72	Louise Harvey, 2 East 129 St.	Republican	No enrollment.
4	72	Samuel Kirby, 20 East 132 St.	do	Voted.
4	72	John Mills, 2090 Madison Ave.	Liberal	Do.
4	72	Sybil Matterson, 2109 5th Ave.	Republican	Do.

BY PEARL SWANGIN

5	72	Hedy Hamilton, 2140 Madison Ave.	Republican	Voted.
5	72	William Jackson, 2120 Madison Ave.	do	Do.
5	72	Eddie Johnson, 2120 Madison Ave.	do	Do.
5	72	Evelyn Major, 2177 5th Ave.	Party void	Do.
5	72	Omar Ahmed, 2177 5th Ave.	Party blank	Do.
5	72	Sabrina K. Ahmed, 2177 5th Ave.	do	Do.
5	72	Simon Brown, 2140 Madison Ave.	Party void	Do.
5	72	Livingston J. Bryant, 2110 Madison Ave.	No party	Transfer of enrollment.
5	72	Vilma R. Chase, 2144 Madison Ave.	Republican	Voted.
5	72	Felix Coleman, 2120 Madison Ave.	do	Do.
5	72	Robert L. Dukes, 2175 5th Ave.	Party blank	Do.
5	72	Vivian Easterling, 2140 Madison Ave.	Republican	Do.
5	72	Lowell Faison, 2199 5th Ave.	Republican	Voted.
5	72	Celia A. Garvin, 2120 Madison Ave.	Liberal	Do.
5	72	Anita F. Gibson, 2144 Madison Ave.	Republican	Do.
5	72	Ruth P. Gibson, 2201 5th Ave.	do	Do.
5	72	George Hamilton, 2140 Madison Ave.	do	Do.

BY TUGGLE & MOBLEY

6	72	Harriet Abel, 10 West 135 St.	No party	Voted.
6	72	Joan Belle, 10 West 135 St.	do	Do.
6	72	Georgia H. Capel, 10 West 135 St.	do	Do.
6	72	Ardmer Clark, 40 West 135 St.	Republican	Do.
6	72	Sarah Dozier, 40 West 135 St.	do	Do.
6	72	Beverly Manning, 40 West 135 St.	do	Do.
6	72	Marcus McCormack, 10 West 135 St.	do	Do.
6	72	Alice Miller, 10 West 135 St.	Missing	Do.
6	72	Lloyd McDuffie, 10 West 135 St.	do	Do.
6	72	Frederick Stephenson, 10 West 135 St.	do	Do.
6	72	Allan Stephenson, 10 West 135 St.	do	Do.
6	72	Jane Tandy, 10 West 135 St.	Party void	Do.
6	72	Mary Woodhouse, 10 West 135 St.	Republican	Do.
6	72	Louis Niblack, 10 West 135 St.	Missing	Do.

BY EULA HODGE

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
7	72	Pauline Carter, 25 West 132 St.	Missing	Voted.
7	72	Ivan Caesar, 28 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.
7	72	Josie Cooper, 2185 5th Ave.	Missing	Void marked in.
7	72	Mary Clay, 34 West 134 St.	Liberal	Voted.
7	72	Oakley Elliott, 25 West 132 St.	do	Do.
7	72	Luther Hilton, Jr., 2186 5th Ave.	Republican	Do.
7	72	Eloise Allen, 25 West 132 St.	Liberal	Do.
7	72	Algera L. Allen, 25 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.
7	72	Dennis Brooks, 2186 5th Ave.	do	Do.

BY REGGIE TUGGLE

7	72	Barbara King, 25 West 132 St.	Republican	Voted.
7	72	Herbert King, 25 West 132 St.	do	Do.
7	72	John Lane, 2186 5th Ave.	do	Do.
7	72	Benjamin Martin, 32 West 132 St.	Liberal	Do.
7	72	Henrieta Mase, 25 West 132 St.	Party blank	Do.
7	72	Ella Meade, 2186 5th Ave.	Liberal	Do.
7	72	John Meade, 2186 5th Ave.	do	Do.
7	72	Thomas Mitchell, 25 West 132 St.	Party blank	Do.
7	72	Mary E. Moragne, 25 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.
7	72	Alma R. Poole, 25 West 132 St.	do	Do.
7	72	Anna Robinson, 2186 5th Ave.	do	Do.
7	72	Monica Scarlett, 25 West 132 St.	Missing	Do.
7	72	Joseph Sellers, 2186 5th Ave.	Party void	Do.
7	72	Tena Smith, 25 West 132 St.	Liberal	Do.
7	72	Edna Spencer, 30 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.
7	72	Ellen Tsilimore, 25 West 132 St.	Party void	Voted.
7	72	Nazarine Tyree, 25 West 132 St.	do	Do.
7	72	Jean Watkins, 25 West 132 St.	Party blank	Do.
7	72	Rev. Arve West, 25 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.
7	72	Barbara Williams, 25 West 132 St.	do	Do.
8	72	Delores Allen, 45 West 132 St.	Liberal	Do.
8	72	James Brown, 45 West 132 St.	Missing	Do.
8	72	Booker G. Cole, 45 West 132 St.	Liberal	Do.
8	72	Frances H. Cole, 45 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.
8	72	Mary Cottrell, 470 Lenox	do	Do.

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

8	72	Melzie Hamrick, 45 West 132 St.	Liberal	Voted.
8	72	Syneatha Humphries, 630 Lenox	do	Do.
8	72	Audrey Johnson, 470 Lenox	Missing	Do.
8	72	Eddie Johnson, 45 West 132 St.	Liberal	Do.
8	72	Tyron Johnson, 45 West 132 St.	Missing	Do.
8	72	William Joseph, 470 Lenox	Republican	Do.
8	72	Pearlie Koto, 470 Lenox	Void	No party.
8	72	James Little, 45 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.
8	72	John Morgan, 470 Lenox	do	Do.
8	72	Virginia Moultrie, 470 Lenox	do	Do.
8	72	William Smith, 470 Lenox	do	Do.
8	72	James Spratley, 470 Lenox	Party blank	Do.
8	72	George Thomas, 45 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.
8	72	Helen Thomas, 45 West 132 St.	Void	Do.
8	72	Jessie Williams, 45 West 132 St.	Liberal	Do.
8	72	Ora Wright, 45 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.

BY D. JOHNSON

9	72	Viola Parker, 108 West 133 St.	Republican	No party.
9	72	Viola Reed, 117 West 132 St.	Party changed	Do.
9	72	Richard Sampson, 125 West 132 St.	Republican	Voted.
9	72	Olessa Simpson, 149 West 132 St.	Liberal	Do.
9	72	Alice Walker, 216 West 133 St.	Republican	Do.
9	72	Sadie Lemon, 2474 8th Ave.	Liberal	Do.
9	72	Mary Love, 2474 8th Ave.	Republican	Do.
9	72	Jane Moore, 2474 8th Ave.	Blank	Do.
9	72	Clement Norman, 253 West 132 St.	Republican	Do.
9	72	Mary Norman, 253 West 132 St.	do	Do.
9	72	Georgiana Palmer, 201 West 132 St.	do	Do.

BY LILLIE B. BROWN

10	72	Canzerlee Best, 440 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	Voted.
10	72	Sylvia Gibson, 440 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	Do.
10	72	Eunice Johnson, 450 St. Nicholas Ave.	Liberal	Do.
10	72	Donald W. Johnson, 2447 8th Ave.	Liberal	Voted.
10	72	Irene Jones, 438 St. Nich. Ave.	Republican	Do.
10	72	Emma B. Jones, 440 St. Nich. Ave.	do	Do.
10	72	Mazzie Quarbebaum, 2451 8th Ave.	Missing	Do.
10	72	Melvin E. Waiters, 422 St. Nich. Ave.	Republican	Do.

BY E. PARKER

11	72	Marsha Cozier, 124 West 132 St.	Blank	Voted.
11	72	Rosie Davis, 2228 7th Ave.	Republican	Do.
11	72	Dora Hobbs, 234 West 132 St.	do	Do.
11	72	Gloria Johnson, 2462 8th Ave.	Liberal	Do.
11	72	James Jones, 112 West 132 St.	do	Do.
11	72	Eugene Lewis, 230 West 131 St.	Republican	Do.

BY E. MCCALL

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
12	72	Catherine Boucarut, 55 West 131 St.	Missing	Voted.
12	72	Flossie M. Bush, 408 Lenox	Republican	Do.
12	72	Mattie Gadson, 69 West 131 St.	Void	Do.
12	72	Lillie Henderson, 69 West 131 St.	Blank	Do.
12	72	Dorothy Hall, 35 West 131 St.	Republican	Do.
12	72	Reuben Richards, 22 West 131 St.	Void	Do.
12	72	Jeannette J. White, 49 West 131 St.	Republican	Do.
12	72	Zuline Wooter, 36 West 131 St.	Liberal	Do.
12	72	Jonnie Wooter, 36 West 131 St.	do	Do.

BY LILLIE B. BROWN

14	72	Opreas Barclay, 3 West 129 St.	No party	Voted.
14	72	Irene Bailey, 2100 5th Ave.	Blank	Do.
14	72	James N. Green, 33 West 130 St.	Liberal	Do.
14	72	Nat Higgins, 52 West 130 St.	Blank	Do.
14	72	William Harris, 28 West 130 St.	Republican	Do.
14	72	George R. Murrain, 39 West 130 St.	Liberal	Do.
14	72	James A. Quick, 29 West 130 St.	do	Do.

BY E. HARRIS

16	72	Mary Anderson, 166 West 129 St.	Republican	Voted.
16	72	James Bell, 20 West 129 St.	do	Do.
14	72	Ella Ellison, 152 West 129 St.	do	Do.
16	72	John Hunter, 2 West 129 St.	No Party	Do.
16	72	Jasper Thompson, 2 West 129 St.	Republican	Do.
16	72	Octavia Johnson, 54 West 129 St.	No Party	Do.
16	72	James Johnson, 54 West 129 St.	Liberal	Do.
16	72	Clarence McClain, 142 West 129 St.	Republican	Do.
16	72	William Nettles, 368 Lenox	do	Do.
16	72	Flossie Perkins, 60 West 129 St.	do	Do.
16	72	John Rawley, 4 West 129 St.	do	Do.
16	72	Majester Steward, 36 West 129 St.	do	Do.
16	72	Ludet Waller, 42 West 129 St.	do	Do.

BY E. MCCALL

18	72	Beverly DeBrill, 2410 8th Ave.	Republican	Voted.
18	72	Lucille Harrison, 225 West 129	do	Do.
18	72	Ethel M. Jenkins, 230 West 131	Void	Do.
18	72	Willie P. Miller, 250 West 131	Republican	Do.
18	72	Nina Pryor, 225 West 124 St.	do	Do.
18	72	Georgia Reid, 260 West 131 St.	do	Do.
18	72	Alice H. Smith, 250 West 131 St.	do	Do.
18	72	Viola L. Sapp, 230 West 131 St.	Liberal	Do.

BY O. WILLIAMS

19	72	Vera Davis, 366 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	Voted.
19	72	Ruby E. Hogans	do	Do.
19	72	Ethel Johnson, 2423 8th Ave.	Void	Do.
19	72	Grant McPherson, 2355 8th Ave.	Liberal	Do.
19	72	Ernie Porter, 311 West 126 St.	Republican	Do.
19	72	Helen Stewart, 305 West 127	Liberal	Do.
19	72	Alvin E. Thomas, 386 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	Do.
19	72	Oscar Walsh, 2361 8th Ave.	Republican	Do.
19	72	Ella Young, 350 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	Do.

BY ANNA ENGLISH

20	72	Margaret Collins, 260 West 125 St.	Republican	Voted.
20	72	Amy Jackson, 320 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	Do.
20	72	Susie F. West, 286 West 127 St.	do	Do.
20	72	Hattie Wooding, 274 West 127 St.	do	Do.
20	72	Louis Whitfield, 167 West 126 St.	Missing	Do.
20	72	Gladys Whitaker, 167 West 127 St.	do	Do.
20	72	Nicholas Williams, 153 West 126 St.	do	Do.

BY J. NELSON

21	72	Joseph M. Wright, 134 West 127 St.	Liberal	
21	72	Catherine Stearns, 145 West 127 St.	Missing	
21	72	Althea Simmons, 237 West 127 St.	Republican	
21	72	Constancia Rivera, 255 West 127 St.	Missing	
21	72	Albert Robinson, 277 West 127 St.	Republican	
21	72	Rosalie Anderson, 277 West 127 St.	Conservative	
21	72	Lue Ethel Bray, 277 West 127 St.	do	
21	72	Annie Chavis, 2155 7th Ave.	Republican	
21	72	Erie Boggan, 217 West 127 St.	do	
21	72	Ruby Douglas, 217 West 127 St.	do	
21	72	Barbara Fells, 217 West 127 St.	do	
21	72	Sybil Gooding, 103 West 127 St.	Blank	

BY M. WARWICK

22	72	Walter Cribbs, 212 West 129 St.	Liberal	Voted.
22	72	Ruby Icelon, 230 West 129 St.	Void	Do.
22	72	Bobby R. Harding, 2406 8th Ave.	Republican	Do.
22	72	Alice Sanders, 102 West 128 St.	do	Do.
22	72	Sophie McDougald, 240 West 129 St.	do	Do.
22	72	Charles Tange, 2406 8th Ave.	Republican	Voted.
22	72	Willie White, 125 West 128 St.	Void	Do.
22	72	Nettie P. Alexander, 101 West 128 St.	do	Do.

## BY LILLIAN UPSHUR

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
23	72	Lloyd Bagley, 54 West 128 St.	Missing	Voted.
23	72	Vernon Bailey, 40 West 128 St.	Republican	Do.
23	72	Eleanor Crute, 40 West 128 St.	do	Do.
23	72	Samuel Grant, 39 West 128 St.	Void	Do.
23	72	William B. Johnson, 53 West 128 St.	Republican	Do.
23	72	Alma Polite, 53 West 128 St.	do	Do.
23	72	Celestine Senor, 1 West 127 St.	do	Do.
23	72	James L. Tyson, 21 West 127 St.	do	Do.
23	72	Mary Wilkerson, 9 West 128 St.	do	Do.

## BY LILLIE B. BROWN

24	72	Elsie A. Cormier, 15 West 124 St.	Republican	Voted.
24	72	Caroline H. Dukes, 1 West 126 St.	do	Do.
24	72	Viola Harrison, 2008 5th Ave.	do	Do.
24	72	Lewis L. Murray, 14-16 West 127 St.	do	Do.

## BY PEARL SWANGIN

26	72	Eugene Adair, 2 West 122 St.	Blank	Voted.
26	72	Willie Mae Allen, 28 Mount Morris Park	Liberal	Do.
26	72	David L. Brown, 24 Mount Morris Park	Blank	Do.
26	72	Evarine Dotson, 15 West 123 St.	Liberal	Do.
26	72	Edwina Fleming, 228 Lenox	Republican	Do.
26	72	James B. Hook, Sr., 33 Mount Morris Park	do	Do.
26	72	Norman H. Horne, 16 West 122 St.	Void	Do.
26	72	Mary Kelly, 22 Mount Morris Park	Liberal	Do.
26	72	Adelaide Neischer, 266 Lenox	Void	Do.
26	72	Hender J. Smothers, 15 West 123	Republican	Do.
26	72	Margaret Taylor, 15 West 123 St.	do	Do.
26	72	William Taylor, 15 West 123 St.	do	Do.
26	72	John Thompson, 22 Mount Morris Park	Liberal	Do.

## BY D. JOHNSON

27	72	Cornelius Adams, 68 West 120 St.	Missing	Voted.
27	72	Alma Brown, 25 West 120 St.	do	Do.
27	72	Hollis Champion, 214 Lenox	Liberal	Do.
27	72	James Davis, 218 Lenox	Missing	Do.
27	72	Loomis Freeman, 42 West 120 St.	Republican	Do.
27	72	Francina Gardner, 23 West 120 St.	do	Do.
27	72	Mae Greene, 68 West 120 St.	do	Do.
27	72	Herbert Hayes, 24 West 121 St.	Missing	Do.
27	72	Annie Manning, 5 West 121 St.	Void	Do.
27	72	Viola Washington, 22 Mount Morris Peak	Liberal	Do.

## BY LOUIS UPSHUR

28	72	Etta Baker, 86 West 119 St.	Republican	Voted.
28	72	Pearl Chambers, 59 West 119 St.	Liberal	Do.
28	72	Edward Clark, 29 West 118 St.	No party	
28	72	Sadie English, 86 West 119 St.	Republican	Voted.
28	72	Mary Franklin, 3 West 118 St.	do	Do.
28	72	Marguerite Gordon, 5 West 119 St.	do	
28	72	Harold Hemmins, 50 West 119 St.	do	
28	72	George Johnson, 69 West 118 St.	Liberal	
28	72	Etta Larry, 27 West 119 St.	No party	
28	72	Maxine Miller, 95 West 119 St.	Liberal	
28	72	Anna Patton, 86 West 119 St.	Republican	
28	72	Sallie Prince, 86 West 119 St.	do	
28	72	Mary Smith, 29 West 118 St.	Liberal	
28	72	Annie Taylor, 37 West 118 St.	do	

## BY E. McCALL

30	72	Carl George, 211 West 117 St.	Liberal	Voted.
30	72	Alfred V. Phillips, 1975 7th Ave.	Republican	Do.
30	72	Alice M. Sutton, 112 West 117 St.	do	Do.
30	72	David Smalls, 100 West 118 St.	Missing	Do.

## BY ANNA ENGLISH

31	72	Adeline Clark, 105 West 118 St.	Void	
31	72	Edward Clement, 201 West 118 St.	Republican	
31	72	Marcus A. Jackson, 150 West 119 St.	do	
31	72	Laura Jones, 204 West 119 St.	do	
31	72	Vapoleon Waters, 103 West 118 St.	do	
31	72	Lucretia White, 152 West 119 St.	do	

## BY O. WILLIAMS

32	72	Luree Brown, 279 West 119 St.	Republican	
32	72	Gale Dolison, 205 West 119 St.	Liberal	
32	72	Lelia Green, 188 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	
32	72	Charles Jones, 272 West 119 St.	Void	
32	72	Kelly Morton, 278 West 120 St.	do	
32	72	Norman Prester, 278 West 120 St.	Republican	
32	72	Florence Stewart, 188 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	

BY E. McCALL

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
33	72	Annie R. Armstrong, 204 West 120 St.	Liberal	
33	72	Iris E. Brash, 113 West 119 St.	Republican	
33	72	Flora L. Footman, 236 West 120 St.	do	
33	72	Ann G. Foley, 1980 7th Ave.	Liberal	
33	72	John Fernandez, 115 West 120 St.	Republican	
33	72	Sarah Heard, 166 West 120 St.	do	
33	72	Esther H. Hunter, 1980 7th Ave.	do	Signature question.
33	72	Beenie Midgette, 149 West 120 St.	Void	
33	72	Arthur Peterson, 124 West 120 St.	Missing	
33	72	Marvis A. Walker, 152 West 120 St.	Void	Voted.
33	72	Horman Wideman, 1990 7th Ave.	Republican	Do.

BY E. PARKER

34	72	Charles Bailey, 120 West 123 St.	Missing	Voted.
34	72	Mable Bowman, 158 West 123 St.	Republican	Do.
34	72	Prince Colloymore, 159 West 121 St.	Blank	
34	72	Willie Fabers, 151 West 122 St.	Republican	
34	72	Lillie M. Gulley, 104 West 121 St.	do	
34	72	Jennie Marsh, 231 Lenox.	do	
34	72	Rita Quarles, 137 West 122 St.	do	
34	72	Hal Truell, 2035 7th Ave.	Missing	
34	72	James Sanders, 114 West 123 St.	Void	
34	72	Annie Thompson, 229 Lenox.	Liberal	
34	72	Rebecca Williams, 245 Lenox.	Republican	

BY LILLIE B. BROWN

35	72	Adam J. Phoenix, 2026 7th Ave.	do	
35	72	Addie M. Richardson, 234 West 122 St.	Missing	
35	72	Gertrude Render, 200 West 133 St.	Liberal	
35	72	Mary Scott, 257 West 122 St.	Republican	
35	72	Virginia Solomon, 268 West 123 St.	Liberal	
35	72	Jesse Tarrant, 2040 7th Ave.	Republican	
35	72	Gloria Vaughn, 200 West 123 St.	do	
35	72	Julia Abner, 226 West 123 St.	Void	
35	72	Eugene M. Dunn, 2026 7th Ave.	Liberal	
35	72	Lettice Droughn, 262 West 123	do	
35	72	Annie M. Grannum, 259 West 122 St.	Void	
35	72	Gloria Johnson, 268 West 123	Liberal	
35	72	Alyce R. Jones, 243 West 122 St.	Republican	
35	72	Isabell Mitchell, 226 West 123 St.	Void	
35	72	William A. McLean, 2026 7th Ave.	Liberal	
35	72	Adon R. McKinzie, 264 West 123 St.	Republican	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

36	72	Willie Finn, 255 West 121 St.	Missing	
36	72	Agnes Harrison, 201 West 120 St.	Liberal	
36	72	Ellis Robinson, 249 West 121 St.	Republican	
36	72	Addie Sheppard, 206 St Nicholas Ave.	do	
36	72	Mary Sylla, 2014 7th Ave.	Liberal	
36	72	Evelyn Thomas, 217 West 121 St.	Void	
36	72	Clarence Wade, 255 West 121 St.	Conservative	
36	72	Christine Washington, 212 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	
36	72	Ralph Williams, 204 West 121 St.	do	

BY REGGIE TUGGLE

37	72	Emma L. Barrett, 438 West 118 St.	Liberal	
37	72	Leory Biven, 50 Morningside	do	
37	72	Ernest Camps, 352 West 118 St.	Republican	
37	72	Ocie Carpenter, 40 Morningside	do	
37	72	Robert Chatman, 40 Morningside	do	
37	72	Porter Craig, 354 West 119 St.	do	
37	72	Alice Gary, 50 Morningside	Liberal	
37	72	Ellen Kennen, 40 Morningside	Republican	
37	72	Joseph Kirkland, 362 West 119 St.	do	
37	72	Catherine Lloyd, 50 Morningside	do	
37	72	James Mack, 35 Morningside	do	
37	72	Carrie Roberts, 40 Morningside	Void	
37	72	Fred Thomas, 437 Manhattan	Republican	
37	72	John Watthe, 357 West 118 St.	do	
37	72	Jeffery Washington, 348 West 118 St.	Liberal	

BY PEARL SWANGIN

38	72	Nina Bell, 450 Manhattan	Liberal	
38	72	Roy E. Bunch, Jr., 458 Manhattan	do	
38	72	Emanuel Ford, 63 Morningside	Republican	
38	72	Samuel R. Gittens, 361 West 120 St.	Liberal	
38	72	Sally M. Lightbourne, 355 West 120 St.	Republican	

BY EULA HODGE

39	72	Evelyn Boyed, 317 West 121 St.	Republican	
39	72	Francis Foster, 509 Manhattan	do	
39	72	Phobe Semper, 346 West 121 St.	do	
39	72	Beatrice Cooper, 494 Manhattan	do	

BY O. WILLIAMS

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
40	72	James Chapelle, 540 Manhattan	Republican	
40	72	James Dairymple, 352 West 124 St.	do	
40	72	Ida L. S. Evans, 530 Manhattan	do	
40	72	Simon Fox, 540 Manhattan	do	
40	72	James O. Foushee, 98 Morningside	Missing	
40	72	Bertha Harley, 530 Manhattan	Republican	
40	72	Silas McAllister, 50 Morningside	do	
40	72	Jesse Wells, 359 West 122 St.	do	
40	72	Lillie Wilkinson, 92 Morningside	do	

BY LILLIE B. BROWN

41	72	Martha Brooks, 370 West 127 St.	Republican	
41	72	Robert Cooper, 376 West 127 St.	do	
41	72	Harold Gobson, 321 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	
41	72	James J. Johnson, 301 St. Nicholas Ave.	Void	
41	72	Vincent Lindsay, 368 West 127 St.	Republican	
41	72	Charles B. Odoms, 374 West 127 St.	Liberal	
41	72	Blanche Pelton, 378 West 125 St.	Missing	
41	72	Goldie Rosemond, 373 West 126 St.	Republican	
41	72	William Sanders, 365 West 126 St.	do	
41	72	Louise Smith, 29 Hancoch Pl.	do	

BY ANNA ENGLISH

42	72	Lucy Barrow, 1315 Amsterdam	Republican	
42	72	Monserate Colon, 430 West 125 St.	do	
42	72	Minnie Cameron, 430 West 125 St.	do	
42	72	Carlos Cabrera, 430 West 125 St.	Void	
42	72	Patricia Mack, 430 West 125 St.	do	
42	72	Celestine Placide, 430 West 125 St.	do	
42	72	Lorraine Coleman, 430 West 125 St.	Missing	
42	72	Marcia Cuevas, 430 West 125 St.	Liberal	
42	72	Dorothy Robinson, 1315 Amsterdam	do	
42	72	James E. Henry, 430 West 125 St.	Blank	
42	72	Alona E. Hill, 430 West 125 St.	Missing	
42	72	Aurea Martinez, 430 West 125 St.	do	
42	72	Olive Newsom, 430 West 125 St.	do	
42	72	Julia Roque, 1315 Amsterdam	do	
42	72	Julia Vigoreaux, 430 West 125 St.	Liberal	

BY MARY WARWICK

43	72	Milagros Alemang, 1295 Amsterdam	Republican	
43	72	Alezta Colon, 1295 Amsterdam	do	
43	72	Elease Harrell, 1295 Amsterdam	Liberal	
43	72	Marie Johnson, 1305 Amsterdam	Missing	
43	72	Jean Weston, 1305 Amsterdam	Liberal	
43	72	Oreby Weston, 1305 Amsterdam	do	
43	72	Agnes Sanders, 1295 Amsterdam	Blank	
43	72	Harry Watson, 1305 Amsterdam	Missing	

BY J. NELSON

50	72	Helen Robinson, 409 West 127 St.	Republican	
50	72	William Timmons, 409 West 127 St.	do	
50	72	Raymond Tate, 445 West 125 St.	Missing	
50	72	Annie Foster, 464 West 126 St.	Republican	
50	72	Jobie Goodwine, Jr., 424 West 126 St.	Liberal	
50	72	Sir Vincent M. Barrett, 406 West 127 St.	Republican	

BY EULA HODGE

51	72	Harry Boyd, 351 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	
51	72	George Himmel, 351 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	
51	72	Dee Loper, 400 West 128 St.	do	
51	72	Leola Franklin, 5 St. Nicholas Ave.	do	
51	72	Eugene Fox, 1 Convent Ave.	do	
51	72	Mildred L. Lane, 351 St. Nicholas Ave.	Missing	

BY LILLIAN UPSHUR

51	72	Ermile Reaves, 35 St. Nicholas Terrace	Republican	
51	72	Betty D. Sheppard, 6 St. Nicholas Terrace	Blank	
51	72	Helen Stirrup, 351 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	
51	72	Eloise E. Stevens, 25 St. Nicholas Terrace	Liberal	
51	72	Robert Tootley, 419 West 128 St.	Republican	
51	72	Lionel Van Duyn, 25 St. Nicholas Terrace	Liberal	
51	72	Emma L. Whitehead, 411 West 128 St.	Republican	
51	72	Mable Williams, 2 St. Nicholas Terrace	Void	

BY S. DeLAIGLE

52	72	Ollie M. Austin, 416 West 129 St.	Liberal	
52	72	Hyman Forte, 409 West 129 St.	Republican	
52	72	Sylvester Scott, 420 West 129 St.	Liberal	
52	72	Leon Shay, 409 West 129 St.	No party	
52	72	Lottie Stokes, 41 St. Nicholas Terrace	Blank	
52	72	Lee Hunter, 142 West 129 St.	Republican	
52	72	Hazel Johnson, 49 St. Nicholas Terrace	do	
52	72	William Johnson, 420 West 129 St.	do	
52	72	Katie Moore, 49 St. Nicholas Terrace	do	

BY PEARL SWANGIN

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
53	72	Carrie Harvey, 41 Convent	Republican	
53	72	Dolores Harvey, 41 Convent	Missing	
53	72	Kenneth Jackson, 408 West 130 St	Blank	
53	72	Margaret E. Lewis, 41 Convent	Republican	
53	72	George B. Pinckney, 50 Convent	do	
53	72	Alvin G. Reid, 420 West 130 St	do	
53	72	Naomi Steele, 1407 Amsterdam	No party	
53	72	Luthia M. Thomas, 41 Convent	Missing	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

54	72	Irvin Brown, 100 Convent	Republican	
54	72	Wilhimina Dye, 100 Convent	do	
54	72	Gloria Galtan, 1467 Amsterdam	do	
54	72	Thelma Kauri, 90 Convent	do	
54	72	Carmelo Ramos, 1429 Amsterdam	do	
54	72	Emma Robinson, 110 Convent	Void	
54	72	Alicia Sanabria, 460 West 131 St	Republican	
54	72	James Sturgis, 1463 Amsterdam	Liberal	
54	72	Mattie Woods, 102 Convent	Republican	

BY W. S. EPPS

1	74	Ernest Thornton, 180 West 135 St	Void	
1	74	Barse Weston, 129 West 133 St	Republican	(Deceased but voted.)
1	74	Martha Wright, 116 West 134 St	Liberal	
1	74	Louis Wright, 2263-7 Ave	Republican	
1	74	Mary Wormsley, 161 West 133 St	do	
1	74	Ross Wilson, 122 West 134 St	No party	
1	74	Eunice Mitchell, 159 West 133 St	Republican	
1	74	Aaron Moore, 180 West 135 St	do	(1st time voting reg Jan. 8, 1970.)
1	74	Gertrude Payne, 197 West 134 St	do	
1	74	Henry Ramsey, 116 West 134 St	Blank	
1	74	Scar Stainback, 180 West 135 St	do	

BY GRAHAM

1	74	Mabel Harris, 192 West 134 St	Republican	
1	74	Mary Hart, 112 West 134 St	do	
1	74	Rufus Edmonds, 180 West 135 St	Missing	
1	74	Melvin Gilliam, 114 West 134 St	Liberal	
1	74	Jesse Jenkins, 471 Lenox Ave	Republican	
1	74	Michelle Lacurtis, 2289-7 Ave	Conservative	

BY E. PARKER

2	74	Patrick Dodson, 319 West 134 St	Liberal	
2	74	Fioretta Harrell E., 2272-7 Ave	do	
2	74	Helen Johnson, 236 West 135 St	Republican	
2	74	Robert Johnson, 221 West 134 St	do	
2	74	Bulah I. Hall, 254 West 135	do	
2	74	Mary Alston, 303 West 134 St	do	
2	74	William Bostick, 2270-7 Ave	Liberal	

BY J. NELSON

2	74			(No machine No.)
2	74	Leona Miller, 2496-8 Ave	Republican	
2	74	Leroy H. Moss, 2262-7 Ave	do	
2	74	Mabel G. McCormick, 484 St. Nich. Ave	do	
2	74	James Townsend		

BY PEARL SWANGIN

3	74	Leila Benson, 316 West 137 St	Republican	
3	74	Terrence Clarke, 318 West 137 St	do	
3	74	Robert Charles, 203 West 135 St	Missing	
3	74	William Duncan, 36 Edgecombe Ave	Republican	
3	74	Samuel H. Edwards, 314 West 137 St	Liberal	
3	74	Robert Foote, 238 West 136 St	Republican	
3	74	Ella Harris, 312 West 137 St	Void	
3	74	Olivia Mayfield, 221 West 135 St	Republican	No signature on front buff card.
3	74	Arthur Scott, 246 West 136 St	do	
3	74	Sarah Williams L., 328 West 137 St	Void	

BY McCALL

4	74	Dennis J. Butler, 170 West 136 St	Republican	
4	74	Lottie B. Cox, 100 West 136 St	do	
4	74	Richard H. Davis, 136 West 136 St	do	
4	74	Samuel A. Hall, 170 West 136 St	Liberal	
4	74	Grady L. Russell, 135 West 135 St	Republican	
4	74	Henry Reid, 111 West 135 St	Void	
4	74	Soffer Smith, 142 West 136 St	Liberal	
4	74	James W. Wheeler, 174 West 136 St	do	
4	74	Dave Washington, 174 West 136 St	Republican	
4	74	Gardner N. Ware, 107 West 135 St	do	

BY LILLIE B. BROWN

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
5	74	Eugene Baker, 235 West 137 St.	Liberal	
5	74	Edward L. Brown, 237 West 136 St.	do	
5	74	Lillian Braswell, 269 West 136 St.	do	
5	74	Lenora Glover, 2340 7th Ave.	Republican	
5	74	James C. Gordon, 201 West 136 St.	Liberal	
5	74	Egbert Hudson, 2322 7th Ave.	Republican	
5	74	Samuel J. Iris, 255 West 137 St.	do	
5	74	Carrie Parker, 229 West 137 St.	do	
5	74	Ira P. Scott, 229 West 137 St.	do	
5	74	Susie Smith, 251 West 136 St.	do	
5	74	Thirstin Sowell, 2350 7th Ave.	do	
5	74	Joann Stephens, 244 West 137 St.	do	
5	74	Ardell Wood, 217 West 137 St.	do	

BY D. JOHNSON

6	74	Rowland Allison, 101 West 137 St.	do	
6	74	King Small, 163 West 136 St.	do	

BY LILLIE B. BROWN

7	74	Claude Mann, 17 West 137 St.	Liberal	
7	74	James E. Owen, 63 West 137 St.	Missing	
7	74	Margaret Phillips, 19 West 137 St.	Void	
7	74	Ernest Richardson, 21 West 137 St.	Republican	
7	74	Thomas Turner, 9 West 137 St.	Liberal	
7	74	Katie Walker, 67 West 137 St.	do	

BY LILLIAN UPSHUR

8	74	Mavis Burton, 2170 Madison Ave.	Republican	
8	74	Betty Belasco, 2225 5th Ave.	do	
8	74	Adele Boston, 2170 Madison Ave.	Missing	Signature different.
8	74	John E. Crawford, 2235 5th Ave.	do	
8	74	Millard J. Graham, 2235 5th Ave.	Blank	
8	74	Michael Goode, 2234 5th Ave.	Liberal	
8	74	Dorothy Goode, 2225 5th Ave.	do	
8	74	Theodore Gross, 2225 5th Ave.	Republican	
8	74	Julian Jefferies, 2170 Madison Ave.	do	
8	74	John Lassiter, 2255 5th Ave.	do	Do.
8	74	Frances L. Lucas, 2255 5th Ave.	Liberal	
8	74	Milton Richardson, 2235 5th Ave.	do	No enrollment, no date, no initial on bottom buff card.
8	74	Bertha Ruffin, 2335 5th Ave.	Republican	
8	74	Rose Stewart, 2255 5th Ave.	do	No enrollment No. on change of enrollment.
8	74	Danice Wilkins Nixon, 2255 5th Ave.	Republican	
8	74	Celia D. Wickham, 2170 Madison Ave.	do	
8	74	John A. White, 2235 5th Ave.	Missing	

BY C. HARRIS

9	74	Effie L. Argumper, 2181 Madison Ave.	do	Date incorrect.
9	74	Moses Allen, 2160 Madison Ave.	do	Do.
9	74	Morris Clemons, 2171 Madison Ave.	No party	
9	74	Anne E. Morrison, 2160 Madison Ave.	Republican	
9	74	Ruth Robinson, 2160 Madison Ave.	do	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

10	74	Grace Calloway, 10 East 138 St.	Republic	
10	74	Clifford Garvin, 2190 Madison Ave.	do	
10	74	Mary D. Galloway, 2200 Madison Ave.	do	
10	74	Minnie James, 2200 Madison Ave.	do	
10	74	Hilda Michael, 10 East 138 St.	do	
10	74	John Palmer, 2265 5th Ave.	do	
10	74	Helen R. Rose, 2265 5th Ave.	No party	
10	74	Inez Simpson, 2190 Madison Ave.	do	
10	74	Francena Taylor, 2190 Madison Ave.	Liberal	
12	74	Mollie Brown, 125 West 138 St.	Republican	
12	74	Ernestine Brown, 137 West 138 St.	Void	
12	74	Roosevelt Cooper, 135 West 138 St.	Republican	
12	74	Annie Cooper, 559 Lenox Ave.	do	
12	74	Clara Coger, 131 West 138 St.	Void	
12	74	Richard Dixon, 108 West 138 St.	Conservative	
12	74	John Deas, 111 West 138 St.	Republican	
12	74	Beulah Harris, 112 West 138 St.	do	
12	74	Vanderbilt Hunter, 133 West 138 St.	do	
12	74	Olivia L. Klass, 100 West 138 St.	do	
12	74	Willie M. Keno, 112 West 138 St.	do	
12	74	Darsye Mitchell, 547 Lenox Ave.	do	
12	74	Margaret Major, 120 West 138 St.	Liberal	
12	74	Vonetta Mack, 112 West 138 St.	Republican	
12	74	Matilda Smith, 145 West 138 St.	do	
12	74	Daisy Wiley, 104 West 138 St.	Liberal	
12	74	James P. Young, 120 West 138 St.	Blank	

BY ANN ENGLISH

29	74	Estella Branch, 126 West 143 St.	Republican	
29	74	Dew Apcillar, 2453 7th Ave.	do	
29	74	Ruby Bash, 130 West 143 St.	No party	
29	74	Rosalie Brown, 115 West 142 St.	do	
29	74	Rosetta Carroll, 2441 7th Ave.	do	
29	74	Henrietta Fagan, 117 West 142 St.	do	No Signature. Do.
29	74	Robert Teams, 125 West 142 St.	Republican	
29	74	William Vanderburg, 147 West 142 St.	do	
29	74	Oscar Walker, 147 West 142 St.	do	

BY LOUIS UPSHUR

Electoral district	Assembly district	Name and address	Party	Explanation
31	74	Mollie James, 141 West 144 St.	Republican	
31	74	James Strickland, 125 West 144 St.	Void	
31	74	Mary Downing, 673 Lenox Ave.	No party	
33	74	Zelma Barnes, 2512th 7th Ave.	Void	
33	74	Edward L. King, 239 West 145 St.	Missing	
33	74	Vernett Mickle, 2508 7 Ave.	do	
33	74	William Sims, 247 West 145 St.	do	
33	74	Walter Simmons, 243 West 145 St.	do	
33	74	Lawford Spencer, 275 West 145 St.	Republican	
33	74	Herbert Williams, 219 West 145 St.	Liberal	

BY ANNA ENGLISH

35	74	Cassandra Buzzell, 306 West 144 St.	Republican	
35	74	Richard Graham, 308 West 147 St.	do	
35	74	Dorothy Hawkins, 2697 8th Ave.	do	
35	74	Albert Hunter, 302 West 145 St.	do	
35	74	John King, 314 West 145 St.	do	
35	74	Rose Anderson, 2697 8th Ave.	Missing	
35	74	Alice Joyner, 306 West 144 St.	Void	
35	74	Willie White, 28 Bradhurst Ave.	Republican	

BY PEARL SWANGIN

36	74	Eleanor Beckett, 345 West 145 St.	Republican	
36	74	Lester Childs, 770 St Nicholas Ave.	do	
36	74	Ruth Buffington, 345 West 145 St.	do	
36	74	Eugene Brooks, 770 St Nicholas Ave.		No Signature.

BY GRAHAM

36	74	Mattie Rideout, 770 St. Nicholas Ave.	Republican	
36	74	Dennis Smith, 770 St. Nicholas Ave.	Void	
36	74	Mary Thompson, 345 West 145 St.	Republican	
36	74	Clarence Thompson, 345 West 145 St.	do	
36	74	Janie White, 746 St. Nicholas Ave.	No party	
36	74	Willie Williams, 2-4 St. Nicholas Place	Void	

BY LILLIE BROWN

36	74	Carlton Coleman, 345 West 145 St.	Republican	
36	74	Leonard E. de Paur, 746 St. Nicholas Ave.	Liberal	
36	74	Alexander Davis, 345 West 145 St.	Republican	
36	74	Walter W. Fraser, 345 West 145 St.	do	
36	74	David W. Henderson, 345 West 145 St.	do	
36	74	Reginald F. Knox, 345 West 145 St.	do	

BY DOTTY JOHNSON

69	74	Marie Austin, 2333 5th Ave.	Missing	
69	74	Gertrude Austin, 2333 5th Ave.	do	
69	74	Joseph Ananias, 2333 5th Ave.	Republican	
69	74	Charles Bland, 2311 5th Ave.	Liberal	
69	74	Carl Dominic, 2311 5th Ave.	Missing	
69	74	Ellis David, 2289 5th Ave.	do	
69	74	John Finney, 2333 5th Ave.	Liberal	
69	74	Jean Gentry, 2311 5th Ave.	do	
69	74	Jeanne Hazer, 2301 5th Ave.	Republican	
69	74	Richard Harwell, 2333 5th Ave.	Blank	
69	74	Simon Jones, 2289 5th Ave.	Republican	
69	74	Frank Jones, 2311 5th Ave.	Missing	
69	74	Gladys Johnson, 2311 5th Ave.	Blank	
69	74	Helen Kiney, 2333 5th Ave.	Liberal	
69	74	Jo Ann Pace, 2289 5th Ave.	do	
69	74	Ina Rouse, 2305 5th Ave.	Missing	
69	74	Doris Taylor, 2311 5th Ave.	Blank	
69	74	Mary Walker, 2289 5th Ave.	Liberal	
69	74	Charlene Walker, 2333 5th Ave.	Blank	
69	74	Cynthia Wiles, 2333 5th Ave.	Republican	

Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the Baptist Ministers Conference to place the following affidavit in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a matter of history concerning the fraud and corruption in New York City in the Primary of June 23, 1970.

[In the Supreme Court, New York County]

AFFIDAVIT

In the Matter of the Application of DAVID N. LICORISH, Petitioner against Maurice J. O'Rourke, Et al., Respondents STATE OF NEW YORK, County of New York.

William C. Chance, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

1. That he is an Attorney at Law maintaining offices at 408 West 145 Street, New York, New York.

2. That attached hereto is a list of the names and discrepancies alleged in the within action, David N. Licorish vs the Board of Election et al.

3. On information and belief as a result of the aforesaid examination of election returns, it was discovered that there were only public counter cards for ten of the fifty four election districts in the 72 Assembly District which is a part of the 18th Congressional District of the State of New York. The aforesaid 18th Congressional District has therein 211 election districts covering seven Assembly Districts.

4. The persons making the actual examination and others will be called as witnesses if deemed necessary by the court.

FINDINGS

No public counter cards

Assembly district:	Election districts
67	11
68	1
69	19
70	32
72	32
74	54

UNAUTHORIZED VOTES ON VOTING MACHINE

93 ED of the 66 AD: 14 more votes on machine than signatures on Buff Cards.

27 ED on the 70 AD: 41 more votes on machine than signatures on Buff Cards.

## INELIGIBLE VOTES

Republicans	616
Liberals	233
Conservatives	11
Voids, missing, blanks	417

## TAMPERING WITH VOTING MACHINES

70 AD: 3 Voting levers found on window ledge 131 East 104 Street. Voting machines abandoned by Police after close of Polls.

72 AD: Russworm Public School, 3 Voting machines unguarded on June 26, 1970.

74 AD: 805 St Nicholas Avenue, New York City. Police left voting machines in lobby of building for at least two days unguarded and unprotected.

18th Congressional District of New York voting machines were never impounded by Police even though Commissioner O'Rourke announced on June 24, 1970 that they had been.

Affirmed under penalties of perjury this 6th day of August, 1970.

(NOTE.—Supporting material for this affidavit identical to that for previously listed affidavit.)

## WASHINGTON REPORT BY HON. LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as I have stated in previous Washington reports, President Nixon inherited a mess in South Vietnam with approximately 540,000 U.S. troops there the day he was inaugurated. By April 15, 1970, he had withdrawn over 110,000 of them and had announced that he would withdraw an additional 150,000 by the end of May 1971.

By the first part of August, our troop strength in South Vietnam had been reduced to approximately 400,000. It will be reduced to 280,000 by the end of May 1971. Secretary of State Rogers and Defense Secretary Laird have suggested that all U.S. troops will be withdrawn from combat assignments in South Vietnam by the end of June 1971, and there is reason to hope that all of our troops will be removed from there by the end of 1971.

President Nixon is achieving his objective of withdrawing our troops in a manner which will permit the people of that country to defend their own soil. While some may disagree with this timetable, the President is achieving what almost everyone regards as highly desirable.

Due to the President's policies, the Communist attitude has begun to soften and our outlook for peace has greatly improved. The Arab Nations and Israel have accepted a 90-day cease-fire during which negotiations could result in a permanent peace in the Middle East. The Paris peace talks on Vietnam have begun to show some progress, and the strategic arms limitation talks—SALT—are showing evidence of producing a reasonable compromise between the United States and Russia on nuclear weapons.

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

It took an aggravatingly long time, but Congress finally passed the bill providing a 15-percent increase in benefits under

the Railroad Retirement Act (H.R. 15733). The House passed it on April 7, 1970, and sent it to the Senate. The Senate passed it on June 25, 1970, with amendments which required a House-Senate conference. On July 29, 1970, the Senate passed the conference report and sent it to the House which passed it the next day and sent it to the President. This action, for which I voted on April 7 and on July 30, 1970, was designed to match the previously approved 15-percent increase in social security benefits. These increases were essential to protect beneficiaries from inflation-created impoverishment.

## BIG FARMER SUBSIDIES

Every year, I have voted to place a limitation of \$20,000 on subsidy payments to individual farmers. On June 9, 1970, the House passed the 1971 agriculture appropriation bill (H.R. 7923) after the amendment to limit individual farmer subsidy payments to \$20,000 had been defeated. Of course, I voted for the amendment.

Now the U.S. Senate has added the \$20,000 limitation to its 1971 agriculture appropriation bill, and the difference between the House and Senate-passed versions are being worked out in conference. If the conference report contains the \$20,000 limitation on payments, I shall vote for it; if it does not, I shall attempt to have the \$20,000 limitation added to the report.

On August 5, 1970, the \$20,000 limitation amendment to the Agriculture Act of 1970 (H.R. 18546), which authorizes agriculture appropriations for the next three fiscal years, was defeated; so I voted against the bill. H.R. 18546 contains a provision which would limit subsidy payments to individual farmers to \$55,000 each year for each crop. This means that farmers who grow two or three crops annually could receive an annual subsidy of \$110,000 or \$165,000 for the next 3 years.

This subsidy program will cost U.S. taxpayers over \$10.5 billion in the next 3 years. This will amount to a cost of about \$100.00 for every person in the United States over the next 3 years. Even the Pennsylvania Farmers Association opposes this bill. This bill passed in spite of my negative vote.

## JACK ANDERSON COLUMN

A recent column by Jack Anderson falsely claimed that, with 22 other members of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I voted to continue \$2 billion annually in excess profits to defense contractors. This totally inaccurate statement resulted from Mr. Anderson's failure to check facts before writing his column.

When the Banking and Currency Committee was considering the defense production act amendments (H.R. 17880), introduced by Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, the section providing for uniform cost-accounting standards to be used by all defense contractors was so poorly written that 23 members of the committee voted to strike it. The committee then voted to include a section similar to one contained in the Senate bill (S. 3302). The new section even

closed some of the loopholes of the Senate section. Conveniently, Mr. Anderson failed to mention this.

H.R. 17880, as reported out of the committee and passed by the House on Friday, July 31, 1970, is substantially better than the bill authored by Mr. PATMAN. It will better achieve the control of defense contractors which is highly desired by Admiral Rickover and myself.

Mr. Anderson stated that the Committee "voted behind closed doors, of course, to hide their actions from the voters back home. This column, however, can identify the Congressmen who voted to line the pockets of the defense contractors at the taxpayers' expense." Actually, rule 15 of the committee states:

At the conclusion of any Executive Session of the Committee, information shall be made available to the press as to how each member voted on any record vote or votes.

Since this rule is followed religiously, all voting information is available to the media.

## FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

The Democratic-controlled Congress continues to increase Federal spending over the budget despite the fact that President Nixon's \$200.8 billion budget for fiscal year 1971, which began July 1, 1970, was the largest in history. I have been voting consistently against this over-budget spending for such items as the additional \$453 million for the Office of Education and for the additional \$541.3 million for independent offices and HUD. It is anticipated that, if over-spending continues, the deficit could reach \$15 billion for fiscal year 1971, \$23 billion for fiscal year 1972, and \$20 billion for fiscal year 1973.

This continued deficit spending will increase inflation, hurt our national economy, cause increased taxes, and increase interest payments on the money we owe. Even with no increased spending, the interest on our national debt will be \$30 billion annually by fiscal year 1973.

We must reduce Federal spending and start paying off our debt if our Nation is to survive. Wasteful programs and abuses of programs must be eliminated. Food stamps and public assistance for able-bodied members of hippie communes is one example of such abuses.

## LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION

For the first time in over 24 years, the House is considering congressional reorganization in the form of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (H.R. 17654). I am supporting this enlightened effort to modernize congressional operations.

When the House is amending a bill, it sits as the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Votes on amendments are taken by "teller votes." Members simply walk up the center aisle to be counted for or against the amendment; no record is made of the way individual Members vote. I successfully supported an amendment to record all teller votes as I want my constituents to know how I vote on all issues.

Other important improvements of H.R. 17654 provide public availability of all

votes taken in executive sessions of the various committees, such as we now have on the Banking and Currency Committee; the televising of House committee hearings, and assigning one-third of a committee's professional staff to the committee's minority membership.

Thank you.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT SIGNS GOOD CONTRACT FOR MONTANA TRANSMISSION LINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years there has been controversy in our public works appropriations bills concerning the proposed use by the Bureau of Reclamation of a 115-kilovolt transmission line constructed by the Montana Power Co. to furnish dual electric service to the Shelby-Cut Bank-Browning area of northern Montana.

I have recently been advised that Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water and Power, James R. Smith, instructed the Bureau of Reclamation's regional director in Billings to consummate a wheeling contract for the use of these facilities to furnish such dual source of power to the area.

Secretary Smith should be highly commended for his outstanding success in culminating this contract in accordance with the wishes of the Congress. Last year, both the House of Representatives and the Senate, in appropriating \$450,000 to start the construction of a Federal line costing \$4 million—which would essentially duplicate the facilities of the Montana Power Co.—instructed the Bureau of Reclamation to resume negotiations with the Montana Power Co. in an effort to reach a satisfactory wheeling agreement. Both bodies of the Congress directed the Bureau of Reclamation to report to the respective Appropriations Committees to secure prior clearance before any of the \$450,000 could be expended for the initiation of construction of the Federal line.

Secretary Jim Smith has displayed great patience in the successful culmination of this matter, particularly in light of the almost blind opposition of some of those persons who would benefit most by this contract. I refer to the cooperative preference customers of the Bureau of Reclamation in that area who now have available a reliable second source of power merely by agreeing to an interconnection with Glacier Electric Cooperative. This is available to them immediately—not 4 years from now—as would probably be the case if actual construction of the Federal line were authorized.

In addition to making these Montana Power Co. facilities available now to the preference customers, the contract saves the Federal Government from spending some \$4 million at a time when we should carefully scrutinize every Federal expenditure in our fight against inflation. I am advised that the contract saves the

U.S. Government some \$419,000 in fixed charges each year until 1976, and substantially that same amount thereafter depending upon the percentage of use the Government makes of such lines.

During some of the controversy surrounding this proposal the charge has been made that it would violate the antitrust laws. This argument has been put in its proper perspective when the Justice Department sent Assistant Secretary Smith a letter on July 22 saying:

You have submitted to this Division drafts of a proposed contract between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Montana Power Company concerning the Bureau's purchase of approximately one half of the capacity of the latter's 115 kv line between Great Falls and Cut Bank, Montana for the purpose of enlarging the transmission capacity into the area and improving the reliability of service to the Bureau's customers. The drafts have incorporated suggestions of our staff intended to avoid the possibility of anticompetition impacts from the signing or the terms of the contract. This letter is based on the most recent draft, copy attached.

With the amendments suggested, there is no Antitrust objection to the Government entering into this contract.

It seems inconceivable to me that anyone can seriously still press for this unnecessary Federal expenditure in light of the successful signing of a wheeling agreement. This is particularly true in light of the Keating amendment which has been carried in every public works appropriations bill for almost 20 years providing that none of the Bureau of Reclamation's appropriations "shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers except where the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer." This is certainly not the current situation in Montana since the Secretary, through his Assistant Secretary Smith, has specifically approved the wheeling agreement.

There are some individuals who are attacking the recently signed contract on the basis of some lack of reliable electric service in the area to serve the ABM system. They suggest that only a Federal line can provide the needed reliability. Such a charge simply cannot be sustained by the facts. I am advised that the people planning the ABM installation in the area are completely satisfied with the adequacy and the reliability of the power supply in the area with the present transmission facilities, including the newly constructed 115 kv. line of the Montana Power Co. To use our national defense to make a spurious argument for unnecessary Federal expenditures of this nature is indeed grasping for straws in the wind.

Mr. Speaker, through the successful conclusion of this controversy by the signing of the wheeling agreement, the Federal Government offers the preference customers in the area an opportu-

nity to have a dual feed for reliable electric service. The cooperatives, in turn, will show their desire to have such reliable service by authorizing an interconnection with this line in accordance with the terms of the newly signed contract. It appears at the moment, however, they may be more interested in the unnecessary expenditure of large sums of Federal funds than they are in obtaining additional reliability of their systems to the benefit of their customers.

The Federal Government, through Secretary Smith, has done its part to assure such reliability in a prudent and economical manner. It is now up to the cooperative representatives to be responsible and authorize the interconnection necessary to upgrade the electric service to their customers. Only then can they convince all of us that they are truly interested in trying to upgrade their power supply rather than spend Federal funds unnecessarily at a time when such funds are in short supply and so badly needed for other higher priorities.

#### ROTC MUST REMAIN ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS

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, at a time when the ROTC program is under attack by leftist forces, I was surprised and dismayed to note earlier this week that a group of our colleagues have introduced a bill to physically move this outstanding and time-honored program from the college campus.

While I can certainly appreciate the concern by our colleagues that something must be done to stop the radicals from disrupting ROTC activities, unfortunately, in my judgment, they have not recommended the best course, but the course of least resistance.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to expect cries of "down with ROTC" by student militants, but when some of our adult colleagues recommend action that would virtually bring this condition about, I feel compelled to disagree with them most vigorously. By taking ROTC off campus, students will become less interested in participating, and it will become a sideline activity.

Mr. Speaker, the Students for a Democratic Society, particularly the Weatherman faction of this dangerous organization, has established as a No. 1 goal the elimination of college ROTC. Through the use of violent tactics they have already gotten commitments from some college administrators to abolish ROTC on their campuses. They fully realize that by destroying ROTC they have eliminated a principal source, especially during time of war, of our officer corps. If successful in this insidious scheme, our military posture will be dealt an irreparable blow.

This is no time to capitulate to the anarchists. It is time to seek ways to strengthen ROTC. It must remain on campus.

### AN ALL-VOLUNTEER MILITARY FORCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RUPPE), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, when I was first a candidate for Congress, in 1966, I pledged to work toward the goal of a volunteer military and an end to compulsory conscription. During that campaign, at the height of the Vietnam war, there were not too many political candidates talking about the issue. In the Congress there was a handful of Republican incumbents, led by our former colleague Robert Ellsworth of Kansas, calling for an end to the draft. Other than limited activity in Congress, and a few political candidates, and some concerned private citizens, such as Bruce Chapman, the author of "The Wrong Man in Uniform," there were not many who believed the volunteer Army was much more than the pipedream of idealists.

A great deal has happened since 1966, much to the gratification of the pioneers of draft reform. In fact, so much has happened that I am concerned that there are those who are adopting the issue without a full understanding of the complexities involved. I am concerned that there are those who are espousing the rhetoric of draft termination and are creating the monstrosity political illusion that we will indeed terminate the draft on July 1, 1971, when indeed, all viable proposals contain a standby draft. When a young man is conscripted through a standby draft he has been just as drafted as a young man conscripted today under our present selective service laws.

Therefore, I have prepared these remarks, as one who has been working for draft reform for a long time, to take a hard and realistic look at where we stand today in relation to the volunteer army.

As we are winding down our defense commitments abroad and encouraging self-reliance on the part of other nations, I too believe the time is right to embark on a comprehensive reform of our present military system. While I laud the President's initiative in the creation of a lottery system, I continue to believe that the ultimate answer to creating an equitable and effective military system is to eliminate the draft and create an all volunteer army. President Nixon has taken major steps in moving the Nation in this direction by announcing the elimination of the draft as his personal goal and by creating a Commission on the All Volunteer Force under the capable leadership of former Defense Secretary Thomas Gates. As the Commission has concluded, since only a minority of our citizenry is needed, a force of men freely choosing to serve could adequately assure our national defense and enhance military dignity and prestige as well. Moreover, the report indicates that the all volunteer force is a feasible as well as a desirable goal to strive for in the current decade.

At present, approximately 50 percent of the men annually entering the Armed Forces are volunteers who enlisted despite low and inequitable entry pay. With

this number continuing to volunteer, an all-volunteer force of 2.5 million men would require only 75,000 annual enlistees who could be obtained by improving recruiting, pay, and conditions of service. Moreover, the Commission estimates that the additional budgetary increase required for the desired force could be met. Finally, by improving basic pay and conditions of service, military career opportunities will be more attractive. Thus these improvements should enable the military to maintain a high quality, more-experienced force with higher motivation and morale.

Achieving these important objectives will require the farsighted initiative and enthusiastic cooperation of the Congress, the Executive, and the military services. I believe we must continue to carefully examine all aspects of the present system and consider alternatives while beginning to develop concrete legislation. First of all, adequate assurance of the national security requires that an in-depth study be made to determine precisely how many men are needed and in what capacity. The Department of Defense should undertake such a study which should include an analysis of the optimum reserve organization and the number of present military jobs which could be performed by civilians or by military volunteers physically unfit for combat. As the Gates Commission points out, not only would replacing military personnel with civilians be less expensive, there would also be reduced demand for new recruits. In an all-volunteer army, civilian personnel would need less training, involve fewer personnel transfers, and require lower levels of compensation. Perhaps when forces have reached their post-Vietnam equilibrium level, a program of civilianization could be initiated and carried out over a 3- to 4-year period.

Attention should be given to developing a variety of options in regard to types of individual training and areas of assignment. Each 18-year-old could then be given a comprehensive booklet when he registers for the draft informing him of the advantages and opportunities available to him in military service. In order to increase public awareness of opportunities and respect for career service, perhaps an education campaign could be launched concerning the nature of the services and the importance of this protective shield for an increasingly prosperous civilian economy.

Naturally, the viability of an all volunteer force depends on the willingness of the Executive, the Congress, and the military to maintain reasonable qualification standards, competitive levels of military compensation, and attractive conditions in military life. If the draft is eliminated, the services will not be able to dictate the previously high mental and physical standards; however, it should be remembered that these standards had to be lowered to meet the requirements of the Vietnam buildup. Moreover, even in the most severe case of unemployables, encouragement can be taken from the fact that private industry has shown it is possible to train a surprising number of uneducated, socially handicapped young men. With regards to compensation, on

an interim basis, raising current pay scales could induce enlistment by making military wages more equivalent to civilian pay while removing a large part of the implicit tax burden on the draftee who is compelled to serve at a financial sacrifice. The current system of multiple allowances should be changed to one of salaries. Salaries should be set for specific jobs on the basis of pay scales for equivalent civilian jobs and carry provisions for pay increases or promotions for a job well done.

Along with improving inservice conditions, we must also strive for major changes in our present recruiting and training programs. The possibility of an all-volunteer force could conceivably reduce ROTC enrollments and thus endanger a highly qualified source of officers. However, because ROTC itself is a volunteer force, it could become the lifeline of any all-volunteer military system. By continuing to serve as an important part of the machinery of officer production, it would assure the military of a flow of college-trained officers so necessary to an increasingly sophisticated Military Establishment. To meet anticipated recruiting problems, ROTC must offer attractive benefits.

The most productive solution would seem to be a complete revamping of ROTC to best meet the needs of changing military requirements and to reflect campus realities. I believe the present program should be replaced with three 10-week summer institutes during which students would receive an adequate salary. The compensation plan could be arranged to continue throughout the academic year thereby providing students with funds for tuition or personal expenses. In addition, there should be an increase in the number of ROTC tuition scholarships. While a campus office would be retained for coordination functions, it would no longer duplicate military efforts. At the same time, while cadets would be allowed to wear uniforms on campus for social events, the visibility of uniformed soldiers would be lowered, perhaps helping to cool the volatile situation which has developed on many campuses.

Restructuring of ROTC would thus provide general benefits to students, the military, and the university. The student would benefit by increased financial support and the flexibility to coordinate military obligations with college plans. Similarly, the military could continue to recruit a broad-based officer corps while cutting costs and reducing duplication efforts. Intensified training would also permit a higher degree of specialization so necessary to the technical requirements of the future. Finally, restructuring would eliminate the dissatisfaction and aura of hostility surrounding the relationship between the military and the university. Conducting training in the summer institutes would remove an inflammatory source of campus unrest and eliminate the controversy concerning the scientific and academic value of present ROTC courses.

Under the Nixon administration, this Congress, and this Nation are moving toward the goal of a volunteer military. But, the realities are such that we will

continue to need strong armed services. It is particularly important that the officer corps in a volunteer military have a strong civilian orientation. In sum, ROTC, which now provides 43 percent of the officers commissioned must be revamped and made more attractive to provide highly motivated officers who are there because of interest—not because they were compelled.

Finally, in addition to making a volunteer service more attractive, steps could be taken to make the draft, on a standby basis, less objectionable. Legislation might include a provision for a national register of all males who might be conscripted when deemed essential for national security, a clearly explained system for the notification, examination, and selection of inductees, and a requirement of a resolution of Congress at the request of the President to invoke the standby draft. While this is by no means a comprehensive list, it does indicate the scope and complexity of the problems that will have to be solved in order for an all-volunteer force to become a reality in the near future.

In closing, I would like to again return to a word of caution about this incredibly important issue which involves the very lives of our young men. Let us not create the illusion that we are going to terminate the draft on July 1, 1971, when, in fact all proposals contain a standby draft. It is probably that a sufficient number of enlistees would not be attracted to institute a true volunteer army next year. It would be the cruelest kind of hoax to tell our young men that we are ending conscription on that date certainly only for them to discover that the draft is still a fact of life once the date passes.

Rather than hold out false and arbitrary deadlines for short-term political gain, let us be completely honest and abandon rhetoric for rhetoric sake, because the issue is too important for cheap hypocrisy. Let us embark with a spirit of profound statesmanship and then let us proceed with enthusiasm and determination, tempered by farsighted realism, in the crucial but complex transition to an all-volunteer force.

#### THE HARD REALITIES OF THE DRUG EPIDEMIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOGAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, for most Americans, the hard realities of the drug epidemic have become another regular, gnawing chapter of the evening news.

Stories of 7-year-old heroin addicts in New York City still shock; stories spelling out widespread drug use in posh suburban communities still hit us with the same tearing impact.

But for many Americans, another aspect of drugs in our society—one that has gained a certain respectability—is not at all shocking.

For me, however, that aspect is almost more disturbing than the growth of drug

subcultures among youth. It is frightening because of its apparent respectability and its effect on youth.

Along with news reports of drug abuse and the in-depth commentary probing the underlying reasons, we, as television viewers and radio listeners, are confronted with a myriad of advertising copy designed to sell drugs.

How often during the day are we told of the virtues of over-the-counter drugs. This pill will keep you alert, that pill lets you sleep, another pill calms shattered nerves, and another pep you up. These are all patent medicines sold without prescription and advertised extensively on radio and television.

We ask ourselves why many youngsters today have virtually no fear of drugs.

The answer to that question is complex, but I would submit that we might find at least a partial answer in the fact that this generation has grown up with television and has been inordinately influenced by television advertising. Every parent of a young child knows the effect of pre-Christmas toy advertising on youngsters.

The effects of television violence have been under study for quite some time, and in recent years we have seen a real, and voluntary effort on the part of the industry to curb the presentation of violence. Its effect on youth has been recognized. But there is, it seems to me, another important question which has not been probed:

What are the effects of advertising on children.

The examples of patent drug advertising I am about to give would be amusing were they not representative of real commercials. We have all heard similar presentation.

We are told about a fellow named "Sam," supposedly representing the common denominator of the American businessman.

Sam has been keyed up for weeks. He has a big contract coming up and his nerves are shot. His boss and the clients do not seem receptive. Sam, in a state of irritation, does not seem to be getting along with his family. In short, life has not been treating him well at all.

Sam manages to spell the whole thing out to his neighbor and business associate. We will call him "George."

George, for his part, tells Sam about a little pill.

In the next scene, Sam is shaking hands with the big clients. His boss tells him he has earned a bonus, and his family tells him what a great guy he is. And Sam tells us he was able to do it all with the help of the little miracle pill that can be purchased at a nearby drug store. In other words, he is telling all the viewers that he solved all his problems and achieved his accomplishments all while under the influence of a drug.

It is frightening. What would be the reaction if that same scenario were applied to the use of alcohol. Sam gets the contract and the raise because of the physical effects, say, of a certain brand of gin.

The public, no doubt, would be alarmed

at that kind of pitch selling liquor, but few people are alarmed at that same pitch selling drugs as a panacea.

And we ask ourselves why youth has no fear of drugs.

Another commercial, aired in New York City, depicts a number of businessmen talking about their frustrations and worries and the pressures of the business world. It obviously bothers them. They take the little pill. Somebody mentions that they will be late for work. One of the businessmen, under the influence of the pill, says, "Who cares."

There is still another ad in which an overly soft spoken, obviously relaxed announcer asks if your wife has been irritable and upset lately. "Maybe she is suffering from simple nervous tension," he suggests. He goes on to suggest that you bring her home a box of little pills and implies maybe it is the answer to her problems and yours.

"Maybe," he says, but maybe she is suffering from schizophrenia, or acute paranoid delusions.

Maybe she is suffering from any other maladies running the gamut from sniffles to cancer.

In all these cases, that "maybe" is something to be analyzed by a physician or psychiatrist.

I would suggest in Sam's case, the hypothetical nervous tension case and the businessmen's copout case, we may be talking about serious medical problems to be dealt with and diagnosed by a medical expert.

We are not dealing with a misrepresentation of the effects of a mouthwash on somebody's social life. The Nation is not facing a bad breath epidemic.

We are talking about the effects of drug advertising—commercials selling chemicals represented as altering mental processes.

I use the word epidemic when I refer to the drug problems of this Nation. It is just that.

The figures associated with drug abuse, especially among the young, paint a frightening picture.

The FBI reveals that since 1960, the number of arrests of persons under 18 rose by 1,800 percent, while the figures for persons over 18 rose by 235 percent.

A conservative White House estimate recently revealed that at least 5 million Americans have used marihuana. The National Institute of Mental Health puts that estimate from between 12 and 20 million.

According to still other estimates, if all the people who smoke pot were arrested and convicted, the number would be about 25 times the number of places to hold them in the total of the Nation's prisons and jails.

The figures for the use and abuse of other drugs are just as appalling.

On the legitimate side, it is estimated that from a quarter to a third of all the prescription drugs sold in this Nation are for mood-changing pills—pep pills or tranquilizers.

To a great extent, we have become and are a drug-oriented society. We spend millions of dollars on mood-altering

drugs—both through prescription and nonprescription purchases.

For example, in one county, San Mateo figures are even more overwhelming.

On the other side, the dark side, the County, Calif., newspaper accounts say that about a sixth of the total high school population has used speed—amphetamines—and more than a third have tried hallucinogens or barbiturates.

We are told by all experts dealing with the drug problem in America that education must provide a good part of the solution, at least for future generations.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has just allocated over \$3 million for drug education training projects. The National Institute of Mental Health provides an ongoing drug education program, and other public and private agencies and organizations are in the battle. It is a battle to save our children.

If we are to educate children on the evils of drug use and drug abuse, that fight will continue to be undermined, as it has for years, by the subliminal bombardment from commercials extolling the virtues of patent drugs.

Much of a child's education today comes from television. To a child, television represents what is real in the world. And when television presents to a child's undiscerning eyes and ears a message approving drugs for the solution of major emotional problems, that approval is real.

And we ask why youth is not afraid of drugs.

We must do everything in our power to slow and halt drug abuse and we must end the commercial persuasion that drugs—any drugs—offer a panacea.

I urge the Federal Communications Commission, the medical profession, the drug industry, the electronic media, public officials, and private citizens to join in solving this problem. It is an effort for future generations.

It is encouraging that the Federal Trade Commission has already initiated an investigation into the relationship between advertising and drug abuse. The report of the Commission is to be made available in January, 1971. No doubt it will contain many controversial findings in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that both the electronic media and the drug industry should take a long, hard look at what patent drug commercials do and how they impress the young and very young.

If voluntary curbs are not instituted, Congress should initiate legislation legally banning such advertisements.

This is a situation that has existed untouched for too long. It must be resolved.

#### REVENUE SHARING COULD LOWER LOCAL PROPERTY TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Hicks) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, all across the State of Washington homeowners are receiving notices from their banks that read:

Due to an increase in your property taxes, your monthly mortgage payment has been raised \$—.

Some families in the Sixth Congressional District have told me that their property taxes have been increased by several hundred percent.

And if this were not bad enough, Mr. Speaker, it appears to be only the beginning for my district. A recent Government study shows that property taxes in some American cities have swollen to alarming proportions.

For example, a family of four living in Pierce or Kitsap Counties who earns \$7,500 per year pays on the average of \$225 annually in property taxes—that already seems pretty high to me.

However, the same family earning \$7,500 in Baltimore pays \$638 per year in property taxes, its counterpart in Buffalo pays \$668, and in Milwaukee the bill is \$812—almost 11 percent of the family's income paid out in property taxes alone.

Renters, too, are losing out to rising property taxes—they simply have been paying them indirectly through rent increases. In fact, Richard Nenneman, financial editor for the Christian Science Monitor, points out that "property taxes are the main reason rents have climbed so fast in the past 5 years."

The heaviest burden, of course, is being borne by retired individuals living on modest fixed incomes—and they can least afford it. Often the bulk of their life's savings is in their homes, and if the present trend continues, I fear that many senior citizens will be taxed right out into the street.

#### THE FINANCIAL SQUEEZE

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government does not tax property—in fact, it never has—nor does it have the authority to roll back increases in the local property tax, but Congress can help by sharing a portion of its revenue with State and local governments.

We are all aware that our fast-growing population is demanding new and better services from local government. And unpopular as the property tax is, other local tax sources seem to have been about squeezed dry. As a consequence, property taxes are going up.

Presently, property taxes account for 87 percent of all local tax revenues collected in the State of Washington. With new funds that would be available through revenue sharing, cities and counties would not need to depend so heavily upon property taxes.

#### HISTORY OF FEDERAL AID

Federal revenue sharing is not a new idea. The Federal Government has, in fact, been helping State and local governments for some time. As far back as 1802, Congress provided that 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the new State of Ohio be applied to the construction of roads in that State. In 1836, during the administration of Andrew Jackson, Congress granted the States \$28 million—an amount equal to that year's entire Federal receipts.

In 1964, Dr. Walter Heller, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Kennedy, first proposed a revenue sharing plan that would spe-

cifically return a percentage of Federal revenues to State and local governments with "no strings attached."

Since then, members of both parties in Congress have introduced legislation for various forms of revenue sharing, and President Nixon has given revenue sharing strong White House endorsement. I personally applaud the President's stand and believe he deserves the support of every Member of Congress in his effort to help develop a workable revenue-sharing plan.

#### THE PRESENT SYSTEM

While the history of Federal assistance to State and local governments goes back to the beginnings of our country, only within the last 20 years has it become a major item in the Federal budget. In the 10 years prior to 1956, Federal aid doubled from \$1.8 to \$3.7 billion, in the next 4 years it doubled again, and between 1960 and 1970, it mushroomed from \$7 to \$27 billion—an increase of 300 percent in 10 years.

Yet, in spite of this growing flow of cash from the Federal Treasury to State and local coffers, there seems to be an increasing amount of dissatisfaction on the part of the recipients, at least with the terms on which the gifts are being made.

Here are a few of the more frequent complaints I receive from officials in the Sixth District:

First. There are too many "strings" attached to Federal aid—funds have to be used for a specified project often at the expense of others equally needed in a State or city.

Second. There are too many programs administered by too many bureaucracies—our colleague from Delaware (Mr. Roth) has counted an incredible 1,315 separate Federal aid programs.

Third. In many cases funds are allocated on a "first-come, first-served" basis. This means that some communities may not even be considered for aid because they are not aware of various programs, or because they cannot afford to hire experts to develop detailed grant applications.

Fourth. There are unnecessary delays in Federal approval of project applications, and in some instances after programs have been started funds will be unexpectedly withdrawn, so that projects must be scrapped at added expense to the taxpayer.

#### WHAT CAN BE DONE

In my view, the best reason for replacing many of the present "strings attached" grants with a more flexible revenue sharing plan is that it would strengthen the hand of State and local officials in dealing with their own particular problems. In addition, it would permit greater leeway for direct citizen participation in programs that effect their communities.

Where grants-in-aid programs have been successful—they should be continued. But where programs simply compound the web of bureaucratic confusion, they should be replaced with direct sharing of Federal revenues.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, it would be all too easy for us in Congress to take the position that these problems should

be solved by State legislatures, city councils, and county commissioners. However, claiming that this is a problem for local government, or strictly a matter for each individual State, simply will not work. The problems of governing 200 million people are too big, too complex, for one branch of Government.

We are all aware that the answers to local problems cannot be manufactured on some Federal assembly line—State and local governments are much better equipped to meet the needs of local citizens. We, in Congress, can help them do this job more effectively by enacting a revenue-sharing plan now.

#### THE MILITARY DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SPANISH-SPEAKING RECRUITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, I asked Attorney General John Mitchell to investigate the armed services for possible violation of title 7 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by denying equal opportunity to Spanish-speaking recruits.

Military job placement and training is based upon the results of the Armed Forces qualifying examination, administered immediately after induction. The examination is given only in English despite the fact that a large portion of the recruits entering the military are more proficient in the Spanish language.

By placing recruits on the basis of intelligence tests given in English, the military is virtually guaranteeing the Spanish-speaking will end up carrying rifles rather than serving as electrical engineers. Because of such biased placement policies, Spanish-speaking recruits fare much worse than their English-speaking counterparts and have a higher casualty rate.

A California court recently threw out a similar testing procedure used by some California schools which resulted in a large number of Spanish-speaking students being placed in mentally retarded classes because the IQ tests were linguistically and culturally biased. Students who retook the tests in Spanish scored an average of 12 IQ points higher.

The Army should permit Spanish-speaking recruits to take placement tests in Spanish and permit all Spanish-speaking recruits now in the armed services to be retested and reassigned. The placement tests themselves should be immediately redesigned to eliminate all traces of cultural bias.

To back up my demands, I have introduced, for myself and the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico (Mr. CORDOVA), H.R. 18929, legislation to require the Armed Forces to permit Spanish-speaking recruits to take placement tests in Spanish.

The problem of language bias is not unique to the Armed Forces, but with programs like bilingual education, the schools and job training and placement programs are beginning to overcome it.

It is about time that the Armed Forces faced up to it as well. The previous ad-

ministration initiated a program to assist the retiring soldier in securing full opportunity upon leaving the military. The armed services should see to it that a similar opportunity is afforded the soldier just entering.

I insert, at this point in the RECORD, the text of the bill:

H.R. 18929

A bill to amend title 10 to require that enlisted members of the Armed Forces be given, upon request, certain examinations in Spanish

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:*

"§ 1041. Examinations in Spanish

"(a) Any enlisted member of an Armed Force, whether inducted for service or otherwise, is, upon request, entitled to take in the Spanish language any examination given to him for the purpose of determining the military job speciality for which he is qualified, for which he will be trained, or to which he will be assigned.

"(b) No examination referred to in subsection (a) shall be given to any enlisted member of the Armed Force unless he has been notified (with adequate explanation) of his entitlement to take the examination in the Spanish language.

"(c) The Secretaries concerned shall prescribe such regulations, which so far as practicable shall be uniform, as are necessary to carry out this section."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 53 is amended by adding after

"1040. Replacement of certificate of discharge."

the following:

"1041. Examinations in Spanish."

SEC. 2. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 1041 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by the first section of this Act shall not apply to any examination given during the 60-day period beginning on the day after the date of the enactment of this act.

#### POLLUTION CAUSED BY DISPOSAL OF WHEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY), is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a situation exists in the dairy industry that is not only financially difficult for dairy farmers but also contributes to the pollution in our rivers. The problem I refer to is the one faced by manufacturers of cottage cheese and Bakers cheese.

As an example, Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers is a dairy marketing cooperative owned by approximately 800 dairymen, for the most part from my district. The cooperative owns and operates three major dairy processing plants and seven distributing branches in the eastern Pennsylvania and south Jersey areas, through which is processed and marketed, on a cost basis, the milk produced on the farms of its dairymen owners.

Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers produces annually approximately 14 million pounds of cottage cheese and approximately 6 million pounds of Bakers cheese. The whey from the cottage cheese and the Bakers cheese is about 42 million

pounds annually. The whey has been and is presently handled as a waste product. The high acid content of cottage cheese and Bakers cheese whey historically has practically nullified the use of the whey. However, recent technological advances indicate cottage whey can and is being used.

The real problem of growing concern is the pollution caused by the disposal of the whey.

Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers recognizes its responsibility to mankind and this most serious and perplexing pollution problem, and in this regard established a grant with the Pennsylvania State University to research wider use for the whey, and it is reasonably expected such a wider use will be found shortly. The cooperative is presently making arrangements with the University of Maryland whereby the cooperative would give financial assistance to the University of Maryland for similar research.

One of the elements of whey is lactose. This country is polluting its streams and waterways with lactose while importing the product at the rate of 4 to 5 million pounds a year. The economics of recovering the lactose from whey are prohibitive when compared with the imported price of lactose. In testimony before the U.S. Tariff Commission, Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers recommended the disallowance of all imports of lactose.

In addition to the serious pollutant problem created by the dumping of cottage cheese whey into our streams and waterways, there is also the problem of imported lactose replacing domestic nonfat milk. Nonfat milk is a quota product. Therefore, imported lactose at a lesser price is creating an additional burden on this country's Government in its efforts to maintain and develop domestic food sources for our growing population. Lactose is a form of milk sugar derived from whey. It is now being used in place of nonfat milk in fortifying low-fat fluid milk, the manufacture of candy, baby foods, and now even in ice cream. Imported lactose could be classified as the new evasion tactic for foreign governments to circumvent our import quotas on milk solids.

Millions of dollars are being spent to develop an effective whey utilization program. Pilot programs are being financed and grants have been made to several individual firms to develop whey products. The Lehigh Valley Cooperative Farmers encourage this approach and would recommend greater efforts by our Government in the interest of developing and utilizing our own domestic agricultural products. Certainly, control of imports is most important. Private industry cannot expend great efforts only to be discouraged by the access of an imported product at a ridiculously low price.

#### GROSS MISREADING OF THE INTENDED BRITISH ARMS DEAL WITH SOUTH AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in the July

31 issue of the Washington Post, there appeared an article by Mr. Kelvin P. Phillips entitled "British Policy in Africa Merits U.S. Aid to Counter Soviet Push."

To attempt to justify the resumption of arms sale by Britain to South Africa on the grounds that this would "counter Soviet push," is dangerously misleading. For, there is no question that the combined naval strength of Britain and South Africa in the area around the cape and in the Indian Ocean cannot force the Soviets out of the area, nor can it really be an effective buffer to the so-called Soviet push.

Mr. Phillips also asserts that in spite of African hostility and Labour Party opposition to the British announcement, Britain's Conservative Government "is sticking to its guns" to carry out its intentions. Such an assertion seems unwarranted; at least for the moment, because it grossly underestimates the great impact in Britain of the African and Commonwealth reaction to the declared British intention. One might recall the immediate demonstrations which took place in Kampala, Lusaka, Mogadiscio, Dar es Salaam, Lagos, and other African capitals. It also overlooks the fact that the Presidents of Zambia, Tanzania, and Uganda met in Dar es Salaam on July 22 and later summoned the British High Commissioner to register their joint protest; and the equally strong opposition expressed by Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau and Mrs. Gandhi of India to the issue. In fact, these protestations have led to some speculation in the London press that this issue may well be the "undoing" of British Foreign Minister Home. The growing intensity of this reaction against the British decision is indicated by the joint communique issued on August 5 by the Foreign Ministers of Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, and Zambia announcing that they had adopted a common strategy on the matter.

It is sufficiently clear that these actions of the countries mentioned have been strong enough to have forced the British Government to reconsider its decision by delaying its timetable and agreeing to consult with the Commonwealth countries before taking the next step. This obviously is an important change.

Phillips' statement that "It cannot really be argued that antisubmarine frigates, Sea Dart ship-to-air missiles, Nimrod maritime reconnaissance planes and the like are weapons against African guerrillas or demonstrators," is perhaps misleading. In fact, several countries neighboring South Africa have expressed their fear that their security is in danger. The Zambia Mail of July 29 for example, reported Vice President Kapwepwe's concern that these weapons could be used to bomb and attack "progressive African governments."

As for Phillips' assertion that the black African nations have not objected to France's arms sales to South Africa this is simply not true. In the United Nations Security Council discussion of the resolution against the proposed British sale of arms to South Africa, for example, numerous complaints against the French were raised.

There is a curious belief by some that

expanded relations between South Africa and Britain might "help bring South Africa out of its Afrikaner nationalist and apartheid cocoon." This is false and especially this particular kind of contact which violates the U.N. arms embargo can only strengthen the Afrikaner nationalist in their racial views. They are likely to feel that outsiders are beginning to see the merit of apartheid which the Nationalist Government has long proclaimed, and are likely to feel strengthened in their espousal of the master-race theory.

Finally, Mr. Phillips' argument that arms sales amounting to 20 to 40 million pounds a year would provide for the maintenance of a British naval force from the Persian Gulf to Malaysia-Singapore is a weak argument indeed. The assertion that this relatively insignificant sum could achieve such an end does not seem reasonable nor convincing.

A step which could lead to the breakup of the Commonwealth and force many of the independent states of Africa to seek military and other support from sources unfriendly to the West does not merit U.S. support. Neither is it likely in the long run to counter a "Soviet push" as Mr. Phillips claims.

#### TRIBUTE TO HIS EXCELLENCY WALTER A. FOERY, BISHOP OF SYRACUSE

(Mr. HANLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, August 4, the apostolic delegate in Washington, D.C., announced that Pope Paul had accepted the resignation of His Excellency Walter A. Foery, bishop of Syracuse. This announcement marked another achievement for the man who has served the people of God as bishop in this diocese for 33 years.

Consecrated on August 18, 1937, and installed in the Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception on September 1, 1937, as fifth bishop of Syracuse, Walter A. Foery was the youngest man ever appointed bishop of this see and held the post longer than any of his predecessors.

Between the dates of installation and resignation lay the most memorable and productive years in history of the diocese.

In an age of slogans and catchwords, Bishop Foery's simple motto, "Keep the Faith," has been the staff with which he guided the spiritual welfare of the 338,000 Roman Catholics in Onondaga, Oswego, Oneida, Madison, Cortland, Chenango, and Broome Counties.

The list of the bishop's accomplishments during these past 33 years surpasses that of most dioceses in the Nation. Knowing the character of the man and his love for children, it is not surprising that such a large share of his time and planning was successfully devoted to an expansion of Catholic education and the spiritual care of young people. During his administration 38 parish grammar schools were founded. His efforts to meet an ever-growing need for secondary and higher Catholic education resulted in 10 new Catholic high

schools, four of which were financed by a \$10 million financial drive on the occasion of Bishop Foery's silver jubilee of consecration, and two colleges, Maria Regina and Le Moyne.

Thousands of central New York Catholics, and I number myself among them, have already benefited from these schools and from the inspired, patient nuns, priests, brothers, and lay teachers who staff them.

Bishop Foery has conferred the Sacrament of Holy Orders on 257 priests for the diocese and has seen the number of diocesan and religious priests increase from 265 in 1937 to 522 today.

Every pastor of our diocesan churches, with the exception of Msgr. William L. Walsh of Our Lady of Pompei, was appointed to his present post by Bishop Foery. He founded the Priests Eucharistic League, instituted diocesan vocational programs for future seminarians and founded novitiates for Marianists and Stigmatine Fathers.

Bishop Foery founded 42 parishes in the diocese and dedicated 84 new church buildings. In 1954 he initiated a diocesan development drive that provided Saint Pius X Home for retired priests, a new chancery building, the renovation of the cathedral, a retreat house for laymen and laywomen, and three new hospital buildings in different parts of the diocese.

Walter A. Foery, fifth bishop of the diocese of Syracuse is a product of the Catholic home of William J. and Agnes O'Brien Foery of Rochester and of the Rochester Catholic schools.

During his tenure as bishop he never asked us to do anything he was not willing to do himself, and in keeping with his own admonition to "keep the faith," he has kept the faith with us for 33 years.

Much of the stability and decisiveness of the American character can be traced to the influence of men such as Bishop Foery. We ask God to send us more men like him.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point a biographical sketch of Bishop Foery which appeared August 6, in the Catholic Sun, the official organ of the diocese of Syracuse:

#### BISHOP WALTER A. FOERY

The Most Reverend Walter Andrew Foery, Fifth Bishop of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Syracuse, today announced that he will resign from the position of Ordinary of the Diocese. He will be succeeded by the Most Reverend David F. Cunningham, present Coadjutor Bishop.

Bishop Foery, 80, has been the spiritual leader of the Roman Catholics living in the counties of Onondaga, Oswego, Oneida, Madison, Cortland, Chenango, and Broome for the last 32 years. A priest for 54 years, Bishop Foery was the youngest of the Bishops appointed to the See of Syracuse and has held the post longer than any of his predecessors. These include: Bishop Patrick A. Ludden, Bishop John Grimes, Bishop Daniel J. Curley and Bishop John A. Duffy.

Bishop Foery was born in Rochester, New York on July 6, 1890, the son of William J. Foery and Agnes O'Brien Foery. His father died when Bishop Foery was five years old. His mother died in 1950 at the age of 81. He attended St. Bridget's School and St. Andrew's and St. Bernard's Seminaries in Rochester. While at St. Bernard's, he earned the degrees Licentiate in Sacred Theology and Doctor of Philosophy. Bishop Thomas F.

Hickey ordained him a priest in Rochester on June 10, 1916.

The Bishop's first assignment was as Assistant Pastor of Rochester's Mount Carmel Parish. He served the Italian Americans of that parish for 16 years, the last 10 years as their pastor. In 1932, he was named pastor of Holy Rosary Parish in Rochester as he continued his two year old duties as Diocesan Director of Catholic Charities. The energetic and social minded Father Foery was designated by the Bishops of the United States as their delegate to the Third International Conference on Social Work in London in 1936. A strong speaker, with working knowledge of foreign languages, he was active in community work in Rochester serving as Vice-President of the Council of Social Agencies and as the Rochester Diocesan delegate to the New York State Welfare Conference. In this latter capacity, he was instrumental in bringing about the Child Labor Laws.

At 46 years of age, on May 26, 1937, Father Foery was preparing to celebrate a requiem Mass at Holy Rosary Parish when word reached him through the Most Reverend Amleto Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate, that Pope Pius XI had named him the Fifth Bishop of the Diocese of Syracuse to succeed the Most Reverend John A. Duffy who was appointed to the See at Buffalo. The Bishop was consecrated in St. Patrick's Cathedral in Rochester on August 18, 1937 and installed in Syracuse's Cathedral on September 1, 1937.

When the new Bishop arrived at the New York Central railroad station in Syracuse in 1937, he said to the huge crowd of well-wishers: "I have come to do the work of the Church." His accomplishments can be measured by comparing the statistics of the Diocese of Syracuse for 1937 and 1970.

Some notable "firsts" during Bishop Foery's administration were: The first new parish established was St. Mary's in Kirkwood, just 24 days after Bishop Foery's installation; his first Diocesan appointment was Father Martin J. Watley as Director of the Propagation of the Faith Office; the first priest death of his new administration was Father Ambrose M. Dwyer of St. Patrick's, Binghamton; and the new Bishop's first public appearance at a civic function was the speech he gave at the County Conference on Childhood and Youth, October 14, 1937.

It is interesting to note that Bishop Foery has appointed every pastor in the Diocese to his present position with the exception of Monsignor William L. Walsh of Our Lady of Pompei Parish in Syracuse.

Although the Diocese has witnessed a vast material growth under the leadership of Bishop Foery, his primary concern has been, and is, the spiritual. On the occasion of the 75th Anniversary of the Diocese in 1961, he said: "While so many of the undertakings of the Diocese partake of the physical and the material, let us never lose sight of our spiritual and supernatural goal. As we thank God for His blessings and seek His continued care, first among our petitions is the salvation of souls. All else is unimportant if in this we fail."

On the human side, Bishop Foery is known for his great love of children and his interest in sports. He enjoys following the Syracuse Chiefs, the LeMoyné Dolphins, the New York Yankees and the New York Giants. The Bishop is an avid reader and much time is spent in preparing the many talks he is called upon to give. His concern for "being on time" is well known throughout the Diocese.

The Bishop has two sisters, Miss Florence Foery and Miss Loretta Foery, and a brother, Frank, all of Rochester.

Under Bishop Cunningham's administration, Bishop Foery will continue to serve the people of the Diocese of Syracuse for whom he has labored so unselfishly these past 33 years.

The response of the priests, sisters, broth-

ers, and all the members of the Diocese of Syracuse was summed up by the late Father John W. Lynch in the closing lines of a poem he wrote on the occasion of Bishop Foery's Golden Jubilee: "He merits all of us, supporting, glad. And, we would have him know, he always had."

#### HIGHWAY SAFETY, NO. 8—WHAT CAN THE INDIVIDUAL DO?

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, since I began inserting into the Record the series of articles from the Christian Science Monitor, I have received a number of letters from concerned citizens inquiring what they can do in the fight against the drunk driver. I really have not had a good answer for them, except to say that they should contact their State legislators. I am sure that many of my colleagues have run into similar problems.

Now I have an answer. The eighth article in this series by Guy Halverson discusses the role of individuals, organizations, and businesses in getting action against the drunk driver. I was surprised to learn just how many people are active in this effort, and that there are a number of rather effective organizations which have gotten organized in recent years. Their programs offer valuable guidance to others who want to help.

The underlying theme of this article is also relevant to many of the problems of our time. So many people say that Government is unresponsive to the wishes of the people. This article is evidence that the opposite is the case. If people make their feelings known, then Government acts. Witness the fact that implied consent laws have been enacted in a number of States recently as the direct result of citizen lobbying. Note that a number of States have lowered their presumptive blood-alcohol definition of drunkenness, as the direct result of citizen lobbying. Previous articles have made a clear case that our laws are not tough enough to get drunk drivers off the road and that enforcement of even weak existing laws is inadequate. But this article makes the equally important point that where change has taken place it is the result of citizen activity in making their views known to their legislators, Governors, and State officials. We need more of this citizen participation to make our democracy function more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, this constructive article gives deserved attention to many of those who have been active in the emerging drive against the drunken driver as well as many of those who have developed and implemented creative programs to deal with alcoholics. They deserve credit for their work, and this article gives it to them. I intend to use it to answer inquiries about what individuals can do about this problem, and I urge my colleagues to give this consideration.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 13, 1970]

#### THE FIGHT NEEDED SO BADLY

(By Guy Halverson)

LOS ANGELES.—"Sometimes I still can't believe that it happened," the attractive

North Carolina housewife says slowly. "My son was a healthy, strong, happy boy. We just didn't expect it."

In early August of 1968 at Albermarle, N.C., while returning home with a friend after visiting a local swimming pool, 11-year-old Mark Sugg was killed by a drunken driver. The two boys were riding bicycles. The driver of the car—a woman—had been mixing liquor with tranquilizers.

Despite an unexpected and cruel personal loss, Mrs. John D. Sugg has refused to retreat behind walls of shock and tragedy. As a key leader of the North Carolina Association of Women Highway Safety Leaders, an organization encompassing some 15,000 women from 250 local women's clubs, Mrs. Sugg is but one of a growing army of citizen warriors throughout the United States determined to stop the drunken driver.

#### EFFECTS ON FAMILIES RECORDED

In cooperation with the North Carolina Department of Motor Vehicles she has just completed a film on her son's accident. And most important, she is actively lobbying for stronger antidrunken-driver legislation at the state level.

"People just don't realize what a family goes through when something like this happens," she says. "Before, accidents like this were always just statistics to me. Now . . . well, I want Mark's death to mean something. Maybe he can serve as a symbol for the fight that's needed so badly in this country."

Mrs. Sugg is not alone in that fight. Though he might be surprised to find himself included in it, there is George W. Sales, a labor-relations counselor at the Rocketdyne Division of North American Rockwell here in Greater Los Angeles.

There is Lt. Floyd Flowers, a rangy southern California police detective who has spent the past months crisscrossing the North American continent in a large walk-in van demonstrating a new portable breathalyzer machine. I met Lieutenant Flowers as he rumbled through the steep inclines of the Colorado Rockies in late May of this year.

Down in Raleigh, N.C., J. Marse Grant, editor of the Biblical Recorder, an arm of the Southern Baptists Convention, drives more than 35,000 miles a year. Disturbed at the rising highway fatality rate, Mr. Grant wrote an impressionistic little book focusing on the effects on the families of accident victims. Called "Whiskey at the Wheel" (Broadman Press), the book is approaching sales of 50,000.

The war against the drunken driver is not just a citizens' crusade. It's also an organization's crusade. Scores of major organizations are involved, ranging from the American Trial Lawyers Association to the traffic-court program of the American Bar Association to the National Safety Council itself. And there are more than 780,000 highway-safety specialists at all levels of government, in private industry, and at major universities, most of whom are more than aware of the menace of the drunken driver.

#### COORDINATION LACKING

Taken together—this army—involving millions of people and hundreds of committees, agencies, and organizations—could be formidable.

But that's the greatest tragedy of all.

Coordination between these agencies—the social rehabilitators, the police, the private citizens' lobbies—is almost nonexistent in any meaningful sense. The highway-safety lobby, I have found, is riven with rivalries, petty squabbles, and struggles over policies and objectives.

The same apathy that virtually smothers public indignation over the role of the drinking driver seems to fragment and divide the safety warriors themselves.

In fact, divisions are already evident over administration of the new Department of

Transportation campaign to curb the drinking driver. The Washington State Patrol, for example, has declined to participate in a DOT study because the force was being asked to undertake acts that it felt were not in the "proper image" of a law-enforcement agency, and also because the force could not meet the needed personnel increase.

Among other things, the force was asked to station troopers outside bars, a practice followed in several other states.

Few of these organizations fully realize their potential. In sheer numbers and influence they make up a collective entity that if properly mobilized could well become one of the most powerful and most effective citizen lobbies in American history.

What's needed, say many experts, is nothing less than a presidential or at least federal conference on the drinking driver. It could pull together representatives from across the nation. Mayors and governors should be included. Speakers should be sent into every major community.

#### TOTAL OFFENSIVE URGED

American highways have become battlegrounds, these experts argue. And the responses should be nothing less than a total citizen offensive.

The National Association of Women Highway Safety Leaders, Inc., vividly illustrates the type of grass-roots strength available in the antidrinking-driver campaign. The association has made eradication of drunken driving one of its top priorities.

The association, which includes scores of local women's clubs around the nation, was formed about three years ago at a national conference of state governors. The women were asked to help muster support for the federal standards passed under the Highway Safety Act of 1966. Today the association is considered a formidable lobby in 26 states. It has weaker, but still visible, organizations in another 11 states. Only in New England and parts of the South is the movement lagging.

In Ohio the state affiliate has local organizations in all 88 counties. Ohio women, such as Mrs. Paul J. Gnau of Cleveland, are contacting state legislators in support of a reduction of the state's presumptive blood-alcohol level, which defines drunkenness. The current .15 percent is considered too loose and a stiffer .10 percent is being sought. A .10 percent bill easily sailed through the Ohio House last year but sank with hardly a moan in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

#### CAMPAIGN IN ILLINOIS

"We're expectant of passage this next year," says Mrs. Gnau, who in addition to being a key official of the Ohio association is also vice-chairman of the national association. The Ohio clubs are also pushing for stiffer enforcement of existing traffic laws.

"We want our judges to know that we're watching them and that we'll have no more of this 'touch on the wrist' business for drinking drivers," Mrs. Gnau warns.

Illinois is one of four states plus the District of Columbia that still have no implied-consent statutes, under which acceptance of a license implies a driver's consent to a chemical or a breath test if arrested.

The Illinois Conference of Women Leaders for Traffic Safety is pushing hard for implied consent. The group is also lobbying for motor-vehicle inspection (only one major Illinois town, Evanston, is believed to have such a statute) and a statewide law for medical review board of physicians to keep medically impaired drivers (including alcoholics) off the highway. Such a program has been successfully applied in Ontario, Canada.

"Starting in October we're going from the top part of the state to the bottom to mobilize support for our program," says Miss Eleanor Freeman of the Illinois conference. Miss Freeman says that her organization is working closely with aides of

Illinois Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie (who favors implied consent) and the National Safety Council, headquartered in Chicago.

Miss Freeman considers association with the National Safety Council most fortunate. The council is the greatest and most prestigious of all agencies in the highway-safety area—almost a subgovernment, some critics grumble. Budgeted at around \$10 million annually, with 85 local commissions and safety committees, the council is both an advisory agency to Congress on matters of legislation, a powerful lobby group, and the principal source of safety statistics in the United States.

Council officials still firmly believe that perhaps the key to highway safety is still the driver himself—and his own sense of personal responsibility. "Highway safety is enormously complicated," says Howard Pyle, council president. "But we know that most accidents still involve a driver error of some kind, we want to reach the individual and we want the individual to put pressure on government officials. Governors are accessible to the public, as are almost no other officials," says Mr. Pyle—himself a former governor.

"The individual can provide quite a din if he has the heart to do so."

#### INDUSTRY DRAWS ON EXPERTISE

For its part, the council has graduated more than 1 million drivers from its defensive-driver schools. It has mounted a major television and press campaign against the drunken driver, in conjunction with the National Advertising Council.

Industry draws heavily on the council's expertise. And for good reason. It is estimated that as much as 5.3 percent of the entire U.S. work force is affected by alcoholism. Consequently, through its alcoholism-prevention and rehabilitation campaigns, industry is seeking to reduce the increasing numbers of workers dependent on liquor—thousands of whom drive to and from work daily.

Industry programs often score as high as a 65 to 70 percent recovery rate—possibly the highest rate of any type of recovery program.

All told, some 300 companies in the United States have alcoholism programs or policies. Some of them, such as at Allis-Chalmers, Equitable Life, and Eastman Kodak, are considered genuinely innovative and successful.

Almost all the programs involve the same features: early identification of the problem drinker, followed by company intervention to channel him into some type of rehabilitative program.

#### FIRM'S PROGRAM TYPICAL

The program of the Rocketdyne Division of North American Rockwell at Canoga Park, not far from here, is typical. Like many aerospace firms, Rocketdyne has had a major employment slump during the past few years, sagging from a 1964 high of 20,000 to around 4,000 now. The company's full-time alcoholism counselor was among those lost in the tightening. But an alcoholism program continues—albeit on a reduced level—under the direction of Mr. Sales, a labor-relations specialist.

"I keep up contact with all top supervisors, asking them for identification of any worker who might show evidence of alcoholism," said Mr. Sales. As we talked, a steady procession of workers and secretaries rushed back and forth past his open office door.

Rocketdyne sends its problem-drinking employees to outside programs such as the Pioneer Foundation at Pomona, or halfway houses or even hospitals with treatment programs. The company also maintains stiff rules designed to prevent workers from driving to work under the influence of liquor. "We insist that our supervisors identify the problem drinker," said Mr. Sales. "We absolutely will not tolerate a cover-up. We want to get to these people if they're here."

#### INSURANCE COMPANIES ACTIVE

Of all American businesses, the insurance industry has taken the strongest lead in seeking to stop the drunken driver. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, headed up by Dr. William Haddon, a former director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, is cooperating with the City of Baton Rouge, La., in a prearrest, road-breath-test program. A number of companies, including State Farm, Preferred Risk, and Allstate have undertaken costly and effective individual campaigns.

Allstate has financed perhaps the most significant campaign of all. During 1969 alone the company ran large advertisements in a number of national publications as well as in special target states. Results were astonishing. Fourteen of 16 target states passed an implied-consent law. Nine of 20 targeted states passed a 10 presumptive level.

Industry, the private citizen, the various highway safety lobbies—individually, each is taking tentative, and in some cases definite, steps to curtail the drunken driver. United they could be invincible allies in wresting stiff and much-needed legislation from too-apathetic state legislators.

But sad to say, unity is not yet the magic password in the highway safety-rehabilitation field.

#### WHAT YOU CAN DO

1. Align yourself with a local safety agency or alcoholism rehabilitation organization. If unsure of what groups are in your area you might want to contact any of the following national organizations:

The National Safety Council, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60611.

National Association of Women Highway Safety Leaders, Inc., 1225 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Room 414, Washington, D.C. 20036.

National Council on Alcoholism, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016.

2. Let your governor and state legislators know that you support a "no-nonsense" .10 percent presumptive blood-level statute as well as an implied-consent law.

If your state has both, push for the even more realistic .08 percent Canadian level.

3. Ask your local law-enforcement agencies to adopt selective enforcement in high-mishap areas and specially trained "drunk squads" along the lines of programs of the San Diego, Calif., department.

Don't accept vague reassurances from department administrators. Visit your law agencies and see firsthand what emphasis is placed on traffic safety in general and stopping the drunk driver in particular.

4. Ask your local chamber of commerce to support industry rehabilitation programs as well as antidrunk-driver campaigns. Contact service groups, such as Rotary International, the Elks, Lions, etc.

#### JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE STUDY OF ENERGY PRODUCTION

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our whole economy is heavily dependent on fuel to produce energy. It has been estimated that the vast amounts of goods and services produced in this country depend on fuel for 99 percent of the necessary power and on human labor for only 1 percent. Obviously, we could not get very far as a society without the fuels necessary to create the huge quantities of energy that we consume.

Almost every day new information is brought to our attention which gives additional cause for concern, perhaps even for alarm, concerning the health of

the energy producing sector of our economy. Again and again we see in the news predictions of dire shortages of electricity, of blackouts or brownouts during hot spells this summer. These predictions are not idle or unfounded, as we have already seen from the recent events in New York, where power supplies had to be reduced and subway service slowed down. Nationally, the Federal Government has already had to take various steps to ease the shortage by reducing its own consumption of electricity. Appeals have been issued to consumers in various parts of the country to go easy on their use of air conditioners and other electrical appliances.

This situation should never have been allowed to develop. The electrical utilities should have done a better job of foreseeing demands. At the very least, they should have stopped advertising for new customers at a time when they were having difficulty meeting the existing demand. The Federal Government should have had policies under which the utilities would have been required to provide adequate capacity, and to do so in ways compatible with the preservation of our natural environment. Both the private and the public sectors appear to have been somewhat derelict of their responsibilities.

What is most alarming is that even worse problems may be ahead of us after this summer is over. Demand for electricity will continue to grow, and we have yet to figure out how to meet this demand in ways which do not do intolerable damage to our natural environment. On top of this, there is mounting evidence of a serious shortage of the basic fuels from which we produce electricity. This shortage is being reflected in rapidly rising prices. The "inflation alert" published by the Council of Economic Advisers last Friday, although it was a pretty feeble substitute for an anti-inflation policy, did contain some very interesting information—some very disturbing information—about the prices of coal and of gas and oil. I ask unanimous consent that the portions of the Council of Economic Advisers "inflation alert" relating to fuel and energy prices be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The price of bituminous coal went up 35 percent during the 12 months ending in June. Not only that, but this price rise has been accelerating. If we take only the last 3 of those 12 months, that is April, May, and June of 1970, the price of bituminous coal was going up at an annual rate of over 80 percent. The increase in the price of residual fuel oil was almost as bad, increasing during those same 3 months at an annual rate of 60 percent. The price of natural gas has not gone up so much, because, of course, this price is regulated in interstate commerce, but, as we all know, there is a serious shortage of natural gas. It is only because of regulation that this price too does not skyrocket, and the flow of natural gas to some users is "interruptible"—service can be cut off when supplies are inadequate.

Of course, there are special factors involved in these extraordinary price in-

creases. The foreign demand for our coal has increased. Domestic utilities are using more coal than they had anticipated, because the building of nuclear generating plants has been delayed. Pollution regulations are requiring electric utilities to switch to low sulfur grades of coal. What all these special factors add up to is that demand is outstripping supply. Our country is blessed with abundant supplies of coal, but new mines and also new gas and oil fields must be developed. This will take time. Meantime we have a classic situation of excess demand, the kind of situation in which the Government must step in and develop policies to check the rise in prices and to protect the public interest in a dependable supply of energy.

It will not take very long for increases in the prices of coal, oil, and gas to be translated into increases in the price of electricity. Over half of the electricity in this country is produced by burning coal. We all know how much the availability of abundant supplies of electricity at reasonable prices has done to benefit the economy of this country and to increase the well-being of our people. Most of us are old enough to remember what it was like in rural areas before electricity became available. We understand what a difference electricity makes. We must not allow faulty public policies to lead to unnecessary increases in the price of electrical energy.

Perhaps it is necessary to have some increase in the price of electricity to cover the cost of generating it in ways which do less damage to the environment. And certainly, the price of coal must cover the cost of providing safe working conditions for the miners. But we must not stand for price increases caused by our failure to develop dependable supplies of basic fuels, our failure to encourage healthy competition in the fuels industry, our failure to do the research which would lead to more efficient and environmentally less harmful ways of producing electricity, and our failure to keep the cost of borrowing money under control.

Each of these failures is putting unwarranted pressure on electricity prices today. Natural gas and low-pollution grades of coal and oil are in short supply. Concentration of ownership in the fuels industry has increased markedly. The Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, chaired by my distinguished Senate colleague, Senator HART, has recently begun some very worthwhile and very useful hearings on the extent of concentration of ownership in the energy sector of the economy. These hearings revealed that of the 10 largest coal companies in the country, only two remain independently owned. The other eight are owned by oil companies, other mineral companies, or other big companies with multiple stakes in the energy field. Certainly we should look further into this increasing concentration of ownership. I doubt whether it can be in the public interest.

The utilities must borrow money, and borrow heavily, if they are to expand their capacity and meet the rapidly growing demand for electricity. The

Council of Economic Advisers points out in its "inflation alert" that the cost of borrowing, as measured by the rate on Aaa corporate bonds, went up 21½ percent in the past year. The utilities' costs of borrowing are, of course, reflected in the price of electricity. This is another way in which bad public policies—in this case, disastrous high interest rate policies—have put upward pressure on the price of electricity.

The many underlying economic factors which help determine the supply of energy and its price should receive a thorough examination. The Joint Economic Committee intends to undertake such an examination. Already the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress has prepared an excellent background study for the committee. This will be published shortly. I plan to schedule hearings on this subject after Congress returns from its Labor Day recess. A dependable energy supply is too fundamental to our economic well-being to allow present inadequate public policies to continue unexamined.

Enclosed for the RECORD is an excerpt from the recent "inflation alert" by the Council of Economic Advisers:

EXCERPT FROM THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS INFLATION ALERT  
FUELS

Prices of industrial fuels have advanced with exceptional rapidity during the past year and especially during the first half of 1970 (Table III-7). The sharpest increase has been for bituminous coal which rose at the annual rate of 18 percent in the last half of 1969 and spurred to a 56 percent rate in the first half of the current year. There have been several reasons for this development. In the first place, there has been a very substantial increase in foreign demand, especially for metallurgical coal used in steel making, while some domestic utilities have had to use more coal than anticipated because of delays in their nuclear generation projects. Secondly, increasingly stringent pollution regulations have required many electric utilities to change their fuel specifications to low-sulfur coal. As it happens, most low-sulfur coal is also metallurgical grade, further augmenting the pressure on the type of fuel. Third, safety regulations are being tightened and, while these may not yet be fully effective, it appears that they have added substantially to mining costs. Labor unrest and wildcat strikes in some fields have put still further pressure on supplies. Finally it takes years to open the new mines that may be needed to cope with this unforeseen increase in demand.

TABLE III-7.—CHANGE IN WHOLESALE PRICES OF FUELS DURING 2D HALF OF 1969 AND 1ST HALF OF 1970

[Not seasonally adjusted, except as indicated]

Item	Percentage change per year during			
	1969, 2d half	1970		
		1st half	1st quarter	2d quarter
Fuel and related products and power <sup>1</sup> .....	3.3	3.6	0.8	6.5
Bituminous coal.....	18.1	56.0	34.4	81.1
Residual fuels.....	6.2	47.6	36.0	60.3
Natural gas.....	2.4	3.1	-1.1	5.1

<sup>1</sup> Seasonally adjusted; includes some commodities not shown separately.

Source: Department of Labor.

The price of residual oil, most of which is imported, has also advanced very rapidly, at an annual rate of 48 percent in the first 6 months of 1970. Here, again, a number of factors have been involved. World demand has been rising sharply. As in the case of coal, many utilities have been required to shift to lower sulfur oils, adding to costs and limiting sources of supply. In addition, tanker rates have increased very rapidly in recent months, partly as a result of the closure of a pipeline through Syria and production cutbacks in Libya.

Prices of natural gas also rose somewhat more rapidly in the first half of 1970 than in the last part of 1969. The increase in natural gas prices, however, has not been nearly as rapid as for coal and residual fuels, averaging an annual rate of only 3.1 percent in the 6 months ended June 1970. It should be noted, however, that natural gas prices are subject to regulation and that the flow of natural gas to utilities and other major consumers is often "interruptible," subject to being cut off when supplies are inadequate to meet total demand.

Another important increase appears to be in progress in energy prices, some of which have already been discussed above. Electricity prices have to date moved only slowly. Wholesale electricity prices are up only 1.8 percent in the twelve months ending in June, although this is itself a departure from the stability of earlier years. Wholesale natural gas prices have increased about three percent in the last twelve months. These conditions of relative stability, however, are likely to change. Recently the Tennessee Valley Authority announced an average price increase of electric power at wholesale of 23 percent. Other power companies have applied to the regulatory authorities for large increases in power rates. The Federal Power Commission has proposed to lift its ceiling on natural gas prices in several areas in order to encourage production.

There are a number of reasons for these price increases. First, the prices of fossil fuel (coal and oil), which accounts for over three-quarters of the production cost to generate electric power, have skyrocketed. Over half of the electric power in the country is generated by burning coal, and utility rates often contain an escalator clause tying the price of power to the price of fuel. Bituminous coal prices, on the average, have increased 35 percent from June 1969 to June 1970; the increase to some utilities has apparently been considerably greater. Power companies also burn residual fuel oil and natural gas. While natural gas has not gone up much in price, the supply has become increasingly short. Gas pipelines have had to interrupt deliveries to some utilities and industrial users, thereby increasing the reliance of large gas consumers on coal and residual oil. The price of residual oil in turn is up 25 percent in the last twelve months. Thus two of the three major sources of fuel for power generation are up significantly.

To help relieve the coal supply situation the ICC has directed that hopper cars be returned promptly to their owners in order to speed up the movement of coal to power plants. Moreover, the Atomic Energy Commission has reduced the production of enriched uranium, thereby saving considerable quantities of power. This in turn has reduced moderately the need for coal.

Contributing to higher power prices is the increase in interest rates during the last year. The rate on Aaa bonds has gone up 21.5 percent in a year. Most power companies have to borrow heavily for expansion and to refinance past borrowings. Thus capital costs, which are significant in this industry, are up noticeably. Moreover, productivity in terms of thermal efficiency and capital cost per kilowatt seems to have reached a limit in the last few years. Prior to that, increases in productivity had been sufficient to offset higher wage and equipment costs. Finally, environmental considerations are increasing the cost of power. Thus the move to low-sulfur fuels which are in short supply has increased costs, and so has the need to find appropriate plant sites which do not harm the environment.

#### STUDIES PROVE BANK PROFITS LINKED TO HIGHER INTEREST RATES

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last year, when the big commercial banks in New York raised the prime rate to 8½ percent, I was convinced that the action was nothing more than a grab for more profits.

The bankers, of course, contended that they were raising price to the American consumers "for the good of the country." They were appalled at the suggestion that they might have raised the price of their product for the purpose of more profits.

In June of 1969, the Banking and Currency Committee conducted extensive hearings into the prime rate increase and at that time, banker after banker appeared before the committee to deny that their earnings had anything to do with the fact that the prime rate went up six times after President Nixon was elected in November 1968.

Mr. David Rockefeller, who has become the spokesman for the Wall Street complex of banks, was very quick to deny that earnings were the reason that his bank had participated in these increases

in the prime lending rate. When he appeared before the committee on June 23, 1969, Mr. Rockefeller stated:

It is said that the commercial banks arbitrarily raised their rates in an unconscionable quest for profits. The fact is that this is simply not true . . . Neither costs nor earnings played a part in this decision.

A year later, in the July 1970 Federal Reserve Bulletin, the Federal Reserve staff flatly contradicts Mr. Rockefeller and his fellow bankers. In an analysis of bank income for 1969, the Federal Reserve states that the fantastic profits of the commercial banking system stem directly from the dramatic increases in interest rates during that year.

Mr. Speaker, I quote from the Federal Reserve Bulletin's analysis:

As in other recent years, most of the rise in gross operating revenue of member banks in 1969 was attributable to income from loans. Such receipts increased half again as much in 1969 as in 1968 and accounted for more than seven-tenths of all operating income—compared with about two-thirds in 1968. While some of this growth reflected a further expansion in volume of loans outstanding, most of it was attributable to the highest average rate of return on loans in more than 40 years.

Overall, the Federal Reserve, which is not known for its adverse statements about the banking system, calculates that the commercial banks had an increase in profits after taxes of more than 16½ percent in 1969. This is an average and there were many major banks with earnings well above this figure.

After the swollen profits of 1969, it was difficult to believe that the banks would show any substantial increase in 1970. But the profitmaking abilities of the commercial banking system have been underestimated.

The reports from the first half of 1970 indicate that the banking system is outstripping the tremendous profits of 1969. The first-half figures indicate that the earnings are up more than 11 percent among the 50 largest commercial banks. A handful of the big banks have shown slight declines but it must be remembered that these are declines from the fattest year in the history of banking. In fact, nine of the 10 largest banks in the Nation show increases in net income per share during the first half of 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I place in the record a table detailing the earnings of major commercial banks in the first half of 1970:

OPERATING RESULTS FOR 1ST HALF OF 1970 COMPARED WITH 1ST HALF OF 1969, FOR THE 50 LARGEST U.S. BANKS (RANKED BY DEPOSIT SIZE)

Deposit rank and name of bank	Net income		Net income per share		Percent change
	1st half of 1970	1st half of 1969	1st half of 1970	1st half of 1969	
1. Bank of America N.T. & S.A. (San Francisco, Calif.)	\$73,583,000	\$67,230,000	\$2.14	\$1.96	+9.2
2. First National City Bank (New York, N.Y.)	67,128,000	63,280,000	2.31	2.25	+2.7
3. Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A. (New York, N.Y.)	46,032,021	44,249,288	1.44	1.39	+4.0
4. Manufacturers Hanover Trust (New York, N.Y.)	41,184,178	34,479,623	2.94	2.46	+19.4
5. Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. (New York, N.Y.)	41,900,000	36,800,000	2.29	2.02	+13.7
6. Chemical Bank New York Trust (New York, N.Y.)	35,549,848	31,406,405	2.43	2.35	+3.4
7. Bankers Trust Co. (New York, N.Y.)	27,344,000	23,719,000	2.67	2.32	+15.3
8. Continental-Illinois National (Chicago)	29,400,000	26,600,000	1.73	1.57	+11.0
9. Security Pacific National Bank (Los Angeles)	26,092,738	23,124,380	1.55	1.38	+12.3
10. First National Bank of Chicago	25,882,000	24,926,000	2.59	2.98	-13.2
11. Irving Trust Co. (New York, N.Y.)	14,565,000	14,926,000	1.93	1.98	-2.5
12. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., (San Francisco)	15,100,000	15,300,000	1.65	1.69	-2.4
13. Crocker-Citizens National Bank (San Francisco)	14,500,000	14,600,000	1.39	1.40	- .7
14. Mellon National Bank & Trust (Pittsburgh)	24,705,000	21,213,000	2.47	2.12	+16.6
15. United California Bank (Los Angeles)	16,116,847	14,117,486	2.66	2.34	+13.2

Footnotes at end of table.

Deposit rank and name of bank	Net income		Net income per share		Percent change
	1st half of 1970	1st half of 1969	1st half of 1970	1st half of 1969	
16. First National Bank of Boston	\$19,930,000	\$19,555,000	\$3.32	\$3.26	+1.9
17. National Bank of Detroit	16,855,975	16,046,174	2.81	2.67	+5.2
18. Marine Midland Grace Trust Co. (New York City)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
19. Franklin National Bank (Mineola, N.Y.)	10,000,000	10,117,000	1.86	1.89	-1.5
20. Cleveland Trust Co.	12,004,000	12,129,000	4.80	4.85	-1.1
21. 1st Pennsylvania Bank & Trust Co. (Philadelphia)	13,400,000	13,000,000	1.19	1.14	+4.4
22. Detroit Bank & Trust	9,981,850	8,846,656	4.07	3.61	+12.7
23. Philadelphia National Bank	10,834,146	9,204,465	2.00	1.70	+17.6
24. Manufacturers National Bank of Detroit	6,566,000	5,486,000	3.84	3.21	+19.6
25. Girard Trust Bank of Philadelphia	8,080,000	7,700,000	3.16	3.02	+4.6
26. Seattle First National Bank	8,934,563	8,937,816	1.98	1.99	-.5
27. Northern Trust Co., Chicago	9,514,000	6,284,000	4.76	3.14	+51.5
28. Union Bank, Los Angeles	8,100,000	7,400,000	1.98	1.81	+9.1
29. Bank of California, N.A. (San Francisco)	2,119,000	2,555,000	.78	.88	-11.3
30. First National Bank of Portland, Oreg.	6,949,727	6,925,603	1.21	1.30	-.8
31. Bank of New York	8,400,000	0,200,000	1.28	1.44	-11.1
32. National Bank of North America (Jamaica, N.Y.)	9,338,000	7,138,000	1.87	1.43	+30.7
33. Harris Trust & Savings Bank (Chicago)	8,850,269	6,283,406	3.54	2.51	+41.1
34. Valley National Bank (Phoenix, Ariz.)	6,798,141	6,164,730	.83	.77	+7.8
35. Pittsburgh National Bank	10,495,000	7,119,000	3.42	2.35	+45.8
36. U.S. National Bank of Oregon (Portland)	6,162,611	5,818,413	1.51	1.44	+4.8
37. First National Bank of Dallas	8,546,200	5,258,100	1.73	1.50	+15.4
38. Citizens & Southern National Bank (Georgia)	9,544,184	6,840,347	.86	.69	+24.6
39. Wachovia Bank & Trust Co., N.A. (North Carolina)	13,098,832	9,912,743	1.83	1.41	+29.7
40. Marine Midland Trust Co. of Western New York (Buffalo)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)
41. Republic National Bank, Dallas	9,030,000	6,690,000	.96	.71	+21.1
42. Fidelity Bank of Philadelphia	8,099,000	7,089,000	2.02	1.82	+19.9
43. National Bank of Commerce (Seattle)	4,926,554	4,174,918			+18.0
44. National City Bank of Cleveland	9,182,000	7,504,000	2.82	2.31	+22.1
45. 1st Wisconsin National Bank (Milwaukee)	7,800,000	6,300,000	1.93	1.60	+20.6
46. North Carolina National Bank (Charlotte)	6,484,562	5,356,833	.99	.83	+19.9
47. Bank of the Commonwealth (Detroit)	5,486,164	4,790,664	1.51	1.42	+6.3
48. Central National Bank of Cleveland	4,300,000	4,700,000	1.31	1.44	-9.1
49. Michigan National Bank, Lansing	3,100,000	3,400,000	1.43	1.55	-7.7
50. 1st City National Bank (Houston)	5,200,000	4,400,000	1.23	1.05	+17.1

<sup>1</sup> Based on income before security transactions.

<sup>2</sup> Figures not available.

<sup>3</sup> Includes American Credit Corp., acquired July 1, 1970; on a pooling-of-interests basis.

<sup>4</sup> Represents increase in net income; no breakdown per share available.

#### UNIVERSAL ENROLLMENT ACT OF 1970

(Mr. UDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include tables and extraneous matter.)

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to introduce, on behalf of myself and 11 colleagues, a bill that goes to the heart of one of the major problems confronting our Nation—the need to draw more people into politics in a constructive and creative manner.

Cosponsoring this legislation with me are my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FULTON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), the gentleman from California (Mr. MOSS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. NIX), the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRASCO).

In the other body today a companion bill is being introduced by Senator DANIEL K. INOUE, of Hawaii, and a number of cosponsors.

Mr. Speaker, at the minimum, the vast majority of Americans should vote in elections. This is their opportunity to select the people who shall make the decisions that affect us all and to set the broad outlines of policy. This is an absolutely critical step in any democratic nation. It is the essence of democratic responsibility. Yet the present dimensions of the problem are appalling.

This Nation achieves its greatest voter participation in presidential elections. Voter turnouts vary with the highest

ranging between 60 and 63 percent, not very impressive compared with turnouts of between 75 and 90 percent or better in Canada, Britain, the Commonwealth democracies, and Western European countries. In elections below the level of presidential contests, State turnouts can fluctuate between 40 and 50 percent of the eligible electorate, and in local elections some turnouts during this past year alone fell to 5, 10, and 15 percent of the eligible voting age population.

This record is even more alarming if approached in another way. We have become used to dealing with statistics in this Nation, a sign of our technological growth and our more impersonal approach to problems. We are dealing here with people. If we translate these percentages into the number of people affected the results are startling. Forty-seven million people did not vote in the 1968 presidential election alone. Further, the number of nonvoters is increasing at an average over the last decade of 1 million each year, 4 million each presidential election. Thirty-nine million people did not vote in 1960; 43 million people did not vote in 1964. As the trend continues it will accelerate. There could be 70 to 90 million people not voting over the next two decades. And this could occur during an era that emphasizes participatory politics and citizen involvement as has no other and in a nation that justly prides itself on being the oldest of democracies; a nation that has led the way in pioneering means of continually increasing individual participation in politics through a variety of commendable means—the secret ballot, elections at all levels of the political system for every conceivable office, referendums, recall devices, primaries, representative conventions, and so on. The list is virtually endless. Our imagination has proven fertile in devising ways of giving citizens the

means to choose their representatives and hold them accountable for their decisions.

Yet somewhere along the line we failed to take adequate notice and provide intelligent remedies for the increasingly serious problem of nonvoting.

In effect, we are talking about a nation within a nation and one that we have failed to include in an elementary way in American politics. Voting should be only the first step in citizen participation.

We are talking of 47 million people not voting, 24 percent of our total population and 40 percent of our eligible voting age population. The number of people is awesome; it is greater than the total electorate of such democracies as England, France, Italy, West Germany, Canada, and Australia.

The potential impact of these nonvoters is great. In 1968, the nonvoters exceeded by 17 million the total number of people who voted for Richard M. Nixon. For every vote separating the two major candidates in that election, there were 150 people who did not vote. In 1960, for every vote separating the major contenders there were 330 people who did not vote. Even in the more decisive elections in our recent history, nonvoters could have changed the majority. Franklin D. Roosevelt defeated Alf Landon in 1936 by 11 million votes; Dwight D. Eisenhower defeated Adlai Stevenson in 1956 by 9.5 million votes; and Lyndon B. Johnson defeated Barry Goldwater in 1964 by 16 million votes.

It is our duty to include these people in politics, to have them vote. If not, the potential for dissatisfaction and alienation is tremendous. And, if it occurs it will be because we did not have the foresight to recognize the problem and resolve it.

Ironically, in earlier times more Americans voted. Between 1840 and 1900—a

period marked by the beginnings of mass suffrage and preceding the adoption of restrictive voter registration requirements—an average of three out of four—76.9 percent—of the electorate voted. In the presidential contest of 1876, the percentage rose to 82 percent of the electorate.

The United States has changed immensely since 1876. In only 92 years, the population climbed from 46 to over 200 million. The winning presidential candidate in 1876 received 4 million votes; in 1964, the winner received 10 times as many. And in 1968, in a three-candidate race, the victor received 31 million votes.

If our population growth is incredible, our technological growth is more so. It is still difficult to grasp the reality of placing a man on the moon in 1969. But other advances are also difficult to grasp. Although we live with these conveniences daily, the mere numbers are staggering: 85 million automobiles in 1968; 100 million television sets, 225 million radios. Increased mobility provided by mass transit and automobile travel should facilitate voter participation. Mass communication—including, along with radio and television, an abundance of newspapers, magazines, and books—should certainly contribute to an informed electorate. And the innovation of electronic voting machines has made the election process speedier.

Yet despite these technological advances, the political participation of Americans has not increased, it has declined.

Mr. Speaker, the decline of democratic participation holds both a danger and a paradox. The danger is that democratic institutions cannot function effectively or respond promptly to society's needs unless citizens participate in the decisions that affect their daily lives. A government that derives its just powers from the consent of the governed must be able to hear the voice of the people if it is to make orderly, systematic adjustments to the problems of change. It cannot assume that silence is consent. Silence may well imply alienation, frustration, and a widening rift between the government and the governed.

The paradox is that while millions of citizens, at odds with basic national policies, are struggling for a more active role in public decisionmaking, participation in the electoral process continues to wane. We hear much talk of participatory democracy and community control, but there can be little hope for success in the more difficult roles of self-determination when so many citizens are not even involved to the extent that they participate in the election of a President. If we can involve all people in presidential elections, perhaps we will open all elections to wider participation. Such involvement will achieve needed reforms if democracy is relevant to mass society.

If the people are to make effective use of their political power, they must begin with the Presidency, the focal point of our political system. The Presidency is more important to the people now than ever before in our history. During the

19th century, when three out of four Americans voted for President, the impact of the Presidency was remote to the average citizen.

This is not true today. Now no individual can escape the constant impact of Presidential decisions and action. Presidential policy toward such distant places as Vietnam, Biafra, and the Middle East is of direct concern to all. A cold war, a hot war, the threat of nuclear weaponry, and the vast power of the military-industrial complex affect us all. We must look to the wisdom and leadership of the President to solve such urgent problems as inflation, unemployment, crime, poverty, hunger, racism, repression, the pollution of our environment. The problems are legion, and Presidential action is essential to their resolution.

Yet 40 percent of the people fail to vote for the President. This fact alone warns that the system is not working well.

People who vote believe in the system. They participate. They have a stake in government. But, to the nonparticipants, their stake in government is not so apparent. Their alienation from the system is harmful not only in their own lives, but it threatens the survival of democracy itself.

Registration efforts must not be concerned with how people vote. The important consideration is that they vote. We can live with decisions made by a full electorate, but those who do not participate may be unwilling to live with decisions they had no voice in making. We must do everything in our power to encourage them to vote. Let the people choose.

The principal cause of nonvoting is registration. Our registration practices are archaic. They have not been modernized to meet the demands of our changing electorate. They are not equipped to deal with the mobility of our national population or the size of our contemporary electorate. They are more onerous and oppressive in the 1970's than they were in the 1870's, a stinging indictment of our neglect of the problem and our failure to do anything about it. Registration practices must be harmonized with the needs of a 20th-century America.

Our bill would accomplish these objectives. It would involve tens of millions more Americans in elections. If enacted, this Nation could experience voter turnouts of from 75 to 90 percent of the voting age population, a level of participation unheard of in recent times but consistent with our earlier performances.

Mr. Speaker, our bill introduces in presidential elections a form of a plan in use in virtually every other advanced democratic nation and several of our States for comprehensive enrollment of all eligible voters. Our bill proposes a universal voter enrollment system; a plan under which the Government would canvass, door to door in each presidential election year to register all eligible citizens. The plan also proposes a National Enrollment Commission to supervise the enrollment and to maintain current and comprehensive election returns as well as the legal provisions that apply to elec-

tions. There is no agency, public or private, that currently does this.

Such a plan is critically needed now. It will become increasingly important as time passes on. It appears that the 18-year-old vote has become a reality. If so, to make it meaningful we must reach these prospective voters and enroll them, thus giving them a realistic opportunity to make good on the promise of participating in elections. If we do not enact such a plan, these people are among those hurt the most by present registration requirements and practices. We will create greater problems for ourselves and our Nation if we legalize the 18-year-old vote and yet provide no mechanism to make it effective.

If the direct election of the President is adopted, the next logical step would be to provide a means of including people in the electorate as our plan does. It would stimulate and encourage participation. Further, a system for the direct election of the President would accentuate the need for a National Enrollment Commission as our plan provides, to serve as a clearinghouse for election information; to make current, accurate returns available; and to assist the States in advising them as to any election problems they may encounter.

Finally, present registration practices are beginning to come under legal assault. Present cases pending in Texas and Ohio question whether requirements and procedures for registering to vote in one State can be substantially different from those in another State. Some counties within a State have no registration requirements. Is this constitutional? One State, North Dakota, has no registration qualifications. Do the citizens in the other States have equal opportunity and equal access to the ballot when they must meet registration barriers to voting?

The whole question of registration practices and procedures is open to constitutional attack. They have never been systematically reviewed. Our plan provides a means for averting many of the complications in present incoherent registration practices. It provides for universal voter enrollment. It reaches those who because of travel, business, schooling, or military obligation are effectively frozen out of participation in elections today; and it provides adequate means for absentee balloting to enable citizens of the United States who are stationed overseas in military or civilian capacities to vote in presidential elections. For these reasons, our proposal for a universal voter enrollment plan should be enacted as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I have had my staff prepare background material on the nature of registration systems, their evolution in the States, and their effect on the vote. I also have various supporting tables, a discussion of the provisions of the universal voter enrollment plan and the text of the bill itself. Since all of this can be extremely useful to my colleagues in acquainting themselves and their constituents with the issues involved in this legislation, without objection I will insert these materials in the Record at this point:

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF REGISTRATION PROCEDURES

The principal restriction on voting is registration qualifications. The original justification for the introduction of registration requirements was the attempt to insure the integrity of elections. The intention was to free them from fraudulent manipulation.

A 1929 work on the subject, and the only major study to date, presented the rationale used to justify registration limitations. The author, Joseph Harris, noted that:

"Our elections have been marked by irregularities, slipshod work, antiquated procedures, obsolete records, inaccuracies and many varieties of downright fraud. In only a few cities is the administration of elections conducted with a modicum of efficiency." [J. Harris, *Registration of Voters in the United States* (1929), pp. 3-4.]

The answer to such abuses according to Harris and those of like mind was a registration system:

"The requirement that all voters shall be registered prior to the day of the election is one of the most important safeguards of the purity of the ballot box. It constitutes the very foundation upon which an honest election system must rest, and if properly administered, prevents many of the more serious frauds which have marked the conduct of elections in the past." [J. Harris, *Registration of Voters in the United States* (1929) pp. 3-4.]

Harris' argument is interesting from a number of perspectives. First, it gives the rationale for supporting registration limitations during the era of their greatest expansion, the mid to late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Second, it represents the thinking of civic reformers who felt, somewhat naively in retrospect, that such checks would purify elections of many, if not most, of their objectionable features. Third, the statement suggests that registration systems were intended primarily for urban areas.

There were a number of reasons for this selectivity. In rural areas, election officials knew most of the voters and thus argued that there was no need for a prior listing of eligible citizens. The population concentrations in the urban areas, however, did not encourage any easy familiarity with all prospective voters, hence the need for a registration system.

Another factor was the maturation of the urban machine. The machine depended upon a controlled vote to maintain its position of power. Such a system encouraged abuse.

For example, in one Chicago precinct (20th Ward, 24th precinct) during one primary election in 1926, the Citizens' Association of Chicago reported that the bogus votes outnumbered the valid ones. Of the 566 votes cast, 352 were described as fraudulent, that is, the ballot cast was not done so by a bona fide resident of the precinct. The argument could be made that the same officials who controlled the polls on election days, resulting in a fraudulent vote count, would control the registration procedures, thus insuring no fundamental changes. Nonetheless, those favoring registration emphasized such cases as these to argue the need for the pre-election listing of eligible voters.

Until this day, registration systems have been centered in cities and have spread only gradually to smaller towns and rural areas. Ohio, for example, has registration only in urban areas of 50,000 or more. A rural state, North Dakota, that boasts of no city over 55,000 population, has no registration at all. Alaska, a state of only 294,000 inhabitants, has relaxed registration procedures which, similar to many areas of sparse population, allows the registrar leeway in adding to the rolls at his discretion people he knows to be eligible to vote.

Registration procedures do have an effect on voting turnout. The U.S. Census publication shows that of the 32 percent of the electorate not claiming to vote in the 1968 elections, 72 percent were barred because of failure to meet registration qualifications. A study was made by Professor Stanley Kelley, Jr., of Princeton University and associates of registration and voting in the 104 largest cities in the United States during the 1960 presidential election. They studied the effect of socio-economic factors (age, sex, race, education, income and length of residence), party competition, and registration requirements (residence and literacy tests, permanent or periodic registration systems, the time and place for registration, and the closing dates for registration) on voter participation. The study concluded that "registration requirements are a more effective deterrent to voting than anything that normally operates to deter citizens from voting once they have registered." [S. Kelley et al., "Registration and Voting: Putting First Things First", *American Political Science Review* (1967), p. 362.] The authors found, for example, that better than three-fourths (or 80%) of the variations found between the number of people voting and those of voting age was accounted for by registration demands. There was almost a perfect correlation in the criteria between the number of people registered and those voting: that is, on the average, for each percentage increase in registration between cities there was a percentage increase in voter turnout. The mean percentage of those of voting age who registered was 73.3 percent with a standard deviation of 14.3. The mean percentage of those registered who voted was 81.6 percent with a standard deviation of 11.7. As the authors noted, the latter set of figures was both higher and varied less than those between voting age population and those registering, thus supporting their contention that the critical hurdle to voting is registration.

In the midwest, some counties still have no registration requirements while others, usually the more urban ones, do. Consistently, the turnout is higher in counties with no registration qualifications. For example, in Missouri the discrepancy in voter turnout between the urban counties (Jackson, St. Louis City, St. Louis County) with registration qualifications and the counties without registration, representing 80 percent of the state's land area, average between 10 percent and 12 percent. The experience of Pennsylvania for the period between 1920 and 1936 and prior to the introduction of statewide registration procedures and of Ohio for the period 1932-1960 when a variety of practices were in effect ranging from no registration through a partial listing of qualifications to a full-fledged registration system illustrates the depressing effect of those requirements on voter participation. For the Pennsylvania counties, there is a six percent to ten percent difference in turnout. The Ohio returns illustrate the same phenomena, a decline in the vote that correlates with the severity of the requirements. (See Table 1.)

## History

## The North

The spiritual ancestor of latter registration systems was a Massachusetts requirement, adopted in 1742, that limited the franchise to property-holders and required local assessors to compile a list of each man's property assets.

The first actual registration law in the United States was enacted by the State of Massachusetts in the year 1800. This provided for the listing of all qualified voters in each town in the Commonwealth prior to elections. While other New England states adopted similar procedures, the practice was slow in spreading to other areas. When a

registration system was adopted prior to 1862, it was done so only in a few selected major urban areas. Columbia, South Carolina instituted registration procedures in 1819. The state of Pennsylvania required registration in 1839 for elections in the city of Philadelphia. And New York City adopted registration qualifications in 1840, but soon abandoned them.

The big push in the adoption of registration limitations began in the 1860's with the accelerated growth of the large urban areas, the industrialization of the nation necessitating large clusters of working people in confined geographical areas, the refinement of machine politics, and the mass immigrations to this country, and particularly to its cities, that took place up until 1920. The steadily increasing electorate culminated in the 19th Amendment giving the vote to women and also provided pressure for a more systematic enumeration of eligible voters.

Between 1860 and 1880 most Northern states adopted registration procedures. Beginning in 1880, the practice also spread to Western and Southern states, although the Southern experience differed from that of the rest of the nation.

The study by Stanley Kelley, Jr., and associates introduced earlier notes that:

"In the period from 1896 to 1924, when the turnout declined almost steadily, state after state enacted registration laws which typically required registration annually and in person of all voters in the nation's large cities; the registration procedures of this era have been described by one student of registration practices [Harris] as 'expensive, cumbersome, and inconvenient to the voter.' In the period from 1924 until the present, during which time the turnout has gradually risen, more and more states have been liberalizing their registration laws, particularly as these apply to the larger cities. In short, turnout in presidential elections in the United States may have declined and then risen again, not because of changes in the interest of voters in elections, but because of changes in the interest demanded of them." [S. Kelley et al., "Registration and Voting: Putting First Things First", *American Political Science Review* (1967), p. 374.]

Whatever the justification or the original intent, registration systems have a selective effect in whom they bar from voting.

A Gallup poll conducted in December of 1969 found that registration systems had an uneven effect on the electorate. The report released by the Gallup organization, entitled "Registration Laws Boon to Republicans," stated that two out of three people not registered had Democratic leanings; the young (50% not registered), and those who rented (44% not registered) rather than owned their own homes were the most heavily hit by registration requirements.

Gallup concludes from his studies that it is not lack of interest but rather residency and other registration qualifications that provide the biggest barrier to voting. The results are not accidental. Registration requirements are more difficult for the less educated to meet. The registration systems favor those in higher social classes, disproportionately increasing their weight in the electorate. The city of Baltimore can serve as an example. Correlation of social class characteristics, as measured by occupation, with the 1960 voter turnout in 83 political units in the city produced the results shown in Table 2.

These figures (Table 2) indicate that the upper-class, as stratified by occupation, have a political weight roughly twice that of the lower classes.

The U.S. Census report on registration and voting in the 1968 election provides a more detailed commentary. The figures are self-reporting and they over-represent the number of people registered and voting. Nevertheless, the trends revealed within the cate-

gorizations of the returns should provide a reliable index of relative discrepancies within the population.

The highest proportion of those not registered and/or not voting fall among blacks, those who did not finish high school, manual and service workers, and those of lower incomes. The family income and education figures, in particular, show a progressively clearer relationship between an increase in income or educational achievement and percentage registered and voting. As an example, 87 percent (86.5%) of those with a college degree are reported as registered and 83 percent as voting. One-half (49.5%) of those with only one to four years education are reported as registered and only 38 percent of the total as voting.

Registration requirements place a disproportionately heavier load on those least able to meet them. The registration system now in effect do not fall on all individuals impartially. (See Table 3.)

#### The South

The modus vivendi worked out between the South and Republican leaders in the contested outcome of the Presidential election of 1876 gave the victory to Hayes in return for the freedom to conduct political affairs in the South much as they had been prior to 1860. To return power to propertied classes favored before the Civil War necessitated the exclusion from the Southern electorate of blacks newly enfranchised since 1865. A number of legal and extra-legal strategies were employed prior to 1890, but beginning approximately in this year and extending through 1920, Southern states settled on restrictive registration procedures as an effective legal means of limiting Negro involvement in elections. There followed during this period such limitations as the "grandfather clause," the "white primary," the poll tax, which effectively barred poor whites as well as blacks, and arbitrarily administered tests of literacy and state and federal constitutional interpretation. Mississippi began the practice in 1890 requiring a "reasonable" interpretation of the Constitution as a prerequisite to voting. By 1915, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reports that other Southern states had adopted similar practices, requiring applicants to meet as a criteria for voting standards of "good character," property qualifications, civic knowledge, and other arbitrary restrictions designed to exclude Negroes from voting. For example, offenses believed to be related to Negroes, crimes of petty larceny or illegal child bearing were grounds for restricting the vote in some Southern states, were included in the laws to cast a net as widely as possible to minimize Negro political involvement.

Once the process began of adding provisions to restrict the vote on grounds of acceptable moral behavior, there was virtually no limit to the ingenuity of the lawmakers in adopting unusual restrictions. The South was not alone in this regard.

A listing of the restrictions placed on who may vote by one Southern and one non-Southern state, Louisiana and Idaho, illustrates how out of hand the process of excluding reputedly undesirable types from elections can become. See Table 4.

It was not until the Supreme Court decision in *Smith v. Albright* (1944) that the trend was effectively reversed. The *Albright* decision outlawed the "white primary." Successive court decisions buttressed by the Congressional passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960 and 1964 began the process of increasing Negro registration. The greatest progress, however, was made with the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Act suspended discriminatory registration requirements, including literacy tests, in any state or political subdivision where 50 percent of the voting age population were either not registered or did not vote. These provisions

applied to Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina and Virginia, as well as to 40 of North Carolina's 100 counties. In addition, the Attorney General of the United States had the discretion to assign federal examiners to register qualified voters and federal observers to monitor elections in the same counties. The Act proved to be extremely successful.

Black registration now exceeds 50 percent in all southern states. As the following table shows, whites as well as blacks benefited from the Act and will benefit from its reenactment by the Congress in 1970. (See Table 5.)

The experience of both the South and the North emphasizes the power of registration qualifications to restrict the vote. It also provides a persuasive argument that a comprehensive voter enrollment plan under government auspices, such as the Universal Voter Enrollment plan, would result in significantly higher voter turnouts.

#### REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS OF THE STATES<sup>1</sup>

Contemporary registration requirements vary greatly. Each was added over a period of time and often at the whim of specific state legislatures or in reaction to a passing public mood. Few states have codified their requirements and systematically evaluated their consequences. As a result, the registration qualifications in effect, as the earlier comparison between the states of Idaho and Louisiana illustrated, can become quite elaborate.

The following reviews the registration requirements of the states presently in effect as they relate to the Universal Voter Enrollment plan. It begins with one of the most common, residency, and discusses these requirements as they pertain to state, county, precinct and city elections, and what, if any, options for presidential waivers are available to potential voters. Each of the states with registration systems has some type of residency requirement in effect. For example, for presidential elections these range from three months or 90 days in some states (New York, Pennsylvania) up to—until it was revised in 1968 to one year—two years in Mississippi. South Dakota uniquely adds a further stipulation that a voter must be a resident of the United States for five years.

American civilians living abroad, estimated in 1960 to be about one-half a million people, are also excluded by residency limitations from voting. American military personnel abroad must qualify for the frequently cumbersome absentee ballots, thus diluting the force of their vote. Of the 2,473,000 military personnel of voting age in November, 1968, 1,142,000, or 46 percent of the total, actually voted.

Several states (e.g., New Mexico, Mississippi, Washington and Utah) exclude Indians not taxed or those, and others, living on Federal lands from voting. The legal stipulations covering these exclusions are so varied that it is virtually impossible to estimate the number of individuals excluded from the ballot by these restrictions.

As the following shows, 33 states have one year residency requirements before one can vote, 33 states require some period of residency in the county, the same number in the precincts, and a smattering of states have city requirements as well, although Connecticut's is in lieu of any other residency qualifications.

Thirty-one states relax their provisions for presidential elections, although the effect of several is questionable. Colorado, as an example, substitutes a six month period for the original one year, the mandatory requirement in 14 other states. Several states permit presidential voting under a waiver system only in specific places, the town clerk's office or for maximum inconvenience, only in one city in the state, as is the case in Delaware.

<sup>1</sup> As of January 1, 1970

The requirements normally in effect stipulate that to vote a person must be a resident of the state for at least one year, of the county for 30 to 90 days, and of the precinct for 30 days. It is estimated that these requirements exclude from the electorate, through an individual's inability to meet the specific residency qualifications in an election jurisdiction, five percent of the potential electorate. For the 1968 election, this would mean that six million voters were denied participation by residency alone.

The following summarizes the various residence requirements in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia. (See Table 6.)

#### State requirements<sup>2</sup>

Thirty-three states and the District of Columbia require an individual to be a resident for a period of one year before he may cast his ballot in an election.<sup>3</sup> Fourteen states have residence requirements of six months—Connecticut has no state requirement, but does have a six month residence requirement for cities—and only two states, New York and Pennsylvania, allow an elector voting privileges after three months and 90 days of residence, respectively.

#### County requirements

Thirty-five states have county residence requirements of from one month to as long as six months. (Hawaii has a residence requirement of three months in a State Representative District.) Fourteen states have no county requirements.

#### Precinct requirements

Thirty-three states have precinct residence requirements of from ten days to six months. Sixteen states have no residence requirements for precincts. Missouri has a precinct residence requirement of ten days in only some of its counties.

#### City requirements

Connecticut has a six month residence requirement in cities, but there are no state, county or precinct requirements. Rhode Island and Massachusetts require a six month residence; New Hampshire, six months in ward or town. Vermont and Maine have a three month requirement. Maryland's residence requirement is six months, but may apply to a county or city, and New York's is three months and also applies to a county or city. Michigan has a city residence requirement of on or before the fifth Friday before the election. All other states have no city requirements.

#### Presidential waivers

Nineteen states and the District of Columbia have no provisions for new residents voting in Presidential elections. Thirty-one states have some type of Presidential waiver, with fifteen of those states requiring lengths of residence of from fifteen days to three months. Delaware, for example, with a three month residence requirement for Presidential elections, requires the individual first, to register in person in Wilmington and, second, to vote in Wilmington only on election day.

Nevada and South Carolina have Constitutional Amendments that will be submitted to the voters this year to change the residence requirements for Presidential elections only.

#### Former residents

The states that allow a former resident to vote by a special or an absentee ballot until residence requirements of the new state are met, or for a specified length of time are as follows:

<sup>2</sup> In some states a Presidential election is an exception; see Presidential Waivers.

<sup>3</sup> South Dakota, Utah and Vermont have Constitutional Amendments pending that are to be submitted to the voters this year that would change the existing residence requirements.

Alaska: May vote absentee for President until he meets residence requirements in new state.

Arizona: May vote absentee for 15 months after leaving if cannot meet requirements in new state.

Connecticut: May vote absentee for 24 months after leaving if cannot meet requirements in new state.

Michigan: May vote until requirements are met in new state.

New Jersey: May vote by special absentee ballot for president if cannot meet requirements in new state.

Texas: May vote by absentee ballot for President for 24 months if cannot meet requirements in new state.

Wisconsin: May vote by absentee ballot for President for 24 months if cannot meet requirements in new state.

Wyoming: May vote absentee until such time as residence requirements are met in new state of residence.

In addition to residency, each of the states with registration systems requires U.S. citizenship as a precondition for voting and sets a minimum age for eligibility. Beyond this, the states have a variety of other requirements ranging from literacy qualifications and provisions barring those in prison or those mentally incapable from voting to the truly exotic, e.g., excluding from the electorate those of "bad character", duelers, Mongolians, those in common law marriages, and so forth. Since these are not of direct concern to our bill they will not be reviewed.

#### Registration procedures

Beyond the registration requirements themselves, there is the added barrier of the physical means by which prospective voters must qualify to vote. These procedures vary widely from one state to the next and frequently within a state. They are not well understood, but they provide an additional obstacle that those who are otherwise eligible must overcome. (See Table 7.)

As Table 7 shows, the periods provided for registration vary greatly. Some are open for specified periods of time, others are open year around. Some close two weeks or less immediately prior to election day; Texas closes its rolls at the end of January, nine months prior to election day. In all cases, the burden is put upon the individual to familiarize himself with the registration dates and places and then to register himself, should he meet the qualifications.

Finally, provisions for absentee voting, as Table 8 shows, can be cumbersome. The initiative is placed on the individual to find the time period in which requests for absentee ballots will be honored and his eligibility can be certified (usually beginning 60 to 90 days prior to the election and ending within the week preceding the vote); to contact, in person or by mail as required in law, the proper official (usually a city or county clerk); and, if he qualifies, to insure that his properly marked ballot reaches the designated election official by the time specified in the law. The total burden is placed on the individual to acquaint himself with the diversity of regulations and to meet the specified time limits and qualifications for absentee voting. The process is awkward and discourages voting. (See Table 8.)

#### Registration and nonvoting

The foregoing introduces state registration qualifications and provides some indication of their effects. In an attempt to establish the causes of non-voting and the groups within the population most seriously affected, the U.S. Bureau of the Census has analyzed the results of recent elections and notably that of 1968. In analyzing the 1968 vote, the Census reported that:

"Higher voter participation was found among men, persons 45 to 65 years old, whites, people living outside the South, those with larger family incomes, and persons in

white-collar occupations, especially professionals and managers. Lower participation was more likely among women, persons under 35 years of age and to a lesser degree those 65 and older, Negroes, residents of the South, those of low educational level, those with small family incomes, and persons in unskilled occupations, such as laborers (both industrial and agricultural) and private household workers."

In exploring the contribution of registration systems to non-voting, the Census found that 67.8 percent of the total voting age population participated in the elections. Most impressively, of all those who claimed to be registered, a striking 91 percent (91.2%) also claimed to have voted.

The Census report is based on a person's response as to whether he voted or registered and thus, by the Census' own admission, overestimates both voting and registration. The figures should be valid as to relative trends and proportional relationships. If this is the case, then the earlier contention that registration systems provide the greatest hurdle to voting has substantial merit.

The 27 million people not registered were asked why they had failed to take this initial step to qualify themselves to participate in elections. The largest group, 53 percent (53.3%) said they were not interested in either politics, the election or political process more generally; ten percent (9.9%) reported that they did not register because they were not citizens; eleven percent (11.2%) did not meet residency requirements; thirteen percent (13.4%) were barred from registering because of illness, lack of transportation, inability to take time off from work, and related reasons; ten percent (9.5%) gave other reasons for not registering but ones that the interviewers were not able to place in the major categorizations provided; and three percent (2.6%) either did not know why they did not register or the interviewer reported no reasons.

Residency qualifications were given as a reason for not qualifying with increasing frequency as one climbed the educational ladder; for example, approximately 16 times as many people with five years or more of college offered this explanation than did those with nine years or less of total schooling. Disinterest was given as a reason for not registering proportionately more often by those with the least education, declining in importance with the formal educational achievements of the respondents. Residency was a great barrier to younger potential voters, than to those middle aged or older. Six percent more blacks offered election disinterest or physical barriers to registration as major reasons for their failure to enroll than did whites. The latter reason was of even greater importance for Negro families, averaging nine percent of the norm for all groups.

Over-all, the evidence indicates that a reasonable set of limited registration requirements, coupled with a universal enrollment system, would greatly increase voter turnout, bringing into the electorate groups badly in need of representation, while at the same time making allowance for those who would normally vote but are excluded by physical inconvenience from registering.

A study by Professor William Andrews [W. G. Andrews, "American Voting Participation", *Western Political Quarterly* (1966), pp. 639-652.] adds an interesting perspective to this analysis. Andrews made a detailed examination of registration and voting in the 1960 election. He estimates that legal restrictions on the vote disqualified approximately 15 million people from participation. In addition, another eight million did not vote because of problems in getting to the polls, traveling or the like. These factors result in the elimination of between 20 and 25 million people from the electorate. Of those remaining in what he refers to as the "eligible, able" electorate, 83.2 percent voted.

If these figures, or those of the U.S. Census are close to being accurate, a modification of registration procedures through the enactment of the Universal Voter Enrollment plan would have two major results: a) it would substantially increase the number of eligible voters; and b) it would stimulate a considerably higher voter turnout.

#### A SOLUTION: UNIVERSAL VOTER ENROLLMENT

There is a way of achieving virtually full enrollment. It is tested, safe, inexpensive and effective. It can vastly increase voter participation. It is Universal Voter Enrollment.

Proven in Canada, Idaho, Washington and in parts of California and elsewhere, it has achieved enrollments of better than 90 percent of the voting age population. Universal Voter Enrollment shifts the initial burden of registration from the individual to the government. Government must move from old and inadequate methods that serve to inhibit voter participation to a new and effective method of enrollment. The United States is virtually the only advanced democratic nation that does not have some variation of the plan in effect.

#### The plan

In the weeks immediately preceding an election, enrollment officers would visit every residence in the land and enroll every qualified person to vote who does not refuse.

For enrollment purposes, the 435 Congressional Districts—the smallest federal election unit—would serve as the unit for enrolling voters. This assures a local operation of manageable size and of comparatively equal population, as well as one that reflects population shifts over the years. Each District would be placed under the supervision of a local District Director. Teams of volunteer sworn election enrollment officers would be recruited and trained by professional staff personnel in comprehensive canvass and enrollment procedures. They would be assigned limited areas within the District in which they would be responsible for enrolling everyone of voting age population.

The enrollment officers would begin with existing lists of state and local voting registration. In the canvass of every residence, enrollment officers would confirm the accuracy and completeness of the lists. Those already registered would be offered federal enrollment if they desired it. Errors and omissions in existing lists would be reported to local officials. In addition, every qualified person who is located and does not refuse enrollment would be placed on the rolls of the District.

Each enrollee would be given a certificate which he would sign together with the District Roll in the presence of the officer. On election day the enrollee, if not registered for state purposes, would present his enrollment certificate for validation, countersign the District Roll, and vote on a special ballot for President and Vice President. If registered for state purposes, he would vote on state ballots, but could have his federal certificate validated as evidence of his having voted.

If the proper authority in a state or local district chose to do so, it could request full state or local registration by the federal enrollment officials. Any jurisdiction which followed this course would have virtually full enrollment at no expense. State or election districts which preferred to perform enrollment functions themselves, on giving adequate evidence of non-discrimination and the removal of all arbitrary barriers to qualification and on obtaining an enrollment exceeding 90 per cent would be eligible to receive federal funds which would otherwise be spent in the jurisdiction for federal enrollment. Under either alternative, a full and uniform enrollment of all voters would be achieved.

To assure awareness of the enrollment effort, and because some people will inevitably be missed in even the most careful

canvass, advertising on radio, TV, and in newspapers during the weeks of enrollment and for several days immediately preceding the election would inform the people of their duty to enroll and vote and of the procedures for doing so.

No citizen would be barred from voting because of failure to enroll before election day, or loss of enrollment certificate, or absence from his District or from the country. Nor would he be disqualified from voting for President if he changed his place of residence—even the day before the election. He would simply have to complete an affidavit identifying himself, following a procedure no more complicated than that required to cash a check. On completion of the affidavit, he would be permitted to vote, and his ballot would be placed in a sealed envelope with the affidavit attached. If he were voting outside the District—for example, at an American Consulate in a foreign country—his sealed ballot and affidavit would be placed in a special delivery envelope addressed to the District Director of his place of residence. Mailed ballots would receive full franking privileges. When the statements in his affidavit were verified, the envelope containing his ballot would be placed with all other ballots received in this manner, opened, and counted. Perjury or misrepresentation would be a federal offense.

#### THE NATIONAL ENROLLMENT COMMISSION

To administer and supervise the Universal Voter Enrollment plan, a National Enrollment Commission would be created. The National Director of Enrollment would be the head of the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Acting in this capacity, the National Director's primary responsibility would be to achieve full voter enrollment. To assist him in the execution of his responsibilities, an adequate staff of career personnel would be maintained in the national office.

The National Enrollment Commission would consist of nine members. The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Census would serve as members. The balance of the Commission would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The members appointed by the President would serve terms of six years. No more than five of the members can be members of the same political party.

The Commission would oversee the performance of the National Director of Enrollment, hear complaints, and recommend methods for improving the elective process. The Commission would report to the President.

The Commission would also be charged with maintaining complete records of all election returns and all laws and procedures for every public election district in the nation. These would be available to the public. At present there is no single depository for such information. As a result, it is extremely difficult to obtain complete and accurate election information from existing sources.

The Commission would be authorized to study and comment on the adequacy and fairness of the election processes of any public jurisdiction, but it would have no power over any state, local or special election district officials. The Commission would also be instructed to undertake any study requested by any public election district designed to improve voter participation or guarantee a republican form of government. It would report to the President after each presidential election, evaluating the thoroughness and fairness of the registration effort and presenting the final election returns. Periodically, it would make available studies on the quality of American voter participation.

The District Director in each of the 435 federal election districts would be provided with staff and funds in election years to carry out the duties of his office. Federal Election Enrollment Officers would be volun-

teer workers serving without compensation. Recruited from civic groups, educational institutions, and individual interest, they would be commissioned as federal officers and subject to federal penalties. They would receive suitable recognition for their public service.

Estimated total costs for the operation of the Commission are \$5 million in non-presidential election years and \$50 million in presidential election years. This averages less than 50¢ per eligible voter in election years—a small price to pay for the involvement of all citizens in the electoral process.

In more detail, the plan would operate as follows:

#### I. The National Enrollment Commission

The National Enrollment Commission would enroll all individuals of voting age population for presidential elections. In addition, it would perform a number of duties directly related to its principal concern. The National Enrollment Commission would:

1. Enroll all voters for presidential elections;
2. Report on its enrollment effort and obtain complete and accurate results of each presidential election;
3. Create an election information center, a public repository of all laws, regulations and procedures and data on voter participation and election results for federal, state, local and special district elections;
4. Study the elective process to assure full voter participation, integrity and efficiency in federal, state and local elections with authority to advise and consult with governmental and non-partisan private groups seeking to improve the democratic process and to report on elections and election practices and recommend techniques for their perfection;
5. Aid and assist governmental and private non-partisan efforts to achieve full voter participation;
6. Train federal enrollment officers and provide training programs for state and local election officials on request.

The National Enrollment Commission would assure all qualified individuals of their right to vote for president and serve an educational function by providing information and analyses relevant to elections. It would collect election laws and the results of public elections held in the United States and make these available to all interested groups and individuals.

The National Enrollment Commission would be non-partisan. The Director would be the Director of the Bureau of the Census. The Director would supervise the National Enrollment Commission as its chief executive officer.

The Commission would have professional staff of adequate size to perform its duties. Its division would include: (1) enrollment services, (2) information, (3) research, and (4) training. The operating budget of the Commission would approximate \$5 million annually.

The operating budget would be increased substantially in presidential election years to approximately \$50 million. The major portion of the additional expense would be to cover the costs of enrolling all eligible voters through door-to-door contact.

#### District Directors

In election years, the Director of the National Enrollment Commission would appoint 435 District Directors—one for each of the Congressional Districts—to supervise the enrollment of voters within their districts.

The District Director's position would be unsalaried.

The District Director would have one responsibility—preparing for and supervising the enrollment of all voters in his district.

The District Director would receive a grant of up to 50 cents for every person of voting age residing in the district to cover enrollment expenses.

Any state or local governmental agency

operating throughout a Congressional District where 90 per cent or more of the eligible electorate is enrolled through local efforts prior to July 1 of any Presidential election year may receive the federal funds available for the District as a grant-in-aid to help defray registration and election costs. A state reaching a 90 per cent or better enrollment of its eligible voters may receive a sum equivalent to the federal funds available for all Congressional Districts within its borders that attain a 90 per cent or better registration.

#### District staff director

The District Director would also have responsibility for hiring a Staff Director to serve for a six-month period (July 1-December 31) during each Presidential election year to supervise administration of the enrollment program in the district. This position would be compensated at an attractive salary to obtain the full time services of a well qualified individual who might take leave of absence from business, education or a profession.

The National Enrollment Commission and its Director would provide the local District Director and his staff with supervision, training and all possible aid in enrolling voters in their districts. The emphasis would be on decentralizing administrative responsibilities and performance. The system as a whole must be flexible and with the capacity to adjust to the peculiar demands and enrollment needs of each of the districts.

#### The district board

Each district shall have a review board of at least five members nominated in equal numbers by the political parties whose candidates received more than 10 per cent of the vote in any public election covering the entire district within the past four years. Whenever an additional board member is necessary to achieve an add number of board members, the District Director shall appoint one member to the Board.

#### The District Director shall:

1. Consult with, advise, and recommend methods for full enrollment and fair election procedures to the District Director.
2. Review complaints and report its findings to the District Director and the National Enrollment Commission.

#### Enrollment officials

The Staff Director, under the supervision of the District Director, and in consultation with the District Board would recruit individuals to conduct the actual enrollment of citizens. This service would be voluntary and the enrollment officers would not be financially compensated.

The enrollment officials would be drawn from civic groups, political party workers, or other organizations and individuals who might want to volunteer their services. Each district should recruit not fewer than one enrollment officer for each one hundred persons of voting age in the district.

In performing their duties, enrollment officers would be administered oaths of office as public officials and subject to legal penalties for any prospective abuse of their offices.

Enrollment officers would be required to attend training sessions prior to participating in the enrollment of voters.

#### II. The enrollment of voters

The quadrennial enrollment of voters would begin on the first Monday in October and would be concluded by the end of the third week in October. The enrollment drive would be short and intensive. It is intended to coincide with the interest and enthusiasm generated during the campaign period. Enrollment activities would complement party and candidate efforts and should help to stimulate interest in the election and a higher turnout on election day.

Enrollment officials would be required to make a minimum of two personal calls at every place of residence in the district, if all

voting age residents were not contacted on the first visit. If the personal visits fail to reach every voting age resident, the enrollment official would be required to leave notification of the times and places where the individual would be able to enroll.

The enrollment officials would be required to compare their enrollment lists with all other available voting lists compiled by state or local governmental agencies to insure that no eligible voter had been omitted from the enrollment.

If the proper state and/or local authorities requested it, enrollment officials would enroll voters for state and/or local elections at the same time they were enrolling them for the Presidential election.

Also, if the state or local authorities requested it, the federal enrollment lists would be made available to the proper state or local agencies to update their enrollment records or to serve as a guide to the voting age population.

Any enrollment list not turned over to state or local authorities for the purpose specified would be destroyed within one month of the official certification of the election results. No registry of citizens would be maintained at the national or district level.

When an individual was enrolled as a voter he would receive a card certifying his enrollment. The card would bear the individual's name, his address and his signature, in addition to the signature of the enrolling official. The same information would appear on the list compiled by the enrollment official and would be available at the polls on election day.

The individual would present his voter card to the election officials at the polls on election day. The card would be validated by the election officials. The voter would also sign the enrollment registry beside the signature obtained at the time of his enrollment. These procedures would safeguard the integrity of the election.

The enrollment as described would qualify an individual to vote for the President and the Vice President. If an individual has registered under state law prior to federal enrollment, he need not enroll to vote for President.

Any individual who was eligible to vote yet whose name did not appear on the enrollment lists would have two options after the regular enrollment period had ended:

1. He could contact the District Director or other designated officials who would have the power to determine the individual's eligibility and add his name to the enrollment list, or

2. He could appear at the polls on election day, sign an affidavit that he was eligible to enroll and cast a special ballot for the President. The ballot would be sealed and then placed in an envelope with the affidavit supporting enrollment. It would be the duty of the District Director to determine the voter's eligibility. If found eligible, the ballot would then be counted along with all others cast in this manner and the results added to the election tally.

An individual who loses his enrollment card could still vote. His ballot would be held separately, under procedures described above, until his eligibility was determined by the local election officials from the information in the affidavit.

An individual absent from his home district, but otherwise eligible to vote in the election, could vote for the President at another polling place. To do so, he would have to provide the local election officials with proper identification—name, address, signature, plus personal identification similar to that for cashing a check. The burden of proof in this case would be placed on the individual. Special ballots could be provided for these contingencies. These ballots would be air mailed, special delivery—franking privileges would be provided—to the individu-

al's home District Director. He would determine the eligibility of the voter and then count his sealed ballot along with the others received in this manner.

#### UNIVERSAL VOTER ENROLLMENT AND STATE PRACTICES

Universal Voter Enrollment is not outside the nature of current registration practices in the United States. It is primarily an extension of present and very successful registration procedures in many of the states, procedures which have led to increased voter participation. A brief look at the basic features of the registration systems employed by Utah, Idaho, Washington and California will illustrate.

The state of Utah had a phenomenally high 1968 estimated registration of 97.8 percent. Utah's registration requirements themselves are of about average difficulty. The emphasis on registration is on bringing it close to the people. Local registration agents, appointed by the County Commissioners, establish and publicize—either through a local newspaper or by notices posted in public places, as required by law—their names, the dates and hours for registering, and the centrally located place within the election district where residents may enroll. In addition to the local agents, individuals may also register with the County Clerk up to 10 days before the election. Mail registration is possible if an individual is absent from the county. It appears that Utah's near perfect voter registration record is due to the ability of the voter registration system to keep registration opportunities as close to the individual as possible. The basic concept of Universal Voter Enrollment brings the process one step closer by having the registrar go to the individual's home and enroll him.

In 1968 the state of Idaho had an estimated 91.4 percent of its potential electorate registered to vote, compared with a national average of 77.8 percent. This ranks the state second only to Utah in this regard.

The principal features of Idaho's registration system are its simplicity, its attempt to decentralize registration centers and give responsibility to local units, and its aggressive search to include new registrants on the voting lists. Local registrars are enlisted for each precinct in the February preceding the election. They set up registration centers in their homes or places of business within the precinct. They also can canvass door-to-door and register voters. New housing developments, small population centers, or the like (for example, mobile housing areas) can request that one of their members be commissioned registrar or deputy registrar with authorization to enroll all the inhabitants. This permission is given virtually without exception. Registration is permitted up to the Saturday preceding the Tuesday's election. Over-all, the Idaho practices are very simple, localized and very successful. The emphasis is on taking the registration to the voter to the extent possible.

The state of Washington ranked third in the nation in 1968 in registration with an estimated 90 percent (89.7%) of the potential voters registered. Washington's registration system is characterized primarily by an evident desire to attempt to register as many people as possible rather than by any unusually facilitative or easy registration requirements. Conveniently positioned local registration centers are set up fifteen days prior to the close of registration in local precinct areas. Door-to-door registration is permitted and encouraged. In addition, portable mobile registration units can be sent into neighborhoods to increase registration opportunities. These practices are perhaps the greatest stimulant to a high registration. In effect, the government eases the citizen's burden by assuming responsibility for taking the registration to him.

Another state with a similar registration

plan is California. The outstanding feature of California's registration system is the freedom and flexibility given local registrars to determine the means to be used in contacting potential voters. Community groups can actively seek out and register voters, door-to-door registration can be employed, and mobile registration units can be sent into localities. In addition, the more conventional media outlets for publicizing registration drives can be supplemented with sound trucks sent through election districts to encourage voters to register.

As a result of very effective and highly successful enrollment programs these states have equally impressive voter turnout records. In the 1968 presidential election, the state of Utah led the nation with a turnout of 76.1 percent, as compared with a national average of 61 percent. Idaho has been either the first or second state in the proportion of voters participating in the last three elections. In 1960 it had a turnout of 80 percent, and for the election years of 1960, 1964 and 1968, it averaged a turnout of 78 percent. Similarly, the state of Washington's voter turnout record in 1968 was 71 percent, ten points above the national average.

The significance of the unusually high voter turnout records in Utah, Idaho and Washington must not be overlooked. It is apparent that the increased voter participation in these states is due to a voter registration system that emphasizes the responsibility of government to bring registration opportunities, to the extent practical, to the voter, primarily by localizing registration centers within precincts. And the Universal Voter Enrollment plan, which likewise places the responsibility for registering voters on the government rather than an individual's willingness and initiative in meeting and overcoming a series of government inspired obstacles to his participation, is primarily an extension to the national level of present practices in many states. Clearly not a radical approach to voter registration, the Enrollment plan fits in well with the American system. The plan will increase participation in the democratic process by enabling as many people as possible in the United States to take part in elections. The importance of citizen participation in a democracy cannot be over-stated and must not be overlooked.

#### THE CANADIAN SYSTEM

There are possible alternatives to the registration plan proposed here. One example is the Canadian enrollment system. In the Canadian system there are two enumerators for each polling district (roughly 250 to 300 people). The two political parties with the highest number of votes in the last election each nominate an enumerator for each urban area. These enumerators, acting as a team, enroll the voters in a door-to-door canvass similar to that proposed in the Universal Voter Enrollment plan.

Enumerators begin enrolling voters 49 days prior to the election. They must go to each residence together at least once during daylight hours and, if they fail to contact the prospective voter, once during the evening. They must also notify residents who are not contacted where the enumerators may be reached.

On the 42nd day prior to the election, the enumerators must return a complete copy of their enrollment list to the "returning officer", an individual in charge of the over-all district's enrollment. The enumerators must also post the list in a public and conspicuous place. Procedures are made available for people omitted from the list to have their names entered on the roll.

Enumerators receive a fee of \$32 plus 10c for each elector on their list of electors, a practice roughly similar to that in use in the state of Idaho.

The practice in rural areas is for the government to appoint the enumerators and

there is only one enumerator per polling division. In other respects the system is generally the same, the basic divergencies allow more flexibility in reaching prospective voters scattered over widely diverse geographical areas. In these respects, the Canadian practices are similar to those in Alaska, South Dakota and more rural areas in the United States.

#### WHY THE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS OF UNIVERSAL VOTER ENROLLMENT PLAN

The intention of the Universal Voter Enrollment plan is to register as many people of the voting age population as possible. The Director of the Bureau of the Census was placed in charge of the operation because he is a non-partisan figure of integrity and the one person in the government with experience in the type of operation envisaged in a residential canvass of all prospective voters.

The duties of the National Director of Enrollment are detailed in the Act. He shall supervise the enrollment of all people who meet state registration qualifications. The only exception to this practice is in the case of residency. It is felt that any individual in the country should have the opportunity to vote for president and vice-president. State residency qualifications should not preclude them from voting in presidential elections.

The National Director of Enrollment would also assist people in voting, provide studies and information on our enrolling and voting practices, advise states on the mechanics of their election problems as requested, collect the results of all elections and make these available to the public and record all the laws covering election jurisdictions. There is no agency in the United States that now provides such badly needed services.

The enrollment of voters would take place in the three week period immediately preceding the week of the election. Thus, the enrollment of voters would coincide with the campaigns for public office, reinforcing the voter's interest and encouraging him to vote on election day.

Every person enrolled to vote in presidential elections shall meet the state qualifications except residency. The person's name and signature shall be entered on an enrollment roll. When he votes, he shall again sign the enrollment roll. These safeguards should promote the integrity of elections and, combined with the residential canvass, should make for the most precise registration system this country has known.

Each enrollee, in addition, will be given an enrollment certificate inscribed with the person's name, address and signature plus the name of the enrolling officer. When he votes, the individual will present this enrollment certificate in addition to signing the enrollment roll.

Should a person fail to register prior to election day for any reason, he may—

(1) contact the election official in his district who will have the authority to validate an individual's qualifications and add his name to the enrollment roll, thus enabling him to vote, or

(2) appear at the appropriate voting place on the day of election, sign an affidavit stating that he meets the requirements for enrollment and voting, in which event he will be enrolled and may cast a special ballot for the offices being contested.

These special ballots will be checked by the election officials in each district to determine the eligibility of those casting them to vote. The same procedure with regard to special ballots will also apply in the case of an individual who misplaces his enrollment certificate.

Any person absent from the election district in which he is eligible to vote will be permitted to cast a special absentee ballot provided at a voting place in any other election district upon presentation to the ap-

propriate election officials of identification showing his name, address, and signature. The special absentee ballot will be mailed, registered mail, special delivery, air mail to the voter's home election district, where the election official will determine whether such person was eligible to vote.

These procedures should protect the integrity of elections. They provide adequate means of determining all bona fide voters. They also allow everyone who is eligible to exercise his right to vote.

The bill does not provide for any national registry. The reasons for this are many. A national registry of citizens could abuse the privacy of the individual. The arguments made before congressional committees against a national data bank apply with equal force to a national registry. There seems to be no need under the provisions of the Universal Voter Enrollment to maintain a dossier on each individual. Rather, the bill provides that the enrollment rolls for each jurisdiction be destroyed within 30 days after the results of the election have been certified unless they are turned over to a state, at the state's request, for use in the state's registration system.

The idea of identifying each individual as he comes of voting age, sending him an enrollment card and then maintaining a permanent roll of all voters holds some attraction. However, there are problems in identifying all prospective voters that the authors of the bill could not overcome. The most feasible means of achieving this would be to have all people register within a specified time period when they reach voting age. There is a compulsory connotation to such a system which could be troublesome to enforce. Also, the idea of government stimulating registration as it does in the bill, rather than forcing registration, is more in keeping with the American experience.

The possibility of establishing a centralized file of registrants with basic data available of direct concern to their registration has several additional problems implicit in its realization. It would be difficult to establish a data center based on present data repositories. Assessments of these repositories conclude that their files are not complete, even the most comprehensive are selective in their focus, and much of their information is dated (addresses, for example) and/or incorrect, and the number of people involved is limited, as befits the specific focus of the agency involved.

Even if the data from all repositories—as it pertains to a registration file—could be pooled, many of the same inadequacies would remain. Many people would not be reached and the accuracy of much of the information would be suspect.

Keeping the data bank on registration current and applicable—allowing for changes of address, newly-eligible members of the electorate, and those disqualified for varying reason (e.g., a criminal conviction)—would represent a continuing and difficult problem to overcome. Where the pressure is not present for annual purification of the files, similar, say, to the Internal Revenue Service, the scope of the problem would increase.

In view of the problems presented by the establishment and maintenance of a national registry of citizens, the authors of the bill concluded that it was not feasible to include a provision for a national registry in the Universal Voter Enrollment system.

The congressional district was chosen as the enrollment unit because it is the federal jurisdiction closest to the voter. Also, it is large enough, on the average of 600,000 per district, to allow for centralized enrollment procedures and normally is of compact enough geographical size to permit efficient enrollment procedures.

The Commission is established in the bill to supervise the overall enrollment procedures. With the exception of the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Bureau of

the Census, the members are appointed by the President for six year terms with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission as constituted is intended to insure an objective, non-partisan and comprehensive enrollment of all voters. It should be composed of nationally known citizens of unquestioned integrity, and its powers to hear and publicize complaints should help insure open and fair enrollment procedures.

The Commission should be provided with staff and legal powers adequate for the obligations it undertakes in the Act.

The Universal Voter Enrollment plan is not intended to intrude on the states in any manner. Its enrollment powers are confined to presidential elections, although the states, if they so desire, are free to employ the enrollment rolls as the basic registration list in their own elections. Further, under the provisions of the act, a state would receive \$100,000, the estimated costs of enrollment in a district under the Universal Voter Enrollment plan, for every congressional district in the state with 90 percent or better enrollment. This practice would reward the state for its efforts and help to defray some of the expense and it would relieve the Director of National Enrollment from registering voters in the District.

The costs of the plan, based on estimates taken from Census and other sources, are under \$5 million in non-election years and \$50 million in election years. At less than 50¢ per voter, this is a very small investment to make for a more vital and responsive political system.

#### CONCLUSION

The Universal Voter Enrollment plan meets one of the greatest deficiencies in American government. It provides a means for registering individuals, 47 million of whom did not vote in the last presidential election. It is safe, tested and designed within the framework of the American experience. It should be enacted now.

The bill proposing the Universal Voter Enrollment plan is as follows:

#### H.R. 19010

A bill amending title 13 of the United States Code by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce through the Bureau of the Census to undertake a quadrennial enrollment of those persons to vote in elections of the President and Vice President that meet the qualifications of the various States other than residency. This Act is to be known as the Universal Enrollment Act of 1970

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Universal Enrollment Act of 1970.*

#### NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF ENROLLMENT

SEC. 2. (a) The Director of the Bureau of the Census shall serve as the National Director of Enrollment.

(b) The National Director of Enrollment may appoint additional staff personnel as deemed advisable and develop the procedures deemed necessary to enroll quadrennially all citizens to vote for President and Vice President who meet the qualifications of the various states except residency.

#### DUTIES OF THE NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF ENROLLMENT

SEC. 3. The National Director of Enrollment shall—

(a) establish and supervise a Federal system for the enrollment of all persons who meet the qualifications for enrollment in the State in which they reside, except that there shall be no residency requirement for President or Vice President;

(b) assist and encourage all qualified persons to enroll to vote in Federal elections;

(c) conduct a continuing study of Federal, State, and local election practices and procedures;

(d) provide advisory, educational, and informational services to State and local authorities regarding elections;

(e) encourage and foster, to the maximum extent possible, State and local efforts to achieve full voter participation in elections;

(f) collect the results of all Federal elections held in the United States, analyze such results in a manner to enable the voters to better understand such results, and provide for the publication of such results and analyses;

(g) compile and maintain the laws and procedures in effect for each election jurisdiction in the United States and make such information available upon request to any interested person;

(h) provide assistance upon the request of local communities to assist such communities in solving their election problems.

#### ENROLLMENT OF VOTERS

SEC. 4. (a) The program to enroll all unenrolled persons in any State who have the qualifications for enrollment in such State shall be carried out during a three week period immediately preceding the week in which the Presidential election is to be held in such State.

(b) During the enrollment period referred to in subsection (a), national enrollment officials acting under the supervision of the National Director of Enrollment shall conduct an intensive drive to enroll all persons who meet the qualifications for enrolling as voters in each election jurisdiction and who have failed to enroll under State law.

(c) No person shall be enrolled by a national enrollment official unless it is determined by such official that such person meets the qualifications prescribed by the laws of the States concerned for enrolling for voting in Federal elections. Whenever such determination has been made with respect to any person his name shall be entered on an enrollment roll compiled by the national enrollment officials for the election district concerned.

(d) Each person who is found to be qualified to enroll to vote shall be issued an enrollment certificate in such form as may be prescribed by the Commission containing the person's name, address, and signature, and the name of the national enrollment official concerned. The identical information shall appear on the enrollment roll referred to in subsection (c). The enrollment roll containing a person's name and other information shall be available at the particular voting place within the election jurisdiction where such person may vote.

(e) Any person enrolled to vote pursuant to this section shall be permitted to vote in the same Federal elections which he would have been permitted to vote had he enrolled under State procedures. When any such person appears at the appropriate voting place to vote he shall be required to present the enrollment certificate issued him pursuant to subsection (d). He shall also be required to sign the enrollment roll a second time beside his first signature.

(f) In any case in which a person has failed for any reason to enroll to vote prior to election day and otherwise meets the State qualifications for voting with the exception that there shall be no residency qualification for voting for President and Vice President as provided in section 3, subsection (a), he may—

(1) contact the election official in charge of the election district concerned and he shall have the authority to validate such person's qualifications and add his name to the enrollment roll, and such person shall be permitted to vote, or

(2) appear at the appropriate voting place on the day of election, sign an affidavit stating that he meets the requirements for enrollment and voting, in which event he

shall be enrolled and may cast a special ballot for the offices being contested.

A special ballot cast pursuant to clause (2) shall be placed in an envelope and sealed with information relating to the enrollment of the voter. The election official concerned shall have the responsibility of determining the eligibility of such person to vote in such election. If the election official determines such person was eligible to enroll and vote the ballot shall be counted together with other ballots cast in the same manner and shall be added to the final election tally.

(g) Any person who appears at the appropriate voting place on the day of election and signs an affidavit stating that he was issued an enrollment certificate under this section but has lost such certificate shall be permitted to cast a special ballot for the offices being contested. The same procedure with respect to a special ballot cast under this subsection shall be followed as in the case of a special ballot cast under subsection (f).

(h) Any person absent from the election district in which he is eligible to vote shall be permitted to cast a special absentee ballot provided at a voting place in any other election district upon presentation to the appropriate election officials of identification showing his name, address, and signature. A special absentee ballot cast pursuant to this subsection shall be mailed, registered mail, special delivery, air mail to the election official of the election district in which such person is eligible to vote. The election official shall determine whether such person was eligible to vote and, if it is determined such person was eligible to vote, the sealed ballot cast by such person shall be counted in the same manner as special ballots cast pursuant to subsection (f). All special ballots cast pursuant to this section shall be sealed separately from other ballots cast in the same manner or in any manner that would permit identifying a particular voter with a particular ballot. Special absentee ballots mailed pursuant to this subsection shall be transmitted by the United States Post Office Department without charge.

(i) National enrollment officials, as well as all other election officials and the staff under the supervision of the National Director of Enrollment, shall be considered public officials for the purposes of section 201 of title 18, United States Code.

#### ENROLLMENT INFORMATION

SEC. 5. (a) No national registry of persons shall be compiled or maintained.

(b) The enrollment roll compiled in any congressional district pursuant to this Act shall be made available to any State or local election officials upon request and permanent possession of such enrollment roll shall be given to any such official 30 days after the results of the election have been certified if a request has been made therefor. Otherwise, the enrollment roll in each election district shall be destroyed by the election official 30 days after the election results have been certified.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON FEDERAL ELECTIONS

SEC. 6. (a) There shall be established a Commission to be known as the National Enrollment Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of nine members, seven of whom shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Bureau of the Census shall serve as members of the Commission. Not more than five of the members shall at any one time be of the same political party. Members of the Commission shall be appointed for a term of six years, except that the terms of office for the first members appointed shall be as follows: three members shall be appointed for terms of two years; two members shall

be appointed for terms of four years; and two members shall be appointed for terms of six years. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed may be appointed only for the unexpired term of his predecessor.

(c) The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman. Neither the Chairman nor the Vice Chairman shall be full-time federal employees. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or disability of the Chairman, or in the event of a vacancy in that office.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers and shall be filled in the same manner, and subject to the same limitations with respect to party affiliations as the original appointment was made.

(e) Five members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

#### COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) Each member of the Commission who is not otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall receive the sum of \$150 per day for each day spent in the work of the Commission, shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) Each member of the Commission who is otherwise in the service of the Government of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work of the Commission shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from his usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

#### DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall—

(1) consult with, advise, and recommend to the National Director of Enrollment, appointed under section 2 of this Act, methods for effectively carrying out the duties of the Commission under this Act;

(2) review complaints of malfeasance and nonfeasance against the National Enrollment Director or those under his jurisdiction and report to the President the results of the Commission's review;

(3) recommend to the National Enrollment Director how enrollment programs in specific election jurisdictions should be improved;

(b) The Commission shall submit an annual report to the President and to the Congress not later than June 30th each year of its activities under this Act together with such recommendation for legislative or administrative action as it deems advisable.

#### STAFF

SEC. 9. (a) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such staff personnel as it deems advisable; and may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$100 a day for individuals.

#### ADDITIONAL POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission or any duly authorized subcommittee or member thereof may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before

such subcommittee or member. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman or any duly designated members of the Commission, and may be served by any person designated by the Chairman or such member.

(b) In the case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued under subsection (a) by any person who resides, is found, or transacts business within the jurisdiction of any district court of the United States, such court, upon application made by the Attorney General of the United States at the request of the Chairman of the Commission, shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission or a subcommittee or member thereof, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under inquiry. Any failure of any such person to obey any such order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof.

(c) Each department, agency, and instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, such statistical data, reports, and other information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act. The Chairman is further authorized to call upon the departments, agencies, and other offices of the several States to furnish, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, such statistical data, reports, and other information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

**DISTRICT DIRECTORS**

SEC. 11. (a) In each year in which a Federal election is held, the National Director of Enrollment shall appoint a District Director for each congressional district. District Directors shall be residents of the congressional district.

(b) It shall be the responsibility of the District Director in each congressional district to organize and supervise the enrollment of all persons residing in such district who can meet the qualifications for voting in Federal elections in the State in which they reside but have failed to enroll to vote.

(c) District Directors shall be paid at a rate not to exceed \$100 a day for individuals.

(d) Except as provided in subsection (e), in any year in which a Federal election is held in any State the Commission shall allocate not more than \$100,000 per congressional district to the District Director for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(e) (1) Where the Commission finds that 90 per centum or more of the persons qualified to enroll to vote in Federal elections in any congressional district were actually enrolled to vote in the most recent Federal election, the Commission shall grant to the appropriate State and local officials of such congressional district the sum of \$100,000 to help defray enrollment and election costs incurred in such district. Whenever a grant

is made under this paragraph no grant shall be made under subsection (d).

(2) When the Commission finds that 90 per centum or more of the persons qualified to enroll to vote in Federal elections in any State were actually enrolled to vote in the most recent Federal election, the Commission shall grant to such State a sum determined by multiplying \$100,000 by the number of congressional districts in such State qualifying for grants under paragraph (1) of this subsection. Grants made under this paragraph shall be for the purpose of helping the State defray the cost of conducting Federal elections and maintaining full voter enrollment.

**DISTRICT STAFF DIRECTORS**

SEC. 12. The National Enrollment Director for each congressional district not qualifying under the provisions of section 7, subsection (e) (1) or (2) shall employ a District Staff Director for a period of six months, beginning July 1, in each year in which Federal elections are held. The District Staff Director shall assist the District Director in supervising the enrollment program carried out in the district. The salary of District Staff Directors shall be fixed by the Commission.

**REGISTRATION OFFICIALS**

SEC. 13. (a) The District Staff Director, under the supervision of the District Director, in each congressional district shall recruit persons to serve as national enrollment officials. It shall be the duty of such officials to enroll persons who meet the State requirements to enroll and vote in Federal elections with the exception that there shall be no residency requirement for President or Vice President.

(b) Persons who are recruited to serve as national enrollment officials shall be given a brief training course prior to assuming any enrollment duties under this Act. The training program shall be conducted under the supervision of the District Director concerned in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commission. The duties of national enrollment officials shall be prescribed by the Commission. The duties of national enrollment officials shall be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Commission and such duties shall be carried out in each congressional district under the supervision and control of the District Director and the District Staff Director of such congressional district. Persons recruited to serve as national enrollment officials shall serve voluntarily without compensation.

(c) National enrollment officials, as well as District Directors, District Staff Directors and their staffs, shall be considered public officials for the purposes of section 201 of title 18, United States Code.

**DEFINITION**

SEC. 14. As used in this Act, the term "Federal election" means any general or special election held solely or in part for the purpose of electing any candidate for the office of President, Vice-President or presidential elector.

TABLE 1.—DIFFERENTIAL TURNOUT RATES BY CLASSES OF COUNTIES

I. OHIO

	Registration category by county		
	Full	Partial	None
1932:			
Mean turnout <sup>1</sup> .....	67.5	79.5	79.5
Standard deviation.....	6.31	7.20	7.20
N.....	28	59	59
1936:			
Mean turnout <sup>1</sup> .....	73.1	82.6	82.6
Standard deviation.....	6.04	6.84	6.84
N.....	28	59	59
1948:			
Mean turnout.....	58.3	58.3	64.3
Standard deviation.....	5.46	4.70	5.76
N.....	6	25	57
1952:			
Mean turnout.....	66.9	71.4	75.0
Standard deviation.....	4.43	4.56	5.52
N.....	17	17	54
1956:			
Mean turnout.....	64.6	67.5	71.6
Standard deviation.....	5.30	3.40	6.14
N.....	22	15	51
1960:			
Mean turnout.....	66.2	73.4	78.6
Standard deviation.....	13.45	4.46	5.35
N.....	28	12	48

<sup>1</sup> Excluding Cuyahoga.

REGISTRATION CATEGORY BY COUNTY  
(EXCLUDING PHILADELPHIA)

II. PENNSYLVANIA

	Registration		No registration
	Full	Partial	
1920:			
Mean turnout.....	41.9	48.2	48.2
Standard deviation.....	5.14	6.61	6.61
N.....	29	37	37
1924:			
Mean turnout.....	46.0	52.8	52.8
Standard deviation.....	5.09	7.05	7.05
N.....	29	37	37
1932:			
Mean turnout.....	51.6	61.6	61.6
Standard deviation.....	5.37	7.81	7.81
N.....	30	36	36
1936:			
Mean turnout.....	70.2	80.0	80.0
Standard deviation.....	5.91	7.43	7.43
N.....	30	36	36

Source: Compiled by Prof. Walter Dean Burnham, Department of Political Science, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

TABLE 2.—OCCUPATION AND 1960 TURNOUT CORRELATED FOR 83 ELECTORAL UNITS, BALTIMORE, MD.

Occupation	1960 turnout	
	Registered	Not registered
Professional-managerial.....	+0.706	
Other white collar.....	+0.610	
Skilled and semi-skilled.....	-0.572	
Unskilled.....	-0.695	

Source: Compiled by Prof. Walter Dean Burnham, Department of Political Science, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

TABLE 3.—REGISTRATION AND VOTING IN THE 1968 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

	Population of voting age	Registered	Percentage registered	Voted	Percentage voting		Population of voting age	Registered	Percentage registered	Voted	Percentage voting
Race:						In central cities.....	18,841	13,427	71.3	12,373	65.7
White.....	104,521	78,835	75.4	72,213	69.1	Outside central cities.....	22,518	17,262	76.6	16,258	72.2
Negro.....	10,935	7,238	66.2	6,300	57.6	In SMSA's of under 1,000,000.....	34,397	25,905	75.3	22,873	66.5
Residence:						In central cities.....	16,776	12,047	71.8	10,994	65.5
Metropolitan areas.....	75,756	55,593	73.4	51,503	68.0	Outside central cities.....	17,621	12,858	73.0	11,879	67.4

Footnotes at end of table.

	Population of voting age	Registered	Percentage registered	Voted	Percentage voting
<b>Residence—Continued</b>					
Nonmetropolitan areas.....	40,778	30,981	76.0	27,461	67.3
Nonfarm.....	35,255	26,454	75.0	23,501	66.7
Farm.....	5,524	4,527	81.9	3,960	71.7
<b>Education:</b>					
Elementary:					
0 to 4 years.....	5,926	2,937	49.6	2,278	38.4
5 to 7 years.....	9,687	6,108	63.0	5,072	52.4
8 years.....	14,817	10,627	71.7	9,242	62.4
High school:					
1 to 3 years.....	20,429	13,987	68.5	12,519	61.3
4 years.....	39,704	30,859	77.7	28,768	72.5
College:					
1 to 3 years.....	13,312	11,038	82.9	10,443	78.4
4 years.....	7,974	6,899	86.5	6,627	83.1
5 plus years.....	4,685	4,120	87.9	4,016	85.7
<b>Occupation:</b>					
White-collar workers.....	33,709	28,167	83.5	26,898	79.8
Manual workers.....	25,229	17,434	69.1	15,719	62.3
Service workers.....	8,078	5,615	69.5	5,068	62.7
Farm workers.....	2,987	2,380	79.7	2,087	69.9
<b>Family income:</b>					
Under \$3,000.....	11,293	7,381	65.3	6,037	53.5
\$3,000 to \$4,999.....	14,557	9,641	66.2	8,435	57.9
\$5,000 to \$7,499.....	22,870	16,475	72.0	15,019	65.7
\$7,500 to \$9,999.....	18,920	14,807	78.3	13,806	73.5
\$10,000 to \$14,999.....	19,744	16,333	82.7	15,496	78.0
\$15,000 and over.....	9,707	8,521	87.8	8,162	84.1

Note: The numbers are in the thousands and the figures are for the civilian noninstitutionalized population.

TABLE 5.—VOTER REGISTRATION RESULTS FROM VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965, BY RACE

State	Percent registered		State	Percent registered	
	Prior to Act	1968		Prior to Act	1968
Alabama:			Virginia:		
Nonwhite.....	19.3	51.6	Nonwhite.....	38.3	55.6
White.....	69.2	89.6	White.....	61.6	63.4
Arkansas:			A breakdown by race is not available.		
Nonwhite.....	40.4	62.8	Source: Political Participation: A Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), pp. 12-13.		
White.....	65.5	72.4	<b>TABLE 4.—Restrictions on the vote in Louisiana and Idaho (persons prohibited from voting)</b>		
Florida:			IN LOUISIANA		
Nonwhite.....	51.2	63.6	Those who are not U.S. citizens.		
White.....	74.8	81.4	Those who do not meet residency requirements.		
Georgia:			Those under 21.		
Nonwhite.....	27.4	52.6	Those who fail literacy test.		
White.....	62.2	80.3	Those judged insane or placed under guardianship.		
Louisiana:			Those who commit a felony.*		
Nonwhite.....	31.6	58.9	Inmates of prison.		
White.....	80.5	93.1	Inmates of charitable institutions.		
Mississippi:			Deserters.		
Nonwhite.....	6.7	59.8	Those dishonorably discharged from military service (unless pardoned).		
White.....	69.9	91.5	Those of bad character.		
North Carolina:			Those convicted of a crime carrying 6 months or more imprisonment.		
Nonwhite.....	46.8	51.3	Those in "common law" marriages.		
White.....	96.8	83.0	Parents of illegitimate children.		
South Carolina:			IN IDAHO		
Nonwhite.....	37.3	51.2	Those who are not U.S. citizens.		
White.....	75.7	81.7	Those who do not meet residency requirements.		
Tennessee:			Those living in or encouraging others to live in "patriarchal, plural or celestial marriages."		
Nonwhite.....	69.5	71.7	Those who teach state laws are not supreme.		
White.....	72.9	80.6	Those of Chinese or Mongolian descent.		
Texas:			*Unless civil rights have been restored.		
Nonwhite.....	153.1	61.6	Source: See tables that follow		
White.....		53.3			

TABLE 6.—STATE RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS

State	In State	In county	In precinct	In city	Presidential waiver	Former residents
Alabama.....	1 year	6 months	3 months		None	
Alaska.....	do	do	30 days		No residence requirement, special ballot.	May vote absentee for President until new State requirements are met.
Arizona.....	do	30 days	do		Not less than 60 days and registered voter in previous State.	May vote for 15 months after leaving State if cannot vote in new State.
Arkansas.....	12 months	6 months	1 month		None	
California.....	1 year	90 days	54 days		At least 54 days but less than 1 year, special ballot.	
Colorado.....	do	do	22 days if moved to another county within 90 days of election.		Not less than 6 months in State, 90 days in county; 15 days in precinct absentee ballot.	
Connecticut.....	do	do	do	6 months	At least 60 days but less than 6 months at town clerk's office within 30 days of election.	May vote absentee in old town 24 months if cannot qualify in new State.
Delaware.....	do	90 days	30 days		At least 3 months may register for a Presidential ballot, only in Wilmington and vote in Wilmington on election day.	
District of Columbia.....	do	do	do		None	
Florida.....	do	6 months	do		No residence requirement, must register between 45th and 75th days prior to election, must cancel old registration, must vote by 5 p.m. of day before election.	
Georgia.....	do	do	do		At least 30 days but less than 1 year and registered voter in previous State, special location.	
Hawaii.....	do	3 months	do		Must meet all requirements to vote except residency, special ballot.	
Idaho.....	6 months	30 days	90 days (for county seat election)		At least 60 days but less than 6 months, special absentee ballot.	
Illinois.....	1 year	90 days	30 days		Less than 1 year in State or 90 days in county but in election district at least 60 days before election, special ballot.	
Indiana.....	6 months	60 days (township)	do		None	
Iowa.....	do	60 days	10 days (for municipal and special).		None	
Kansas.....	do	do	30 days		At least 45 days but less than 6 months in township, precinct or ward, special ballot.	
Kentucky.....	1 year	6 months	60 days		None	

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 6.—STATE RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS—Continued

State	In State	In county	In precinct	In city	Presidential waiver	Former residents
Louisiana	1 year	6 months	3 months		Less than 1 year and registered voter in previous State special ballot.	
Maine	6 months			3 months	No residence requirement, special ballot.	
Maryland	1 year	6 months (or city)	6 months (if less vote in old precinct).		Less than 6 months in State provided resided in ward or election district at least 45 days before election.	
Massachusetts	do			6 months (or town).	Less than 1 year but at least 31 days in city or town preceding election, special absentee ballot.	
Michigan	6 months				( <sup>5</sup> ) Less than 6 months but more than 30 days and is ineligible to vote in old State, special ballot.	May vote after leaving State if cannot vote in new State.
Minnesota	do		30 days (if less may vote in former precinct if in same municipality)		Less than 6 months must apply at least 30 days prior to election, special ballot.	
Mississippi	1 year	1 year	6 months		None.	
Missouri	do	60 days	In some counties precinct residence requirement of 10 days.		Less than 1 year but more than 60 days, special ballot.	
Montana	do	30 days			None.	
Nebraska	6 months	40 days	10 days		Less than 6 months in State; or less than 40 days in county but more than 2 days, special ballot.	
Nevada	do	30 days	do		None. <sup>2</sup>	
New Hampshire	do		6 months (in ward or town).		Less than 6 months but more than 30 days, special ballot.	
New Jersey	do	40 days			Less than 6 months but at least 40 days in State and county, special ballot.	May vote by special absentee ballot for President if cannot vote in new State.
New Mexico	1 year	90 days	30 days		None.	
New York	3 months	3 months (city or village).			Must be resident for 3 months and 30 days in election district, special ballot.	
North Carolina	1 year		30 days (may vote in old precinct).		Less than 1 year but more than 60 days, special ballot.	
North Dakota	do	90 days	30 days		Was a citizen of another State and meets all other requirements to vote, no residence requirement, special ballot.	
Ohio	do	40 days	40 days		Less than 1 year but more than 40 days and was a qualified voter in former State, special ballot.	
Oklahoma	6 months	2 months	20 days		Less than 6 months but more than 15 days, meets all other requirements and was qualified voter in former State, special absentee ballot.	
Oregon	6 months				Less than 6 months to 5 p.m. on day before election, special ballot.	
Pennsylvania	90 days		60 days		None.	
Rhode Island	1 year			6 months	do	
South Carolina	1 year (ministers, teachers and their spouses, 6 months.)	6 months	3 months		None. <sup>4</sup>	
South Dakota	1 year <sup>3</sup> (5 years in United States.)	90 days	30 days		do.	
Tennessee	1 year	3 months			do.	
Texas	do	6 months			Less than 1 year but more than 60 days and was qualified voter in former State special ballot.	May vote absentee for President for 24 months after leaving State if cannot vote in new State.
Utah	do <sup>4</sup>	4 months	60 days		None.	
Vermont	do			90 days	do.	
Virginia	do <sup>7</sup>	6 months	30 days		do.	
Washington	1 year	90 days	do		Less than 1 year but more than 60 days, special ballot.	
West Virginia	do	60 days			None.	
Wisconsin	6 months		10 days (if less may vote in old precinct).		Less than 6 months and was a qualified voter in former State, no residence requirement, special ballot.	May vote absentee for President for 24 months after leaving State if cannot vote in new State.
Wyoming	1 year	60 days	10 days		None.	May vote absentee until new State requirements are met.

<sup>1</sup> State representative district.  
<sup>2</sup> On or before the 5th Friday preceding election (if less may vote in old district).  
<sup>3</sup> Constitutional amendment on the ballot for 1970 creating special procedures.  
<sup>4</sup> Legislation pending which deals with this subject.  
<sup>5</sup> Constitutional amendment to be submitted to voters to change the State residency requirement to 180 days.  
<sup>6</sup> Constitutional amendment to be submitted to voters in 1970 to change the residency requirements to 90 days in the State, 60 days in the county and 30 days in the precinct.  
<sup>7</sup> Proposed constitutional amendment would change the requirements to 6 months in the State and 30 days in the precinct.  
 Source: Election Laws of the 50 States and the District of Columbia, The Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, June 5, 1968; local election officials.

TABLE 7.—REGISTRATION PROCEDURES

State	Registration		Where to register	Registration period	Cancellation, registration, purge
	In person	By mail			
Alabama	P		County board of registrars	Close 10 days prior to the election; open Oct. 1 to Dec. 31 in odd years, the number of days being discretionary with each county; 10 days beginning 3d Monday in January in even years; in larger cities open 4 additional times for 10 days each.	Complete registration of all persons entitled to register every 2 years.
Alaska	P	M	Local election board	Open year around; close 14 days prior to election	1968: No registration required. Present: Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years.
Arizona	P	M	County recorder	Open year around; close 4 months prior to primary and 7 weeks to general election.	Cancellation for failure to vote in neither preceding primary nor general election.
Arkansas	P		Permanent registrar or his deputy	Open year around; closes 20 days prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years.
California	P	M	County clerk	Open year around; closes 53 days prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in preceding general election.
Colorado	P	M	County clerk (Denver Election Commission)	Open year around; closes 20 days prior to and 45 days after general election and 20 days prior to primary.	Cancellation for failure to vote once in 1 year.
Connecticut	P		Town clerk or registrar of voters	Open 8th week prior to election and 1 day each month during the year; closes 4th week prior to any election.	Annual canvass to purge registration list.

Footnotes at end of table.

State	Registration		Where to register	Registration period	Cancellation, registration, purge
	In person	By mail			
Delaware	P	M	County department of elections	Open on the 4th Saturday in July, 2d Saturday in September, and 3d Saturday in October prior to election.	Cancellation for failure to vote in 2 years.
District of Columbia				Pre 1969: Open January 1; close 45 days prior to election. At present open year around; close prior to election.	Pre 1969: Reregistration of all voters each election year. At present cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years.
Florida	P		County supervisor of registration	Open year around; close 30 days prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 2 years.
Georgia	P		County board of registrars	Open year around; close 50 days prior to election except when there is a November general election, then open 1 day a week during the 50-day period.	Cancellation for failure to vote in 3 years.
Hawaii	P	M	County clerk (Honolulu—City clerk)	Open year around; close 5th Friday before primary; open 10 days after primary; close remainder of period between primary and general election.	Cancellation for failure to vote in preceding primary or general election.
Idaho	P	M	County auditor	Open 1st Monday in March; close Saturday next preceding primary and Saturday next preceding general election.	Cancellation for failure to vote in last general election.
Illinois	P		County clerk	Open year around; close 28 days prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years.
Indiana	P	M	County clerk or board of registration	Open Dec. 1 until 29 days prior to primary; open May 15 until 29 days prior to general election.	Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years (changed to 2 years in 1969).
Iowa	P	M	City or town clerk or commissioner of registration	(a) Open year around; close 10 days before election; (b) Open 2d Tuesday and last Saturday prior to election for 3 days and on election day.	(a) Optional permanent system: Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years; general; (b) regular system: Cancellation for failure to vote in 2 years.
Kansas	P	M	City clerk (In Johnson, Sedgwick, Shawnee, and Wyandette Counties with election commission).	Open year around; close 20 days prior to any election	1968: No registration required. Present: Cancellation for failure to vote in November general elections held in even-numbered years.
Kentucky	P		County clerk (Louisville—Board of Registration Commissioners).	Open year around; close 59 days prior to and 5 days after general election and primary.	Cancellation for failure to vote in any election during a 2-year period.
Louisiana	P		Registrar of parish	Open year around; close 30 days prior to primary and general election.	Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years in large parishes; general reregistration every 4 years in small parishes; cancellation for failure to vote in 2 years in certain parishes.
Maine	P	M	Board of selectmen in towns; board of registration in cities.	Depending on size of city open 4th and 8th, 6th to 10th, 8th to 14th, or 10th to 18th day prior to election; close 3, 5, 7 or 9 days prior to election.	Annual purge by registrar.
Maryland	P		Board of supervisors of election	Open 1st and 3d Tuesday of each month with additional sessions at discretion of board; close 5th Monday prior to and 15 days after general and primary elections.	Cancellation for failure to vote in 5 years.
Massachusetts	P		Town or city clerk	Open year around; close 31 days prior to statewide elections and 20 days prior to city elections.	Combination of annual canvass and checklist.
Michigan	P	M	City or township clerk	Open year around; close 5th Friday prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 2 years.
Minnesota	P	M	City clerk or commissioner of registration	Open year around; close 20 days prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years.
Mississippi	P		Circuit clerk (county registrar)	Open year around; close 4 months prior to election	General reregistration at discretion of county board.
Missouri	P		County clerk (Kansas City—St. Louis City and County Board of Election Commissioners).	Open year around; close 24 days preceding election in small counties; close 4th Wednesday prior to election in large counties.	Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years in larger cities; 2 years in smaller cities.
Montana	P	M	County clerk and recorder	Open year around; close 40 days prior to any election	Cancellation for failure to vote in any general election.
Nebraska	P	M	County clerk (Douglas and Lancaster Counties—Election commissioner).	Open year around; close on 2d Friday prior to election	Purge by board prior to State general elections and at their discretion.
Nevada	P	M	County clerk	Open year around; close on 7th Saturday prior to primary and 6th Saturday prior to general election.	Cancellation for failure to vote at any general election.
New Hampshire			Board of supervisors of checklist of town or city.	List posted for corrections 30 days prior to election; close to corrections 5 days prior to election.	Checklist.
New Jersey	P		City board of elections or municipal clerk	Open year around; close 40 days prior to any election	Cancellation for failure to vote once in 4 years.
New Mexico	P	M	County clerk	Open year around; close 42 days prior to any election	Cancellation for failure to vote at last general election.
New York	P	M	Board of elections in county seat	Open year around; close 30 days prior to any election	Cancellation for failure to vote once in each period of 2 successive calendar years.
North Carolina	P		County chairman of board of elections or local registrar.	Open year around; close 21 days prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years; general reregistration at option of county board.
North Dakota					No registration required.
Ohio	P		County election board	Open year around; close 41 days prior to any election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 2 years; cities may call general reregistration every 4 years.
Oklahoma	P		County election board or deputy registrar	Open year around; close 10 days prior to any election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years.
Oregon	P	M	County clerk (Portland—Registrar of elections).	Open year around; close 30 days prior to any election	Annual mail canvass by board.
Pennsylvania	P		County Board of elections (Philadelphia—Registration division).	Open year around; close 50 days prior to any election and 25 days after primary and 30 days after general election.	Cancellation for failure to vote in 2 years.
Rhode Island	P		Local board of canvassers and registration	Open year around; close 60 days prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 5 years.
South Carolina	P		County registration board	Open year around; close 30 days before general and primary election.	Cancellation for failure to vote in an election during period since last two preceding statewide elections; general re-registration every 10 years.
South Dakota	P	M	County auditor	Open year around; close 15 days prior to any election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 4 years.
Tennessee	P	M	County election commission	Open year around; close 30 days prior to any election	Do.
Texas	P	M	County tax assessor—Collector	Open Oct. 1; close Jan 31	Annual registration of all voters.
Utah	P	M	County clerk	Open 1st Tuesday; 2d Saturday and 4th Tuesday of month prior to primary. Open 4th Saturday and 3d Tuesday and 1st Wednesday prior to general election.	Cancellation for failure to vote at last or next previous general or municipal election.
Vermont			Board of civil authority of town or city	List posted 30 days prior to election; close to corrections 36 hours prior election on Saturday before a Tuesday election.	Check list.
Virginia	P		General registrar of county or city	Open year around; close 30 days prior to election	Purge at the direction of county and on every 6 years.
Washington	P		County auditor or city clerk	Open year around; close 30 days prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 30 months prior to Apr. 1 of odd numbered years.
West Virginia	P	M	Clerk of circuit court	Open year around; close 20 days prior to election	Cancellation for failure to vote in 2 years.
Wisconsin	P	M	City, town or village clerk (Milwaukee—Board of Election Commissioners.)	Open year around; close 3d Wednesday prior to election in large cities; 2d Wednesday prior to election in small cities.	Cancellation for failure to vote in 2 years in small cities; annual purge in larger cities.
Wyoming	P	M	County clerk	Open year around; close 15 days prior to and 10 days after election	Cancellation for failure to vote in any general election.

Sources: League of Women Voters of the United States, 1730 M Street NW., Washington, D.C. Law and the Due Process Clause," Houston Law Review, spring 1970. 20036, "Year of the 1970 Voter—Get Ready to Vote." Robert Doty, "The Texas Voter Registration

TABLE 8.—ABSENTEE VOTING PROCEDURES

Request absentee ballot when	Secure absentee ballot from	Official application	Voted ballot must be received by election officials	
Alabama.....	From 45 to 5th day before election.....	Register of the county civil circuit court.....	Yes.....	No later than day of election.
Alaska.....	Not more than 6 months nor less than 4 days prior to election.....	Secretary of State—Pouch AA—Juneau 99801.....	.....	Postmarked no later than day of election.
Arizona.....	Within 30 days prior to the Saturday before an election.....	County recorder.....	.....	By 7 p.m. of day of election.
Arkansas.....	Within 90 to 1 day prior to election.....	County clerk.....	Yes.....	By 7:30 p.m. of day of election.
California.....	Not more than 60 nor less than 7 days prior to election.....	do.....	In some counties.....	By 5 p.m. of day prior to election.
Colorado.....	From 90 days to the Friday before an election.....	County clerk (Denver, election commissioner). Town clerk.....	.....	By 5 p.m. of day of election.
Connecticut.....	Anytime so voted ballot can be received in Conn. by day prior to election.....	County department of elections.....	Yes.....	By 6 p.m. of day prior to election.
Delaware.....	From 30 days to 12 noon of day prior to election.....	County supervisor of elections.....	Yes.....	By 12 noon of day prior to election.
Florida.....	From 45 days to 5 p.m. of day prior to election.....	County board of registrars.....	.....	By 5 p.m. of day prior to election.
Georgia.....	Within 90 to 5 days prior to election.....	County clerk (Honolulu, city clerk).....	.....	By 7 p.m. of day of election.
Hawaii.....	Not more than 60 nor less than 5 days prior to election if within state; nor less than 10 days if outside state.....	.....	.....	Postmarked no later than the day prior to any election.
Idaho.....	Anytime prior to election.....	County clerk.....	.....	By 12 noon of day of election. Return ballot by certified or registered mail.
Illinois.....	Not more than 30 nor less than 5 days prior to election.....	County clerk (Chicago election district, board of election commissioners).....	Yes.....	In time to be delivered to local precincts by 6 p.m. of election day.
Indiana.....	Within 90 days prior to election.....	County election board.....	Yes.....	By 6 p.m. of day of election.
Iowa.....	Within 20 days prior to election.....	County auditor.....	Yes.....	In time to be delivered to local precinct before 8 p.m. of election day.
Kansas.....	For primary, between April 1 and Thursday prior to election. For general election, between Sept. 1 and Thursday prior to election.....	County clerk or election commissioner.....	Yes.....	By 12 noon of day prior to election in counties using paper ballots.
Kentucky.....	Anytime prior to 20 days before election.....	County court clerk.....	Yes.....	By 6 p.m. of day of election.
Louisiana.....	Between 60th and 6th day prior to election.....	Clerk of parish court (New Orleans, civil sheriff of parish). Town or city clerk.....	.....	In time to be delivered to the precinct by 8 p.m. of day of election.
Maine.....	Anytime prior to election.....	Board of supervisors of elections.....	Yes.....	By 3 p.m. of day of election.
Maryland.....	Anytime prior to 10 days before election.....	City or town clerk.....	.....	By 8 p.m. of day of election.
Massachusetts.....	Anytime prior to day before general election.....	City or township clerk.....	Yes.....	Before polls close on day of election.
Michigan.....	Anytime prior to election.....	County auditor.....	Yes.....	By 8 p.m. of day of election.
Minnesota.....	Not more than 45 nor less than 1 day prior to election.....	County or city registrar.....	.....	Before polls close on election day.
Mississippi.....	Not earlier than 60 days prior to election.....	County clerk or board of election commissioners.....	Yes.....	In time to be delivered to precinct before polls close.
Missouri.....	Between 30th and 4th day prior to election.....	County clerk and recorder.....	Yes.....	By 4 p.m. of day prior to election.
Montana.....	Between 45th and 1 day before election.....	County clerk (Douglas and Lancaster Counties, election commissioner).....	Yes.....	By 8 p.m. of day of election.
Nebraska.....	Between 90th and 2nd day prior to election.....	County clerk.....	.....	By 10 a.m. of Thursday, following day of election.
Nevada.....	Anytime prior to 7 days before election.....	Town or city clerk.....	.....	Before polls close on day of election.
New Hampshire.....	Anytime prior to election.....	County clerk.....	.....	In time to be delivered to local officials before polls close on election day.
New Jersey.....	Anytime prior to 8 days before election.....	do.....	Yes.....	By 8 p.m. of day of election.
New Mexico.....	Anytime prior to 10 days before election.....	Board of elections of County or Borough.....	Yes.....	By 12 noon of day prior to election.
New York.....	Between 30th and 7th day prior to election.....	Chairman of county board of elections.....	Yes.....	By 5 p.m. of Friday prior to election.
North Carolina.....	Between 46th and 5th day prior to election.....	County auditor.....	Yes.....	By 6 p.m. of Wednesday prior to election.
North Dakota.....	Within 30 days prior to election.....	.....	.....	In time to be delivered to precinct before polls close on election day.
Ohio.....	Between 30th and 5th day prior to election.....	County election board.....	Yes.....	By 12 noon of Friday before day of election.
Oklahoma.....	Anytime but preferably at least 30 days before election.....	do.....	.....	By 5 p.m. of Friday before day of election.
Oregon.....	Between the 60th and 5th day prior to election.....	County clerk (Multnomah County, Department of records and elections). Local board of canvassers.....	Yes.....	By 8 p.m. of day of election.
Pennsylvania.....	Anytime prior to 7 days before election.....	County board of registration.....	Yes.....	By 5 p.m. of Friday prior to election.
Rhode Island.....	Anytime but completed form must be received by board by 21st day before election.....	County auditor.....	Yes.....	By 9 p.m. of day of election.
South Carolina.....	Anytime prior to 30 days before election.....	County election commission.....	Yes.....	Before polls close on election day.
South Dakota.....	Anytime prior to election.....	County clerk.....	Yes.....	By 7 p.m. of day of election.
Tennessee.....	Between 40th and 5th day prior to election.....	do.....	Yes.....	By 10 a.m. of day of election.
Texas.....	Between 60th and 4th day prior to election.....	do.....	Yes.....	By 1 p.m. of day of election.
Utah.....	Within 30 days prior to election; earlier if overseas.....	Town or city clerk.....	Yes.....	By 8 p.m. of day of election.
Vermont.....	Anytime prior to 4th day before election.....	.....	.....	In time to be delivered to local election officials before polls close.
Virginia.....	Between 60 and 5 days prior to election if within United States between 90 and 10 days prior to election if outside United States.....	Precinct or general registrar.....	Yes.....	In time to be counted in precinct before polls close.
Washington.....	Within 45 days prior to election.....	County auditor or city clerk.....	.....	No later than 10 days after primary and 15 days after general election.
West Virginia.....	Between 60th and 4th day prior to election.....	Clerk of circuit court.....	Yes.....	In time to be delivered to local polls by 7:30 p.m. election day.
Wisconsin.....	Between 90th and 3d day prior to election.....	Town or city clerk (Milwaukee, board of election commissioners). County clerk.....	.....	In time to be delivered to local precinct by 8 p.m. of election day.
Wyoming.....	Within 40 days prior to election.....	.....	.....	In time to be delivered to precinct officials when polls open.

### JUSTICE FOR RHODESIA: WILL YOU ACT, MR. HEATH?

(Mr. LANGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 51 House colleagues who have joined with me, I am taking this opportunity to announce a new initiative undertaken on behalf of the good people of Rhodesia, who have traditionally courted friendship with the United States.

On numerous past occasions Members of both Houses of the Congress, from both sides of the political aisle, and representing all parts of the United States have joined in efforts to bring an end to the unproductive and negative atmos-

phere surrounding current American policy toward that nation.

And now the accession of the new Conservative Government of Prime Minister Edward Heath to power in Great Britain has afforded a new opportunity to work for this desirable goal. Vowing during the recent campaign to seek new initiatives toward conciliation with the states of Southern Africa, Mr. Heath should now be encouraged in his efforts to achieve this wise goal.

I wish to extend publicly my deepest appreciation to my good friends and colleagues—all 51 of them—who have joined with me in sending a personal letter to Mr. Heath regarding this matter.

As the letter has already been delivered to the Prime Minister at his London office, I feel it appropriate at this time to

make public the message contained. The letter reads as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 9, 1970.

The Right Honorable Mr. EDWARD HEATH,  
Prime Minister, London, England.

SIR: We, the undersigned Members of the United States Congress, wish to congratulate you on your recent accession to the high office of Prime Minister. In addition we wish to express to you our hopes for great success as you grapple with the problems of the new government.

One of the many concerns which is occupying the attention of a large number of us in the United States Congress, and one in which there is a deep grassroots sentiment all over this country of ours, is the continuation of economic sanctions by the United Kingdom against Rhodesia.

Our official and national policy has hith-

erto been one of support for the United Kingdom in her efforts to effect a reconciliation without bloodshed with her runaway colony. However, after five years of inconclusive efforts, the Government of Rhodesia has finally severed all connections with the mother country. The imposition of strict economic sanctions against Rhodesia, by vote of the Security Council of the United Nations, has resulted neither in the economic collapse or breakdown of that country's financial structure, nor has it forced her leaders to come to terms with the British Government at the bargaining table.

What is apparent to us are the following facets of the problem:

1. Rhodesia is not on the verge of a collapse.
2. Great Britain and most other free western world trading partners have lost a valuable and growing Central African market.
3. Subvention and third-nation channels of trade are being opened up which lead to distortions of international trade and investment and a sense of hypocrisy in our official commercial relationships.
4. The cessation of our trading relationships has caused a void which we may find hard to fill in view of the fact that other countries, whose basic philosophies are inimical to those of the western free world nations, are stepping up their trade and investment there, and may be adverse to sharing their advantage with us in the future.
5. The white population of Rhodesia is apparently able to "make do" under continuing sanctions, but our concern is also for the native population which is increasingly being caught in an economic squeeze.
6. The cost of the British blockade against oil imports by Rhodesia must seem needless in view of Rhodesia's ability to get her needs supplied by South Africa and Portugal.
7. In the final analysis the prevention of the Rhodesian problem from erupting into a wider African impasse or its settlement is considered to be solely within the internal jurisdiction of the United Kingdom.

With these facts before us and without any intention of interfering in your Government's internal affairs, the consensus of the undersigned is that we want to ask you to consider, at your earliest opportunity, the possibility of ending British economic sanctions against Rhodesia. We feel that new channels of renegotiation could speedily be opened and with that eventuality in prospect a British request to the United Nations for a cessation of sanctions would be readily granted. Such a proposal of magnanimity on the part of your new government towards Rhodesia would result in greater accommodations being achieved than envisioned hitherto. We feel that we express to you, unofficially, the desire of a great proportion of the American people in the sure hope that Rhodesia will be reaccepted into the comity of nations and that with your help she will be able to ensure far greater political participation by all segments of her population.

It is with this sincere desire for a speedy renewal of discussions and the concurrent withdrawal of sanctions that we, the undersigned, wish you an effective course of action.

We remain, Sir,

Signed by the following Members of Congress:

Yours sincerely,

James A. Haley, Earl F. Landgrebe, Roger H. Zion, William L. Scott, Watkins M. Abbitt, Tom S. Gettys, George W. Andrews, Jamie L. Whitten, Joe D. Waggoner, Jr., Durward G. Hall, Edward J. Derwinski, Jack H. McDonald, Wm. M. Colmer, Philip M. Crane, and O. C. Fisher.

Odin Langen, Charles H. Griffin, James M. Collins, William J. Randall Thomas G. Abernethy, James G. Fulton, Carleton J. King, Maston O'Neal, James A. McClure, Robert H.

Michel, Donald E. Lukens, John Buchanan, Sam Steiger, E. Y. Berry, and Robert L. Sikes. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., Ben B. Blackburn, John J. Flynt, Jr., L. Mendel Rivers, Thomas M. Pelly, William J. Scherie, L. H. Fountain, Roy A. Taylor, G. V. Montgomery, Del Clawson, and Clarence E. Miller.

Harold R. Collier, George A. Goodling, William L. Dickinson, Albert Watson, Fletcher Thompson, Don H. Clausen, John M. Ashbrook, John M. Zwach, Ancher Nelsen, Gene Snyder, and Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize here that our letter to Mr. Heath was sent through proper State Department channels, and Secretary Rogers has been fully advised of the contents. And while there was a certain amount of delay due to protocol in forwarding our letter, nevertheless, I appreciate the State Department's cooperation in making the delivery.

Mr. Speaker, I am greatly encouraged by recent events and trends involving our relations with Rhodesia. Paramount in this issue has been the change of administration in London. Mr. Heath is neither pledged nor committed to the harsh and errant policies of the past, and now has a glowing opportunity to reestablish the traditionally close and harmonious relationship that has existed with the Rhodesian people. Furthermore, our State Department has given a great deal of attention to our letter to Mr. Heath, which obviously means that they too realize the importance of what is happening. The inertia of the past has at last yielded to movement and hope for progress.

Mr. Heath has promised to set Great Britain on a better course toward Rhodesia. Our Department of State will be both wise and anxious to cooperate with the British whose sovereignty and sole responsibility in this matter have long been recognized by the Department.

It is my understanding that we may expect a direct reply to our letter from the office of the Prime Minister. To be certain, my colleagues and I look forward to that response with great hope and earnestness. The goal of conciliation with Rhodesia is both just and wise, and there can be no question that success is going to be achieved.

On behalf of my fellow cosigners, I invite every Member of this House to join with us in initiating new efforts toward this goal, and I publicly challenge the Department of State to take the leadership in bringing the United States to share this better policy of enlightenment and conciliation.

#### A PLAN FOR CLEAN AIR

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining with 18 of my colleagues in establishing an ad hoc Congressional Clean Air Committee and in introducing a bill, H.R. 18980, that incorporates a series of clean air amendments presently being considered in the Senate. These amendments would do much to realize the "Plan for Clean Air by 1975" proposed by En-

vironmental Action, and endorsed by a number of the country's major conservation organizations. It is our hope that the Clean Air Act of 1970 can be strengthened before it is finally enacted into law.

The recent smog crises warned not of a passing problem, but of a growing problem; the temperature inversions have served to unveil the dimensions of our air pollution problem and have demonstrated the need for immediate action. Today an estimated 142 million tons of pollutants are discharged annually into the atmosphere at an estimated cost of \$13 billion to the taxpayers; and, estimates suggest that this cost goes even higher—to \$30 billion a year. In addition to the economic costs, pollution is undermining the public's health—often killing its victims over a long period of time without special occasions of temperature inversions, smog, or noxious odors.

Mr. Speaker, our present air pollution control statutes are pitifully weak—giving us no more than minimum auto emission control devices with an 80-percent failure rate and providing us little protection from the industrial smokestack. Unfortunately, the bill passed by the House just promises more of the same: A smoke screen for national and local inaction and a continued license to pollute.

The legislation I am introducing today with the ad hoc Congressional Clean Air Committee would provide the amendments needed to strengthen the Clean Air Act of 1970 in the areas in which it is weakest. Essentially, H.R. 18980 provides for the following:

First. Public disclosure by individual and corporate polluters of the pollutants they are discharging into the air and in what quantity.

Second. Exemption from the national auto emission standards for States establishing standards that are more restrictive than the national standards.

Third. A low-emission automobile by 1975.

Fourth. Regulation of fuel additives by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Fifth. Class action suits by individuals against polluters or against Government agencies not enforcing the pollution control laws.

Sixth. Establishment of national emission standards for stationary polluters within 2 years.

Seventh. Prohibition against Government contracting with violators of the Federal clean air statutes.

Today there is no law requiring polluters to register with the Secretary of Health Education, and Welfare the nature and quantity of the pollutants they are putting into the atmosphere. It is even difficult for the Government to get this information from companies, and often they are able to do so only by agreeing not to release the information to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we all partake in a common ownership in the air—and that the public has the right to know who is polluting the air it breathes and to what extent. I propose that both

individual and corporate polluters be required to file with the Federal Government quarterly reports on the substance and quantity of their pollution; these reports would be subject to public disclosure and would be verified by the Government through monitoring.

The automobile is our country's single largest polluter of the air, accounting for 60 percent of the Nation's total air pollution, and contributing up to 75 to 80 percent of the pollution in cities such as New York and Los Angeles. The cities of our country cannot survive much longer under such conditions, particularly since even with improved auto emission standards and control devices, the automobile's total pollution will again reach today's proportions at the end of the decade due to the increased number of vehicles.

Essentially, two things need to be done to meet the automobile challenge. First, States must be allowed to establish auto emission standards that are more restrictive than the national standards; the way the law is written now, California is the only State that can adopt tighter standards, but surely the auto pollution in States such as New York is as critical as California's. And second, an alternative to the internal combustion—IC—engine must be developed. Both electric and steam propulsion systems have been offered as alternatives to the IC engine. But, Detroit has stalled their development because of its investment in the IC propulsion system. And yet, sufficient data is available which demonstrates that the steam engine, in particular, can both operate and provide the performance demanded by the driving public; furthermore, its emissions are less than 1 percent of the IC engine.

Unfortunately, Detroit is motivated only by the dollar, and does not seem concerned about its pollution. The incentive to change will have to be an economic one. Therefore, I propose that Detroit be given a deadline of January 1, 1975, by which time it will be allowed to market only a low-emission vehicle. I think that if this is required—and the alternative is to go out of business—the auto manufacturers will find a way to make a pollution free engine go.

We have to acknowledge that considerable costs will be incurred in retooling for a new engine, and so I am introducing today, House Concurrent Resolution 714, first introduced by Senator GAYLORD NELSON, to provide that it be the sense of Congress that there be a moratorium on automobile styling changes. This would make available the estimated \$1 billion spent each year by Detroit in model changeovers to finance the development and conversion to a clean propulsion system.

Mr. Speaker, let us accept the recent air pollution disaster alerts which spread across the globe from New York City to Tokyo as warnings of things to come. In Biblical days Babylonia was warned of disaster when the words, "Mene Mene Takel, Upharsin" appeared on the king's banquet hall wall. Today we are being warned, not by words, but by smog settling over our cities. The Babylonians were destroyed. Let us not suffer this same fate. There still is time but that time is running out.

Members of the ad hoc Congressional Clean Air Committee and sponsors of its bill are:

ALPHONZO BELL, Republican, California.

JOHN BRADEMANS, Democrat, Indiana.

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat, California.

LEONARD FARBSTEIN, Democrat, New York.

DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat, Minnesota.

GILBERT GUDE, Republican, Maryland.

MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Democrat, Massachusetts.

KEN HECHLER, Democrat, West Virginia.

EDWARD I. KOCH, Democrat, New York.

ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN, Democrat, New York.

RICHARD MCCARTHY, Democrat, New York.

PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR., Republican, California.

ABNER J. MIKVA, Democrat, Illinois.

F. BRADFORD MORSE, Democrat, Massachusetts.

RICHARD L. OTTINGER, Democrat, New York.

OGDEN REID, Republican, New York.

HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, Wisconsin.

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat, New York.

CHARLES A. VANIK, Democrat, Ohio.

#### SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS IN NIXON WELFARE PLAN FOR AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED PERSONS

(Mr. BURTON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the following suggestions of mine to improve the program, financing, and administration of the adult public assistance categories—may be of interest to those following the Nixon welfare plan.

The material follows:

##### SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS—AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED, AUGUST 1, 1970

(A) Program—(Aged, blind, and disabled)

1. Increase Aged, Blind, and Disabled minimum payment to \$130/month (as of Jan. 1, 1971)<sup>1</sup>

2. Include a Cost of Living factor—to be applied to the minimum payment (as of Jan. 1, 1972).

(This amount—a Federal expense—must be disregarded by states, for their payments over the minimum—thus assuring adult recipients receiving more than the minimum will also benefit from this cost of living provision.)

3. Reduce the present 65 year in Aged programs to 60.

4. Require that states "disregard" \$750/month. (This provision of current law is now permissive.)

5. Provide statutory assurance that no applicant for, or recipient of adult public assistance on the effective date of the applicable provisions of the bill shall have their benefits reduced, nor be rendered ineligible as a result of the enactment of the legislation.

6. Requires states to meet their budgeted needs for adult recipients.

NOTE.—If the food stamps—for aged, blind,

and disabled—are converted into cash—accomplish this by raising the above \$130/month minimum to \$140.

7. (B) Source of funds—and cost analysis (See Attached).

8. (C) Administrative suggestions (See Attached).

9. (D) Technical changes (See attached).

10. (E) Blind and disabled—Special provisions.

Extend the 3-year training and rehabilitation period to enable their training and/or rehabilitation to be completed (Section 1603 (a) (3) and (4)).

Extend Aged treatment of "relatives" to Blind and Disabled.

Permit Blind to earn up to poverty level (Section 435c) before imposition of 50% income deduction.

Add \$30 per month to minimum—for Blind.

Provide \$1 million for "Prevention of Blindness" program.

#### B. ADULT CATEGORIES—AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED: SOURCE OF FUNDS AND COST ANALYSIS TO INCREASE MINIMUM INCOME

\$66.2 Million,<sup>1</sup> reduced cost of substituting "freeze" and 10% saving.

+ \$38.9 Million,<sup>2</sup> use exact, rather than rounded costs of Adults.

+ \$128.8 Million,<sup>3</sup> impact of pending Social Security 5% bill.

Subtotal \$233.9 Million, + \$300.0 Million,<sup>4</sup> added Social Security income to "concurrents."

Subtotal \$533.9 Million, Less \$420 Million,<sup>5</sup> cost to increase minimum from \$110/mo. to \$130/mo.

Balance \$113.9 Million.

+ \$46.7 Million,<sup>6</sup> residual impact in 1971 of 15% Soc. Sec. Bill.

Subtotal \$160.6 Million, Less \$154.1 Million,<sup>7</sup> added costs to lower age from 65 to 60 years.

Balance \$6.5 Million.

Add Annual Cost of Living Adjustment to the Minimum.

(The costs can be borne within added Social Security income impact.)

#### FOOD STAMPS CONVERTED TO CASH

If 100% Utilization: \$360 Million (3 Million adults/mo. x 12/mo. x \$10 (F.S. Bonus/mo.) equals \$360 Million plus \$36 Million (\$1.00/mo./transaction (paid to Banks) x 3 Million Adults x 12 months) equals \$396 Million (round to \$400 million).

If 60% Utilization: \$240 Million plus \$57 Million (1/3 of \$400 est.—added F.S. Costs) (Table 1) for Adult portion of same) plus \$50 Million (Admin. F.S. Savings, if Adults F.S. converted to cash).

Subtotal \$347 Million.

Less 240 Million,<sup>8</sup> added Costs to Increase Min. from \$130 to \$140/mo.

Balance, \$107 Million.

Less 95 Million, added Costs to Mandate current "permitted" \$7.50/mo.

Balance \$12 Million.

Less 12.26 Million,<sup>9</sup> add costs to raise those between 60 & 64 to \$140/mo. from \$130.

Balance, 0.

This analysis does not take into account the \$29 to \$45 million of reduced food stamp costs when the House approved the \$110/month minimum.

#### FOOTNOTES

(NOTE.—Senate finance: This term used to identify the June 1970 Family Assistance Act of 1970, revised and resubmitted to the Committee on Finance by the Administration.)

<sup>1</sup> See Senate Finance, page 26, Table VI. The Adult savings are \$166.2 Million. The Adult savings using the "Freeze" year, less 10% is \$100 Million; hence a difference of \$66.2 Million.

<sup>2</sup> See Senate Finance, page 73, Table I. The stated cost of Adults is \$600 Million. This is a rounded figure. The actual figure is \$561.1

Million (See June 25, 1970 SRS—Planning & Evaluation estimates).

The House passed Social Security bill will reduce Adult costs by: \$61.0 Million, Aged; \$0.7 Million, Blind; \$8.0 Million, Disabled (See May 26, 1970 Estimates (X)); \$23.1 Million, Cost of Living Increase Factor; \$36.0 Million, Widows Increase (82½% to 100% PIA); Total \$128.8, Pending Social Security Bill.

See NCSS Report G-2 (2/69)—“Concurrent Receipt of Public Assistance Money Payments and OASDI Cash Benefits by persons Aged 65 or Over.”

(A) Each year from 3.0% (last 10-year average—from 1960 to 1969, included) to 3.5% (last 5-year average—from 1964 to 1969, included) more aged welfare recipients also received social security payments. For example: In February 1969, 58.2% of Aged Welfare also received social security.

In February 1964, 40.7% of Aged Welfare also received social security.

In 5 years, 17.5% increase. Five-year average, 3.5% per year increase.

In February 1969, 58.2% of Aged, Welfare also received social security.

In February 1960, 28.5% of Aged, Welfare also received social security.

In 10 years, 29.7% increase. Ten-year average (rounded) 3.0% per year increase.

(B) Also, each year, aged “concurrents” receive a higher amount of social security cash benefits. For example:

In February 1969, \$63.10/mo. average OASDI cash benefit.

In February 1964, \$48.80/mo. average OASDI cash benefit.

In 5 years, \$14.30/mo. increase. Five-year average, \$2.86/mo. increase.

In February 1969, \$63.10/mo.—average—OASDI cash benefit.

In February 1960, \$43.30/mo.—average—OASDI cash benefit.

In 10 Years, \$19.80/mo.—increase. 10 Year Average, 1.98/mo.—increase.

For obvious reasons, the last 5 years data and averages are the most recent and relevant. In this most recent 5 year period we see a 3.5% average increase every year in the number of concurrents—and a \$2.86/mo. average increase every year in the OASDI cash benefits paid.

Since all the adult cost estimates were based on Feb. 1969 social security data (the latest available at the time in 1969 that the legislation was introduced)—after the House

passed H.R. 16311, upon my request, HEW calculated the projected cost reductions due to this interplay of Social Security benefits and Adult Welfare payments to 1971 and 1972 (See Estimate (E) April 17, 1970).

See House Committee Report, H.R. 16311, page 51, Table VII.

The 15 percent social security bill would result—for first full year—in savings in Adult Public Assistance of \$164 million aged; \$23.5 million (blind and disabled) total adult assistance cost reduction—\$187.5 million first full year.

One quarter (first quarter of calendar 1970) not in “freeze” year of Calendar 1970; therefore, one quarter of savings recaptured—(\$46.7 million).

Cost of lower age from 65 to 60 years: If \$90 minimum/month, \$104 million; if \$150 minimum/month, \$177.8 million; cost increment, \$12.25 million for each \$10 increase over \$90.00, so at \$130/min (4 steps) \$104 million plus (4 times \$12.25) equals \$154.1 million to lower age to 60 years, at \$130/mo. minimum.

Added costs (in addition to footnote 7)—if minimum is increased from \$130 to \$140/mo. (for 60–64 year olds) another \$12.26 million.

TABLE 1.—OAA MONEY PAYMENT RECIPIENTS ALSO RECEIVING OASDHI CASH BENEFITS, TOTAL OAA MONEY PAYMENT RECIPIENTS, AND TOTAL OASDHI CASH BENEFICIARIES AGED 65 OR OVER IN THE UNITED STATES, SPECIFIED MONTHS IN 1948-69

Month and year	OAA money payment recipients also receiving OASDHI cash benefits				OAA money payment recipients also receiving OASDHI cash benefits						
	As percent of—		As percent of—		As percent of—		As percent of—				
	Total OAA money payment recipients	Total OASDHI cash beneficiaries aged 65 or over	Total OAA money payment recipients	Total OASDHI cash beneficiaries aged 65 or over <sup>1</sup>	Total OAA money payment recipients	Total OASDHI cash beneficiaries aged 65 or over	Total OAA money payment recipients	Total OASDHI cash beneficiaries aged 65 or over <sup>1</sup>			
June 1948	146,000	6.1	10.0	2,365,000	1,457,000	February 1960	669,000	28.5	6.6	2,349,000	10,135,000
September 1950	276,000	9.8	12.6	2,810,000	2,192,000	February 1961	709,000	31.0	6.5	2,288,000	10,870,000
August 1951	377,000	13.8	11.9	2,728,000	3,174,000	February 1962	744,000	33.7	6.4	2,208,000	11,668,000
February 1952	406,000	15.1	12.0	2,654,000	3,404,000	February 1963	807,000	37.2	6.5	2,169,000	12,488,000
February 1953	426,000	16.3	10.7	2,572,000	4,010,000	February 1964	871,000	40.7	6.6	2,139,000	13,123,000
February 1954	462,000	18.0	9.6	2,567,000	4,801,000	February 1965	944,000	44.7	7.0	2,113,000	13,580,000
February 1955	487,000	19.2	8.6	2,537,000	5,640,000	February 1966	1,007,000	48.7	7.1	2,067,000	14,246,000
February 1956	514,000	20.4	7.9	2,520,000	6,490,000	February 1967	1,096,000	53.1	7.0	2,062,000	15,558,000
February 1957	553,000	22.2	7.8	2,489,000	7,127,000	May 1968	1,154,000	57.2	7.1	2,019,000	16,144,000
February 1958	596,000	24.2	7.1	2,464,000	8,420,000	February 1969 <sup>2</sup>	1,181,000	58.2	7.1	2,028,000	16,539,000
March 1959	644,000	26.7	6.9	2,410,000	9,379,000						

<sup>1</sup> Estimated by the Social Security Administration.  
<sup>2</sup> Over 10 years, 29.7 percent; 2.97 percent increase in 1 year.  
<sup>3</sup> Over 5 years, 17.5 percent; 3.5 percent per year.

<sup>4</sup> Data on concurrent receipt of OAA and OASDHI estimated on national basis; State reporting waived for February 1965.  
<sup>5</sup> Does not include Guam and the Virgin Islands; data not reported.

TABLE 2.—AVERAGE PAYMENTS TO CONCURRENT RECIPIENTS OF OASDHI CASH BENEFITS AND OAA MONEY PAYMENTS AND TO NONBENEFICIARY RECIPIENTS OF OAA MONEY PAYMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES, SPECIFIED MONTHS IN 1951-69

Money and year	Average payments to concurrent recipients of OASDHI cash benefits and OAA money payments				Money and year	Average payments to concurrent recipients of OASDHI cash benefits and OAA money payments			
	Average OASDHI cash benefit	Average OAA money payment	Combined average OASDHI and OAA payments	Average OAA money payment to beneficiary recipients of OAA		Average OASDHI cash benefit	Average OAA money payment	Combined average OASDHI and OAA payments	Average OAA money payment to beneficiary recipients of OAA
August 1951	\$29.85	\$36.00	\$65.85	\$44.85	February 1961	\$45.80	\$44.90	\$90.65	\$63.35
February 1952	29.60	36.85	66.45	46.60	February 1962	47.30	41.95	89.20	65.30
February 1953	33.90	38.75	72.65	51.55	February 1963	47.75	44.10	91.80	70.50
February 1954	33.90	40.35	74.30	50.35	February 1964	48.80	47.80	96.65	70.15
February 1955	38.75	37.40	76.15	50.65	February 1965	( <sup>5</sup> )	( <sup>5</sup> )	( <sup>5</sup> )	( <sup>5</sup> )
February 1956	38.70	40.35	79.05	52.00	February 1966	52.75	47.70	100.45	77.75
February 1957	40.10	42.70	82.75	55.45	February 1967	52.96	56.75	109.70	80.30
February 1958	40.70	43.60	84.30	59.25	May 1968 <sup>4</sup>	61.85	56.50	118.35	82.05
March 1959	43.85	43.80	87.70	60.60	February 1969 <sup>5</sup>	63.10	59.30	122.40	85.80
February 1960	43.30	45.80	89.10	61.70					

<sup>1</sup> Over 10-year period, plus \$19.80; average 1 month, \$1.98 increase.  
<sup>2</sup> Over 5 years, \$14.30; average 1 month, \$2.86 increase.  
<sup>3</sup> Reporting requirement waived for 1965.

<sup>4</sup> Does not include Guam and Nevada; data not reported.  
<sup>5</sup> Does not include Guam and the Virgin Islands; data not reported.

C. ADMINISTRATIVE SUGGESTIONS—ADULT (AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED) PROGRAMS

1. “Freeze” all states at their “current” (Calendar 1970) level of non-federal expenditures—for Adult cash payments.

2. As of Jan. 1, 1971, each state should receive a 10% reduction in amount of their non-federal share during Calendar 1970.

The non-Federal share is approximately \$1 billion/year. A 10% reduction equals \$100 million/year. (This reduction would be equitably shared by all the States (unlike House version).)

(If the Administration would allocate 10% of its first year revenue sharing—already budgeted amount of \$1 billion, and I strongly

recommend that the Senate Finance Committee urge this course of action—then I would further recommend that the 10% reduction in the “current year” expenditures in each state be continued until the state’s (Adult) costs are phased out.

3. The “freeze” amount 10% savings should be required to be shared with local

political subdivisions to the same extent that these political subdivisions shared the cost of the non-federal share of the Adult cash payments in Calendar 1970.

4. "Freeze" all states, as of July 1, 1970, so as to prohibit manipulation of eligibility or standards in order to falsely depress their non-federal costs during the "current" year.

Note: The current year (Calendar 1970) "freeze" should obviously permit the states to comply (without added cost to the states) with the provisions of the bill and to implement their already approved state plan.

I would concurrently urge the following changes to simplify the proposed Federal administration of the adult programs:

1. HEW should be required to administer the Adult Programs by Jan. 1, 1973, unless, by January 1, 1972, a State "opts out."

(The pending proposal requires them to "opt for").

2. HEW should be authorized to increase or reduce other funds due the state under the Social Security Act to effectuate the "freeze" and 10% state cost reduction policies without necessitating a state to "send money to Washington."

3. Conform adult program to family provisions, to standardize and simplify administration as follows:

Treat "casual and inconsequential" income that is disregarded and eliminate liens (as recommended by the administration). See comparable provisions in FAP—Sec. 443(b)(2), (5), (6), & (9) and Sec. 452(b)(8). Also, authorize quarterly benefit determinations (see Sec. 446(a)(1)). Also, Adult program should prohibit "imputing income" to recipients living in their own home.

4. Provide for Federal administration of Adults if a state fails to comply with the provisions of this legislation.

#### (D) TECHNICAL CHANGES

1. Amend Section 1007 to include Railroad Retirement annuitants and others with outside income. For greatest administrative simplicity and equity, add after "Social Security recipient" the following language (and make section permanent law): ", and the equivalent treatment of other income for the aged, blind, and disabled public assistance recipients who do not receive OASDI."

2. Restore the House-passed version of 1603(a) (current law) dealing with computation of work expense in Adult programs.

3. The Cost of Living adjustment (in the Adult minimum) should contain a prohibition against the deduction of this Cost of Living amount from the payment to which the recipient is otherwise entitled. [By this wording, the entire Adult caseload would receive the benefit of the C/L].

The same procedures and standards utilized in the Federal Employees Retirement Act should be applied to the Adult Public Assistance Programs.

4. In the event, the Adult minimums are not raised to \$130/month for each Aged, Blind, and Disabled recipient—the Social Security increases contained in the pending bill should be required to be disregarded.

However, in any event for those who do not receive an increase in total income (incl. OASDI and the minimums) as a result of the passage of the bill, the Social Security increases should be required to be passed on.

5. Add a provision assuring that payments for medicare be disregarded as income or resources.

6. The Secretary, in all programs, should be authorized to make payments from the 1st of the month of application for benefits.

7. Add language providing specific statutory assurance that no family eligible for assistance under current law shall after the effective date of the applicable portions of the bill be rendered ineligible by the passage of the legislation, nor shall its benefits be less than those to which they are entitled under existing law.

8. Add language mandating no diminution of eligibility standards or payments in states that have programs for the working poor. In addition, require states that now have such programs to maintain eligibility standards and payments in AFDC-UP programs as of the date of enactment.

9. Restore the preamble as originally recommended by the Administration and add language expressing the intent of Congress that the Federal government assume responsibility for administration and payments in all public assistance programs in the long term.

#### RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. POLLOCK

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this year to head the Republican 90th Club, composed of Members elected to this body for the first time for that Congress.

Without recapping history, I should state that our 1966 class represents the largest Republican group in years to make it to this Chamber. We organized as a club shortly after our arrival here and have continued to meet frequently with prominent figures in and out of Government. These are give-and-take sessions involving frank exchanges of views and discussion of mutual problems. During these past 4 years we have developed a working relationship affording special opportunities to observe the day-to-day performance of each Member.

Our membership will be voluntarily decreased after the next election by the departure of some headed for other positions in public service. One will become a Federal judge, several have been nominated for the Senate, and others are running for Governor.

At a recent meeting of the 90th Club, we noted with regret the fact that these valued Members will not be returning. One of those we will be missing is our good friend the Honorable HOWARD W. POLLOCK, who has announced his candidacy for the governorship of Alaska after nearly 4 years in the U.S. House of Representatives.

It is with a mixture of pleasure and sorrow that I include at this point in the RECORD the resolution adopted at that meeting of the 90th Club, pleasure in revealing our high regard for HOWARD POLLOCK, and sorrow that he will not be back with us:

#### A RESOLUTION

Whereas Congressman Pollock has rendered distinguished service as Alaska's lone representative in the U.S. House, proving himself an able legislator and earning the respect and trust of his fellow Congressmen; and

Whereas Congressman Pollock was elected by the members of the 90th Club to serve as their representative to the Republican Policy Committee, thus becoming the first Alaskan to be honored with that important office, and for his excellent service in that capacity received an award from the 90th Club for distinguished Congressional service; and

Whereas Congressman Pollock is the only Alaskan, and only living American to have served in a territorial legislature, a state

legislature, and the United States Congress and, thus, has shown his ability to lead and represent the people of Alaska on both the State and federal levels; and

Whereas the members of the 90th Club will sincerely miss our esteemed colleague, and do deeply regret that Congressman Pollock will not be returning next year to his seat in the U.S. Congress; and

Whereas, as the lone Representative from Alaska, he has constantly kept in mind the welfare of ALL Alaskans, with their diverse, and, sometimes, conflicting interests, striving to fairly represent all viewpoints, promoting legislation favorable to the greater good of all Alaskans, as well as promoting the welfare of the United States as a whole; and

Whereas the efforts of Congressman Pollock to resolve the Native Land Claims is an outstanding example of his above-mentioned legislative efforts made in behalf of the best interests of all Alaskans and the entire United States, for until these claims are settled, all Alaskans are hampered in their efforts to develop the State, and the entire United States must wait until this settlement occurs before the vast resources of Alaska's mineral, oil, and gas deposits are readily available, and to this effect, Congressman Pollock has labored tirelessly to resolve this issue; and

Whereas Congressman Pollock possesses both the personal qualities, and experience, necessary for leadership of a vital state, in particular: intellectual ability, educational background, diplomacy, enthusiasm, perceptiveness, fairness, varied political experience, both in state and national politics; and

Whereas Congressman Pollock has shown great leadership ability throughout his entire political career as well as his personal life; and

Whereas Congressman Pollock has demonstrated his concern for the well-being of his state, above and beyond personal considerations, relinquishing virtually assured reelection to his third term in Congress for a challenging race for the Governorship of Alaska; and

Whereas Congressman Pollock's entire life has been an example of challenge well met, and he has proven his ability to turn challenge into success; and

Whereas the State of Alaska, now, more than at any other moment in history, faces a challenge which, if correctly met, can propel Alaska into an era of unprecedented prosperity for the benefit of all Alaskans as well as the entire United States;

We, the Congressmen of the 90th Club, therefore resolve that, while we personally regret the loss to Congress of our respected and valued colleague, we do hereby commend the Honorable HOWARD W. POLLOCK for his selfless decision to run for the Governor's seat of Alaska, and do hereby endorse Congressman Pollock as a man unusually well-prepared and well-motivated to meet the challenges facing the State of Alaska at this time, and do wholeheartedly as a group commend his candidacy for Governor.

#### PROTECTING THE WORLD'S ART TREASURES

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, I advised this House that more than 100 cultural leaders of our country had signed a petition addressed to the Honorable U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, urging protection for the architectural and art treasures of the world from the threat of damage and destruction wherever they are located. I further advised the House that a request

had been made to President Nixon asking that he submit the Hague Convention for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict to the Senate for ratification. Since that date, I have been advised by the White House that the request is under consideration.

I would also like to especially note that this mobilization of cultural leaders came about partially as the result of a meeting which I had with Elizabeth C. Baker of Art News magazine, whose immediate concern was for the safety of Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom, the great architectural gems of Cambodia.

I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to add to the rollcall of names those who have joined in signing the petition sent to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The rollcall follows:

B. Adams.  
Joseph and Dorothy Ansen.  
Elizabeth C. Baker, Art News Magazine.  
Cornelia Bailey.  
Dr. and Mrs. Richard M. Baum.  
Charles Becker, Los Angeles.  
J. Braun, University of Southern California.  
Devra M. Breslow, Los Angeles.  
Dr. and Mrs. Martin Brunner.  
Peggy Christian, Los Angeles.  
Dr. and Mrs. Alfred Cordley.  
William B. Dailey, Los Angeles.  
Mr. and Mrs. Gustav Dalla Calle, Los Angeles.  
Florence Dauben, Los Angeles.  
Ross N. De Vian.  
Roy Doumani.  
Dr. and Mrs. Robert Einstein.  
Helen J. Epstein.  
Mr. and Mrs. Alan Fels.  
Margot Flatan, Los Angeles.  
Dr. Marvin S. Freilich, MD, L.A. County Museum of Art.  
Tom S. Fricaro.  
Phillip Glusker, Beverly Hills.  
Margaret R. Goldschmidt.  
John I. Goodlad, University of California, Los Angeles.  
Jean Haase, Los Angeles.  
Lois T. Handler.  
Arthur T. Harris.  
Mrs. Dalzell Hatfield, Dalzell Hatfield Galleries.  
Sam Hellinger, Los Angeles.  
Dr. and Mrs. E. Craig Heringma.  
John Huinger, Los Angeles.  
Hilda H. Hunter, Pasadena, Calif.  
John T. Hurst, School of Architecture and Fine Arts Dean, University of Southern California.  
James Jarvis.  
Jeanne Kamm, Los Angeles.  
Norman M. Kelly, Los Angeles.  
Ruth W. Klebau.  
Mr. and Mrs. Leo M. Klein.  
Nanette Klein, Los Angeles.  
Isabelle Kleinfield, New York, N.Y.  
Mrs. David Leipziger.  
Mr. and Mrs. Kim Linnett, Palos Verdes Estates, Calif.  
T. David Lipton, MD, and Judith Lipton.  
Saul and Lillian Marks.  
Sylvia Meller, Los Angeles.  
Henry W. Mills.  
John J. Nelson, Los Angeles.  
Bonnie Newman, Los Angeles.  
Gary Nuttenberg, Los Angeles.  
Patsy Palmer.  
Alice L. Palt, Los Angeles.  
Ferdinand Ponthier, Los Angeles.  
Lucretia Randall.  
Yella M. Roberts, Los Angeles.  
Alice L. Reiffer, Beverly Hills.  
Robert Rounds, Los Angeles.  
Dr. and Mrs. Max M. Saks.  
Mr. and Mrs. T. Salmeyer.

Mrs. Mary Saltzberg.  
Helen Saltzberg.  
Dr. and Mrs. Samuel Sapin.  
Dr. and Mrs. Jud R. Scholtz.  
Marvin Scholtz.  
Mr. and Mrs. N. J. Schweitzer, Los Angeles.  
Blessing B. Semler.  
V. W. Small, Santa Monica, Calif.  
Mrs. L. W. Smith.  
Lee Soble.  
Percy and Janice Solotoy.  
Mrs. Leonard M. Sperry.  
Herbert Sterzer, Los Angeles.  
Whitney I. Stewart.  
Serena Stier, Ph.D.  
Geraldine Strock.  
A. L. Strock.  
Mr. and Mrs. Henry A. Vewentes.  
J. Wall, University of Southern California Fine Arts Department.  
Barbara D. Weber.  
Charles D. Weber.  
Charles and Frances White.  
Mrs. Roy B. Williams.  
Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Willens.  
Frank and Hausi Willy, Los Angeles.  
Mr. and Mrs. Al Yaller, Beverly Hills, Calif.  
Mr. and Mrs. David Zeitlin.  
Josephine Zuller.

#### PROPOSED REVENUE SHARING

(Mr. BURTON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Leo Rennert, one of our most perceptive reporters, should be of interest to our colleagues:

[From the Sacramento Bee, Aug. 5, 1970]

THE \$536 MILLION IS EARMARKED YEARLY FOR CALIFORNIA IF REVENUE SHARING BECOMES LAW

(By Leo Rennert)

WASHINGTON.—In an effort to pump new life into President Nixon's revenue sharing plan, the Treasury Department has told California members of Congress that their state would receive \$536 million a year if the proposal becomes law.

The department, however, failed to state this amount would not become available for another five years. Nor did it mention the fact that the program would start with a fractional allocation of only about 5 per cent—with all 50 states having to divide half the sum projected for California.

During the current fiscal year, which began July 1, California would receive \$28.5 million—approximately 1-20th of the department's advertised amount.

#### SLOW START

In pushing revenue sharing, Nixon actually recommended to Congress a slow spending start—a national total of \$275 million next spring which would grow gradually to a \$5 billion level in the fiscal year starting July 1, 1975.

The department omitted the timetable from a thick brochure it sent lawmakers, listing only the allocations for their states "during the first full year of permanent implementation." Nowhere is this period defined as the 1975-76 fiscal year.

In response to a press query, Charles Arnold, the department's information chief, confirmed that congressional approval of Nixon's plan would result in a flow of considerably less money to the states during the first five years.

The national total would rise from \$275 million this fiscal year to \$1.5 billion in fiscal 1972, \$2.2 billion in fiscal 1973, 3.2 billion in fiscal 1974, \$4.2 billion in fiscal 1975 and finally to \$5.1 billion in fiscal 1976.

#### NO STRINGS

The funds would go to states, cities and counties without any strings attached as to their use. The President contends this would reduce federal control and give state and local officials more discretion in determining priorities for expenditure of federal funds.

The proposal, however, has made no headway in the democratic-controlled Congress. Critics contend it is unwise for one level of government to raise taxes and permit another level to decide how to spend it. They also have expressed concern that revenue sharing eventually would supplant or tend to reduce many of the present categorical grant-in-aid programs for health, education, mass transit, urban renewal and rural assistance, which carry much higher price tags.

In its projection for California, the department estimates that the state's \$536.3 million share (five years hence) would be divided so that state government would keep \$370.5 million while local governments would receive \$165.8 million. The local slice would be split on the basis of \$85.4 million to counties and \$80.4 million to cities.

By 1975-76, annual allocations would total \$1.6 million for the City of Sacramento, \$1.1 million for Fresno, \$283,000 for Modesto, \$424,000 for Bakersfield, \$152,000 for Redding, \$712,000 for Stockton, \$268,000 for Santa Rosa and \$248,000 for Vallejo.

#### THE \$2.9 MILLION

County shares in five years would amount to \$2.9 million for Sacramento, \$1.8 million for Fresno, \$943,000 for Stanislaus, \$529,000 for Butte, \$162,000 for Colusa, \$503,000 for El Dorado, \$159,000 for Glenn, \$639,000 for Humboldt, \$2 million for Kern, \$307,000 for Kings, \$279,000 for Madera, \$287,000 for Mendocino, \$583,000 for Merced, \$345,000 for Napa, \$791,000 for Placer, \$1.4 million for San Joaquin, \$818,000 for Shasta, \$225,000 for Siskiyou, \$549,000 for Solano, \$1 million for Sonoma, \$242,000 for Sutter, \$178,000 for Tehama, \$975,000 for Tulare, \$429,000 for Yolo and \$194,000 for Yuba.

For the current fiscal year each jurisdiction would receive about 5 per cent of the listed amount.

#### HEARINGS ON LOBBYING

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the House on July 8 adopted House Resolution 1031 directing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, of which I am chairman, to conduct investigations and studies of lobbying activities and campaign finances, and to report our findings and recommendations at the earliest practicable date.

While these two complex subjects are in some way related, our committee has decided to hold separate hearings on each inasmuch as many witnesses would want to address themselves to only one of the two areas.

Accordingly, the committee had scheduled public hearings for September 10, 15, 16, and 17 to seek views from the general public for our guidance in determining what, if any, remedial legislation is necessary to improve regulation of lobbying practices.

At a later time appropriate to the legislative program, we will establish a similar schedule for Members' testimony or submission of statements on lobbying.

I make this announcement in order to alert those Members who may be queried by interested constituents as well as to

notify those Members interested in submitting views on lobbying, whether they desire to appear in person or file statements for inclusion in the record of the hearings.

Following this portion of the assignment, we expect to conduct similar hearings on the raising, reporting and use of campaign funds for candidates for the House, as directed in House Resolution 1031.

#### DISCLOSURE OF FUNDS

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, if citizens are to have a complete picture of a candidate's campaign for public office during the coming elections, they must have a complete and detailed reporting of all campaign receipts and expenditures. Maryland and many other States provide for detailed campaign disclosures, but there are no such safeguards in the laws governing the District of Columbia.

I have felt it essential to provide detailed reporting of my campaign receipts and expenditures for the District of Columbia and I have introduced, with cosponsorship by 47 of my colleagues, legislation to close this loophole in the District law and I urge its adoption. I am heartened by the support of my colleagues and the favorable response I have had from the community. Washington radio station WTOP recently editorialized in support of this legislation, noting that "a District of Columbia disclosure law would help to purify elections from one end of the country to the other."

Citizens should also have the benefit of a statement of the financial holdings of elected public officials. This provides another measure by which citizens can assure themselves that public officials are not subject to conflicts of interest which could prevent or deter them from performing their official duties in an objective manner. I insert in the RECORD at this point a statement of my wife's and my financial holdings:

*Financial statement of Gilbert Gude and Jane Callaghan Gude, his wife, July 25, 1970*

Assets:	
Cash, checking and savings accounts .....	\$3,083
First National Bank of Maryland, (stock—100 shares) .....	4,500
Part ownership of A. Gude Sons Co., Inc. (family landscape nursery and florist firm) .....	625,000
Residence .....	65,000
Life insurance, cash value .....	6,670
Household furnishings, personal belongings .....	\$23,000
Two automobiles .....	2,160
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>729,413</b>
Liabilities:	
Accounts payable .....	500
Mortgage, residence .....	20,114
Personal note .....	9,000
Life insurance, loan .....	500
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>30,114</b>
<b>Net worth .....</b>	<b>699,299</b>

The only substantial change in our holdings in the last year has been the acquisition of the listed bank stock.

Net income in 1969 after taxes, \$39,225. All income exclusive of that from the U.S. Government was from sources listed under assets.

#### RESOLUTION COMMENDING HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that at a recent meeting of the 90th Club, our membership adopted a resolution commending the service in this body of the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE, representing the 10th Congressional District of Florida. Since the resolution speaks for itself, I include at this point in the RECORD a copy of the resolution passed by our 90th Club, which I have the honor to serve as president:

##### 90TH CLUB RESOLUTION

Whereas, Members of the Congress of the United States and other public officials are looked upon to provide innovative thought and decisive judgment concerning the welfare and the destiny of their constituents and of their country; and

Whereas, since becoming a Member of the Congress of the United States the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE, United States Representative from the Tenth Congressional District of Florida, has conscientiously concerned himself with the vital issues confronting the people in his District and in our Nation today, and has made in depth research studies into many important issues with the result that the information obtained and submitted by him has been extremely valuable to the Members of Congress, Republican and Democratic; and

Whereas, the Members of the House Republican Leadership appointed and recommended the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE for appointment, and he was appointed, a member of the prestigious House Foreign Affairs Committee and to the Executive Committee of the Republican National Congressional Committee; and

Whereas, the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE was appointed to serve as a member of the only official Congressional Study Mission to investigate and report its findings on the Biafran-Nigerian conflict; and

Whereas, the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE did in the fulfillment of his assignment go into the war torn zone at great personal risk and did, therefore, submit to the Congress a report which contained information valuable to the Congress and to the Executive Branch of our government; and

Whereas, the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE because of the trust and confidence the Republican leadership has in him, was appointed by the Congress of the United States as a delegate and advisor at the historic first General Assembly of the Association of American States, and served as a delegate and Congressional advisor at the recent meeting of that organization assembled in Washington, D.C.; and

Whereas, the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE had the distinction of being one of the first to recognize and call the public's attention to the naval and military build-up of the Soviet Union in the Mid-East which could well have upset the balance of power in world affairs at the expense of our nation's security; and

Whereas, the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE has been a strong critic of reckless govern-

ment spending policies, and has been a strong advocate for Congressional reform and Congressional review of our government's spending policies with the result he was cited by the Americans for Constitutional Action, the United States Chamber of Commerce and by the National Associated Businessmen for his notable voting record in the Congress of the United States, in support of those legislative measures which would serve to sustain, strengthen and defend the free enterprise system and the spirit and principles of the Constitution of the United States, and was also further recognized by the AMVETS, who bestowed upon him a special meritorious commendation for leadership in the Congress of the United States in sponsoring and supporting effective programs for the continuing growth, welfare and security of the nation and its citizens, and was cited in this regard also by a number of other organizations;

Now therefore, Be it Resolved that the 90th Club, which is composed of 58 Republican members of the Congress of the United States, hereby commends and pays tribute to the Honorable J. HERBERT BURKE, the Representative of the 10th Congressional District of Florida for his valuable and faithful service and constructive efforts on behalf of the people of his District and of his nation since becoming a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Signed this Aug. 6, 1970.

WILEY MAYNE,  
President, 90th Club.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER REGARDING INTRODUCTION OF THE AIR POLLUTION ABATEMENT ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today I and 18 of my colleagues are joining in a bipartisan effort to get effective action to deal with the very real and serious threat posed by the pollution of our air.

The events of this summer have given us dramatic evidence of just how serious that threat is. During the last week of July in New York, air pollution rose to such levels as to endanger public health and require emergency abatement measures. Similar incidents have occurred in other major cities throughout the Nation and, indeed, throughout the world.

To date, existing legislation designed to deal with this problem has proven to be so ineffective as to actually protect polluters. We can no longer tolerate this situation. The health and even the lives of our citizens depend on our taking effective action now.

The major failure of existing programs is that they do not attack pollution at its source, but instead set vague and unenforceable standards of general air quality. Only by attacking pollution at its source can we deal effectively with the problem.

The automobile is the cause of 60 percent of our national air pollution and as high as 92 percent of the pollution in some of our urban areas. The legislation that my colleagues and I are proposing today will deal with this problem in two steps.

First, it will require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to speed up the application of abatement standards. Under this measure, the standards now proposed to be applied to 1975 auto-

mobiles would be applied for 1973 models. This is an important step but it is only a beginning. Even the 1975 standards will permit more pollution than is safe for the people of this country. The legislation that we are introducing will require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to undertake a crash program of research into feasible alternatives to the internal combustion engine, and will require that after 1975 no motor vehicle shall be sold in this country that exceeds the lowest emission standards for any otherwise feasible propulsion system. It sets fines of \$25,000 for the first violation and \$50,000 for each subsequent violation and it provides that each motor vehicle sold in violation of this law will constitute a separate offense.

The other major causes of air pollution in this country are emissions from stationary sources such as power generating and manufacturing plants and heating and incineration facilities. The only way to deal with this type of pollution is to set specific standards for the maximum emissions of all forms of pollution to be permitted from each installation. The legislation that we are introducing today directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a program of research to determine maximum acceptable emissions. It requires that by 1972 the standards shall be enforced for every stationary source. In order to assure compliance it sets a fine of \$10,000 for the first violation and \$25,000 for each subsequent violation and specifies that each day of continued violation shall constitute a separate offense.

The cause of pollution from both motor vehicles and many stationary sources is the fuel and fuel additives that are consumed. The legislation we are introducing directs the Secretary to relegate the sale or use of fuel or fuel additives. It requires him to conduct an immediate program of research to determine what fuel and fuel additives can safely be used and how they can be used to assure the protection of the public health. Based upon this information the Secretary shall, by 1971, issue standards for safe fuel additives and after January 1, 1975, it shall be unlawful for any person or corporation to sell and use fuel or fuel additives that fail to conform to these standards. A fine of \$25,000 will be assessed against violators for the first offense and \$50,000 for each subsequent offense. Again, each day of violation shall constitute a separate offense.

Finally, this legislation authorizes any citizen to bring action to compel compliance with this law and provides that any person bringing information that leads to the conviction of a violator shall receive 50 percent of the fine assessed.

Since I first came to Congress in 1965, I have been warning of the dangers of pollution and advocating the enactment of effective legislation to protect the public from this threat. Time and time again Congress has approached the problem and then failed to take the forceful and effective action that is essential. We can no longer wait. My col-

leagues and I are therefore joining in the formation of a congressional Clean Air Committee, the purpose of which is to win early enactment of this legislation and then to assure its effective enforcement.

I am pleased to be able to report that the effort we are launching here today is fully coordinated with a similar program in the Senate. In the other body, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, GAYLORD NELSON, is leading an effort to incorporate similar provisions to those proposed in our bill as amendments to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970 when that measure is reported to the Senate floor.

With this kind of organized effort, I believe that it is possible to correct the failures of the past and enact legislation that will for the first time give us the tools to clean up our air and preserve a wholesome and liveable environment.

#### IT PAYS TO ORGANIZE

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Eli Rucker of Chilhowee, Mo., has written a letter to the editor of one of the papers in our congressional district which in my opinion is worth sharing with my colleagues.

It is entitled, "It Pays to Organize" and covers such subjects as women's rights, the TV appearances of male hairdos which he says would look good on any woman and sundry other comments that show a great sense of humor by this constituent.

Consistently enough he points out that the really disorganized group in our society are the tax-paying law-abiding, silent majority. The fact that they are disorganized is probably the reason they are the forgotten people. My salute goes to my friend, Eli Rucker of Chilhowee, for his well-considered views on the plight of the silent majority of our citizens.

But in my opinion it is significant that he firmly believes that even though we have spent billions of dollars and lost hundreds of our best men in Southeast Asia to prevent a Communist takeover of a small Asian country, we cannot lose sight of the fact that it is still possible for a conspiracy to take over this great country of ours and our freedom slide by default into oblivion. He is so right that we must resolve that those brave men who died shall not have died in vain.

The letter to the editor follows:

#### IT PAYS TO ORGANIZE

DEAR EDITOR: It pays to organize. So they say, and every segment of our society seems to be organized except the law-abiding tax-paying majority.

To my knowledge, the latest group to organize is a group of women back east, to fight for women's rights and surely no one would blame them for that, but some of their group are against men and I for one don't blame them on that score either.

Since woman throughout the ages has been bogged down with the burden of bring-

ing children into the world, and one lady I listened to on TV thinks it's time they shove that job off on men. Now, I am not one who claims to know much about such things, but in falling back on the little I know, I have grave doubts about them getting that job done. But if the long-haired boys find out about it, they at least will try. And I will admit some of them would make very good looking mothers, but of course it takes more than looks to be one.

About all us ordinary folks know these days is what we read in the papers or see on TV, and all are impressed one way or another by what they see and hear. On the talent scout program Saturday evening a young fellow about 25 or 30 years old showed up in a hair-do that would look good on any woman. It was neatly combed down over his ears, or holes in his head! Your guess is as good as mine. But, he also wore a mustache, which detracted somewhat from his motherly appearance, since I have no recollection of ever seeing a mother wearing a mustache. But the fellow is deserving of one compliment. His hair-do was neatly combed, as many of the long-haired boys look as though their hair has never been introduced to a comb.

Now back to the question of organizing. It looks from here that everybody is organized except those that should be. The atheists, anarchists and communists are all organized and they are making their influence felt and known everywhere except Washington, D.C., who haven't heard about it or else too politically minded to do anything about it.

The disorganized in our society are the tax-paying, law-abiding, silent majority and that is probably the reason why we are the forgotten people. And I can think of but one reason why we are not organized and that you too may know. I will tell you a story that I heard that probably explains it. The story: One day while a group of inmates from an asylum, about 20 in all, were policing the grounds and only one guard was guarding them. A passerby noticed that spectacle and said to one of the inmates, "Is there only one man guarding you fellows?" "Yes, that's all," said the inmate. "Well, said the passerby, if you fellows would organize you could overpower the guard and go free." So the inmate said, "If we could organize, we wouldn't be here."

Now, good citizens in this section of America, let's not be so naive as to rear back on our haunches and watch the communists and anarchists take over without letting our voices be heard.

This nation has sent half a million men to fight and die in an effort to prevent a communist takeover of a small Asian country. In doing so, he gave rise to an increased effort on the part of that longtime conspiracy to take over here.

So, win or lose in Asia, if and when the half million men are brought home and find that those who sent them over there to fight for freedom have let that freedom slide by default into oblivion and these words from Lincoln's Gettysburg speech float through their minds, and I quote: "that we highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain." they probably will want to pay a visit to every one of the 40,000 graves of those that won't be back and place this epitaph:

"One hundred billion dollars gone down the drain and 40,000 of America's best—died in vain."

ELI RUCKER.

CHILHOWEE, MO.

#### THE GREAT ENERGY GRAB

(Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his

remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the monopolistic oil industry has embarked on a scheme to ultimately control virtually all raw energy sources in the United States. Such control, if successful, would lead to a stranglehold on the entire economy of our Nation because everything we do—everything we produce—depends upon energy. No factory, no store, no home, no transportation system can operate without it. The implications are frightening for the economic well-being and the security of the entire Nation.

What is happening, Mr. Speaker, will be the No. 1 domestic economic crisis of this generation—a crisis resulting from exorbitantly high fuel and power costs coupled with widespread fuel and power shortages. This crisis can lead to catastrophe.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the oil industry is comprised of the most powerful economic giants in the country. Due to high depletion allowances and other forms of protection, they have amassed huge capital assets. But the oil interests are not satisfied with huge profits and control over their own huge industry. Through a powerful and effective lobbying force they have caused our Government to impose and uphold extremely low quotas for foreign oil imports. This in itself has been a major factor in moving petroleum fuel prices to an artificially high level and in the creation of severe fuel oil shortages last winter. These shortages are likely to be worse this winter and prices will be higher. The only thing we will have plenty of fuel for will be for the fires of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, let us now talk about coal. Recently the Tennessee Valley Authority announced an earth-shaking 25- to 30-percent rate increase. Between two-thirds and three-quarters of the reason for this gigantic boost is the fact that the price of coal has virtually doubled in a year's time. TVA was paying \$4 per ton. In July of this year the price was as high as \$8.20 per ton and continuing to increase.

Why has the price of coal more than doubled? Is it higher wages, Republican interest rates, the Coal Mine Safety Act, additional reclamation expenses? Only in relatively small part are these the causes, Mr. Speaker. The main reason is that there is an unprecedented demand for coal for domestic power generation and unprecedented increases in exports, mainly to Japan. Coal is in very much a seller's market. Current coal prices bear little or no relationship to costs, but are simply based on charging the maximum the traffic will bear.

But the crowning blow, Mr. Speaker, is that the oil industry is buying up the coal industry a mile a minute and is doing everything possible to market both petroleum products and coal at prices which have little relation to production costs. The oil industry is trying to take complete control over the coal industry and the results are proving disastrous.

And another question, Mr. Speaker, what is the Justice Department doing about this? Is this not a clear violation

of antitrust laws? Are not these practices monopolistic in a form clearly detrimental to the public interest? Does the oil industry really care about our national economic well-being? Does it really care about the citizens whose hard-earned dollars create their great wealth? I wonder.

Mr. Speaker, after the oil giants control all the oil and gas and coal, and carefully continue to throttle down oil imports, what is there left? Except for direct application of solar energy and a small hydroelectric generating capacity there are only the nuclear fuels. These fuels are of dramatically more importance today than anyone dared dream just 5 years ago. The main reason is the fantastic increase in coal prices. This administration has already, in more ways than one, tipped its hand on what it wants to do with the huge Government-owned gaseous diffusion uranium production plants at Oak Ridge. It wants to sell them to private industry. Who wants to buy them? The oil industry, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the greedy, public-be-damned oil industry. If the present course of the oil industry continues and their schemes of monopoly are permitted to materialize while this administration and the Justice Department sit idly by, the Dixon-Yates scandal is going to look like a kindergarten game.

The attitude of those controlling the base energy sources is further reflected in a report in Business Week—August 1, 1970, page 22—which stated:

The major oil companies, which control most of the natural gas supplies in the U.S. have made it clear that they are not interested in increasing gas production until it becomes more profitable than other investments they can make. But that could mean a 60 percent increase in the present ceiling prices that producers can charge for natural gas.

These same companies control a major portion of the coal reserves, and it is clear from what is happening that the same attitude exists insofar as any effort to increase coal production is concerned.

As a first step in encouraging the Congress to exercise its urgent duties to investigate and act to save the country from this disastrous takeover, I have introduced a resolution urging and requesting the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the high prices of coal. Other actions will follow along related or similar lines.

Mr. Speaker, again I point out, the security of the Nation is at stake. At the present time if a national emergency required large blocks of power on short notice the Nation's electric industry would find it almost impossible to provide it on a sustained basis unless coal supplies are increased drastically. It is unthinkable to permit a continuation of the present trends which severely limit the capacities of the Nation's electric utilities to respond to a national crisis.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a Nation. An American must work approximately 3.6 months to buy a small car while a Russian must work 23.3 months.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of illness in the family.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ALBERT, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HICKS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTAIN, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WILLIAMS, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SAYLOR, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. WATSON, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RUPPE, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HOGAN, for 60 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD, for all Members speaking on the veto message of the President, to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI, to extend his remarks in the RECORD today immediately before the vote on the independent offices appropriation veto.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in his special order today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. SPRINGER in four instances.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. HORTON in nine instances.

Mr. PELY in three instances.

Mr. RUPPE in two instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.

Mr. FOREMAN in three instances.

Mr. PRICE of Texas in four instances.

Mr. ERLÉNBERG.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. SEBELIUS in two instances.

Mr. BOB WILSON in two instances.  
 Mr. RED of New York in two instances.  
 Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.  
 Mr. LUJAN.  
 Mr. McCLURE.  
 Mr. KLEPPE.  
 Mr. LANDGREBE.  
 Mr. BELL of California.  
 Mr. BUCHANAN.  
 Mr. KEITH in five instances.  
 Mr. McCLOSKEY.  
 Mr. MIZE.  
 Mr. SHRIVER.  
 Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.

Mr. ROBISON.  
 Mr. DEVINE.  
 Mr. WHITEHURST.  
 Mr. BURKE of Florida in three instances.  
 Mr. MACGREGOR.  
 Mr. SNYDER in two instances.  
 Mr. MORSE.  
 Mr. CONTE.  
 Mr. DUNCAN in two instances.  
 Mr. LLOYD.  
 Mr. GERALD R. FORD.  
 Mr. BROZMAN.  
 Mr. HOGAN in five instances.  
 Mr. WATSON in two instances.  
 Mr. HOSMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BOGGS.  
 Mr. FRASER in five instances.  
 Mr. WALDIE in two instances.  
 Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.  
 Mr. FARSTEIN in six instances.  
 Mr. WOLFF in two instances.  
 Mr. SYMINGTON.  
 Mr. HARRINGTON in six instances.  
 Mr. BINGHAM in two instances.  
 Mr. LEGGETT in three instances.  
 Mr. CULVER in two instances.  
 Mr. POWELL in five instances.  
 Mr. PATTEN in two instances.  
 Mr. ROGERS of Florida in five instances.  
 Mr. HELSTOSKI in four instances.  
 Mr. LOWENSTEIN in eight instances.  
 Mr. STUCKEY.  
 Mr. GRIFFIN.  
 Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.  
 Mr. NEDZI in three instances.  
 Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.  
 Mr. GALLAGHER.  
 Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.  
 Mr. DULSKI in four instances.  
 Mr. MAHON in three instances.  
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.  
 Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.  
 Mr. ABBITT in three 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. 14956. An act to extend for 3 years the period during which certain dyeing and tanning materials may be imported free of duty.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3102. An act to amend section 4 of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, as amended, to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior can make fisheries loans under the Act, and for other purposes.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 12, 1970, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 17711. An act to amend the District of Columbia Cooperative Association Act, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 14, 1970, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2305. A letter from the Deputy Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a list showing the number of individuals in each General Schedule grade employed by the administration under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, on June 30, 1969, and on June 30, 1970, pursuant to 65 Stat. 736, 758; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL  
 2306. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on action required to improve the Department of Defense career program for procurement personnel; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2307. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on progress and problems in U.S. aid to the economic unification of Central America, Department of State, Agency for International Development; 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. MILLER of California: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Senate Concurrent Resolution 49, Concurrent resolution providing for congressional recognition of the Goddard Rocket and Space Museum (Rept. No. 91-1416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 18686. A bill to authorize the lease and transfer of Burley tobacco acreage allotments; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 1247. Joint resolution to amend section 19(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (Rept. No. 91-1418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 8668. A bill to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee of conference. Conference report on S. 3637 (Rept. No. 91-1420). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 11771. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox Indians, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 14396. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians; with amendments (Rept. No. 91-1422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15469. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Yakima Tribes in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 47-A, 162, and consolidated 47 and 164, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 15624. A bill to convey certain federally owned lands to the Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 16833. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims case 47567, and a judgment in favor of the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation for and on behalf of the Uncampahgre Band of Ute Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 349, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 91-1425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 18298. A bill to amend the Central Valley reclamation project to include Black Butte project; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91-1426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1197. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 10874, a bill to provide for the establishment of the Gulf Islands National Seashore, in the States of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, and Mississippi, for the recognition of certain historic values at Fort San Carlos, Fort Redoubt, Fort Barrancas, and Fort Pickens in Florida, and Fort Massachusetts in Mississippi, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1427). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1198. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 18776, a bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1428). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 18969. A bill to provide for comprehensive surveys with respect to the ade-

quacy of game and other animals and game birds and other birds and fish, and their habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia):

H.R. 18970. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 18971. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance financed in whole for low-income groups, through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits, and to provide a system of peer review of utilization, charges, and quality of medical service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILBERT (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. DENT, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KARTH, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MINISH, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. NIX, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROE, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 18972. A bill; National Public Employee Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 18973. A bill to direct the establishment of health standards for employees of food service establishments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McFALL (for himself, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. MESKILL, and Mr. RARICK):

H.R. 18974. A bill to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act to make its benefits available to certain areas of extra high unemployment, to authorize additional funds for such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McKNEALLY (for himself, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. POWELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MONAGAN, and Mr. GILBERT):

H.R. 18975. A bill to amend section 222(h) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for penalties for violation of any safety requirement prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 18976. A bill to prohibit denial of equal employment opportunity by States and local governments because of color, race, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 18977. A bill to amend title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 18978. A bill to provide that disabled individuals entitled to monthly cash benefits under section 223 of the Social Security Act, and individuals retired for disability under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, shall be eligible for health insurance benefits under title XVIII of the Social Security Act without regard to their age, and to reduce from \$50 to \$25 the annual deductible imposed under the supplementary medical insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. RODINO, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 18979. A bill designating certain election days as legal public holidays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. BELL of California, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MORSE, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. VANIK, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia):

H.R. 18980. A bill to provide for the abatement of air pollution by the control of emissions from motor vehicles, motor vehicle engines, stationary sources and fuel, and fuel additives in order to protect the health and welfare of the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 18981. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to promote the creation of a national grid for the supply of electric power; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 18982. A bill to provide emergency authority for the guarantee of loans to aid business enterprises to meet temporary and urgent financial needs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 18983. A bill; Newsmen's Privilege Act of 1970; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 18984. 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 United States 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. RUPPE:

H.R. 18985. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to make a survey of St. Marys River, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HALKINS, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mr. TUNNEY):

H.R. 18986. A bill to amend the Truth-in-Lending Act to protect consumers against careless and erroneous billing, and to require that statements under open-end credit plans be mailed in time to permit payment prior to the imposition of finance charges; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 18987. A bill to require the Council on Environmental Quality to make a full and complete investigation and study of national policy with respect to the discharging of material into the oceans; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VIGORITO (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. HAYS, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RHODES, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. KOCH, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. VANIK):

H.R. 18988. A bill to reduce pollution which is caused by litter composed of soft drink and beer containers, and to eliminate the threat to the Nation's health, safety, and welfare which is caused by such litter by banning such containers when they are sold in interstate commerce on a no-deposit, no-return basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 18989. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide increased fines for violation of the motor carrier safety regulations, to extend the application of civil penalties to all violations of the motor car-

rier safety regulations, to permit suspension or revocation of operating rights for violation of safety regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 18990. A bill for the relief of certain farmers who sold Commodity Credit Corporation mortgaged grain to Lafayette Farm Services, Inc., Lafayette, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 18991. A bill to extend the boundaries of the Arapaho National Forest in Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 18992. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more favorable income tax treatment for gain derived by individuals from the sale or exchange of capital assets held for more than 2 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 18993. A bill to amend section 700 of chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide penalties for showing disrespect for the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18994. 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. 18995. A bill to repeal chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code (relating to firearms), to reenact the Federal Firearms Act, and to restore chapter 53 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as in effect before its amendment by the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 18996. A bill to amend section 4182 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, to remove statutory restrictions on the sale of .22 caliber ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 18997. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Thaddeus Kosciuszko Home National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 18998. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States and subdivisions thereof in the enforcement of State and local laws, rules, and regulations within the national forest system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 18999. A bill to reduce pollution which is caused by litter composed of soft drink and beer containers, and to eliminate the threat to the Nation's health, safety, and welfare which is caused by such litter by banning such containers when they are sold in interstate commerce on a no-deposit, no-return basis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 19000. A bill to amend the act of April 24, 1961, authorizing the use of judgment funds of the Nez Percé Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McKNEALLY (for himself, Mr. WYDLER, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. POWELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MONAGAN, and Mr. GILBERT):

H.R. 19001. A bill to amend section 5 of the Department of Transportation Act to authorize the National Transportation Safety Board to employ 5,000 investigators to carry out its powers and duties under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 19002. A bill to improve the administration of criminal justice by promoting professionalization of police, criminal court, prosecutorial, public defender, probation, parole, corrections and related personnel, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. PIKE, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. ROE, Mr. FRASER, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. YATRON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ANDERSON, of Tennessee, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. KAZEN, Mr. FISH, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. BIES-TER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina):

H.R. 19003. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that members of the Armed Forces be assigned to duty stations near their homes after serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. POAGE, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. McDADE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. NIX, Mr. KYROS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. JOHNSON of California):

H.R. 19004. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that members of the Armed Forces be assigned to duty stations near their homes after serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. McKNEALLY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. PELLY, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. GUDE, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 19005. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that members of the Armed Forces be assigned to duty stations near their homes after serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 19006. 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. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. HALEY, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SKUBITZ, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. CAREY, Mr. KYL, Mr. UDALL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. RHODES, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. KEITH, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. HATHAWAY, and Mr. FREY):

H.R. 19007. A bill to designate certain lands as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WOLD, Mr. KEE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. ESCH, and Mr. RIEGLE):

H.R. 19008. A bill to designate certain lands

as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. SPRINGER):

H.R. 19009. A bill to provide for employment within the Environmental Protection Agency of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BRASCO):

H.R. 19010. A bill amending title 13 of the United States Code by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce through the Bureau of the Census to undertake a quadrennial enrollment of those persons to vote in elections of the President and Vice President that meet the qualifications of the various States other than residency. This act is to be known as the Universal Enrollment Act of 1970; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 19011. A bill to amend chapter 3 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to U.S. contributions to international organizations and programs, to provide for a program to control illegal international traffic in narcotics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 19012. A bill to provide for the construction of naval vessels in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 19013. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide a more adequate survivors' annuity plan for the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 19014. A bill to prevent the dumping of chemical, biological, or radiological weapons or materials into any body of water; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI (for himself, Mrs. REID of Illinois, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, and Mr. ERELBORN):

H.R. 19015. A bill to declare the Illinois and Michigan Canal abandoned as a navigable waterway of the United States of America and quitclaim any interest which the United States of America may have therein to the State of Illinois to remove or prevent clouds upon land titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH (for himself, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. FISH, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STRATTON, and Mr. GRIFFIN):

H.R. 19016. A bill to extend for 2 months the period within which the Secretary of Commerce is required to report the decennial census tabulation of total population by States for the apportionment of Representatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 19017. A bill to require the Department of Defense to determine disposal dates and methods for disposing of certain military material; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 19018. A bill to require the Council on Environmental Quality to make a full and complete investigation and study of national policy with respect to the discharging of ma-

terial into the oceans; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. UDALL):

H.R. 19019. A bill to prohibit the discharge into any of the navigable waters of the United States or into international waters of any military material without a certification by the Council on Environmental Quality approving such discharge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 19020. A bill to improve judicial machinery by providing for the appointment of a district court executive for each district court having six or more authorized permanent judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 19021. A bill to amend title 23, Highways, United States Code, relating to Indian reservation roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 19022. A bill to require under the supervision of the Securities and Exchange Commission a full and fair disclosure of the nature of interests in business franchises, and to provide increased protection in the public interest for franchises in the sale of business franchises; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 19023. A bill to the Consumer Agricultural Food Protection Act of 1970; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 19024. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to establish statutory limits on emissions from motor vehicles manufactured after January 1, 1972; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.J. Res. 1354. Joint Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to limit the tenure of Senators and Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (for himself, Mr. HAYS, Mr. NIX, Mr. FOUNTAIN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. PEPPER):

H.J. Res. 1355. Joint resolution concerning the war powers of the Congress and the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ICHORD:

H. Con Res. 712. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee's annual report for the year 1969, House Report No. 91-983, 91st Congress, second session; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. PODELL, Mr. KOCH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. KARTH, Mr. NIX, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. POWELL):

H. Con. Res. 713. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KOCH:

H. Con. Res. 714. Concurrent resolution on the conversion to a low-emission propulsion system for motor vehicles to replace the internal combustion engine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALEN (for himself, Mr. FRASER, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. FINDLEY,

Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RIEGLE, and Mr. ROBISON):

H. Con. Res. 715. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Intelligence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. HOWARD, and Mr. UDALL):

H. Con. Res. 716. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the pollution of waters all over the world and the necessity for coordinated international action to prevent such pollution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. Res. 1199. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 19026. A bill to provide for the advancement in grade of a certain officer in the U.S. Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 19025. A bill for the relief of Miguel Maria Irtigoyen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

569. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the General Assembly and General Board of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), relative to conscription, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PETER LISAGOR

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine in its current edition has paid a well deserved tribute to Chicago Daily News, Washington Bureau Chief Peter Lisagor.

It has been my privilege to know Peter Lisagor for almost three decades and I concur in the tribute paid him by Time.

Since he is not one for flowery compliments, I shall confine my remarks today to a simple request to place the Time article in the RECORD.

The article follows:

#### HORIZONTAL IN WASHINGTON

Washington, D.C., is a city of hustlers and manipulators, full of pitfalls for the journalist, and covered by some of the most experienced reporters in the U.S. It stands to reason that the newspaper correspondent conceded by his colleagues to be Washington's all-round best would be cynical and a big smug. He isn't. The Chicago Daily News' Peter Lisagor, 55, has made his mark by 20 years of hard work and humor, and if he has scooped every competitor and pulled every beard in the capital, he remains the most popular newsman in town.

Laughter is Lisagor's calling card. He has stepped on Khrushchev's foot, fallen asleep in the Taj Mahal and walked head-on into a lamppost (with bloody consequences) while recording the words of Lyndon Johnson. He tells terrible jokes and laughs so hard at them that everyone laughs with him. Still, no member of the press corps makes the mistake of writing off "Old Pete" as a buffoon. They all laughed when he felled security by slipping his rented car, crudely lettered State Department 1-A into a key position in Khrushchev's 1959 motorcade through Des Moines, but the joke was on them. It usually is.

#### WHISPERS WITH J.F.K.

The lighthearted Lisagor is admired as a great generalist in a field where specialists are taking over. As chief of the News's five-member bureau, he practices what he calls "horizontal" journalism—he and his reporters follow their stories wherever they lead rather than sticking to narrow beats, as they might at a large "vertical" bureau. Pete himself covers the White House, foreign policy, Washington politics and whatever captures his fancy. He is reputed to have the widest range of true friends in the Government's employ of any correspondent in D.C. L.B.J. has called him "brilliant." To the consternation of Lisagor's colleagues, John Kennedy used to call him aside for lengthy whispered consultations. J.F.K., a fellow sufferer, was

actually asking about Pete's bad back. "I always told the other reporters it was a privileged conversation about Berlin or Cuba or the cold war," Lisagor recalls gleefully, "and that I couldn't divulge any part of it."

Lisagor modestly attributes his popularity to the fact that he works for a provincial paper. None of his sources, he claims, ever see what he writes. But being a "busher" in the balliwick of the Eastern press giants has had its drawbacks. Lippmann or Reston could get a Cabinet member by phone, but Lisagor once waited weeks trying to see John Foster Dulles. He got an interview immediately when, on the strength of a New York Times Sunday Magazine assignment, he identified himself as Mr. Lisagor for the Times.

On another occasion, the wire services entirely ignored one of his scoops—the discovery that President Syngman Rhee had refused the offer of Indian troops at the height of the Korean War—until he leaked it to the New York Herald Tribune. By 1966, when he beat everyone with the first authentic account of the Jackie Kennedy-William Manchester squabble, A.P. and U.P.I. were finally paying attention.

#### RON'S BAD NEWS

Outside the profession, much of Lisagor's recognition and prestige is due to his appearances on television, which he pretends to disparage. "I belong to the dirty-fingernail set," he boasts. "Those who work with pencil and notebook, as opposed to the folk heroes on T.V. I'm a working stiff, a shoe-leather man." He is embarrassed when little girls recognize him and ask for his autograph. Nevertheless, he does a weekly report for NET and is the most frequent guest journalist on NBC's *Meet the Press*, a program that displays Lisagor's most conspicuous talent: he is far and away the most skillful interrogator in the business. On TV, at press conferences, and at the now-famous breakfasts run by Godfrey Sperling of the *Christian Science Monitor*, he breaks through the reserve of official after official with the wit, insight and irreverence of his questions.

"After a year," he asked an evasive Daniel P. Moynihan, "how does it feel to be the house liberal?" Lisagor had used the approach before. "If you were Secretary of State," he asked Johnson Adviser McGeorge Bundy several years ago, "would you want a McGeorge Bundy in the White House?" And when Nixon Press Secretary Ron Ziegler began a song and dance about how General Lewis Hershey had not actually been named as Selective Service director but promoted to a higher advisory post, Lisagor stopped the nonsense and broke up the house by asking quietly: "How did he take the bad news, Ron?"

#### SHORN OF BRITCHES

Those fortunate enough to catch Lisagor in print (his features and weekend columns are syndicated in 90 cities but seldom appear in D.C. or New York) find Pete hanging on no ideological peg. An apolitical anomaly in

a highly partisan town, he is praised by Bill Buckley's *National Review* and quoted by the liberal *New Republic*. "An old editor once told me to walk down the middle of the street and shoot windows out on both sides," he says. "I guess that's about what I try to do." He will agonize for hours over his lead. One colorful effort dramatized L.B.J.'s technique of silencing the G.O.P. by stealing its issues: "There is no other word for it—the Republicans have been held up in broad daylight by a daring political desperado from Texas. Lyndon B. Johnson has shorn them of their britches, in the patois of the Feder-nales."

Pete Lisagor's "plain folks" pose is an honest one. He was a 14-year-old orphan when he went to Chicago from the West Virginia coal fields in 1930. He played pro baseball "for \$65 a month and hamburgers" in Iowa, until he saved enough money to go to the University of Michigan. With time out for the Army and a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard, he has worked for the *News* almost continually since 1939. In Washington, Old Pete never flaunts his unique eminence, but he obviously enjoys it. When a friend called to ask if a big story had been leaked to him—he had a 24-hour beat on it—he chuckled comfortably and replied: "They don't leak stories to me. I'm just a barefoot boy from over the mountains."

#### THE IMPACT OF CRIME ON SMALL BUSINESS

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most far-reaching problems facing the businessman today is that of theft of materials in transit. These thefts result in disruption of business schedules, as essential parts do not arrive on time. Ultimately, of course, it is a problem which affects every American consumer, because it causes higher prices through increased insurance costs.

I am encouraged to note that the Senate Small Business Committee, chaired by Senator ALAN BIBLE, has undertaken an extensive investigation of this situation and has held a number of hearings on this subject recently.

Late last year the committee issued a report detailing the problem as it pertains to shipment by air. This report is particularly informative, and I insert the introduction, conclusion and other relevant passages at this point in the RECORD: