on the Environment and the Commerce Technical Advisory Board Noise Abatement Panel of the U.S. Dept. of Commerce.

His hobby? "Reading everything I can get my hands on about noise."

EARL WARREN OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Association Chairman, Earl Warren, and his guests were quite outspoken recently on the recent hijacking of the U.S. aircraft.

Many find it strange that Chairman Warren did not explain his complicity in the international situation which he worked so many years to create and nurture, and which continues to destroy constitutional government and reduce the strength of the American people.

Perhaps the reason Mr. Warren and his group are more concerned about the hijacking of an airliner in the Middle East than about the hijacking of the USS *Pueblo*, the EC–121, and the USS *Liberty* or the many hijackings to Cuba, is that the Boeing 747 was not owned by Pan American but rather by a New York City bank.

Mr. Speaker, I include two related newsclippings at this point:

[From The Evening Star, Sept. 10, 1970]

"ALMOST UNBELIEVABLE"

(By Ymelda Dixon)

Secretary of State and Mrs. William P. Rogers stopped by briefly at the John Quincy Adams Rooms of the State Department last night.

He was outspoken on the hijackings: "It is almost an unbelievable situation. How could any people do these things?"

Rogers was deeply concerned about the welfare of the women and children on the planes. "It is so hot in those planes. I checked with Charles Tillinghast, president of TWA today. The airlines people are very helpful, and the other governments are as concerned as we are."

The Rogers, taking time to stop by at the reception which honored Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. envoy to the Vatican and chairman of the President's Commission for the Observance of the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations, showed their esteem for Lodge and the United Nations.

Lodge, in town for meetings of the commission, will return to Rome in November.

He looks 10 years younger than when he was handling the peace talks with the North Vietnamese in Paris. He laughingly admitted it is much easier to deal with Rome than with the North Vietnamese.

Hosts at the magnificent 6 to 8 o'clock reception was the chairman of the United Nations Association of the U.S.A., former Chief Justice Earl Warren and Mrs. Warren.

Guests of honor with Lodge, were Frederick L. Ehrman and Spyros P. Skouras.

Skouras is general chairman of the annual United Nations Concert and Dinner in Washington, set for Oct. 17. A former movie mogul, he now is chairman of the Board of Prudential-Grace Lines.

In the manner of the Golden Greeks, he is building a great shipping line and hopes to help restore the prestige of the American merchant marine.

Mrs. Skouras is a rarity among the wives of film families—the first and only wife.

Last night, Mrs. Skouras and the Skouras' daughter, Mrs. George Fowler, wife of a Connecticut surgeon, both wore Dior gowns with diamond and turquoise jewelry.

Ambassador of Israel and Mrs. Rabin came to the reception, Rabin plainly showing the strain of the past weeks.

Leah Rabin was smart in an Israeli midi dress.

"Israeli women, with all their troubles, take time to think of fashion and are wearing the midi," said Mrs. Rabin, who recently returned from her homeland.

Secretary of Agriculture and Mrs. Clifford Hardin and many chiefs of diplomatic missions and their wives also attended.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1970]

TERRORISM: FALLOUT ON PAN AMERICAN

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

The Arab terrorists who destroyed a Boeing 747 in Cairo earlier this week may have channeled $24 million into the coffers of Pan American World Airways.

Although the plane carried Pan Am's insignia, the jet actually belonged to the First National City Bank, which leased the aircraft to Pan Am.

Pan Am, however, shouldered the responsibility for insuring the plane, and now the company is considering keeping the $24 million in insurance payments, airline officials said yesterday. Another Boeing 747—owned outright by the company—would be substituted in the lease agreement.

With large, unused lines of bank credit, Pan Am faces no immediate cash shortage, company officials said yesterday. Nevertheless, the extra $24 million would provide an additional cushion of funds during a period marked by increasing anxiety over "liquidity."

Last year, Pan Am lost $25 million, and, so far in 1970, the company has recorded a $12 million deficit, although these losses don't accurately reflect the airline's cash flow. Depreciation on equipment, for example, officially counts as an expense but doesn't represent an immediate cash outlay.

According to one high Pan Am official, the airline could also decide to repay First National City Bank for the jet and simply eliminate the lease. In that case, he said, the airline actually might record a small profit, because the lease price is $23 million and the insurance coverage is nearly $24 million.

Precisely what happens, this official said, depends on a multitude of highly-technical factors—including which of two insurance policies covers the Cairo explosion. One policy protects the company from ordinary losses against airplane destruction (this is called "hull" insurance), and the other (called "war-risk" insurance) comes into force only as a result of a wartime loss.

"The war risk (insurers) claim that the loss is commercial, and the commercial (insurers) claim that it's war risk," the official said.

Reports that international airlines are receiving cancellation notices of insurance, industry experts said yesterday, probably center on war-risk policies. According to these experts, it's likely that hijacking losses will be classified universally as "war risks" for international carriers, and the policy rates may be raised.

These experts, however, minimized the possibility of a permanent loss of insurance.

For Pan Am, the loss of the 747 may constitute something less than a grave hardship, one airline analyst said yesterday Like many other airlines, he said, Pan Am may have too many planes—too much "capacity"—for the available traffic.

If Pan Am decided to substitute another Boeing 747 for the destroyed plane in the First National City Bank lease the $24 million in cash would not be recorded in as profit but simply as a transfer of assets from capital equipment to cash.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, September 14, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

The just shall live by faith. Romans 1: 17.

Almighty and most merciful Father, we begin the week conscious of our own need and yet aware of Thy great power to sustain us in our endeavors on behalf of our beloved land. Keep us faithful in the performance of our duties, loyal to every high and holy principle, responsive to the needs of our citizens, and above all receptive to the leading of Thy living spirit.

We pray for our country—that as a people we may be delivered from malice, bitterness, and ill will. Strengthen within us all a true sense of justice, a due regard for the rights of others, and a genuine spirit of good will. Together may we get in step with Thee and with one another as we go forward to one Nation with liberty and justice for all.

In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 10, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 16539. An act to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide that the Secretary of Transportation shall be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council.

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

H.R. 4182. An act to authorize voluntary admission of patients to the District of Columbia institution providing care, education, and treatment of mentally retarded persons; and

H.R. 17809. An act to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendments of the Senate to the bill H.R. 16968 entitled: "An act to provide for the adjustment of the Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants, and for other purposes."

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

S. 5. An act to promote the public welfare; and

S. 437. An act to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to survivor annuities under the civil service retirement program, and for other purposes.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C.
September 11, 1970.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 11:50 a.m. on Friday, September 11, 1970, said to contain a Message from the President wherein he transmits the report of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

The report of the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, which I am transmitting to the Congress today, presents cogent suggestions for commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of our nation.

I strongly endorse the Commission's primary recommendations that:

—The commemoration be national in scope, seeking to involve every State, city and community;

—The Bicentennial be a focal point for a review and reaffirmation of the principles on which the nation was founded and for a new understanding of our heritage;

—This be the occasion for looking ahead, for defining and dedicating ourselves to our common purposes, and for speeding the accomplishment of specific local projects responsive to our changing national priorities.

The goal which the Commission has established is most appropriate for our nation at this time: "to forge a new national commitment, a new spirit for '76, a spirit which vitalizes the ideals for which the Revolution was fought; a spirit which will unite the nation in purpose and dedication to the advancement of human welfare as it moves into its third century."

I concur with the Commission's concept of a Bicentennial Era with its focal point in 1976.

The Commission is now moving from the planning to the development stage of the Bicentennial Era. To assist it in its task, I have these comments on some specific areas:

ON MAKING THE CELEBRATION NATIONAL IN SCOPE

1. I invite the Bicentennial Commissions now formed or forming in each of the 50 States, along with Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Territories, to share in a special effort to ensure active and nationwide participation in the celebration of America's 200th birthday. In the year preceding July 4, 1976, I invite each of those areas to accept the responsibility for a single week in which national focus would be on that area's local traditions and commemorative activities, in a way that would permit the Nation and the world to observe both our historic development and our local activities to meet the challenges of the third American century.

2. The Commission urges a "multi-city exposition" and quite properly concludes "there should be no commercially-oriented world's fair in the traditional sense anywhere in the Nation during the Bicentennial Era." I agree. There can be no single Bicentennial city. Nor is any traditional type of world's fair in one city adequate to the challenge of a national celebration.

However, since American civilization has drawn on the genius and traditions of nations throughout the world, and has contributed as well to their development, we should actively encourage international participation in our celebration. To do this in an orderly and well-planned way, we should select a principal site on which that international participation can focus. Philadelphia, site of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and the creation of our Constitution, would be the natural place for this activity.

Accordingly, I am now instructing the Secretary of State to proceed officially with appropriate registration procedures with the Bureau of International Expositions for an international exposition in Philadelphia in 1976. Such an exposition, however, is to be primarily cultural, inspirational and non-commercial in character, with the emphasis on quality rather than size.

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 91-269, I am directing the Secretary of Commerce to review the financial and other support to be secured for the Philadelphia exposition from both government and private sources and, together with David J. Mahoney, Chairman of the Commission, and George P. Shultz, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to report to me the result of this review.

If suitable financing arrangements can be worked out, Philadelphia can be an exciting focal point for international participation in a way that will carry forward the regard of our Founding Fathers for "the opinion of mankind" without in any way restricting the scope of the celebration to a single city. In fact I hope that foreign visitors and visiting groups, including artists and performers, will travel to every corner of the Nation and participate in as many Bicentennial events as possible.

3. It would be appropriate for the Nation's capital to play an important role in helping to set the tone for the national celebration. I have already made known my support for such long-range projects as a new rapid transit system, the Federal City Bicentennial Development Corporation, and an acceleration of urban renewal plans. I am directing Chairman Mahoney to begin a series of meetings with Mayor Washington, the National Capital Planning Commission, Chairman Mark Evans of the National Capital Historic Region Bicentennial Committeee, Counselor to the President Daniel P. Moynihan and Director Shultz to define specific plans and costs for my review and to recommend ways to achieve community participation in the planning and development process.

4. The Commission report asks the City of Boston "to develop a program to explore and examine the revolutionary roots of America through its great historical resources" and endorses the completion of Miami's permanent Trade and Cultural Center (Interama) "as a part of the Bicentennial observance." These plans, as well as others from cities in other sections of the country, are to be strongly encouraged.

5. The Commission pointed out that improved travel facilities would "contribute greatly to a successful Bicentennial celebration," and expressed particular interest in special urban corridor projects in the Northeast which would not only expedite the flow of visitors from one historical site to another, but would also provide permanent benefits for a significant percentage of the American population. I am instructing Secretary Volpe and Director Shultz to analyze these projects, including costs and timing, and to submit their recommendations to me.

ON FINANCE AND ORGANIZATION

1. I will refrain from making commitments to any particular project rec-

ommended by the Commission until timing and cost data are submitted and studied. As policy choices and costs become evident, Chairman Mahoney will resubmit some of these recommendations to the Commission and will inform me of the Commission's preferences.

2. The Commission will have important operational responsibilities: the Bicentennial Calendar, publications, films, the setting of standards and the coordination and monitoring of many projects closely tied to the national celebration. It may be advisable to enlarge the Commission and constitute it as the "Board of Directors" of a corporate structure equipped to deal with operating functions. I am asking Chairman Mahoney to meet with Director Shultz and to recommend to me a plan for future Commission organization and funding.

ON THE OVERALL THEME

A "Festival of Freedom" does not, in my opinion, grasp the unique character of the American experience. True, this event will be festive, colorful and affirmative; yet it must also be thoughtful, profound and searching.

There is a phrase in the Declaration of Independence that is based on English political philosopher John Locke's concept of "Life, liberty and property" being the inalienable rights of man. Thomas Jefferson's dream for the new nation transcended the material; he saw property rights not as an end in itself, but as one means to human happiness.

For that reason, he substituted the phrase "the pursuit of happiness," and that ideal has constantly reasserted itself—most recently as a renewed concern for "the quality of life."

That thread is woven through the fabric of American life over two centuries. It keeps us from getting smug about our success; it reminds us of the need for the spiritual as we attain more of our material needs; it keeps us moving, growing, changing for the better.

Improving the quality of life is, in a sense, a more compelling concept in this era of advanced technology than it was in the time of Jefferson. I believe that this is the area in which we will find the fundamental theme for our anniversary observance of the continuing revolution that is the United States of America.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 11, 1970.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *September 11, 1970.*

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelop from the White House, received in the Clerk's Office at 11:50 a.m. on Friday, September 11, 1970, said to contain a message from the President entitled "A Call for Cooperation" concerning pending legislation.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

A CALL FOR COOPERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-381

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

A CALL FOR COOPERATION

In the course of the past year and one-half I have sent more than 50 messages to the Congress proposing legislation to deal with certain problems, or to achieve certain national objectives. On two occasions I have sought to provide a comprehensive summation of these messages, thereby presenting an administration philosophy.

In the first of these, my message of October 13, 1969, I asserted that if ours is not to be an age of revolution it must be an age of reform, and declared that this would be the watchword of the Administration: REFORM. I listed then a series of such measures already proposed:

Reform of the Draft
Reform of the Welfare System
Reform of the Tax Code
Revenue-Sharing Reform
Postal Reform
Manpower Reform
Social Security Reform
Reform of the Grant-In-Aid System
Electoral Reform
D.C. Government Reform
OEO Reform

I spoke then of further issues for which the Administration proposed new initiatives: with respect to hunger and malnutrition; population; crime; narcotics and pornography; manpower facilities and unemployment insurance; public transportation and air facilities.

In my State of the Union Message of January 22, 1970, I returned to this theme, proposing that as we enter the seventies, we should enter also a great age of reform of the institutions of American government.

The first principle of reform is that government programs and institutions should be effective. They should deliver what they promise. Too many promises of the 1960s have not been kept. The nation is now paying a price for this.

This principle is a cornerstone of the New Federalism. We seek to develop a new sense of partnership between the Federal government and State and local governments, to assign responsibility and authority for public functions to the level best qualified to carry them out. In the name of the "urban crisis," for example, the 1960s saw the Federal government increasingly caught in issues of municipal housekeeping that are most appropriately the business of a city council. But simultaneously the great fiscal power of the Federal government was never brought to play—through revenue sharing—to provide local governments with sufficient resources to enable them to solve their own problems in their own ways.

The second principle of reform is that America must find a way to direct its own growth. We have entered a decade in which our gross national product will increase by $500 billion, an amount greater than the entire growth of the American economy from 1790 to 1950. Out of this vast increase in wealth we can create a life of unprecedented achievement for ourselves, and for the nation. Or we can choke on it. "Toward Balanced Growth: Quantity with Quality," the theme of the report of the National Goals Research Staff, could well be the theme of the 1970s.

In foreign affairs I have held out the hope that if our new policies succeed America may have the best chance since World War II to enjoy a generation of uninterrupted peace. More then is the reason to consider forthwith how we are to use the abundance of peace.

The great question of the seventies, as I pointed out in my State of the Union Message, is, shall we surrender to our surroundings, or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, to our land and to our water? I promised a national growth policy, to bring balance and order to the great changes in population, industry, and patterns of education and training that would affect the quality of life in the three decades ahead.

In February I sent to the Congress the most comprehensive proposals in the area of environmental protection and enhancement ever set forth by any adminstration. Since then I have proposed the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a focal point for setting general environment pollution standards affecting all media and forms of pollution.

I have now virtually completed the domestic legislative proposals I will make to the present Congress. I would like then to take one further opportunity to sum up. I would like to acknowledge the important achievements already behind us, and also to stress the very considerable amount of work which is still before the Congress and which must be done if we are to meet our responsibility to this new decade, much less to begin to fulfill its promise.

In my message of last October I stated that if a working partnership between men of differing philosophies and different parties is to continue, then candor on both sides is required.

Candor requires first that we acknowledge the exceptional circumstances which were thrust upon us by a relatively rare event in American history. For the first time in 120 years an incoming President of one party has faced a Congress dominated by another.

Given the system of "checks and balances" built into our government, it would be reasonable to predict that in such a situation the institutions of the Presidency and the Congress would thwart one another, and that stalemate would ensue. The American Constitution was devised in large measure to limit the exercise of power. We should not be surprised if on occasion it makes such exercise difficult.

Yet this need not be. It is not less a quality of our Constitution that by providing a voice to wide ranging and diverse interests it makes it possible from time to time to face up to issues of national importance, and to make genuinely national decisions about them. Some decisions can be reached only if both parties are willing to share responsibility; some programs can be enacted only if both parties share the credit.

This, then, is a time to face such issues. As President, I have sought to do so. I have proposed to Congress legislation dealing with issues about which there has been an unmistakable national judgment that something needs to be done. Revenue sharing, for example, was pledged by both parties in their 1968 platforms. We need it; the public supports it. Yet, until now, no President has felt it possible to propose revenue sharing, no Congress has made any move toward enacting it. Draft reform, welfare reform, crime control, environmental protection, are other issues that need urgent actions. I have felt it possible to approach these matters as national issues about which we could make national decisions in which both parties would participate, for which both would honorably accept responsibility and justly claim recognition.

Whatever will be the judgment of history, the record of this moment is that Congress has not responded. There are exceptions, of which all involved can and should be proud. But the larger fact is that Congress, in a mood of nostalgia and partisanship, has too much devoted its energies to tinkering with programs of the past while ignoring the realities of the present and the opportunities of the future.

Time now slips away. The Congress is coming to a close. Its work is not done. The issues I have asked to be considered have not been considered. And yet matters press. We cannot wait for politics. We must seek a record of achievement all can share.

As we build this record, we must not lose sight of the overriding need for fiscal responsibility. Year after year during the 1960s the Federal government incurred a deficit. In the early years of the decade there was a justification for this. The economy was operating at less than full employment capacity. In the later years there was no justification whatever: persistent deficits could lead only to a disorderly and punishing inflation. This was predictable; it was predicted; it came to pass.

It need not happen again, and it must not. This is why I have been forced to veto appropriation bills sent me by the Congress in amounts well above those requested. I understand full well the feeling for worthy purposes that inspires such action. But there is a higher national interest. Economics has taught us to think in terms of the entire economic system. To affect one part is to affect all parts. The Federal government must act in accordance with that knowledge and reality. Just as the President sends a unified Budget to the Congress, the Congress surely should devise some manner of unified response. I have suggested that Congress establish an overall spending ceiling, and adjust the various appropriation bills to accord with that ceiling. There may be other and better ways of attaining this goal. But we can no longer avoid the necessity of finding some means whereby the present fragmented and competitive legislative process that mandates and promotes Federal spending can be brought under control so that the impact of the total Federal budget is to sustain and encourage economic growth, rather than to disrupt it. This is the course of fiscal responsibility.

If restraint is one condition of fiscal responsibility, timeliness is surely another. In recent years Congress has more and more tended to put off the enactment of appropriations bills until months after the beginning of the fiscal year. It is now September. The fiscal year began July 1st. Yet only four out of fourteen appropriations bills have been enacted. This practice begins to threaten the very basis of orderly and effective government.

Fiscal restraint in no sense precludes a reordering of national priorities. To the contrary, it is only when such restraint is exercised that a purposeful direction of events can occur. In fiscal 1971, for example, for the first time in two decades, the expenditures of the Federal government on Human Resources are greater than the expenditure on Defense and Defense-related activities. We have reversed the trend of the 1960s. Our priorities *have* changed. But this change can be effective only in the context of disciplined and responsible fiscal policy. The matter may be put more strongly. Anyone who seriously wishes to see a reordering of priorities for the nation either must insist on doing so in a responsible and disciplined manner, or must be judged not to be serious.

REFORMING THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE PAST

Of the major items of reform which I have proposed to the Congress, and which I described in my message of October 13, 1969, some have been acted upon.

The Tax Reform Act of 1969, which had some troublesome features, nevertheless did incorporate most of the measures reforming the Tax Code which I had proposed.

The Administration asked for and obtained the extension of the *Economic Opportunity Act* to permit the OEO to carry out its new role.

One of the most important measures of reform passed by this Congress so far is the *Postal Reorganization Act* establishing the United States Postal Service. It is a landmark bill demonstrating not only ability to respond to a complex and persisting problem with bold and creative measures, but demonstrating as well the power of bipartisan effort when it is exercised with determination and will. This Act will need to be improved upon as the new system is established, but we have a sound structure.

Last year the Congress passed legislation I recommended to permit a change from the oldest-first to a youngest-first order of call in Selective Service, to reduce the period of prime vulnerability to one year, and to select individuals through a lottery system.

Thus we have made a beginning. But our work is nowhere near ended. The other major reforms I listed last October still have not been enacted. Since that time I have proposed a wide range of measures of equal importance. In far the greater proportion these, too, await action by Congress.

REFORM OF THE DRAFT

As long as the draft is necessary to meet our military manpower needs, it must be made to operate as equitably and consistently as possible.

This year, by Executive Order, future occupational, agricultural, and paternity deferments were eliminated. At the same time, I requested the Congress to restore the discretionary authority of the President on undergraduate student deferments so that these deferments could also be eliminated in the future. I also proposed that legislation be enacted to improve the random selection system by permitting the establishment of a direct national call of inductees. The Congress has not acted on these proposals. But the only long range solution is to end our need to draft by attaining an all-volunteer armed force. On April 23, 1970, I proposed military pay legislation to the Congress as an important step toward achieving an objective of reducing draft calls to zero. Unfortunately, this legislation has not been enacted.

In the meantime—and for all time—America owes an obligation to the men who have fought in Vietnam, and not less to those who backed them in the Armed Forces elsewhere. The *Vietnam Veterans Assistance Act* which I have proposed to the Congress would provide important new GI Bill benefits relating to post-secondary school training, the provision of Small Business Administrations loans to veterans from minority groups, and the provision of guaranteed loans for the purchase of mobile homes. This legislation has not been enacted; it should be.

REFORM OF THE WELFARE SYSTEM

The *Family Assistance Act* has been properly described as the most important piece of domestic legislation to go before the Congress in thirty-five years. It is one of the dozen or half-dozen most important pieces of domestic legislation in American history. The Act provides a basic national income supplement for all needy families with children. It abolishes the bankrupt welfare system of the past, which has so greatly contributed to our present crisis, and creates an altogether new system based upon work incentives (including support for child care services), job training and provision, and directed primarily to creating self-sufficient independent families. Where persons are genuinely dependent, as are the aged and disabled, or female headed families with young children, the bill provides national standards of benefits which will enormously improve the condition of the poor in many parts of the nation.

In April of this year the *Family Assistance Act* passed the House of Representatives by a resounding and gratifying vote. Hearings are now taking place in the Senate. It would be tragic beyond words if this historic opportunity were to be allowed to slip away from us. I am confident that this will not happen, but to prevent it the Senate will, of course, have to move with some dispatch.

The Family Assistance Plan is the keystone of an income strategy for the elimination of poverty in the United States. In 1969 the first move in this strategy was accomplished when Congress adopted the Administration's proposal to abolish income taxes for the poor. Reform of the Manpower Program and Unemployment Insurance are equally essential, and the latter has now also been enacted. But the strategy will be incomplete until the Family Assistance Plan is enacted as well.

On May 6, 1969, before the Family Assistance Plan was proposed, I sent to Congress a message on hunger and malnutrition, in which I declared that the moment is at hand to put an end to hunger in America itself for all time. Since then, major reforms have been carried through toward this goal. But legislation is required. The *Food Stamp Act Amendments*, which I recommended to the Congress, established the path-breaking principles that very poor families would receive free stamps, that for other families cash requirements would be limited to 30 percent of family income, that uniform minimum national eligibility standards would be established, and a range of similiarly important reforms. This legislation still has not been enacted.

Family welfare is necessarily related to family size and the availability of health services. On July 18, 1969, I sent the first Message to Congress ever on the subject of population. At the time I proposed that we should establish as a national goal the provision of adequate family planning services within the next 5 years to all those who want but cannot afford them, adding that in no circumstances will the activities associated with our pursuit of this goal be allowed to infringe upon the religious convictions or personal wishes and freedom of any individual, nor will they be allowed to impair the absolute right of all individuals to have such matters of conscience respected by public authorities. Part of this program has gone forward, but in order to reach our goal of being able to serve the estimated five million women who are in need of subsidized, publicly assisted family planning services, family planning legislation should be enacted by the Congress this year.

On the broader question of the future course of population growth and its implications for our society, I am pleased to observe that the *Commission on Population Growth and the American Future* which I proposed in my Message has been approved by the Congress and is now in operation.

In February of this year this Administration sent to the Congress the *Health Services Improvement Act* dedicated to the creation of integrated, effective, consumer-oriented health care systems by the consolidation of four existing and overlapping programs in this field. The Act would "decategorize" certain aspects of these programs, provide "joint funding", authorize the transfer of funds among these programs and encourage experimentation in the delivery of health services. The Congress has not yet taken final action on this legislation.

REVENUE-SHARING REFORM

As I stated in October, for the first time in the history of this government, we have recommended a national policy of permanent sharing of the Federal income tax revenues with the States and lesser political units of the country. My proposal, the *Revenue Sharing Act of 1969*, would begin with $1 billion in its first full fiscal year, and rise to approximately $5 billion by FY 1976: It would be difficult to identify another proposal that has received such widespread endorsement. It is elemental economics, elemental good sense, elemental good government. Both parties endorsed Revenue Sharing in their 1968 platforms, and it has widespread public support. Yet neither the House nor the Senate has held hearings on this Administration's bill.

MANPOWER REFORM

Earlier in this message I stated that the first principle of reform is that government programs should be effective. With this object in view I have proposed a *Manpower Training Act* which would consolidate the major manpower training programs carried on by the Department of Labor into one funding authority, abolish categorical programs, provide that the administration of the programs be progressively decentralized to the States and metropolitan areas, and further provide an automatic increase of 10 percent in manpower funds when the national unemployment rate equals or exceeds 4.5 percent for three consecutive months.

Here is the New Federalism in action. Consolidate in the interests of flexibility. Decentralize where operations are best managed locally. Assert national standards of performance, and provide automatic adjustments to changes in the national economy. In the history of American Federalism there has been no comparable transfer of functions: a process that for more than a third of a century has taken responsibilities away from State and local governments and lodged them in Washington would now for the first time be reversed, not to reestablish an old arrangement, but to create a new one. Hearings have been held in both the House and Senate, but as yet neither body has responded to the essentials of this historic legislation.

One of the most important measures to pass either session of the Congress thus far is the recently enacted *Employment Security Amendments of 1970*, which I recommended July 8, 1969. This precedent-shattering legislation will not only cover 4.75 million additional jobs—in small businesses, nonprofit organizations, State hospitals, and State institutions of higher education among others—it will also provide an extension of the benefit period up to 13 weeks which is automatically triggered when the insured unemployment rate for the nation reaches 4.5 percent for three consecutive months, and would remain in operation until that rate drops below 4.5 percent for a corresponding three months. These provisions become effective January 1, 1972.

This is the most extensive reform of the unemployment insurance program ever enacted. Something of moment has occurred. This important income maintenance program has been made flexible, responsive, equilibrating. This is what modern government should be doing in a dozen such areas.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

In the *Social Security Amendments* currently before the Congress, I requested an automatic cost-of-living adjustment in Social Security benefits to compensate elderly Americans, as I stated in October, for the losses they are suffering because of an inflation they could do nothing either to prevent or to avoid. This is an act of fairness which I proposed in my 1968 campaign for the Presidency and which the Congress should no longer deny to our senior citizens. In addition, I proposed several benefit liberalizations and reforms which would make social security a more equitable and effective instrument of income security for the aged. This measure has passed the House and awaits action in the Senate.

REFORM OF THE GRANT-IN-AID SYSTEM

The Congress consented to my reorganization plan which provided for the establishment of the new *Office of Management and Budget* and the *Domestic Council*. I am confident that these new entities will be major factors in improving the management of domestic affairs in the years ahead. However, there are other aspects of management reform which require legislation which has not been acted upon.

In the fourth month of the Administration I proposed to reform the increasingly chaotic and unmanageable grant-in-aid system of the national government by providing the President with power, subject to Congressional veto, to consolidate related assistance programs.

This is no small matter. It is one of the reforms that is absolutely necessary if our present governmental system is to be made to work. Again we face a familiar situation. We have made some improvements through action by the Executive Branch, but legislation is necessary. Hearings have been held on the *Grant Consolidation Act* in both the House and the Senate, but neither body has acted.

We have recently proposed dramatic changes in the manner in which Social Services are delivered to their intended beneficiaries. As an amendment to the Family Assistance Act, we proposed greater flexibility in the use of services money and related HEW programs—including permissive authority for State and local governments to transfer up to 20 percent from one appropriation to another under certain conditions. More

over, we would launch a new Government Assistance Program to help Mayors and Governors strengthen their policy direction and management of important HEW services. The Senate Finance Committee was gratifyingly prompt in holding hearings on this important amendment, and I hope the Congress will enact it this year.

The *Federal Economy Act* is a related measure. Programs need to be consolidated; from time to time they need to be eliminated. This is an elemental principle of the decent management of public affairs. In February, 1970, I proposed program changes that would save $2.1 billion in Fiscal Year 1971—money urgently needed for other programs. More than half of those changes that require Congressional approval have not been put into effect. Further, the Congress is blocking over $170 million of the savings I proposed to achieve by executive action. In all, Congress is not acting on over $700 million in savings, or one-third of my proposals. In those areas where I have been left free to act I am accomplishing 100 percent of the savings planned.

ELECTORAL REFORM

No one subject more profoundly involves the issue of popular sovereignty than the method of electing the President. For almost two centuries the system of the Electoral College has somehow worked, albeit just barely at times, and at other times even doubtfully. Every four years the American democracy places a large, unacceptable, and unnecessary wager that it will work one more time, that somehow an institution that never in any event functioned the way the framers of the Constitution anticipated, will somehow confer the Presidency on that candidate who obtains the largest number of votes. The Electoral College need not do so. Indeed on occasion it has not done so. But far more importantly—whatever the popular vote—it need not confer the Presidency on any candidate, if none has a majority of the electoral vote.

Our ability to change this system in time for the 1972 elections is a touchstone of the impulse to reform in America today. It will be the measure of our ability to avert calamity by anticipating it.

As I stated in my October 1969 message, I originally favored other methods of reforming the electoral college system, but the passage by the House of a direct popular election plan indicated that this thoroughly acceptable reform could be achieved, and I accordingly supported it. Unfortunately, the Senate has not completed action. Time is running out. But it is still possible to pass the measure and to amend the Constitution in time for the 1972 elections.

D.C. GOVERNMENT REFORM

Last October I called to the attention of Congress one of the truly unacceptable facts of American life, and asked for the enactment of legislation I had proposed which would bring about the orderly transfer of political power to the people of the District of Columbia. I called for a Constitutional amendment giving the District at least one representative in the House and such additional representatives as Congress may approve, and providing for the possibility of two United States Senators. (We need to keep continually in mind the population of the District is greater than that of at least ten States.) I asked for an interim arrangement providing the District with a non-voting Congressional representative, and the creation of a Commission on Government for the District of Columbia to propose a permanent governmental arrangement. I have been heartened by progress toward the non-voting representative, but I share the chagrin that most Americans feel at the fact that Congress continues to deny self-government to the nation's capital. I would remind the Congress that the founding fathers did nothing of the sort. Home rule was taken from the District only after more than seventy years of self-government, and this was done on grounds that were either factually shaky or morally doubtful. Surely we cannot allow this inadmissible situation to persist as the American Bicentennial dawns.

FOREIGN TRADE

In a message to the Congress of November 18, 1969, I proposed the *Trade Act of 1969* which would significantly strengthen the trade agreements program of the United States, recognizing that ultimately it is rising world trade and production that must form the base for the prosperity of developing nations. At the same time, the bill would establish a viable program of tariff adjustments for industries and adjustment assistance for firms and workers affected by imports. It would also promote the reduction or elimination of non-tariff barriers to trade, by eliminating the American Selling Price System. While this legislation awaits enactment, I again express my concern about the growing tone of protectionism in the arguments being made in the Congress.

The *Merchant Marine Act Amendments* provide for a long-range merchant marine building program of 300 ships in the next ten years, with a lessening of dependence on operating-differential subsidy for liner carriers, and the buildup of the bulk commercial carrier fleet for the foreign commerce of the United States. This is a trade expansion measure of fundamental importance. The bill has passed the House of Representatives, but has not as yet passed the Senate.

CRIME

In my October, 1969 Message I declared that there is no greater need in this free society than the restoration of the individual American's freedom from violence in his home and on the streets of his city or town. These words were carefully chosen. The issue of crime is easily misunderstood, and on occasion deliberately so. The issue of crime is freedom. When individual citizens are the direct victims of violence, or the indirect victims when they are forced to restrict their own movements out of fear of violence, fundamental liberties are abridged. A government that fails to protect those liberties is not worthy of the name. At the time of my statement the issue had been the source of more legislative requests from the Administration than any other single subject. Today, not far from a year later, only two bills have passed. One was the *District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act*—a measure of major importance. It provides for the expansion and strengthening of the entire system of law enforcement and criminal justice in the nation's capital. As I said in October, the Act provides more judges, new enforcement tools, reorganization of the archaic court system, a new public defender's office, and reform in the procedures for dealing with juvenile offenders.

The second was an amendment to the *Federal Youth Corrections Act* to provide more effective and improved methods for dealing with young people in the Federal criminal justice system.

Among the most important crime proposals that have been before the Congress for more than a year, and which have not been enacted, are these:

—*The Controlled Dangerous Substances Act.* This Act would substantially revise existing drug laws by providing new means for controlling dangerous drugs by establishing a new, comprehensive and realistic penalty structure designed to provide courts with guidance and flexibility in handling offenders, and by providing more effective enforcement tools for diminishing the availability of dangerous drugs.

—*Organized Crime Control Act.* This is an omnibus bill embodying recommendations of the President's Crime Commission, the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws, and other groups. The ten titles codify and strengthen existing Federal laws relating to the prosecution of organized crime. Again, this is an issue easily misunderstood. The most important issues involved in organized crime are not those which are most commonly discussed. It has been estimated that as much as $50 billion a year passed through the hands of organized crime in illegal gambling alone. What is involved here is not the act of gambling by the individual citizen, but the corruption of government that invariably accompanies it. Similarly, the social consequences of the drug traffic controlled by organized crime spread far beyond the personal tragedy of the addict. They weaken the fabric of society itself.

This proposal would make large-scale gambling a federal offense and would make it a felony for large-scale gamblers and law enforcement officers or public officials to obstruct enforcement of State and local laws against gambling through bribery of government officials. And it would replace numerous disparate witness-immunity laws scattered throughout the United States Code with a single uniform provision. It is a long overdue reform. This bill provides, among other things, for increased sentences, up to 30 years, for dangerous adult special offenders—the recidivist, the professional offender, and the organized crime leader.

—*Wagering Tax Amendments.* This proposal would prohibit the use against the taxpayer of information obtained through his compliance with the wager-

ing tax, while at the same time increasing the coverage and amount of the taxes, and authorizing a grant of immunity to essential witnesses.

—*The Bail Reform Act Amendments.* This proposal would authorize a judge to detain, after a hearing, a person charged with certain categories of Federal crimes who was found to pose a danger to another person or the community if released.

—*Protection of Minors from Obscenity Act and the Prohibition of Transportation of Salacious Advertising Act.* These two bills would prohibit the use of the mails for the distribution of matter harmful to minors or advertisements explicitly designed and intended to appeal to a prurient interest in sex.

—*Criminal Justice Act Amendments.* This proposal would institute fundamental and urgently needed reforms in the provision of legal defenders for poor persons. Crime involves the issue of freedom, and that includes freedom from unjust arrest and conviction. Vigorous and competent legal defense is fundamental to this freedom, and it results in justice for not only the accused but also the accuser.

These crime control measures have been before the Congress for more than a year. There are further measures of equal and as great urgency also before the Congress.

—*The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Amendments.* The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration was established in 1968 in the Department of Justice to assist, through a grant program, State and local governments in strengthening and improving law enforcement. These amendments now pending in Congress would authorize appropriations for this important program for fiscal year 1971 and beyond and would amend the basic authority to permit better utilization of the available funds.

—*Explosives Regulation Proposals and Amendments.* We have proposed legislation to regulate the business of importing, manufacturing or dealing in explosives through a system of licenses and permits as well as prohibiting the purchase of explosives by mail-order. In addition, we have proposed amendments to the U.S. Criminal Code which would provide urgently needed powers to control the epidemic of terrorist bombings and nihilist destruction which has suddenly become a feature of American life. Here again the object of crime control is not simply to deter people from breaking the law and to punish persons who have broken the law, but more importantly to maintain and protec the freedom of citizens to live their lives without fear and without injury. The stability of democratic society is what really is at stake.

EDUCATION REFORM

If the impulse to reform may be muted with respect to some areas of American life, there would seem to be near universal agreement that reform is overdue and urgent at every level in the field of education. There is a difference, however, between reform and retribution. If education has failed—*where* it has failed—the remedy is not to destroy it, but to restructure it. Moreover, failure as perceived by one group may be success in the eyes of another. Opinions about education must be informed by knowledge about the subject. From this it follows that the first thing to understand about education is that our understanding of the process is weak indeed. At most, it can be described as just beginning. This is a lesson we learned in the 1960s at no little cost.

During that decade, Congress was extraordinarily generous in its support of education, particularly in its enthusiasm for trying to compensate through education for the environmental disadvantages of our least fortunate children. Support for education comprised the fastest-growing segment of the Federal budget by the mid-point of that ten-year period. This support—regarded as long overdue by most Americans, and begrudged by almost no one—generated an extraordinary flurry of activity in American education at all levels.

Much of this activity was based on the familiar premise that if only the resources available for education were increased, the amount that youngsters learn would increase, too. Somehow, it seemed reasonable to assume that the amount of dollars invested in education was all that really mattered. For we thought we knew what education was all about.

It is, therefore, perfectly understandable that we, as a nation, have been reluctant to accept the findings of massive research and bold scholarly analysis which suggest that perhaps our cherished assumptions may simply not be true. Or, if true, they are far more complex and difficult to understand than we thought. It is entirely understandable that we have all been reluctant to acknowledge how little return our investment has brought, how disappointing the educational results of our ambitious programs have been. But the simple and alarming fact has gradually become apparent, that we did not really understand the educational process well enough to have a purposeful effect on its outcome, which is, of course, what children learn.

There is no shame associated with this conclusion, and no blame to be assigned. But it is time to realize that every time we invest a billion dollars in a compensatory program, we raise the hopes of millions of our most disadvantaged citizens; which hopes are more than likely destined to be dashed, for the programs and strategies on which they rest are themselves based on faulty asssumptions and inadequate knowledge. This is bad government. It is bad politics. It is bad education.

This Administration did not take the easy way out of this sad paradox. The easy response would have been to ignore the research findings or to stop spending money across the board on education. In fact, the total sums budgeted by this Administration for education have risen steadily—to nearly $12 billion this year—and will continue to do so. For many of these programs have auxiliary benefits that should not be denied our young people. Far from cutting back—or pretending that programs "work" when in fact they do not—this Administration has chosen the tougher route of *reform and research.* For we are confident that the day will come when in fact every young American can learn as much and go as far as his abilities will permit. But that day will be slow in coming if we fail now to abandon outmoded precepts and to move beyond simplicities. (While at the same time giving full honor and credit to those who re-awakened the nation to its educational shortcomings.)

Accordingly, this Administration has taken a number of executive actions aimed at the reform and renewal of American education, consistent with the principle of the New Federalism that elementary and secondary education are properly the province of States and localities. The *Office of Child Development* has been created within HEW as the focal agency for our Early Learning Program and other activities aimed at enhancing The First Five Years of Life. The *President's Commission on School Finance* is now at work examining the pressing and complex problems associated with the financial support of public and non-public schools. The *Right to Read* has been established as a prime educational goal and a *National Reading Council* has been appointed to monitor the nation's progress toward it. We initiated a rigorous—and continuing—review of the Title I program.

But the reforms in Federal education programs that are most needed must represent the combined efforts of the Congress and the Administration. In two major Messages to Congress last March, I made a series of proposals for reform and renewal, first in elementary and secondary education, then in higher education. These were augmented by our proposed *Emergency School Aid Act*, and by the thorough-going reform of the Impacted Aid Program transmitted as part of the *Federal Economy Act.*

In these proposals I asked that the Congress establish a *National Institute of Education*, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in order to bring to education the intensity and quality of research and experimentation that we have grown accustomed to in biomedical research under the National Institutes of Health. Staffed by scholars and experts from many fields, and free of many of the constraints on established agencies, the National Institute would offer reasonable hope that in time we might convert our present ignorance about the processes of education into hard knowledge about learning and how to effect it. Its purpose is to assist schools in solving the pressing problems which beset them. Congress has not held hearings on this important and far-reaching proposal.

I asked that the Congress reform the mammoth—and in its present form, inexcusable—program popularly known as Aid to Federally-impacted Areas. As I observed in March, this program neither assists States to determine their own education expenditures nor re-directs funds to the individual districts in greatest need. Four Presidents, representing both parties, have asked Congress to take up the long overdue but politically un-

popular task of eliminating its most egregious flaws. Although hearings have been held on this long-needed reform, no Committee action has been taken in either house.

I asked the Congress to enact a special two-year *Emergency School Aid Program* to expedite and encourage the process of desegregation in the United States, and to enhance the possibility that our youngsters can benefit from interracial educational experiences. Surely there has been no domestic public issue in twenty years to engage the attention and concern of more citizens than the relationship of the races within our nation's schools. To the extent that this relationship can be eased and assisted through the use of Federal funds, I have asked Congress to join with the Administration in doing so. I hope that Congress will complete action on this legislation at an early date.

My request that Congress speedily appropriate $150 million under existing authority so that we might begin this challenging task before schools open this September was regrettably cut in half to $75 million.

In higher education, the Administration submitted one of the most comprehensive pieces of education legislation in history, the *Higher Education Opportunity Act*. Its key elements bear repeating.

By substantially revising the present structure of student financial aid, it would be possible, for the first time, to assure every lower-income student entering college a combination of Federal grants and subsidized loans sufficient to give him the same ability to pay as a student from a family earning $10,000.

At the same time, I proposed to make Federally-guaranteed loans available to *every* college and graduate student in the United States, regardless of income. *The National Student Loan Association*—a "secondary market" for student loan paper—would make this possible, and the loans that we propose to guarantee would be sufficient in amount, and flexible enough in length of repayment, that any student prepared to invest in his own future could finance his own education. By making loans available to all, and by concentrating subsidies on those who need them most, the United States would finally be able to tell its young people that no qualified student who wants to go to college need be barred by lack of money.

In looking at the complex ties between institutions of higher education and the Federal government, this Administration concluded that for three decades now the Federal government has been hiring universities to do work it wanted done. The time has come for the Federal government to help academic communities to pursue excellence and reform in fields of their own choosing as well, and by means of their own choosing. Accordingly, I asked Congress to create a *National Foundation for Higher Education*, to be funded initially at $200 million a year, and to be guided in its policies by a Board representative of the general public as well as the higher education community itself. In creating this Foundation, it would also be possible to consolidate a series of narrow categorical programs that have long distorted the needs and wishes of our colleges and universities.

It would be naive to ignore the all-too-apparent fact that higher education may not be as popular in the United States as formerly. There has been a serious loss of faith in our universities, not least within the institutions themselves. The specter of "student unrest"—and the alleged political consequences of appearing to reward disruptive students and faculty—has tended to paralyze efforts in this field. But it is too easy to do nothing, to let our dismay over the behavior of individual persons and institutions prevent us from sustaining and reforming our long-range investment in education. This is the time to move beyond politics, to move even beyond our individual sentiments, and to take the bold steps that alone can assure the continuation of excellence and the opening of opportunity in American higher education. I therefore urge the Congress to look again at the *Higher Education Opportunity Act* that I submitted, to understand the Administration's complete openness to responsible amendments, and to join with me in moving together on behalf of our young people.

URBAN AFFAIRS

In my October 1969 message I also asked the Congress to enact an *Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act*. This measure will provide the nation's deteriorating public transportation system an unprecedented measure of public support. In the six year period that ended in June of this year, the Federal government provided only $800 million to aid the public transit industry. The Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act would provide for a program that is four times greater over the next five years, and altogether totals $10 billion over the next twelve years. Both the Senate and the House have been actively concerned with this legislation, and a reasonably similar bill has passed the Senate. But I am still waiting for a sound bill for signature.

Beyond this, the Administration has sent to the Congress a wide range of legislation dealing with transportation—including highway authorization and user charges, railroad safety, and emergency transportation assistance.

The *Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970* is a measure of comparable importance. The object of the bill is to reform the primary Federal housing programs in such a way as to markedly increase their effectiveness in stimulating the production of housing for families of low, moderate, and middle income. The improvements take the form of simplifying, consolidating, and making consistent the numerous programs now on the books. There are now more than 50 narrowly conceived programs in the Federal Housing Administration which would be reduced to eight basic programs with sufficient flexibility to meet widely varying needs. The various subsidized housing programs would be combined into three basic programs, each providing the same level of subsidy to families in similar circumstances. This measure is urgently needed if Federal housing programs are to be made effective and equitable. Unfortunately, although hearings have been held in both the House and the Senate, neither body has acted.

The Congress did enact the vitally-needed *Emergency Home Finance Act*, and the Department of HUD launched its creative "Operation Breakthrough" applying new technology to housing. But basic reform is necessary to help move these forward steps toward the goal.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

In a Message to the Congress at the end of October last year I proposed a comprehensive program of consumer protection, involving eighteen recommendations for the advancement of consumer interests. Five bills were subsequently introduced, embodying eleven of these recommendations requiring legislative action. The *Consumer Representation Act* provides for the establishment of an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Division in the Department of Justice. The *Consumer Protection Act* would broaden the powers of the Federal Trade Commission in the field of consumer protection, and would create for the first time on a national basis a cause of action in Federal courts in cases of unfair and deceptive practices without regard to the amount in controversy. The *Consumer Product Testing Act* would promote the development of adequate and reliable methods of testing characteristics of consumer products. The *Drug Identification Act* and the *Consumer Warranty Act* would provide important new standards in their respective areas.

Almost a year has passed. Not one of these bills, except for a modified warranty bill passed by the Senate, has been acted on by either body of the Congress.

EMPLOYEE WELFARE AND PUBLIC INTEREST PROTECTION

In a Message to Congress on August 6, 1969, on the subject of *Occupational Safety and Health* I proposed the establishment of a comprehensive Federal occupational safety and health program. It does not exaggerate to declare that such a program ought to have become Federal law three generations ago. This was not done, and three generations of American workers have paid for it. I proposed legislation to create a Presidentially-appointed independent *Occupational Safety and Health Board* to promulgate standards on a national basis, and to provide broad powers of enforcement by the Secretary of Labor. Unaccountably, this urgent legislation has not been enacted.

On March 13, 1970 I proposed the *Employee Benefits Protection Act* which would broaden and strengthen the provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plan Disclosure Act. This proposal has received wide endorsement from labor and management groups which would be affected by it, but Congress to date has not acted.

In August, 1969, the Administration's proposed *Equal Employment Opportunity Enforcement Act* was introduced in the Senate and the House. Unfortunately, in the thirteen months that have passed, neither House has acted to provide these powers necessary to improve the effectiveness of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

On February 27 of this year I proposed to Congress the *Emergency Public Interest Protection Act* which would add important new procedures to the emergency disputes provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. In addition, I proposed the establishment of a *National Special Industries Commission* to conduct a wide ranging study of labor relations in industries which are particularly vulnerable to national emergency disputes. Again, Congress has not acted.

CREATING THE CONDITIONS OF THE FUTURE

The first task of government in the post-industrial age, as I have stated, is that of reforming the institutions of the past. The second task is that of creating the conditions of the future. The fundamental fact is that of choice. We can choose to debase the physical environment in which we live, and with it the human society that depends on that environment, or we can choose to come to terms with nature, to make amends for the past, and build the basis for a balanced and responsible future.

The most neglected and the most rapidly deteriorating aspect of our national life is the environment in which we live. In my State of the Union Message last January, I promised to arrest that decline and begin to revive our habitat. In the eight months that have followed, the Administration has proposed a program that fulfills that promise, the most comprehensive and costly program in this field in America's history. During the same period, the Administration has taken a series of executive actions aimed at the same goals. But the Congress has not yet seen fit to take final action on any of our legislative proposals. If it was not evident before, it must surely now be apparent to anyone who lived through the grim smog and pollution that gripped the Eastern Seaboard in late July, that prompt and vigorous action is necessary if our lives and those of our children are not to be blighted by *preventable and curable* environmental deterioration.

As my first official act of the decade, on January first I signed into law the *National Environmental Policy Act* establishing the *Council on Environmental Quality*. The Council is charged with analyzing important environmental conditions and trends, making a thorough review of all Federal programs which affect the environment, and recommending policies for protecting and improving the quality of the environment.

On July 9 I sent to the Congress a reorganization plan which would establish an *Environmental Protection Agency*, consolidating the major environmental pollution standard setting responsibilities of the Federal government together with certain related research, enforcement and abatement programs. At the same time I proposed formation of the *National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration* within the Department of Commerce to consolidate Federal programs for monitoring and understanding the environment. Among other things, this would provide better coordination and direction of our oceanic programs.

Responsibility for anti-pollution programs is now fragmented among several Departments and agencies, thus weakening our overall Federal effort. Air pollution, water pollution and solid wastes are different forms of a single problem, and it becomes increasingly evident that broad systems approaches are going to be needed to bring our pollution problems under control. The reorganization would give unified direction to our war on pollution and provide a stronger organizational base for our stepped-up effort.

On February 10 of this year, I sent to the Congress a special message on the environment. This presented a 37-point action program, with special emphasis on strengthening our fight against water and air pollution.

In the field of water pollution, my major legislative recommendations included:

—Authorization of $4 billion to cover the Federal share of a $10 billion program to provide expanded municipal waste treatment facilities.

—Establishment of an *Environmental Financing Authority* to help finance the local share of treatment plant costs.

—Reform of the rigid formula by which funds are allocated under the treatment grant programs.

—Greatly strengthened enforcement authority, including provisions for court-imposed fines of up to $10,000 a day for violations.

The Senate has held hearings on the water pollution proposals, but has taken no floor action. The House has not even held hearings.

Among my major legislative recommendations for the control of air pollution were:

—More stringent procedures for reducing pollution from motor vehicles.

—Establishment of national air quality standards.

—Establishment of national emissions standards for pollutants from stationary sources.

—A major strengthening of enforcement procedures, including extension of Federal air pollution control authority to both inter- and intra-state situations and provision for fines of up to $10,000 a day for violators.

While the House passed these proposals in June, the legislation has not yet been reported to the Senate for floor action.

In addition, the message spelled out 14 separate measures I was taking by administrative action or Executive Order. These included such wide-ranging initiatives as launching an extensive Federal research and development program in unconventionally-powered, low-pollution vehicles, requiring the development of comprehensive river basin plans for water pollution control, re-directing research on solid waste management to place greater emphasis on re-cycling and re-use, and the esablishment of a *Property Review Board* to recommend specific Federal properties which should be converted to other high priority uses including conversion to parklands, or sold.

I again urge the Congress to act soon and favorably on the legislative proposals contained in that message. They are vital to our growing effort to protect and improve our environment.

On February 4, I issued an Executive Order directing a prompt clean-up of air and water pollution caused by Federal facilities. This task is well underway. As I said then, the Federal government should set an example for the rest of the country. We are doing so.

On April 15, I sent a message to the Congress requesting legislation that would, if enacted, bring to an end the dumping of dredged spoils into the Great Lakes as soon as disposal sites are available. Neither the House nor the Senate has even held hearings on this bill.

On May 20, I submitted to the Congress two treaties and amendments to another treaty dealing with the prevention of oil spills. At that time, I also submitted a comprehensive *Ports and Waterways Safety Act* to aid further in attacking the causes of oil pollution. Although Senate hearings have been initiated on one of the treaties, Congressional action on these important measures remains uncompleted.

On May 23, I announced that the United States would propose a new treaty placing the natural resources of the deep seabed beyond the 200 meter depth under international regulation.

On June 1st, a revised National Contingency Plan for dealing with oil spills was announced at my direction by the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality.

On June 11, I sent a message to the Congress requesting the enactment of legislation cancelling twenty Federal oil leases for off-shore drilling which had been granted in 1968 in the Santa Barbara Channel, and creating a Marine Sanctuary. The Senate has held hearings but taken no floor action. The House has not even held hearings, this despite the fact that oil spillages near our beaches and shores may be the single most offensive and reprehensible assault on the environment that we have yet witnessed.

To repeat, the most comprehensive and costly program of environmental control in the history of the Nation is now before the Congress. The clock is running. We dare not be too late.

THE CHALLENGES OF CHANGE

In a review such as this, extended as it is, not all of the important measures proposed by my Administration and still pending before the Congress could be discussed. Some others must be mentioned—the legislation to reform the Federal government's relationship to the American Indians, to enhance the role of public broadcasting, to limit the operations of one-bank holding companies. Of crucial importance also are the revenue-producing measures proposed but not acted upon—including the extension of

certain excise taxes, the acceleration of collection of gift and estate taxes, the stockpile disposal bills, the proposed *Postal Revenue Act*, and a special tax on the lead used in gasoline—which are so necessary to the maintenance of a sound fiscal position. Legislation is also needed to establish a realistic and effective farm program.

I have sought here to describe the issues of substance and of process which confront us at this time, setting them in the framework of a general approach to government as we come to the end of one era of social policy and begin the grand adventure of another.

For I believe the nation to have moved into a new era. I believe further that this view is shared by commentators and analysts of widely varying political positions. It is a view increasingly voiced by political leaders. It has become a matter of increasing public perception, and in measure, common acceptance.

The era upon which we are entered is not so easily defined as it is perceived. But it is not on those grounds any less real. To the contrary, the emergence of a post-industrial society is the dominant social reality of the present moment. Our task is to understand, and to respond to these changed circumstances.

The problems of this new era surround the question of choice: what kind of life would we live; what kind of society would we have? Growth becomes less of a goal and more of an issue. What kind of growth? For what purposes? With what consequences?

Our present problems in large degree arise from the failure to anticipate the consequences of our past successes. It is the fundamental thrust of technological change to change society as well. The fundamental task of government in the era now past was to somehow keep abreast of such change, and respond to it. The task of government in the future will be to anticipate change: to prevent it where clearly nothing is to be gained; to prepare for it when on balance the effects are to be desired; and above all to build into the technology an increasing degree of understanding of its impact on human society. With this in mind, the *National Commission on Productivity*, which I recently appointed, will be evaluating the impact of technology and other factors related to achieving higher levels of productivity vital to the healthy growth of our economy.

What is true of technology is equally true of government. It must become more self-aware, self-examining, self-correcting. There are amends to make and promises to keep that will engage our energies for years to come. But most of all there is a great adventure to be lived. For a period in the not distant past it might have seemed that American society was faltering. It may have been. But we have steadied now. We are regaining a sense of balance, of direction, and of forward thrust. This has been the achievement of the people. The measure of government—the challenge to government—is to sustain that movement.

This challenge is now before the Congress. It is a challenge not merely to the men who now hold office there but to the institution itself. Congress has not been spared the attacks on the institutions of American democracy which have increasingly characterized this period of our history.

There is but one answer to such charges, and that is to respond with energy and good faith to the legislative issues before it.

It is the responsibility of the President to take the initiative in such matters, and I have done so. A legislative program that will mark this era in history has been presented, and is ready for enactment. More is at stake than the issues with which that legislation deals, transcendent as some of these may be. More is at stake than the reputation of one political party or another for legislative wisdom or political courage. What is at stake is the good repute of American government at a time when the charge that our system cannot work is hurled with fury and anger by men whose greatest fear is that it will.

Matters press, we cannot wait for politics. We must seek a record of achievement all can share. It may be that none of us knows how fateful the outcome will prove.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 11, 1970.*

THE STRANGE POLLUTION ARITHMETIC OF PRESIDENT NIXON

(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, President Nixon cannot make up his mind—one month, he is all for fighting pollution; the next month, he decides it is all too costly, and says we must give up the fight in the name of fiscal integrity.

In the midst of reprinting the text of presidential campaign documents, I hope the press will find space somewhere to point out the inconsistencies and incongruities of the President's shifting position on pollution. Last Friday, as part of "Campaign 70," the President sent up a message citing the Congress for failing to act on various measures. During the course of his lengthy dissertation, the President patted himself on the back for legislation authorizing $4 billion of Federal funds to help pay for expanded municipal waste treatment facilities.

To many, and this apparently includes most of the Nation's press, President Nixon's statement makes it appear that this administration is willing to spend whatever is necessary to end pollution and to prevent the dumping of raw sewage in our streams and lakes.

However, this is the same President who exactly 1 month earlier—August 11, 1970—blasted the Congress for voting $500 million to help local communities build water and sewer facilities. This is the same President who went on national television to veto these funds for water and sewer facilities.

On August 11, President Nixon attacks the Congress for voting funds for water and sewer facilities. On September 11, the President attacks Congress for failing to vote more funds for water and sewer facilities.

On August 11, the President sent a message up telling the Congress:

> I flatly refuse to go along with the kind of big spending that is wrong for all of the American people.

On September 11, the President faced the other direction and pronounced:

> To repeat, the most comprehensive and costly program of environmental control in the history of the nation is now before the Congress. The clock is running. We dare not be too late.

What will he do for October 11?

Mr. Speaker, the President's inconsistencies on our environmental problems only serve to illustrate the pure political nature of his attack on the Congress last Friday. I am sure that many of President Nixon's advisers are totally disinterested in the problems of pollution and it was easy for them to forget that this same President had already delivered a crushing blow to the very programs he now claims to be promoting.

Actually, the President's message is more significant for the omissions than it is for substantive legislative issues mentioned. Many of the major issues that have come before the Banking and Currency Committee were strangely omitted from the President's list of priorities. These include measures in the area of banking reform, control of organized crime, consumer protection, and housing.

After seeing the President's message, I wrote him calling his attention to the omissions and asking that he clarify his position on these essential legislative matters. I place in the RECORD a copy of my letter to President Nixon:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
September 12, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

In a spirit of legislative cooperation, I urge you in the strongest terms to correct the serious omissions in your message to Congress on Friday. Mr. President, these omissions, which have not gone unnoticed among Washington's army of lobbyists, will deal a serious blow to essential legislation to bring about banking reform, control of organized crime and consumer protection.

In a sweeping message covering dozens of pieces of legislation and thousands of words, it is startling that there is no mention of the legislation to bring one-bank holding companies under regulation. As you know, this legislation is the most important banking legislation to come before the Congress since the early 1930's and its outcome will determine the economic structure of this nation for years to come. This measure has passed the House and the issue is before the Senate this very next week. It is amazing that on the eve of this important legislative decision, your all-encompassing message completely omits mention of bank holding companies.

This omission, Mr. President, must have heartened the big bank lobbyists who have descended on Washington in record numbers and who are now holed up in hotel suites awaiting the opening gun in the Senate battle over this legislation.

The failure to mention this legislation appears to be such a massive switch in position by an Administration that has constantly reassured the public and the Congress that it was seriously interested in meaningful regu-

lation of these giant conglomerates and against the tremendous economic concentration they represent. Mr. President, many of us in the Congress have depended on your words of March 24, 1969, when you told the House and Senate:

"Legislation in this area is important because there has been a disturbing trend in the past year toward erosion of the traditional separation of powers between the suppliers of money—the banks—and the users of money—commerce and industry.

"Left unchecked, the trend toward the combining of banking and business could lead to the formation of a relatively small number of power centers dominating the American economy. This must not be permitted to happen; it would be bad for banking, bad for business, and bad for borrowers and consumers.

"To protect competition and the separation of economic powers, I strongly endorse the extension of Federal regulation to one-bank holding companies and urge the Congress to take prompt and appropriate action."

What has happened that now causes you to downgrade this essential measure? I hope you will clarify your position before the Senate takes up this legislation next week.

Likewise, I was amazed that your message contained no mention of the Congress' efforts to control the use of secret foreign bank accounts for illegal purposes. As you know these secret numbered accounts are the very lifeblood of nearly all the organized crime that is carried on in this nation. Law enforcement experts everywhere agree that the control of the use of these accounts by U.S. citizens will be one of the most serious blows that can be dealt against organized crime.

Some of the crime that would be controlled under this legislation is what popularly known as "white collar and Wall Street" style crime, and I hope that this fact did not cause any of your advisors to leave out mention of this bill in your message.

Mr. President, after a long struggle and many difficulties created by shifting positions of your people in the Treasury Department, we passed the secret foreign bank account bill in the House and it now awaits action in the Senate. I hope you will see fit to support this as a major fight against crime.

Your message contains a section entitled, "Consumer Protection," but for some reason leaves out mention of the "Fair Credit Reporting" legislation. This legislation, of course, would give the American consumer protection against the improper use of credit information, and gives him recourse against malicious and careless defamation of his character. This is a serious problem and in many cases credit-worthy consumers have been denied needed credit and even lost employment because of the improper and careless use of information collected by credit reporting agencies. Your support is greatly needed to get enactment of this measure.

I am happy to see your recognition of the need for housing and urban development legislation and I hope this now means that your Administration will be supporting the New Towns measure which has been reported out of the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee over solid Republican opposition. As you know, the Administration this year sent up a limited bill, primarily designed to recodify existing law and extend existing housing programs. The Democrats in Congress felt this would be totally inadequate in face of the mounting housing and urban problems. As a result, the Democrats in both Houses have introduced new measures in these areas and I hope that they will have your support and that you will do whatever possible to diminish opposition from within your party in the Congress.

Enactment of good housing and urban development legislation of course has been made much more difficult by your veto of funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development last month. Without question, your veto has created great confusion about housing legislation and has resulted in a serious delay in these programs. Your veto eliminated funds for urban development and for critically needed water and sewer facilities. This veto has strengthened the hands of those who have always opposed such legislation, but I hope that your vetoes will not have resulted in a loss of good housing legislation in the 91st Congress.

Your message mentions environmental problems in several instances, but the greatest blow at programs to deal with pollution came when your veto eliminated the money needed to help local communities build water and sewer facilities. What assurance does the Congress have that additional legislation voted in this area will not be vetoed? In all candor, Mr. President, you have created the great delay in dealing with these problems.

Once again, I am gravely disappointed by the failure of your message to give recognition to the American people's deep concern about high interest rates and their destructive effect on the economy. The Congress, in Public Law 91–151, gave you wide powers to control interest rates—to roll them back—and to see that credit was allocated to areas where it was needed the most and away from inflationary sectors. You have not used the power although I am convinced that a tremendous majority of the American people want lower interest rates.

To many, it may seem strange that a President would send forward a message chiding the Congress about legislative action when the President has not used laws which this same Congress has already put on the books to correct serious economic problems.

Mr. President, I respectfully urge you to review your message and send forward a new communique indicating your support of essential legislation.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

U.S. INCREASED PARTICIPATION IN FOUR MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. N. 91–383)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 11, 1970.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is now pending before the House a bill of vital importance to the international economic and financial interests of the United States. H.R. 18306 authorizes increased U.S. participation in four multilateral financial institutions: The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank.

We and many other nations have given these institutions strong support in the past. They have earned this support by using their resources well in the service of a growing and prosperous world economy, a more stable international monetary system, and a more rapid growth of the developing countries. Their hallmark is shared contributions, impartial expertise, and the assurance of high standards of economic performance.

In asking the Congress to adopt this legislation, I have taken particular care to see that the financial obligations it entails are compatible with this Administration's fiscal programing. H.R. 18306 is a prudent and financially responsible combination of contingent liabilities, monetary transactions and expenditures carefully spaced over a long period of time.

A large part—almost $900 million—of the total authorization represents contingent liabilities and will enable the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank to borrow further in private markets to carry out important parts of their lending programs. This guarantee or callable capital subscription should not involve budgetary costs.

Another substantial portion of the authorization—$1.5 billion—is a monetary transaction involving an increase in our IMF quota. This Fund quota increase will not result in budegtary costs.

As to the remaining authorizations in H.R. 18306, less than $1.3 billion will require an actual expenditure of dollars; of which $35 million will be spent in fiscal year 1971, $70 million in fiscal year 1972 and $155 million in fiscal year 1973, with the rest spread out over a number of additional years.

Passage of the legislation is essential

—to maintain United States leadership in international monetary affairs and to avoid a substantial and continuing loss in our share of allocations of Special Drawing Rights beginning on January 1, 1971;

—to enable other countries to subscribe to almost $2 billion of World Bank capital stock and to carry out a policy of maintaining equity in Bank and Fund subscription which we have strongly advocated in the past;

—to allow us to participate with other developed countries in the peaceful development in Asia;

—to join with our Latin American neighbors in an effort to speed economic and social progress.

This legislation has my full support. I believe that the national interest will be served by passage of H.R. 18306, and I strongly urge prompt and favorable action by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

THE LATE JOHN A. McELVENEY

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, my beloved mother many times used an expression, "Here today and away tomorrow; be prepared."

On Thursday last when this House adjourned shortly after 8 o'clock in the evening, there sat in his usual seat in the third row on the right Jack McElveney. You will remember that Jack McElveney was the immaculately neat, always cheerful and pleasant gentleman who has been with us for many, many years. He first became an employee of

the House of Representatives 49 years ago, on March 4, 1921.

On Saturday afternoon Jack suddenly was away from us, and it now becomes my sad duty today to announce his sudden passing.

His remains are at Gawler's Funeral Home on Wisconsin Avenue and may be viewed from 9 o'clock tomorrow morning until 10 o'clock tomorrow night. The family, including his two brothers, will be present from 2 to 4 tomorrow afternoon and from 7 to 9 in the evening.

A Solemn Requiem Mass for the repose of Jack's soul will be said on Wednesday, September 16, at St. Joseph's Church, Second and C Streets NE., at 11 a.m.

I might remind those of us who came here in recent years that Jack McElveney in years gone by was an aide to such men as James M. Mead before he was elected a Member of the other body, while he was a Member of the House of Representatives from Buffalo, N.Y.; by the late Representative Peter Gansevoort Ten Eyck of Albany, N.Y., and by the late Representative Parker Corning of Albany, N.Y. He also served as the bill clerk of the House.

I know that he will be missed by his many friends among the membership and personnel of the House. May God have mercy on his soul.

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

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to learn of the death of our amiable assistant bills clerk, Jack McElveney. As many of us know, Jack used to occupy almost habitually the aisle seat nearest the Democratic entrance in the third row. There was hardly a legislative day that went by in the last 8 years that I did not sit next to him, as we talked about "kings and cabbages," but mostly about politics and Hawaii. He meticulously clipped out news articles about Hawaii that he had come across in his reading of the New York Times, the Washington Post, or the Washington Evening Star. We talked about the Congress and Members of Congress of earlier days. I sat there beside him and listened to his fabulous anecdotes. I was fascinated by his expertise on horses. I am truly going to miss Jack. As I try now to analyze why it was that I felt so close to Jack McElveney, I find my reasoning leading me to the conclusion that we had something very strong in common—a great love for this House of Representatives.

Perhaps many do not know, Mr. Speaker, that Jack McElveney had retired several years ago and that since then he was in attendance every day in this Chamber out of love for this body, and performed his usual tasks without compensation, other than his retirement pay. He would have reached his 78th birthday next month.

Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY) in grieving over the loss of a dear and beloved friend.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to his brothers, Dan and Leo, and other members of his family.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, upon entering the House Chamber this noon, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the sudden passing of John A. B. "Jack" McElveney.

His usual cheerful and sincere greeting as well as the interesting anecdotes and stories about his past experiences will be sorely missed. He served the Congress in both the Senate and House for 42 years and it was obvious that he enjoyed his work and his association with the House of Representatives.

He would offer his services and assistance without hesitation. On innumerable occasions when he was asked the status of bills on the calendar, the action taken on certain legislation, the record vote outcome on bills, the information was always available and accurately reported to the Members.

At the close of business last Thursday, as was his usual custom, he said to me:

> Congressman, are you going to Wisconsin this weekend?

He followed his query with the admonition:

> Take it easy—don't work too hard. Have a good weekend here or in your wonderful Wisconsin.

Little did we realize that those were to be his last words to me. To his family and to his many friends I extend my sincere condolences.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks with regard to the passing of the late beloved Jack McElveney.

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

There was no objection.

FILING OF DISCHARGE PETITION ON H.R. 18279, THE ORGANIZED CRIME CONTROL ACT OF 1970

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a petition to discharge House Resolution 1169 which will provide for 4 hours general debate on H.R. 18279, which is essentially and substantially the same as S. 30, that passed the other body in January of this year.

During the recess in conversation with my constituents I found one of the subjects most on the minds of people in my district was crime and student unrest. I found there was as much concern about these matters as about inflation, unemployment, and the condition of the economy.

If there should be any reluctance on the part of Members to sign a discharge petition because it might circumvent ordinary parliamentary procedures, I think we should remember that for a long while now certain criminal elements in this country have been regularly and continuously circumventing the property rights and personal rights of our law-abiding citizens.

Let me emphasize that those Members who do see fit to sign this petition are in effect saying to their constituents they are trying to do something about crime. By signing the discharge petition they are putting themselves squarely on record that they are determined to pass a comprehensive crime bill before we go home this fall. We can accomplish this objective if sufficient signatures are obtained on the discharge petition.

I invite Members on both sides of the aisle to sign this petition. This is not a partisan matter. I plan to renew this invitation frequently during the remainder of this session.

REMARKS BY DOROTHY ELSTON, TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, for the record, the venom in high places in this administration has filtered down to the Treasurer of the United States, Dorothy Elston, who in Indianapolis on this past weekend found it possible to describe our late President, John F. Kennedy, as a "horrible misfit in the Presidency."

You expect that kind of talk from some people in our society, but have we not had enough hate in high places? President Lincoln said:

> I have no malice in my heart for any man. What I deal in is too vast for malice.

AIR PIRACY MUST BE STOPPED

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

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I heartily applaud the announcement by President Nixon last Friday of the steps this Nation is taking to deal with the terrible menace of air piracy to which this Nation and the world have been subjected in the last few days. The United States, in order to protect its citizens and other passengers on U.S. airlines, must act forthrightly and decisively. I have long contended that armed guards should be placed on certain flights. We must do everything in our power to prevent air piracy and hijackings. Undoubtedly, armed security personnel on our planes will help.

In my view, however, it will be easier to deter such crimes than to prevent them. It is imperative that all nations agree to extradite or punish air pirates. These modern-day freebooters must have no hope of finding a safe haven after their attacks on international commerce. Where ever they land, air pirates should know that they face swift and sure justice.

Until those nations of the world which harbor air pirates and refuse to punish them or extradite them are ready to meet their international responsibilities, U.S.-flag air carriers should be prevented from landing in those countries. In fact, I would urge we go a step further. A total quarantine by all international airlines should be imposed upon any nation which refuses to deal speedily and effectively with air pirates. Taking scores of innocent people hostage for political

purposes is an act of the most heinous nature and should be dealt with as such.

Civilized people the world over are becoming sick and tired of violence—violence in the streets—violence on the campuses—violence in the skies. Of all these crimes, none is more repulsive than air piracy. It must be stopped.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S MESSAGE OF SEPTEMBER 11 TO THE CONGRESS

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the political experts and the campaign managers of both parties are pointing to a very disturbing factor in this off-year election; that is, voter apathy. Even though the country is wracked with dissension, and the issues are many, the voters do not seem to care if they go to the polls in November or not. A principal reason for that apathy, Mr. Speaker, may well be that the electorate has lost faith in the powers of Congress to accomplish anything definitive. President Nixon stresses this mistrust and loss of confidence in his message to the Congress last Friday. The President said:

> More is at stake than the reputation of one political party or another for legislative wisdom or political courage . . . what is at stake is the good repute of the American government at a time when the charge that our system cannot work is hurled with fury and anger by men whose greatest fear is that it will.

The White House message listed 16 broad categories and more than two score specific measures Congress has failed to act on, and they include social security reform, draft reform, electoral reform, the crime bills, consumer protection, and the family assistance program.

I can state, here and now, that the bulk of that legislation has been held up by Democrats, whose only purpose appears to be obstructionism. The Democrats have stalled all of those vital measures of the Nixon administration for the unannounced but obvious reason of pure partisanship. Stripped of leadership, trying to edge away from their past concessions to the ultraliberals, this party tries to compensate for its weakness by manipulating Congress. The President's message is without rancor, but it clearly indicates his concern with a so-called loyal opposition that seems to put the best interests of the party ahead of their country.

THERE IS STILL TIME TO SALVAGE A PROGRESSIVE RECORD FOR THE 91ST CONGRESS

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has sent to Congress a damning dossier on Democratic dalliance, an exposé of the formula of failure that has characterized too much of the tenure of the 91st Congress.

I cannot discern what political gains the majority Members of the House envision from their policies of becoming roadblocks in the path of progress. I believe the American people asked for answers when they changed the party leadership at the White House in 1968, and they will be embarking on the same quest when they change party leadership in the House in November. The President has shown a willingness to tackle problems. The leadership of this Congress has shown an unwillingness to shoulder responsibility, a perverse partisanship, but a willingness to sacrifice the Nation's good on the altar of political gimmickery.

It is notable that Democrat National Chairman Lawrence O'Brien last Thursday charged that President Nixon is a "do-nothing" President. It stretches everyone's credulity to hear such a charge when a wagonload of bills awaits action—sent to Congress by the President, but sat on by the Demo-leadership in the House.

There is still time to salvage a remnant of progressive record for the 91st Congress, and I would hope that, if only in self-defense, some of the thinking Members on the other side of the aisle would don their work shoes and help us get some of this legislation on the books.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first measure on the Consent Calendar.

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

PREVENTING UNAUTHORIZED MANUFACTURE AND USE OF CHARACTER "JOHNNY HORIZON"

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3838) to prevent the unauthorized manufacture and use of the character "Johnny Horizon," and for other purposes.

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

S. 3838

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior may establish and collect use or royalty fees for the manufacture, reproduction, or use of the character "Johnny Horizon," originated by the Bureau of Land Management and announced in the July 3, 1968, issue of the Federal Register (33 Federal Register 9677) as the official symbol for a public service antilitter program to maintain the beauty and utility of the Nation's public lands.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall deposit into a special account all fees collected pursuant to this Act. Such fees are hereby made available for obligation and expenditure for the purpose of furthering nationwide antilitter campaigns.

SEC. 3. Chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding a new section to be known as section 714, as follows:

"§ 714. 'Johnny Horizon' character or name

"As used in this Act, the name or character 'Johnny Horizon,' means the representation of a tall, lean man, with strong facial features, who wears slacks and sport shirt buttoned to the collar (both green, when colored), no tie, a field jacket (red, when colored), boot-type shoes (brown, when colored) and who carries a backpack, which was originated by the Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior, as the official symbol for a public service antilitter program to maintain the beauty and utility of the Nation's public lands.

"Whoever, except as authorized under rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior, knowingly manufactures, reproduces, or use the character 'Johnny Horizon', or any facsimile thereof, or the name 'Johnny Horizon' as a trade name or mark, or in such a manner as suggests the character 'Johnny Horizon', so that such use is likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive, shall be fined not more than $250 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

"This section shall not make unlawful the use of any such emblem, sign, insignia, or words which was lawful on the date of enactment of this Act.

"A violation of this section may be enjoined at the suit of the United States attorney, upon complaint by the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 4. The analysis of chapter 33 immediately preceding section 701 of title 18 is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"714. 'Johnny Horizon' character or name."

SEC. 5. The rights in the name and character "Johnny Horizon" shall terminate if the use by the Secretary of the Interior of the name and character "Johnny Horizon" is abandoned. Nonuse for a period of two years shall constitute abandonment.

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

AMENDING THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949 TO PERMIT ROTATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 406) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the rotation of certain property whenever its remaining storage or shelf life is too short to justify its retention, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone conversant with this bill what happens to stocks that may be sold in foreign countries? Are those stocks sold to foreigners? What happens to them?

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

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

There was no objection.

RELEASING THE CONDITIONS IN DEED TO LAND HERETOFORE CONVEYED BY THE UNITED STATES TO THE SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1366) to release the conditions in a deed with respect to a certain portion of the land heretofore conveyed by the United States to the Salt Lake City Corporation.

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

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

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to me on that or, rather, let me ask him if there is anything I can tell him about the Salt Lake City bill which will clarify the matter for him. It is a very noncontroversial Senate bill.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield to me?

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

Mr. HALL. I will say, first of all, there is a statement by the Department of the Interior that the action has already been taken and hence this legislation is unneeded. Second, the request for putting over without prejudice is by request insofar as the gentleman from Missouri is concerned. Inasmuch as the action has been taken, the gentleman now has the time, and I will give him any more information I have, if he will continue to yield, but that is the legislative situation.

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

There was no objection.

ALLOWING PURCHASE OF ADDITIONAL SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT FOR PASSENGER MOTOR VEHICLES OVER AND ABOVE STATUTORY PRICE LIMITATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2763) to allow the purchase of additional systems and equipment for passenger motor vehicles over and above the statutory price limitation.

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

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATOR TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS FOR JANITORIAL SERVICES, TRASH REMOVAL, AND SO FORTH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 17455) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts for janitorial services, trash removal, and similar services in federally owned and leased properties for periods not to exceed 3 years, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 17455

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection 210(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 490(a)), is further amended (1) by striking the semicolon after the word "owned" in paragraph (14) and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and (2) by adding the following new provision after the word "and" at the end of paragraph (14): "for janitorial services, trash removal, and similar services in federally owned and leased properties; and".

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

PROVIDING FOR ADDITION OF FREEMAN SCHOOL TO HOMESTEAD NATIONAL MONUMENT OF AMERICA, NEBR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3259) providing for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument of America in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 3259

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to further the interpertation and commemoration of the pioneer life of early settlers of the West, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation or purchase with donated or appropriated funds the following described lands and interests therein, on which is situted the old school building known as Freeman School:

Begining at the southeast corner of the southeast quarter of section 22, township 4 north, range 5 east, sixth principal meridian, Gage County, Nebraska, thence running north on the east line of the said quarter section 297 feet, thence west 214.5 feet, thence south 297 feet, thence east 214.5 feet to the point of begining.

The Secretary is further authorized, in order to protect the setting of the Freeman School, preserve an adequate visual relationship with the existing Homestead National Monument of America, and provide access to the school from the national monument, to acquire by any of the above methods such lands and interests therein, as he deems necessary within the areas in certain sections of township 4 north, range 5 east, sixth principal meridian, Gage County, Nebraska, which are described as follows:

Section 22, beginning at a point 297 feet north of the southeast corner of the southeast quarter on the east line of the said quarter section, thence north along the east line of the said quarter section 103 feet, thence west 300 feet, thence south 400 feet to the south line of said quarter section, thence east along the south line of said quarter section, 85.5 feet to the boundary of the Freeman School property, thence north along the boundary of the school property 297 feet, thence east along the boundary of the school property 214.5 feet to the point of beginning;

Section 23, the south 300 feet of the southwest quarter thereof;

Section 26, the north 300 feet of the northwest quarter northwest quarter thereof;

Section 27, beginning at the northeast corner of the northeast quarter, thence south along the east line of the said quarter section 300 feet, thence west 300 feet, thence north 300 feet to the north line of said quarter section, thence east along the north line of said quarter section 300 feet to the point of beginning; all containing about 31 acres.

SEC. 2. The property acquired pursuant to this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the Homestead National Monument of America, in accordance with the Act of March 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184), and the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, beginning on line 18, delete all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 3. For the purposes of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated not more than $50,000, of which not more than $45,000 (April 1970 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein shall be appropriated for the rehabilitation and development of the Freeman School."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3259 by our colleague from Nebraska (Mr. DENNEY) provides for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument in Nebraska.

Homestead National Monument was authorized by the Congress in 1936 as a memorial to the pioneers who settled and civilized the West. At this site—the place believed to be the first homestead in the country—visitors can visually relive the pioneer life at the homestead cabin of Daniel Freeman.

H.R. 3259 will add a new dimension to the historic character of the area by adding to it the Freeman Schoolhouse. The school is not within the existing monument grounds, but it is located nearby so that no large land acquisition program is necessary. The bill contemplates the purchase of protective easements for the corridor connecting the monument and the school grounds—not more than $5,000 is expected to be needed for this purpose—and the school building and the 1.2-acre tract upon which it is located is to be donated to the United States by the Homestead Historical Association.

Basically, the old school house is a sound structure, Mr. Speaker, but some repairs and restoration work will be needed. In addition, a parking lot, fence and interpretive devices are to be installed. Altogether, these improvements will involve an investment of about $45,000.

The committee recommends one amendment to the bill which merely places a ceiling on the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the acquisition and development program contemplated. As reported by the committee, expenditures will be limited to no more than $50,000.

Mr. Speaker, that briefly describes the nature and purpose of H.R. 3259, as recommended by the committee. The mem-

bers of the committee feel that the Freeman School will be a suitable addition to the existing Homestead National Monument and we urge the enactment of the bill.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument in the State of Nebraska.

This legislation should have special meaning for all those Americans who are interested in passing on to future generations important symbols of the early development of our country.

The bill would preserve a red brick schoolhouse that was built by Mr. Daniel Freeman, America's first homesteader under Lincoln's famous Homestead Act, for his own large family.

Constructed from handmade brick and measuring 36 feet by 20 feet, with walls 12 feet high, "the little red schoolhouse" was used as a place of education from 1872 through 1967—96 years. It is Nebraska's oldest, continually operated school.

The land on which it is situated is adjacent to the Homestead National Monument in Gage County, Nebr., established several years ago by Congress on the original Freeman property. Fortunately, the school is only one-fourth of a mile from the visitors' center, so it can easily be administered by the National Park Service in conjunction with existing facilities.

In fact, the National Park Service recommended in 1968 that the one-room schoolhouse be added to the monument grounds. In making its recommendations after a thorough study, the Park Service made these observations:

As a schoolhouse, it symbolizes the pioneers' determination to civilize the frontier and provide opportunities for the common man as soon as possible.

The one-room country school will soon be a thing of the past, and it seems appropriate that an example be preserved by the National Park Service.

The office of the Secretary of the Interior has also joined in support of this measure. Let me read briefly from a letter sent from his office late last year concerning the particulate of this legislation and their possible cost:

The parcels described . . . are: (1) The property now held by the Homestead Historical Association and an adjacent strip of road right-of-way owned by the State Highway Department, which together comprise 1.2 acres; and (2) a 600-foot-wide strip of land lying between the school and the present monument boundary, 300 feet on either side of the ¼ mile section of State Route 4 which separates the two, together with the protective strips adjacent to the monument boundary and the school property, altogether comprising about 31 acres. We expect that the former lands will be donated to the United States: as to the latter, we expect to acquire scenic easements, by donation or for nominal cost, which would protect the setting of the school and preserve an adequate visual relationship with the monument. Access to the school would be provided by the existing State Route 4. The estimated cost of acquiring scenic easements, which embrace parts of five ownerships, is not more than $5,000. The estimated cost of developing the school property, including rehabilitation of the school and constructing a parking facility, is approximately $45,000.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's Program.

A measure identical to this one was introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senators HRUSKA and CURTIS, and it passed that body last April 27.

The American educational system is today the best in the world. It is only fitting that we remind our fellow citizens, through the preservation of the Freeman School, how far we have come in so short a time period.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 58) providing for the addition of the Freeman School to the Homestead National Monument of America in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 58

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to further the interpretation and commemoration of the pioneer life of early settlers of the West, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by donation or purchase with donated or appropriated funds the following described lands and interests therein, on which is situated the old school building known as Freeman School:

Beginning at the southeast corner of the southeast quarter of section 22, township 4 north, range 5 east, sixth principal meridian, Gage County, Nebraska, thence running north on the east line of the said quarter section 297 feet, thence west 214.5 feet, thence south 297 feet, thence east 214.5 feet to the point of beginning.

The Secretary is further authorized, in order to protect the setting of the Freeman School, preserve an adequate visual relationship with the existing Homestead National Monument of America, and provide access to the school from the national monument, to acquire by any of the above methods such lands and interests therein, as he deems necessary within the areas in certain sections of township 4 north, range 5 east, sixth principal meridian, Gage County, Nebraska, which are described as follows:

Section 22, beginning at a point 297 feet north of the southeast corner of the southeast quarter on the east line of the said quarter section, thence north along the east line of the said quarter section 103 feet, thence west 300 feet, thence south 400 feet to the south line of said quarter section, thence east along the south line of said quarter section 85.5 feet to the boundary of the Freeman School property, thence north along the boundary of the school property 297 feet, thence east along the boundary of the school property 214.5 feet to the point of beginning;

Section 23, the south 300 feet of the southwest quarter thereof;

Section 26, the north 300 feet of the northwest quarter northwest quarter thereof; and

Section 27, beginning at the northeast corner of the northeast quarter, thence south along the east line of the said quarter section 300 feet, thence west 300 feet, thence north 300 feet to the north line of said quarter section, thence east along the north line of said quarter section 300 feet to the point of beginning; all containing about 31 acres.

SEC. 2. The property acquired pursuant to this Act shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior as part of the Homestead National Monument of America, in accordance with the Act of March 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1184), and the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.).

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 58 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3259, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 3259) was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO STUDY FEASIBILITY AND DESIRABILITY OF NATIONAL LAKESHORE ON LAKE TAHOE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2208) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility and desirability of a national lakeshore on Lake Tahoe in the States of Nevada and California, and for other purposes.

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

S. 2208

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to consider preserving appropriate segments of the lakeshore of Lake Tahoe and adjoining lands and waters in their natural condition for public outdoor recreation, the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall study, investigate, and formulate recommendations on the feasibility and desirability of establishing such areas as a national lakeshore. The Secretary shall consult with the Secretary of Agriculture; the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army; and any other interested Federal agencies, as well as the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and other State and local bodies and officials involved; and shall coordinate the study with applicable outdoor recreation plans, pollution control plans, highway plans, and other planning activities relating to the Lake Tahoe Basin. Federal departments and agencies are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such statistics, data, reports, and other material as the Secretary may deem necessary for purposes of the study.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress, within one year after the date of this Act, a report of his findings and recommendations. The report of the Secretary shall contain but not be limited to, findings with respect to—

(a) the scenic, scientific, historic, outdoor recreation, and natural values of the water, lakeshore, and related upland resources involved, including their use for driving for

pleasure, walking, hiking, riding, bicycling, boating, swimming, picnicking, camping, forest management, fish and wildlife management, scenic and historic site preservation, hunting, fishing, and winter sports;

(b) the potential alternative beneficial uses of the water, lakeshore, and related upland resources involved, taking into consideration appropriate uses of the land for residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, and transportation purposes, and for public services;

(c) the type of Federal, State, and local programs that are feasible and desirable in the public interest to preserve, develop, and make accessible for public use the values identified;

(d) the relationship of any recommended national lakeshore to existing or proposed Federal, State, and local programs to manage in the public interest the natural resources of the entire Lake Tahoe Basin.

SEC. 3. Pending submission of the report of the Secretary to the Congress, the heads of Federal agencies having administrative jurisdiction over the Federal lands within the area referred to in section 1 of this Act shall, consistent with the purposes for which the lands were acquired or set aside by the United States and to the extent authorized by law, encourage and provide maximum opportunities for the types of recreation use of such lands referred to in section 2(a) of this Act.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "Congress," and insert "President and the Congress of the United States,"

Page 3, line 7, strike out "and".

Page 3, line 11, strike out "Basin." and insert "Basin; and".

Page 3, following line 11, insert a new subsection (e) as follows:

"(e) alternative means of restoring and preserving the values inherent in the area under present ownership patterns."

Page 4, lines 1 and 2, strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert in lieu thereof "not more than $50,000".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, like H.R. 16977, which was cosponsored by Representatives WALTER BARING and HAROLD JOHNSON, S. 2208 is drafted to prompt a study of Lake Tahoe to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing a national lakeshore on its shoreline.

As every Member of this House knows, the Secretary of the Interior has general authority to make studies of this type and the Congress seldom plays any role in determining what areas are to be studied or when. Naturally, these studies play a part in our policymaking decisions because no legislative action is appropriate until basic background information is available.

S. 2208 authorizes and directs the Secretary to conduct a specific study on the Lake Tahoe shoreline within 1 year. The spokesman for the Department of the Interior indicated that this is a reasonable period of time to collect and prepare the information needed by the Congress to determine the best possible course of action.

Mr. Speaker, there is no other method available to the Congress to establish priorities and prerequisites for these studies. Whether we authorize them specifically or not, they require some investment of public funds. The only question is whether these moneys will be used to compile information on areas which the Congress wants studied or whether they will be used to study areas which the Department wishes to have considered.

EXPLANATION OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

Three substantive amendments are recommended by the committee:

The first is drafted to require the Secretary to transmit a report of his findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress simultaneously, within 1 year.

The second requires the study to include in its considerations the alternative of accomplishing the environmental objective without disrupting present ownership patterns.

The third limits the amount authorized to be appropriated to conduct the study to $50,000. It should be emphasized that this reflects the amount of money estimated to be needed by the Department.

The members of the committee feel that it is appropriate for Congress, in its wisdom, to give some guidance to the Secretary on matters such as these, from time to time. The Congress has approved study bills like S. 2208 for other areas when it felt such action warranted. In this instance, the committee feels that this study should be expedited. It is conceded that this area needs some attention. If the information suggests that a lakeshore would be desirable, then further legislative action may be taken, but until we have the basic information to make such a determination, no legislative action would be appropriate. For these reasons, I urge the enactment of S. 2208, as recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

POTOMAC VALLEY CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1179) granting the consent of Congress to amendments to the compact creating the Potomac Valley Conservancy District and establishing the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask someone what the cost of this legislation would be to the Federal Government?

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The 1940 compact imposed a $30,000 per year ceiling upon the total contribution of the four States and the District of Columbia to the support of the commission. The 1940 compact, authorized the United States, which is not a signatory party to contribute to the support of the commission, but without the monetary limitation imposed upon the signatories. Nevertheless, the amount of the U.S. contribution has been related to the amounts of the other contributions. Thus, in fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971 only $5,000 was appropriated each year by the Congress.

Because the $30,000 limit is no longer realistic as a total contribution for the four States and the District of Columbia the amendments simply remove the monetary ceiling on the signatory contributions. The amendments in no way affect the amounts the United States may contribute.

However, we have been assured that the amount of contribution required by Federal appropriations will not exceed $10,000.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the gentleman is saying there is going to be a 100-percent increase in the Federal Government's contribution to this compact between Virginia, Maryland, and how many other States?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

Mr. GROSS. Why should the Federal Government be involved in this expenditure at all? Why should not the District of Columbia and the States of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia take care of the costs of this commission or compact?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. At the present time it relates only to pollution. Now it will apply to all water resources development of this particular river and area between the States of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia, and West Virginia. Now, I do believe that the Federal Government has a vital interest in the pollution and water resources problems, and I think that if there is no more than $10,000 spent for this participation, that that is a very small sum for the Federal Government to participate in.

Mr. GROSS. As a matter of principle why is there an increase of $5,000? Can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is because they are broadening the scope of the compact here to consider all of the water resources problems, not just pollution.

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

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

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, as the bill now stands there is no restriction or limitation or reason in the law for the Federal Government to contribute anything. Now, as far as upping the contribution of the Federal Government to $10,000 in furtherance of pollution abatement control, and because of other increasing activities in these areas, there is a prospect that the Federal Government may increase its contribution, but it has no requirement to make the contribution.

Mr. GROSS. It does not have to make a contribution of any kind?

Mr. HARSHA. That is correct, under the existing law.

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

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

Mr. KYL. My colleague, of course, understands that the Federal Government has to get involved because the very nature of the interstate compact involves the Federal Government. There are some things the States among themselves cannot do without advice and direction from the Federal Government.

It is my opinion that in compacts of this nature the Federal Government has in fact saved a great deal of money and a great deal of time, because in interstate water compacts the Federal Government could—and in most cases has—assumed the total burden of all the research and development, and so on. Here the States themselves are trying to operate together.

Mr. GROSS. That is what the gentleman from Iowa hopes, and both the gentlemen from Iowa hope, that the States will assume their share of the burden, but I do not know whether they will. The gentleman from Iowa is well aware, I am sure, that there are other compacts between States in which the Federal Government is not involved, and I know of no good reason why these four States and the District of Columbia cannot take care of financing this compact themselves.

And I might say, in addition, that we get the doubtful pleasure of paying a part of the contribution of the District of Columbia to this compact. I am fearful, as the gentleman from Iowa and other Members of the House should be, that the Federal Government's partial involvement in this compact will eventually wind up with the Federal Government carrying the big end of the load for whatever is done with respect to the Potomac River, to which these States and the District of Columbia contribute heavily to its pollution.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, as this proposal is written at the present time it does not carry any obligation beyond this participation of the Federal Government. I share the concern of the gentleman about these matters, but if indeed the Federal Government is to contribute more, or if it is to become more deeply involved, it will require more and additional legislation later on. And I am sure the gentleman from Iowa will be here to protect the interests of the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa presently addressing the House has no sinecure on life I might be here today and gone tomorrow. This is the time when attention ought to be given to the commitment on down the road and into the future. I am not going to make a further issue of this, but I am fearful of what I see here.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 1179, which we bring to the floor today is of vital importance to the conservation of the water resources of the Potomac River Basin. The committee is unaware of any objection to this bill. House Joint Resolution 1179 would:

First, broaden the authority of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to include water resources and associated land resources. Its present authority is restricted to water pollution abatement.

Second, allow the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to cooperate, assist, and provide liaison for and among public and nonpublic agencies in the formulation and coordination of plans and programs for the protection and development of the water and associated land resources of the Potomac River Basin.

Third, provide for the establishment of sections of the commission for the purpose of dealing with problems of pollution and of water and associated land resources in specific areas which affect two or more, but not all signatory bodies.

Fourth, eliminates a provision in the original compact which limits the total contributions of the signatories to not over $30,000 annually. Although no limitation is stated in the amendments to the compact, there is a provision which contains a formula for pro rating contributions among the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, District of Columbia, and United States. One thing I would stress is that the amendments to the 1940 Potomac River Sanitation Compact which we have before us today should not be confused with the proposed Federal interstate compact which was developed in 1967 by the Potomac River Basin Committee. The proposed Federal interstate compact which is modeled after the existing Delaware River Basin compact is presently under review by the interested States and Federal agencies. Should the Advisory Committee's proposal be accepted by the States and the Congress at sometime in the future it would absorb the functions of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin with which House Joint Resolution 1179 is concerned.

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was established in 1941 by a compact among the States and District of Columbia following the grant of congressional consent thereto. As it was created the concern of the Commission was limited to the abatement and prevention of water pollution, and, in fact, its authority was limited strictly to making recommendations. In order to have its recommendations accepted it had to create a climate of mutual concern and cooperation among State agencies. Through the development of public interest the Commission was of service to the respective governing bodies in furthering the necessary activities required for pollution control.

The Commission's activities have produced commendable results in the control of water pollution, particularly in the light of the constraints which were placed upon it; however, with the increasing demand of the public for the proper development in conservation of our water resources and the enhancement of our total environment, the enactment of the proposed amendments would permit the Commission to provide the necessary coordination and leadership required for the best utilization of all the resources of the Potomac River Basin.

The current trend in providing adequate control measures for water, water pollution control, and related land resources is to attack the problems of a river basin as an entity through the development of comprehensive planning. This objective would be effectively carried out on the Potomac River Basin by this legislation. Congressional consent to the proposed amendments will permit the Commission to update its activities and to cope with the problems of today and to plan for the future.

During the committee's consideration of this legislation the Department of the Interior suggested certain changes in the compact. We have been able to accommodate their recommendations by withholding approval to article II(f)(2). The interested States and the District of Columbia have advised us through the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin that there is no objection to withholding of Federal consent to the provision and that the compact amendments would be effective without the need for any additional State legislation.

I wish to express my appreciation to the Chairman of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. FALLON) who introduced House Joint Resolution 1179, and who has been primarily responsible for bringing this legislation to the floor today; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, the Subcommittee which considered this legislation; the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), and the remainder of my colleagues on the Public Works Committee on both sides of the aisle who have been so helpful at all times.

(Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of California) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the law which created the Potomac River Conservancy District and the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin was adopted by the State of Maryland and West Virginia and the Commonwealths of Pennsylvania and Virginia in 1940. During discussions preceding the development of this compact proposal, it was agreed that because of the severity of water pollution throughout the Potomac River Basin the authority of the Interstate Commission should be directed solely to alleviating this problem.

During the subsequent years this proved to be a wise decision. First efforts were directed toward determining the facts regarding pollution and toward securing the enactment of adequate States laws requiring pollution control. Recent reports indicate that 97 percent of the sewered population of the basin are now served by secondary type water pollution control plants. A similar condition exists within the industrial com-

munity. It would be difficult to find a comparable river basin with this kind of a record.

Even so we have a long way to go to secure a satisfactory water quality in the Potomac. Ever increasing populations will require treatment plants with more capacity and greater capability to remove pollutants. Sediment must be controlled as well as other pollutants such as bacteria and nutrients contained in land runoff. We are also faced with the critical need for additional water supplies in the Washington region and in other areas throughout the basin.

We have discovered that the utilization and development of water and associated land cannot be separated from pollution in today's society.

House Joint Resolution 1179, which I had the privilege of introducing, would provide congressional approval to amendments to the Potomac sanitation compact which have been adopted by the States of Maryland and West Virginia and the Commonwealths of Pennsylvania and Virginia, and would authorize the District of Columbia to enter into the amended compact.

The amendments would:

First. Broaden the authority of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to include water resources and associated land resources. Its present authority is restricted to water pollution abatement.

Second. Allow the Interstate Commission to cooperate, assist, and provide liaison for and among public and nonpublic agencies in the formulation and coordination of plans and programs for the protection and development of the water and associated land resources of the Potomac River Basin.

Third. Allow the Commission to establish "sections" for the purpose of dealing with problems of pollution and of water and associated land resources, in specific areas which directly affect two or more signatories. No signatory may be excluded from any section. The exercise of any powers vested solely in a section must be financed through funds provided by the signatories, including the United States, participating in the section.

Fourth. The amendments drop a provision in the original compact law which limited the total contributions of the signatories to not over $30,000 annually.

These amendments to the Potomac River sanitation compact should not be confused with the proposed Federal-interstate compact which was developed in 1967 by the Potomac River Basin Advisory Committee. Should the Advisory Committee's proposal be accepted by the States and the Congress at some time in the future it would absorb and take over the functions of the present Commission. In the meantime these amendments will allow the Interstate Commission to proceed with its programs on a more adequate and satisfactory basis.

I wish to express our appreciation for the excellent work on this bill by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), the chairman of the River and Harbor Subcommittee, the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON) who is so ably managing the legislation today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), and all the members of the Committee on Public Works on both sides of the aisles who have cooperated so splendidly in bringing this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the resolution we are considering today is to broaden the authority of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin to include water resources and associated land resources. This will be in addition to the present authority of water pollution abatement. In addition, it would allow the Interstate Commission to provide for liaison among public and nonpublic agencies, and aid the formulation and coordination of plans and programs necessary for the protection and development of water and associated land resources of the Potomac River Basin. It would do away with the limit, now in the law, on the total contributions of the signatories so that in the future it may exceed over $30,000 annually. It provides for the establishment of sections of the Commission so that problems of pollution and of water-associated land resources which affect two or more signatory bodies can be dealt with effectively.

The resolution before us would grant the consent of Congress to these changes and would result, I believe, in the strengthening of the compact's pollution abatement responsibilities as well as authorizing the Commission to contribute to and coordinate the activities of the Federal, State, local, and private agencies concerned with the Potomac River Basin.

I wish to emphasize that this does not affect the proposed Federal-State compact that has been recommended by the Potomac River Advisory Commission and is being considered by the legislatures of the States of Maryland and Virginia. Indeed, the purpose of the existing compact and the amendments is to provide an interim working organization until such time as the proposed Potomac River Basin Authority Committee makes its proposals, which in turn must be accepted by the States and the Congress. At that time, a new operating agency would be developed. This interim action will provide for time for the States to consider the proposals for the new compact and generally will serve as that steppingstone to the development of an effective Potomac River Basin control.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 1179

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given, subject to the conditions set forth in section 2 of this joint resolution, to the amended compact creating the Potomac Valley Conservancy District and establishing the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin which has been entered into by the States of Maryland and West Virginia, and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia, which compact as amended reads as follows:

"COMPACT

"Whereas, it is recognized that abatement of existing pollution and the control of future pollution of interstate streams can best be promoted through a joint agency representing the several states located wholly or in part within the area drained by any such interstate stream; and

"Whereas, the Congress of the United States has given its consent to the States of Maryland and West Virginia, the Commonwealths of Pennsylvania and Virginia, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact providing for the creation of a conservancy district to consist of the drainage basin of the Potomac river and the main and tributary streams therein, for 'the purpose or regulating, controlling, preventing, or otherwise rendering unobjectionable and harmless the pollution of the waters of said Potomac drainage area by sewage and industrial and other wastes'; and

"Whereas, the regulation, control, and prevention of pollution is directly affected by the quantities of water in said streams and the uses to which such water may be put, thereby requiring integration and coordination of the planning for the development and use of the water and associated land resources through cooperation with, and support and coordination of, the activities of Federal, State, local and private agencies, groups, and interests concerned with the development, utilization and conservation of the water and associated land resources of the said conservancy district;

"Now, therefore, the States of Maryland and West Virginia, the Commonwealths of Pennsylvania and Virginia, and the District of Columbia, hereinafter designated signatory bodies, do hereby create the Potomac Valley Conservancy District, hereinafter designated the Conservancy District, comprising all of the area drained by the Potomac river and its tributaries; and also, do hereby create, as an agency of each signatory body, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, hereinafter designated the Commission, under the articles of organization as set forth below.

"ARTICLE I

"The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin shall consist of three members from each signatory body and three members appointed by the President of the United States. Said Commissioners, other than those appointed by the President, shall be chosen in a manner and for the terms provided by law of the signatory body from which they are appointed and shall serve without compensation from the Commission but shall be paid by the Commission their actual expenses incurred and incident to the performance of their duties.

"(A). The Commission shall meet and organize within thirty days after the effective date of this compact, shall elect from its number a chairman and vice-chairman, shall adopt suitable bylaws, shall make, adopt and promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary for its management and control, and shall adopt a seal.

"(B). The Commission shall appoint and, at its pleasure, remove or discharge such officers and legal, engineering, clerical, expert and other assistants as may be required to carry the provisions of this compact into effect, and shall determine their qualifications and fix their duties and compensation. Such personnel as may be employed shall be employed without regard to any civil service or other similar requirements for employees of any of the signatory bodies. The Commission may maintain one or more offices for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place within the area of the signatory bodies.

"(C). The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements and shall make an annual report thereof and shall in such report set forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it

pursuant to this compact. The Commission, however, shall not incur any obligations for administrative or other expenses prior to the making of appropriations adequate to meet the same nor shall it in any way pledge the credit of any of the signatory bodies. Each of the signatory bodies reserves the right to make at any time an examination and audit of the accounts of the Commission.

"(D). A quorum of the Commission shall, for the transaction of business, the exercise of any powers, or the performance of any duties, consist of at least six members of the Commission who shall represent at least a majority of the signatory bodies; *Provided, however,* That no action of the Commission relating to policy or stream classification or standards shall be binding on any one of the signatory bodies unless at least two of the Commissioners from such signatory body shall vote in favor thereof.

"ARTICLE II

"The Commission shall have the power:

"(A). To collect, analyze, interpret, coordinate, tabulate, summarize and distribute technical and other data relative to, and to conduct studies, sponsor research and prepare reports on, pollution and other water problems of the Conservancy District.

"(B). To cooperate with the legislative and administrative agencies of the signatory bodies, or the equivalent thereof, and with other commissions and Federal, local governmental and non-governmental agencies, organizations, groups and persons for the purpose of promoting uniform laws, rules or regulations for the abatement and control of pollution of streams and the utilization, conservation, and development of the water and associated land resources in the said Conservancy District.

"(C). To disseminate to the public information in relation to stream pollution problems and the utilization, conservation and development of the water and associated land resources of the Conservancy District and on the aims, views, purposes, and recommendations of the Commission in relation thereto.

"(D). To cooperate with, assist, and provide liaison for and among public and non-public agencies and organizations concerned and pollution and other water problems in the formulation and coordination of plans, programs, and other activities relating to stream pollution or to the utilization, conservation, or development of water or associated land resources, and to sponsor cooperative action in connection with the foregoing.

"(E). In its discretion and at any time during or after the formulation thereof, to review and to comment upon any plan or program of any public or private agency or organization relating to stream pollution or the utilization, conservation, or development of water or associated land resources.

"(F) (1). To make and, if needful from time to time, revise and to recommend to the signatory bodies, reasonable minimum standards for the treatment of sewage and industrial or other wastes now discharged or to be discharged in the future to the streams of the Conservancy District, and also for cleanliness of the various streams in the Conservancy District.

"(2). To establish reasonable physical, chemical and bacteriological standards of water quality satisfactory for various classifications of use. It is agreed that each of the signatory bodies through appropriate agencies will prepare a classification of its interstate waters in the District in entirety or by portions according to present and proposed highest use, and for this purpose technical experts employed by appropriate state water pollution control agencies are authorized to confer on questions relating to classification of interstate water affecting two or more states. Each signatory body agrees to submit its classification of its interstate waters to the Commission with its recommendations thereon.

"The Commission shall review such classification and recommendations and accept or return the same with its comments. In the event of return, the signatory body will consider the comments of the Commission and resubmit the classification proposal, with or without amendment, with any additional comments for further action by the Commission.

"It is agreed that after acceptance of such classification, the signatory body through its appropriate state water pollution control agencies will work to establish programs of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes which will meet or exceed standards established by the Commission for classified waters. The Commission may from time to time make such changes in definitions of classifications and in standards as may be required by changed conditions or as may be necessary for uniformity and in a manner similar to that in which these standards and classifications were originally established.

"It is recognized, owing to such variable factors as location, size, character and flow and the many varied uses of the waters subject to the terms of this compact, that no single standard of sewage and waste treatment and no single standard of quality of receiving waters is practical and that the degree of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes should take into account the classification of the receiving waters according to present and proposed highest use, such as for drinking water supply, bathing and other recreational purposes, maintenance and propagation of fish life, industrial and agricultural uses, navigation and disposal of wastes.

"ARTICLE III

"For the purpose of dealing with the problems of pollution and of water and associated land resources in specific areas which directly affect two or more, but not all, signatory bodies, the Commission may establish Sections of the Commission consisting of the Commissioners from such affected signatory bodies, *Provided, however,* That no signatory body may be excluded from any Section in which it wishes to participate. The Commissioners appointed by the President of the United States may participate in any Section. The Commission shall designate, and from time to time may change, the geographical area with respect to which each Section shall function. Each Section shall, to such extent as the Commission may from time to time authorize, have authority to exercise and perform with respect to its designated geographical area any power or function vested in the Commission, and in addition may exercise such other powers and perform such functions as may be vested in such Section by the laws of any signatory body or by the laws of the United States. The exercise or performance by a Section of any power or function vested in the Commission may be financed by the Commission, but the exercise or performance of powers or functions vested solely in a Section shall be financed through funds provided in advance by the bodies, including the United States, participating in such Section.

"ARTICLE IV

"The moneys necessary to finance the Commission in the administration of its business in the Conservancy District shall be provided through appropriations from the signatory bodies and the United States, in the manner prescribed by the laws of the several signatory bodies and of the United States, and in amounts as follows:

"The pro rata contribution shall be based on such factors as population; the amount of industrial and domestic pollution; and a flat service charge; as shall be determined from time to time by the Commission, subject, however, to the approval, ratification, and appropriation of such contribution by the several signatory bodies.

"ARTICLE V

"Pursuant to the aims and purposes of this compact, the signatory bodies mutually agree:

"1. Faithful cooperation in the abatement of existing pollution and the prevention of future pollution in the streams of the Conservancy District and in planning for the utilization, conservation, and development of the water and associated land resources thereof.

"2. The enactment of adequate and, insofar as is practicable, uniform legislation for the abatement and control of pollution and control and use of such streams.

"3. The appropriation of biennial sums on the proportionate basis as set forth in Article IV.

"ARTICLE VI

"This compact shall become effective immediately after it shall have been ratified by the majority of the legislature of the States of Maryland and West Virginia, the Commonwealths of Pennsylvania and Virginia, and by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and approval by the Congress of the United States; *Provided, however,* That this compact shall not be effective as to any signatory body until ratified thereby.

"ARTICLE VII

"Any signatory body may, by legislative act, after one year's notice to the Commission, withdraw from this compact."

SEC. 2. (a) The consent granted by this joint resolution does not extend to any of the four paragraphs making up article II (F) (2) of the amended compact.

(b) Nothing contained in the amended compact set forth in this joint resolution shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of this compact.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized, on behalf of the District of Columbia, to enter into the amended compact set forth in this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 67) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Maryland and West Virginia and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia, as signatory bodies, for certain amendments to the compact creating the Potomac Valley Conservancy District and establishing the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill in its provisions which the gentleman seeks to substitute?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, this

is substantially the same bill with a minor change.

Mr. GROSS. With a minor change in the bill, did the gentleman say?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is no substantive change. The differences in the two versions are solely limited to the drafting foremat.

Mr. GROSS. It does not increase the obligation on the part of the Federal Government for this compact; does it?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, it does not. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa, I do not think there is any interstate compact involving interstate rivers where the Federal Government is not involved and has a responsibility. But in this bill, it does not increase that responsibility with respect to the Federal appropriations that we spoke about.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California (Mr. JOHNSON)?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution as follows:

S.J. RES. 67

Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Maryland and West Virginia and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia, as signatory bodies, for certain amendments to the compact creating the Potomac Valley Conservancy District and establishing the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

Whereas, by Public Resolution Numbered 93, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, approved July 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 748), Congress granted consent to the States of Maryland and West Virginia and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia, hereinafter designated signatory bodies, to enter into a compact for the creation of a Potomac Valley Conservancy District and the establishment of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin; and

Whereas, all said signatory bodies have entered into said compact; and

Whereas, all the said signatory bodies have adopted identical proposed amendments to said compact, for which they seek the consent of Congress, by virtue of which amendments said compact will read as follows:

"COMPACT

"Whereas, it is recognized that abatement of existing pollution and the control of future pollution of interstate streams can best be promoted through a joint agency representing the several states located wholly or in part within the area drained by any such interstate stream; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has given its consent to the States of Maryland and West Virginia, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Virginia, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact providing for the creation of a conservancy district to consist of the drainage basin of the Potomac river and the main and tributary streams therein, for 'the purpose of regulating, controlling, providing, or otherwise rendering unobjectionable and harmless the pollution of the waters of said Potomac drainage area by sewage and industrial and other wastes'; and

"Whereas, the regulation, control and prevention of pollution is directly affected by the quantities of water in said streams and the uses to which such water may be put, thereby requiring integration and coordination of the planning for the development and use of the water and associated land resources through cooperation with, and support and coordination of, the activities of Federal, State, local and private agencies, groups, and interests concerned with the development, utilization and conservation of the water and associated land resources of the said conservancy district;

"Now, therefore, the States of Maryland and West Virginia, the Commonwealths of Pennsylvania and Virginia, and the District of Columbia, hereinfater designated signatory bodies, do hereby create the Potomac Valley Conservancy District, hereinafter designated the Conservancy District, comprising all of the area drained by the Potomac River and its tributaries; and also, do hereby create, as an agency of each signatory body, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, hereinafter designated the Commission, under the articles of organization as set forth below.

"ARTICLE I

"The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin shall consist of three members from each signatory body and three members appointed by the President of the United States. Said Commissioners, other than those appointed by the President, shall be chosen in a manner and for the terms provided by law of the signatory body from which they are appointed and shall serve without compensation from the Commission but shall be paid by the Commission their actual expenses incurred and incident to the performance of their duties.

"(A). The Commission shall meet and organize within thirty days after the effective date of this compact, shall elect from its number a chairman and vice-chairman, shall adopt suitable bylaws, shall make, adopt and promulgate such rules and regulations as are necessary for its management and control, and shall adopt a seal.

"(B). The Commission shall appoint and, at its pleasure, remove or discharge such officers and legal, engineering, clerical, expert and other assistants as may be required to carry the provisions of this compact into effect, and shall determine their qualifications and fix their duties and compensation. Such personnel as may be employed shall be employed without regard to any civil service or other similar requirements for employees of any of the signatory bodies. The Commission may maintain one or more offices for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place within the area of the signatory bodies.

"(C). The Commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements and shall make an annual report thereof and shall in such report set forth in detail the operations and transactions conducted by it pursuant to this compact. The Commission, however, shall not incur any obligations for administrative or other expenses prior to the making of appropriations adequate to meet the same nor shall it in any way pledge the credit of any of the signatory bodies. Each of the signatory bodies reserves the right to make at any time an examination and audit of the accounts of the Commission.

"(D). A quorum of the Commission shall, for the transaction of business, the exercise of any powers, or the performance of any duties, consist of at least six members of the Commission who shall represent at least a majority of the signatory bodies: *Provided, however,* That no action of the Commission relating to policy or stream classification or standards shall be binding on any one of the signatory bodies unless at least two of the Commissioners from such signatory body shall vote in favor thereof.

"ARTICLE II

"The Commission shall have the power:

"(A). To collect, analyze, interpret, coordinate, tabulate, summarize and distribute technical and other data relative to, and to conduct studies, sponsor research and prepare reports on, pollution and other water problems of the Conservancy District.

"(B). To cooperate with the legislative and administrative agencies of the signatory bodies, or the equivalent thereof, and with other commissions and Federal, local governmental and non-governmental agencies, organizations, groups and persons for the purpose of promoting uniform laws, rules or regulations for the abatement and control of pollution of streams and the utilization, conservation and development of the water and associated land resources in the said Conservancy District.

"(C). To disseminate to the public information in relation to stream pollution problems and the utilization, conservation and development of the water and associated land resources of the Conservancy District and on the aims, views, purposes and recommendations of the Commission in relation thereto.

"(D). To cooperate with, assist, and provide liaison for and among, public and nonpublic agencies and organizations concerned with pollution and other water problems in the formulation and coordination of plans, programs and other activities relating to stream pollution or to the utilization, conservation or development of water or associated land resources, and to sponsor cooperative action in connection with the foregoing.

"(E). In its discretion and at any time during or after the formulation thereof, to review and to comment upon any plan or program of any public or private agency or organization relating to stream pollution or the utilization, conservation or development of water or associated land resources.

"(F)(1). To make, and, if needful from time to time, revise and to recommend to the signatory bodies, reasonable minimum standards for the treatment of sewage and industrial or other wastes now discharged or to be discharged in the future to the streams of the Conservancy District, and also for cleanliness of the various streams in the Conservancy District.

"(2). To establish reasonable physical, chemical and bacteriological standards of water quality satisfactory for various classifications of use. It is agreed that each of the signatory bodies through appropriate agencies will prepare a classification of its interstate waters in the District in entirety or by portions according to present and proposed highest use, and for this purpose technical experts employed by appropriate state water pollution control agencies are authorized to confer on questions relating to classification of interstate waters affecting two or more states. Each signatory body agrees to submit its classification of its interstate waters to the Commission with its recommendations thereon.

"The Commission shall review such classification and recommendations and accept or return the same with its comments. In the event of return, the signatory body will consider the comments of the Commission and resubmit the classification proposal, with or without amendment, with any additional comments for further action by the Commission.

"It is agreed that after acceptance of such classification, the signatory body through its appropriate State water pollution control agencies will work to establish programs of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes which will meet or exceed standards established by the Commission for classified waters. The Commission may from time to time make such changes in definitions of classifications and in standards as may be required by changed conditions or as may be necessary for uniformity and in a manner similar to that in which these standards and classifications were originally established.

"It is recognized, owing to such variable factors as location, size, character and flow and the many varied uses of the waters subject to the terms of this compact, that no single standard of sewage and waste treatment and no single standard of quality of receiving waters is practical and that the degree of treatment of sewage and industrial wastes should take into account the classification of the receiving waters according to present and proposed highest use, such as for drinking water supply, bathing and other recreational purposes, maintenance and propagation of fish life, industrial and agricultural uses, navigation and disposal of wastes.

"ARTICLE III

"For the purpose of dealing with the problems of pollution and of water and associated land resources in specific areas which directly affect two or more, but not all, signatory bodies, the Commission may establish Sections of the Commission consisting of the Commissioners from such affecting signatory bodies: *Provided, however,* That no signatory body may be excluded from any section in which it wishes to participate. The Commissioners appointed by the President of the United States may participate in any section. The Commission shall designate, and from time to time may change, the geographical area with respect to which each section shall function. Each section shall, to such extent as the Commission may from time to time authorize have authority to exercise and perform with respect to its designated geographical area any power or function vested in the Commission, and in addition may exercise such other powers and perform such functions as may be vested in such section by the laws of any signatory body or by the laws of the United States. The exercise or performance by a section of any power or function vested in the Commission may be financed by the Commission, but the exercise or performance of powers or functions vested solely in a section shall be financed through funds provided in advance by the bodies, including the United States, participating in such section.

"ARTICLE IV

"The moneys necessary to finance the Commission in the administration of its business in the Conservancy District shall be provided through appropriations from the signatory bodies and the United States, in the manner prescribed by the laws of the several signatory bodies and of the United States, and in amounts as follows:

"The pro rata contributions shall be based on such factors as population; the amount of industrial and domestic pollution; and a flat service charge; as shall be determined from time to time by the Commission, subject, however, to the approval, ratification and appropriation of such contribution by the several signatory bodies.

"ARTICLE V

"Pursuant to the aims and purposes of this compact, the signatory bodies mutually agree:

"1. Faithful cooperation in the abatement of existing pollution and the prevention of future pollution in the streams of the Conservancy District and in planning for the utilization, conservation and development of the water and associated land resources thereof.

"2. The enactment of adequate and, insofar as is practicable, uniform legislation for the abatement and control of pollution and control and use of such streams.

"3. The appropriation of biennial sums on the proportionate basis as set forth in Article IV.

"ARTICLE VI

"This compact shall become effective immediately after it shall have been ratified by the majority of the legislature of the States of Maryland and West Virginia, the Commonwealths of Pennsylvania and Virginia, and by the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and approval by the Congress of the United States: *Provided, however,* That this compact shall not be effective as to any signatory body until ratified thereby.

"ARTICLE VII

"Any signatory body may, by legislative act, after one year's notice to the Commission, withdraw from this compact."

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Maryland and West Virginia and the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania and the District of Columbia to adopt the aforementioned amendments and enter into the amended compact hereinbefore recited and every part and article thereof: *Provided,* That nothing contained in such amended compact shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of this compact: *And provided further,* That the consent herein given does not extend to section (F) (2) of article II of the amended compact.

SEC. 2. The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to enter into, on behalf of the District of Columbia, the amended compact hereinbefore recited.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

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

A similar joint resolution H.J. Res. 1179, was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF THE GODDARD ROCKET AND SPACE MUSEUM

The Clerk called the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 49) providing for congressional recognition of the Goddard Rocket and Space Museum.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution as follows:

S. CON. RES. 49

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby recognizes the Goddard Rocket and Space Museum of the Roswell Museum and Art Center, Roswell, New Mexico, as a fitting memorial to Doctor Robert H. Goddard, who pioneered in rocket experimentation and contributed to America's success in landing men on the moon, and who is known as the "Father of the Rocket", and as an appropriate and outstanding institution for the collection, preservation, and display of the works and memorabilia of Doctor Goddard.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as ranking minority member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, and member of the Manned Space Flight Subcommittee, I strongly urge the Members of the House of Representatives support Senate Concurrent Resolution 49. This resolution provides for congressional recognition of the Goddard Rocket and Space Museum of the Roswell Museum and Art Center, of Roswell, N. Mex.

Dr. Robert H. Goddard was an outstanding, world famed U.S. scientist. His dedication and determination in the field of rocketry have been largely responsible for mankind's ability to reach outer space. Dr. Goddard's vision and efforts in rocketry and space flight often were ridiculed. His ability to foresee the future of science, technology, and space flight urged him on to the development of the basic launching systems which the United States uses even today.

Much of Dr. Goddard's work on liquid rocket development was done on the high plateau near Roswell, N. Mex. In 1945, shortly after Dr. Goddard's death, his launching tower was moved to the grounds of the Art Center and Museum in Roswell. Other contributions have been made over the years, such as rocket parts and photographic murals. Most recently, a reconstruction of the Goddard workshop and a new Goddard planetarium have been constructed. Funds from the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation have assisted in building a special wing in which to house the Goddard collection at Roswell.

On April 25, 1959, the Robert H. Goddard Rocket and Space Museum was dedicated by Dr. Wernher von Braun. This outstanding collection at Roswell represents our country's early efforts in rocketry and especially the efforts and dedicated work of Dr. Robert H. Goddard. This history of determination, research and development in rocketry, space, and propulsion are a part of our great American heritage. We in Congress should recognize the high ability and dedication of Dr. Robert H. Goddard in placing U.S. technology first in rocketry, foremost in space, and first in the successful landing of not one but two fine teams of astronauts, the Apollo 11 crew and the Apollo 12 crew, on the lunar surface and returning them safely.

Dr. Goddard, had he lived, would have been thrilled as any U.S. citizen with this accomplishment, as well as the space rescue of the Apollo 13 crew, which was achieved through the high competence and cooperation of ground mission control and the Apollo 13 astronauts themselves.

My compliments to the people of Roswell and the State of New Mexico as well as to the Guggenheim Foundation on their good work in preserving our space program and this goodly heritage for the present American generation and for all future generations.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE SAC AND FOX INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11771) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox Indians, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if the only thing involved in this bill is the difference be-

tween the two tribes as to the percentage of the amount that each tribe should receive under a judgment awarded by the Indian Claims Commission; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. That is correct. My purpose in asking that it be passed over without prejudice is to give the Oklahoma tribe a little more time to consider the matter before the House acts on it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED)?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CHEMEHUEVI TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 14396) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians.

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

H.R. 14396

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians which were appropriated (by the Act entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes", approved April 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 81)) to pay the judgment awarded by the Indian Claims Commission (dockets numbered 351 and 351–A), together with interest thereon, shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this Act referred to as "Secretary") in equal shares to those persons whose names appear on the roll prepared in accordance with section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The Secretary shall prepare a roll of all persons—

(A) who were born on or prior to and living on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) who are lineal descendants of members of the Chemehuevi Tribe as it existed in 1860; and

(C) whose name or the name of a lineal ancestor appears as a Chemehuevi Indian on any available census roll or other record or evidence acceptable to the Secretary.

(2) Applications for enrollment must be filed in the manner and within the time limits prescribed by the Secretary for that purpose.

(b) Any person who has applied for and has been determined as eligible to share in the awards granted by the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 88, 330, and 330–A, to the Southern Paiute Indian Nation or in dockets numbered 31, 33, 37, 80, 80–D, 176, 215, and 347, to "Certain Indians of California" shall not be entitled to share in the awards granted under this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary shall distribute a share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee. The Secretary shall distribute the per capita share of a deceased enrollee to his heirs or legatees upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary. Sums payable to enrollees or their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures, including the establishment of trusts, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect their best interests.

(b) Any individual aggrieved by a determination of the Secretary under this Act shall be given an opportunity to be heard upon reasonable notice in accordance with the provisions of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code. Unless such individual otherwise agrees, the hearing shall be held in the State of California within sixty days of the date of notice. An individual aggrieved by the decision rendered after such hearing shall be entitled to judicial review of such decision in accordance with sections 701–706 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 4. No part of any funds distributed under this Act shall be subject to Federal or State income taxes or any lien, debt, or attorney fees.

SEC. 5. The roll prepared by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to this Act shall not be deemed to constitute the membership roll of the Chemehuevi Tribe.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 16, add a new sentence reading as follows: "The determination of the Secretary regarding the utilization of available rolls and records and eligibility for enrollment of an applicant shall be final."

Page 2, line 21, after "31," strike out "33," and after "215," insert "333,".

Page 2, line 24, strike out "(a)".

Page 3, lines 9 through 18, strike out all of subsection (b).

Page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out "taxes or any lien, debt, or attorney fees." and insert "taxes."

Page 3, following line 24, insert a new section 6 as follows:

"SEC. 6. The Secretary may make appropriate withdrawals from the judgment fund and interest thereon, using interest funds first, to pay costs incident to carrying out the provisions of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill S. 4033, an identical bill to the House bill, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

S. 4033

An act to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians which were appropriated (by the Act entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes", approved April 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 81)), to pay the judgment awarded by the Indian Claims Commission (dockets numbered 351 and 351–A), together with interest thereon, shall be distributed by the Secretary of the Interior (hereafter in this Act referred to as "Secretary") in equal shares to those persons whose names appear on the roll prepared in accordance with section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The Secretary shall prepare a roll of all persons—

(A) who were born on or prior to and living on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) who are lineal descendants of members of the Chemehuevi Tribe as it existed in 1860; and

(C) whose name or the name of a lineal ancestor appears as a Chemehuevi Indian on any available census roll or other record or evidence acceptable to the Secretary.

(2) Applications for enrollment must be filed in the manner and within the time limits prescribed by the Secretary for that purpose. The determination of the Secretary regarding the utilization of available rolls or records and the eligibility for enrollment of an applicant shall be final.

(b) Any person who has applied for and has been determined as eligible to share in the awards granted by the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 88, 330, and 330–A, to the Southern Paiute Indian Nation or in dockets numbered 31, 37, 80, 80–D, 176, 215, 333, and 347, to "Certain Indians of California" shall not be entitled to share in the awards granted under this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall distribute a share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee. The Secretary shall distribute the per capita share of a deceased enrollee to his heirs or legatees upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary. Sums payable to enrollees or their heirs or legatees who are less than twenty-one years of age or who are under a legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures, including the establishment of trusts, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate to protect their best interests.

SEC. 4. No part of any funds distributed under this Act shall be subject to Federal or State income taxes.

SEC. 5. The roll prepared by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to this Act shall not be deemed to constitute the membership roll of the Chemehuevi Tribe.

SEC. 6. The Secretary may make appropriate withdrawals from the judgment funds and interest thereon, using interest funds first, to pay costs incident to carrying out the provisions of this Act.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 14396) was laid on the table.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 4033 is to authorize the use of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Chemehuevi Tribe of Indians in Indian Claims Commission Dockets Nos. 351 and 351–A. The net amount available is $1,064,844.41.

The money has been appropriated and invested temporarily in interest-bearing securities. The Indians may not use the money, however, until Congress has approved their plans.

The tribe has not existed as an organized entity for many years. The lineal descendants of the original tribe are scattered. Many of them are enrolled at the Colorado River Indian Reservation, but none of them live on the Chemehuevi Reservation. The latter was established in 1907 by Executive action. It now consists of 28,223 acres of land that are uninhabited but have potential recreation value.

The Department of the Interior estimates that the living lineal descendants eligible for enrollment will number 1,300 to 1,400. The bill provides for a per capita distribution of the entire judgment to the enrollees. Under the circumstances involved here no other use of the money is feasible. Although some of the Chemehuevis are attempting to organize the

tribe and establish a tribal government, it is clear that not all of the Chemehuevis will join the new organization and that the new organization will not be the successor of the aboriginal tribe.

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

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the chairman of the Interior Committee, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL) has supported my bill H.R. 14396 from the time I first introduced it until this day. And on behalf of the Chemehuevi Indians I thank my colleagues in both the House and the Senate for bringing equity and justice to this very deserving tribe at this time.

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY JUDGMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE YAKIMA TRIBES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15469) 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.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 3337, be considered in lieu of the House bill, H.R. 15469. In explanation thereof, I will state they are identical bills.

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

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

S. 3337

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the funds appropriated by the Act of October 31, 1965 (79 Stat. 1133, 1152), to pay judgments to the Yakima Tribes of the Yakima Reservation in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 47–A and 162, and by the Act of July 22, 1969 (83 Stat. 49), in consolidated dockets 47 and 164, together with interests thereon, after payment of attorney fees and litigation expenses, may be advanced, expended, invested, or reinvested for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Any part of such funds that may be distributed per capita under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax; and any per capita share payable to a person under twenty-one years of age or to a person under legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures, including the establishment of trusts, as the Secretary determines will adequately protect the best interest of such persons.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 3337 is to authorize the use of a judgment recovered against the United States by the Yakima Tribes in Indian Claims Commission dockets No. 47–A, 162, and consolidated dockets 47 and 164. The net amount available, including accumulated interest, is $2,119,370.

The money has been appropriated and most of it has been invested temporarily in certificates of deposit. The Indians may not use the money, however, until Congress has approved their plans.

The tribes have an enrolled membership of 5,748 persons. About 3,850 of them live on the reservation. The others live away from the reservation.

The tribes propose to invest $250,000 and use the revenues for an additional educational fund. The remainder will be used to make a $300 per capita payment to each member of the tribes.

The tribal income from reservation resources has been increasing steadily each year, and in fiscal year 1970 it amounted to $5,435,000. From this income the tribes make an annual per capita distribution of $250 to each member, which takes about $1,467,000. This leaves a substantial sum each year which goes into a variety of reservation programs and into a cash reserve. In view of these plans for development of reservation resources with current income, the tribes want to use most of the present judgments to supplement the annual per capita payments.

The Southern Ute Tribe proposes to invest its funds until a specific program for their use has been developed.

The Department of the Interior has agreed that secretarial approval for the use of the funds will not be given until more detailed plans are submitted for approval by this committee.

These three tribes have made good use of other judgment money received in the past.

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as sponsor of H.R. 15469, the House bill providing for disposition of the appropriated funds to pay judgments in favor of the Yakima Tribes of Indians, I am pleased this bill is before the House today, and I urge passage.

This bill is noncontroversial, providing for the procedures to be followed in the award of Indian Claims Commission judgments to the Yakimas. The claims involved settlements in connection with erroneous interpretations of the land descriptions under the 1855 treaty.

I might say that the funds, $2,210,991.40, were previously appropriated and this bill, therefore, does not provide for the expenditure of additonal funds.

It is commendable of both the Yakima Tribal Council and the Yakima General Council that they plan to retain from the judgment funds $250,000 to be invested as an educational fund. These funds are to be invested and the interest will be utilized annually in support of the Tribe's education programs.

The remainder of $2,100,000 in consolidated dockets covered by the legislation will be paid prorata to the tribal membership, at $300 per capita. I have been advised that many of the Yakimas who have school-age children, have been counting on this distribution of the funds to help them get their youngsters ready for school this fall. House passage of the bill at this time, is welcome news to these parents, especially.

It was my pleasure to introduce this measure at the request of the Yakimas and it is my pleasure today to urge its adoption.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 15469) was laid on the table.

CONVEYING CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LAND TO THE CHEROKEE TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 15624) to convey certain federally owned land to the Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma.

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

H.R. 15624

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That upon payment by the Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma, as provided in section 2 of this Act, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in that part of the northwest quarter lying south of United States Highway Numbered 62, section 20, township 16 north, range 22 east, Indian meridian, Oklahoma, comprising 38.5 acres more or less, heretofore acquired for school purposes, shall vest in the Cherokee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, and such land shall not be subject to any exemption from taxation, or restrictions on use, management, or disposition because of Indian ownership.

SEC. 2. In full consideration for the transfer of title, the Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma shall pay the United States $2,258.80, payment to be made to the Secretary of the Interior within ninety days after this Act is approved and deposited in the general fund of the United States Treasury.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, following line 7, insert a new section 3 reading as follows:

"SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act as of August 20, 1964, less the payment of $2,258.80 as provided in section 2, should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker.

The purpose of H.R. 15624 is to sell to the Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma 38.5 acres of land for $2,258.80, which is the amount paid by the United States when it bought the property. The property is a part of a 93-acre tract that was purchased by the Government in 1935 for an Indian school farm. The school farm has been discontinued, and the property is excess to the needs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Forty acres of the original 93 acres were conveyed to the tribe by the Act of August 20, 1964 (78 Stat. 559), without consideration, and the land has been developed by the tribe for industrial uses.

The 38.5 acres covered by this bill are needed by the tribe to continue this development. Developments already completed include a restaurant, arts and crafts shop, service station, warehouse, office building, and indstrial building. Further developments contemplated include a motel, expansion of the industrial building, retail shopping area, and various tourist oriented projects. This industrial program should contribute significantly to Indian employment and an improved standard of living.

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

PROVIDING FOR THE DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE CONFEDERATED BANDS OF UTE INDIANS AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 16833) 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 Uncompahgre Band of Ute Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 349, and for other purposes.

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

H.R. 16833

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians appropriated by the Act of May 13, 1966 (80 Stat. 141), pursuant to the final judgment entered in Court of Claims case numbered 47567; and the funds on deposit to the credit of the Ute Tribe of the Unitah and Ouray Reservation, for and on behalf of the Uncompahgre Band of Ute Indians, that were appropriated by the Act of April 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 81), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 349; and the interest thereon, less attorney fees and litigation expenses, shall be available for use by the respective tribes in accordance with the Act of August 21, 1951 (65 Stat. 193; 25 U.S.C. 672), the Act of August 12, 1953, (67 Stat. 540; 25 U.S.C. 674), the Act of June 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 300; 25 U.S.C. 676), and the Act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868; 25 U.S.C. 677), as amended.

SEC. 2. Any portion of the funds distributed per capita to the members of the respective tribes shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill, S. 3997.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3997

An act 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 Uncompahgre Band of Ute Indians in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 349, and for other purposes

Be is enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians appropriated by the Act of May 13, 1966 (80 Stat. 141), pursuant to the final judgment entered in Court of Claims case numbered 47567; and the funds on deposit to the credit of the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, for and on behalf of the Uncompahgre Band of Ute Indians, that were appropriated by the Act of April 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 81), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 349; and the interest thereon, less attorney fees and litigation expenses, shall be available for use by the respective tribes in accordance with the Act of August 21, 1951 (65 Stat. 193; 25 U.S.C. 672), the Act of August 12, 1953 (67 Stat. 540; 25 U.S.C. 674), the Act of June 28, 1954 (68 Stat. 300; 25 U.S.C. 676), and the Act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868; 25 U.S.C. 677), as amended.

SEC. 2. Any portion of the funds distributed per capita to the members of the respective tribes shall not be subject to Federal or State income tax.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of S. 3997 is to authorize the use of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Confederated Bands of Ute Indians in Court of Claims docket No. 47567, and the use of a judgment against the United States recovered by the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Indian Claims Commission docket No. 349. The net amounts available, after division between the three Ute Tribes entitled to share, are as follows:

Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation	$2,371,546
Southern Ute Tribe	830,000
Ute Mountain Tribe	963,017

The money has been appropriated, but the Indians may not use the money until Congress has approved their plans.

The bill provides that the money may be used for any purpose requested by the tribe and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation proposes to pool this judgment money with several other tribal funds, and to establish three investment funds the earnings from which will be used for educational grants, tribal government operations, and per capita payments to members.

The Ute Mountain Tribe proposes to invest approximately $622,706 in an economic development fund for the reservation, and to use the balance to make a $300 per capita payment to its members.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 16833) was laid on the table.

AMENDING CENTRAL VALLEY RECLAMATION PROJECT TO INCLUDE BLACK BUTTE PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 18298) to amend the Central Valley reclamation project to include Black Butte project.

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

H.R. 18298

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Central Valley project, California, authorized by section 2 of the Act of Congress of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 850), is hereby amended to include the Black Butte project on Stony Creek, which was authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers by the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887). Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Black Butte project shall be financially integrated with the Central Valley project and coordinated operationally with the other storage units of the Central Valley project by the Bureau of Reclamation under the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That the Black Butte Dam and Reservoir will be physically operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers and in a manner compatible with recreational use of the reservoir: *Provided further,* In the event that prior to January 1, 1971, one or more agencies enter long-term contracts with the Secretary of the Interior under reclamation law to repay the cost of the Black Butte project allocated to conservation, and the Secretary of the Interior has received resolutions of the Boards of Directors of said agency or agencies expressing the desire not to be so included, then said project will not be included in the Central Valley project.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike "60" and insert in lieu thereof "50"; and

Page 2, beginning on line 5, strike out "reservoir:" and all of the proviso ending on line 13 and insert "reservoir."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 18298 is a fairly simple bill albeit an urgent one that should be passed as soon as possible. Its purpose is to authorize the Black Butte Reservoir project constructed and operated by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, to be integrated operationally and financially with the Central Valley Federal reclamation project. There is no direct cost to the Federal Government involved in this legislation and there is no change in operation jurisdiction contemplated.

Black Butte Dam and Reservoir were authorized in 1944 for the multiple purposes of flood control and water conservation with the stipulation that the Secretary of the Interior would be responsible for marketing of the water yield and the return of the reimbursable costs associated therewith. To overcome delays in the marketing of the water and to achieve the benefits of flood control at an early date, the State of California pursuant to an act of its legislature entered into an agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation to underwrite the reimbursable costs of the project if long-term water sales contracts were not con-

summated by January 1, 1971; or alternatively legislation was not enacted to integrate the project into the Central Valley development.

The long-term contracts have not been forthcoming and the agreement is approaching its terminal date. If H.R. 18298 is not enacted, the control of the water supply will pass from the Federal Government into the hands of the State which can then dispose of the resource in any manner it sees fit.

There is a growing need for the water yield from Black Butte Reservoir in the Federal service area of the Central Valley project, and I believe that this federally developed water supply should be retained in Federal hands so that it can be used to meet this growing need. In our hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs there was no objection to this philosophy, albeit there is little doubt that the State would be pleased to assume jurisdiction over this resource.

If H.R. 18298 is passed, it will be possible to develop plans for conjunctive operation of this reservoir with reservoirs under the control over the Bureau of Reclamation which will increase the effectiveness of the total storage system.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that the Congress in authorizing Black Butte Dam and Reservoir obviously intended that the water yield from it would be marketed and utilized in the general area of the project. As matters now stand, the only way that we can be certain that this will, indeed, take place is to enact this measure and retain Federal jurisdiction over the issue.

For this reason, I support H.R. 18298 and urge that all Members join with me in extending their support.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in explanation of H.R. 18298 immediately prior to passage of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON INSTITUTIONAL INVESTORS STUDY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1247) to amend section 19(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 1247

Whereas additional time is required for the Securities and Exchange Commission to complete its institutional investors study, and file a report with respect thereto, pursuant to section 19(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 19(e) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78s(e) is amended by striking out in paragraph (1) "September 1, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1970".

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

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE STUDIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8668) to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies, to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes.

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

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.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, upon the request of any person, firm, organization, or others, public or private, to make special studies on matters within the authority of the Department of Commerce; to prepare from its records special compilations, lists, bulletins, or reports; to perform the functions authorized by section 2 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 823; 15 U.S.C. 1152); and to furnish transcripts or copies of its studies, compilations, and other records; upon the payment of the actual or estimated cost of such special work.

In the case of nonprofit organizations, research organizations, or public organizations or agencies, the Secretary may engage in joint projects, or perform services, on matters of mutual interest, the cost of which shall be apportioned equitably, as determined by the Secretary, who may, however, waive payment of any portion of such costs by others, when authorized to do so under regulations approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 2. All payments for work or services performed or to be performed under this Act shall be deposited in a separate account or accounts which may be used to pay directly the costs of such work or services, to repay or make advances to appropriations or funds which do or will initially bear all or part of such costs, or to refund excess sums when necessary: *Provided,* That said receipts may be credited to a working capital fund otherwise established by law, and used under the law governing said funds, if the fund is available for use by the agency of the Department of Commerce which is responsible for performing the work or services for which payment is received. Acts appropriating funds to the Department of Commerce may include provisions limiting annual expenditure from said account or accounts.

SEC. 3. The following laws, or parts of laws, are hereby repealed:

(a) That proviso in the Act of March 1, 1919 (ch. 86, sec. 1, at 40 Stat. 1256), which reads as follows: *"Provided further,* That all moneys hereafter received by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in payment of photographic and other mechanical reproduction of special statistical compilations from its records shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt."

(b) The Act of May 27, 1935 (ch. 148, 49 Stat. 292; 15 U.S.C. 189a, 192, 192a).

(c) The proviso in the Act of May 15, 1936 (ch. 405, sec. 1, at 49 Stat. 1335; 15 U.S.C. 189), which reads as follows: *"Provided,* That the Secretary of Commerce may make such charges as he deems reasonable for lists of foreign buyers, special statistical services, special commodity news bulletins, and World Trade Directory Reports, and the amounts collected therefrom shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

(d) The Act of December 19, 1942 (ch. 780, 56 Stat. 1067; 15 U.S.C. 1520).

(e) The proviso in section 3 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 823; 15 U.S.C. 1153), which reads as follows: *"Provided,* That all moneys hereafter received by the Secretary in payment for publications under this Act shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, such account to be available, subject to authorization in any appropriation Act, for reimbursing any appropriation then current and chargeable for the cost of furnishing copies of reproductions as herein authorized, and for making refunds to organizations and individuals when entitled thereto: *And provided further,* That an appropriation reimbursed by this special account shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be available for the purposes of the original appropriation."

(f) The proviso in title III of the Act of October 22, 1951 (ch. 533, title III, section 301 at 65 Stat. 586; 15 U.S.C. 1153a), which reads as follows *"Provided,* That moneys hereafter received by the Secretary pursuant to section 3 of said Act of September 9, 1950, for publications provided thereunder, shall be available for reimbursing any appropriation as provided by said section."

SEC. 4. Except as to those laws expressly repealed herein, nothing in this Act shall alter, amend, modify, or repeal any existing law prescribing fees or charges or authorizing the prescribing of fees or charges for services performed or for any publication furnished by the Department of Commerce, or any of its several bureaus or offices.

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

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 1170) to authorize the Department of Commerce to make special studies to provide services, and to engage in joint projects, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1170

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized, upon the request of any person, firm, organization, or others, public or private, to make special studies on matters within the authority of the Department of Commerce; to prepare from its records special compilations, lists, bulletins, or reports; to perform the functions authorized by section 2 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 823; 15 U.S.C. 1152); and to furnish transcripts or copies of its studies, compilations, and other records; upon the payment of the actual or estimated cost of such special work.

In the case of nonprofit organizations, research organizations, or public organizations or agencies, the Secretary may engage in joint projects, or perform services, on matters of mutual interest, the cost of which shall be apportioned equitably, as determined by the Secretary, who may, however, waive payment of any portion of such costs by others, when authorized to do so under

regulations approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 2. All payments for work or services performed or to be performed under this Act shall be deposited in a separate account or accounts which may be used to pay directly the costs of such work or services, to repay or make advances to appropriations or funds which do or will initially bear all or part of such costs, or to refund excess sums when necessary: *Provided*, That said receipts may be credited to a working capital fund otherwise established by law, and used under the law governing said funds, if the fund is available for use by the agency of the Department of Commerce which is responsible for performing the work or services for which payment is received. Acts appropriating funds to the Department of Commerce may include provisions limiting annual expenditure from said account or accounts.

SEC. 3. The following laws, or parts of laws, are hereby repealed:

(a) That proviso in the Act of March 1, 1919 (ch. 86, sec. 1, at 40 Stat. 1256), which reads as follows: *"Provided further*, That all moneys hereafter received by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in payment of photographic and other mechanical reproduction of special statistical compilations from its records shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt."

(b) The Act of May 27, 1935 (ch. 148, 49 Stat. 292; 15 U.S.C. 189a, 192, 192a).

(c) The proviso in the Act of May 15, 1936 (ch. 405, sec. 1, at 49 Stat. 1335 (15 U.S.C. 189)), which reads as follows: *"Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce may make such charges as he deems reasonable for lists of foreign buyers, special statistical services, special commodity news bulletins, and World Trade Directory Reports, and the amounts collected therefrom shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

(d) The Act of December 19, 1942 (ch. 780, 56 Stat. 1067; 15 U.S.C. 1520).

(e) The proviso in section 3 of the Act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 823; 15 U.S.C. 1153), which reads as follows: *"Provided*, That all moneys hereafter received by the Secretary in payment for publications under this Act shall be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, such account to be available, subject to authorization in any appropriation Act, for reimbursing any appropriation then current and chargeable for the cost of furnishing copies or reproductions as herein authorized, and for making refunds to organizations and individuals when entitled thereto: *And provided further*, That an appropriation reimbursed by this special account shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be available for the purposes of the original appropriation."

(f) The proviso in title III of the Act of October 22, 1951 (ch. 533, title III, section 301 at 65 Stat. 586; 15 U.S.C. 1153a), which reads as follows: *"Provided*, That moneys hereafter received by the Secretary pursuant to section 3 of said Act of September 9, 1950, for publications provided thereunder, shall be available for reimbursing any appropriation as provided by said section."

SEC. 4. Except as to those laws expressly repealed herein, nothing in this Act shall alter, amend, modify, or repeal any existing law prescribing fees or charges or authorizing the prescribing of fees or charges for services performed or for any publication furnished by the Department of Commerce, or any of its several bureaus or offices.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 8668) was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROGRAM FOR THE RESEARCH AND PROMOTION OF WHEAT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 13543) to establish a program of research and promotion for U.S. wheat.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill is also listed under the suspensions for today, and it does need debate, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

LEASE AND TRANSFER OF BURLEY TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 18686) to authorize the lease and transfer of burley tobacco acreage allotments.

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

HALTING INTERNATIONAL AIR PIRACY; FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR 25TH U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

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

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join today with concerned citizens throughout our Nation and the world in welcoming the opening tomorrow of the United Nation's 25th General Assembly. My sincere hope and prayer is that the event will signal the strengthening of this international peacekeeping organization. And what better way for it to do so than to take the firm and resolute action necessary to once and for all effectively cope with the problem of airplane hijacking.

Such violence and terrorism as we have seen in the past several days can only be met with the determined cooperation of all nations under the direction of the United Nations. First and foremost, it should be the responsibility of the U.N. to establish agreements among all nations whereby landing privileges would be denied to all hijacked planes and sanctuary would not be given to air pirates. In addition, an international tribunal should be established to try all hijackers, with a guilty verdict bringing the death penalty.

It should also be within the United Nations' power to insure safety against hijacking by placing transportation blockades on any country which would not agree to such antihijacking measures.

Because the world today is so dependent upon the air transportation industry for business and pleasure, its security must be insured to the greatest extent. In that connection, the use of armed security guards on international and domestic flights would present an active and effective deterrent.

Mr. Speaker, the world has reached the end of its patience on this question. Air piracy and the destruction of private property cannot be tolerated any longer. This question deserves and demands top-priority consideration at the coming sessions of the 25th General Assembly.

ARMED FORCES PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION AND PERSONNEL STRENGTH OF RESERVES

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendment.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is a bill being called up under unanimous consent? What is the legislative situation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has asked unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the House bill (H.R. 17123), with a Senate amendment thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 17570, AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 17570) to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend and improve the existing program relating to education, research, training, and demonstrations in the fields of heart disease, cancer, stroke, and other related diseases, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STAGGERS, JARMAN, ROGERS of Florida, SPRINGER, and NELSEN.

MARINE SCIENCES COUNCIL EXTENSION

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R.

16607) to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 16607

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 3 of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (33 U.S.C. 1102(f)) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16607 would amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue for 1 year the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development. In amending the 1966 act, the bill would change the expiration date of the National Council from June 30, 1970, to June 30, 1971, a 1-year extension beyond the expiration date provided for by Public Law 89-454, as amended by Public Law 90-242, and Public Law 91-15. The Senate has already provided for this 1-year extension, having passed S. 3617.

The Marine Sciences Council is a Cabinet-level, policy planning, and coordinating body chaired by the Vice President. It was organized to advise and assist the President in developing policy and coordinating national marine science activities. The Council was established on an interim basis but it has been continued yearly since it was organized in 1966 to coordinate Federal programs affecting our marine resources until some permanent agency could be created. One of the principal functions of the Marine Sciences Council therefore has been to make recommendations concerning a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA. In this respect, on July 9, 1970, the Congress received from the President Reorganization Plan No. 4, to create such an agency. This plan is now pending before the Congress.

My Subcommittee on Oceanography and the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries were unanimous in their view that the National Marine Sciences Council should be continued for an additional year. Should Reorganization Plan No. 4 go into effect as expected, the Council would assist in the administrative coordination that will be required during the transition period.

Mr. Speaker, there was no opposition to this bill during our hearings. Departmental reports were all favorable. Accordingly, I recommend that H.R. 16607 be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to answer any inquiries which might be put regarding this matter. It merely extends for a period of 1 year the life of the existing National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development. It came from the subcommittee and the full committee by unanimous vote. It has received the approval of all departments, agencies, and bureaus of the Federal Government, including the Bureau of the Budget.

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

Mr. LENNON. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The life of this commission or council, whatever it is, has been twice extended; has it not?

Mr. LENNON. The life of the Council has been extended twice before for a period of 6 months each time. It would be extended by this bill.

I know the gentleman is familiar with the fact that on July 9 of this year the President sent to the Congress two reorganization plans, Reorganization Plans Nos. 3 and 4. In the judgment of the committee, it is essential that the life of the Council be continued for at least 1 year, in order to determine the final implementation of the presidential recommendations with respect to those two reorganization plans.

Mr. GROSS. Where does this Council gets its funds?

Mr. LENNON. Is the gentleman familiar with the composition of the Council? Is the gentleman familiar with the membership on the Council?

Mr. GROSS. No; I am not.

Mr. LENNON. Let me say to the gentleman that the Vice President of the United States is the Chairman of the Council. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Treasury constitute the members of this National Council.

The President was authorized by the original legislation to establish a staff sufficient in his judgment to make this a viable organization.

I want to say we would have, in my judgment, few oceanography or marine science programs today if it were not for the work, to a great degree, this Council has done since it came into being. It is not our intention to continue it indeterminately, but we wish to have it continued until such time as it has to a substantial degree related its efforts to the President's request for Reorganization Plans Nos. 3 and 4. We wish to continue the life of this Council as a coordinating body at that policy level.

Mr. GROSS. This Council was established in 1966; was it not?

Mr. LENNON. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. And its life has been twice extended and there is the protestation in the report that it is not contemplated that it be extended indefinitely. However, it seems to have a rather long life for a council that was supposed to be of short duration.

Mr. LENNON. If the gentleman will help us to expedite the President's recommendation for the reorganization plan, which has been delayed for a period of 3 weeks by reason of the House's recess, then I am sure we could bring this Council's life to some ultimate end.

I do say in all sincerity that I personally know the work this Council has been able to accomplish both in the prior and this present administration, and I believe if the gentleman were as familiar with it as I am, he would undoubtedly be in favor of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his explanation.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague from North Carolinia, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Oceanography (Mr. LENNON), in urging this House to consider favorably H.R. 16607, to extend the Marine Science Council for 1 additional year.

I believe I should emphasize that the gentleman from California (Mr. MAILLIARD) and I introduced this legislation, H.R. 16607, at the request of the White House. It is an administration measure. However, we also introduced it because we personally believe it is important. It is especially important that during the present interim period when we are considering the President's reorganization Plan No. 4, which would create a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—within the Department of Commerce, and also undoubtedly important in the early months of NOAA's life—I repeat, it is especially important that during that period that the Marine Science Council be maintained to provide vigorous staff support to the President, and as a coordinating mechanism, to help maintain our present momentum in oceanic activities.

The National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, as this body is formally designated, was established by the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, Public Law 89-454. The Marine Resources Act represented the culmination of some 7 years of intensive congressional effort to develop an effective statutory base for a comprehensive long-range and coordinated national program in marine science.

The act also established a Commission on Marine Science to make a comprehensive investigation and study of all aspects of marine science in order to recommend an overall plan for an adequate national oceanographic program that would meet the present and future needs of this Nation. The Commission under the leadership of Dr. Julius Stratton issued its report entitled "Our Nation and the Sea" in January 1969.

The Commission's life expired following submission of its report. As a corollary to the Commission on Marine Science, the Marine Science Council was established to assist the Commission and the President in carrying out their respective responsibilities under the act.

The Council under the chairmanship of the Vice President and composed of six Cabinet Secretaries, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of the National Science Foundation has performed a vital role in coordinating the diverse efforts of the

United States in the field of marine science.

The work of the Council originally was intended to terminate 120 days following submission of the report of the Commission on Marine Science to the Congress. Public Law 90-242, however, extended the life of the Council to June 30, 1969. At that time, while your Subcommittee on Oceanography was holding extensive hearings on the report of the Commission, it was felt that the Council should continue to fill its essential coordinating role for at least an additional year. Accordingly, Public Law 91-15 extended the Council to June 30, 1970.

President Nixon now has submitted Reorganization Plan No. 4 to the Congress to establish a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce. It is expected that plan will become effective the first week of October, and it has received the overwhelming support of your Subcommittee on Oceanography. The chairman of our subcommittee and I have had the honor of testifying in support of this reorganization plan before the Committee on Government Operations and at that time represented 23 of our colleagues of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Undoubtedly, there will be a period of months before the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—becomes fully operational and is able to assume its leadership role.

While the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act established both the Commission on Marine Science and the Marine Science Council as temporary bodies, the act does place upon the President continuing responsibilities in the field of marine science, including the assignment of lead agency responsibility for the conduct of on-going marine science activities and the annual review of our marine science activities conducted by the various departments and agencies of the United States. The act also requires the President to transmit to Congress in January of each year a comprehensive report of the activities and accomplishments of all agencies and departments in the field of marine science during the preceding fiscal year, together with an evaluation of such activities in terms of the objectives of the act.

The President undoubtedly will be assisted in carrying out these continuing responsibilities by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. However, in view of the time required for this new agency to become fully operational, it is essential that the President have at his disposal an executive-level coordinating body. The Council is the best mechanism to assist the President during this final phase of our national effort to create a focal point for civil oceanic and atmospheric programs.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 16607 will extend the Council for 1 additional year to June 30, 1971. The other body has passed an identical bill which I understand will be called up following passage of H.R. 16607. This bill was unanimously reported by your Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I urge the House to give it their favorable consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 16607.

The question was taken; and—two-thirds having voted in favor thereof—the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, S. 3617, an identical bill to H.R. 16607, is now pending before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill—S. 3617—to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, which is identical to the House bill, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

S. 3617

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f) of section 3 of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (33 U.S.C. 1102(f)) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971".

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

A similar House bill—H.R. 16607—was laid on the table.

SEAMEN'S SERVICE ACT

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill—H.R. 15549—to further the effectiveness of shipment of goods and supplies in foreign commerce by promoting the welfare of United States merchant seamen through cooperation with the United Seamen's Service, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 "Seamen's Service Act".

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act, by authorizing appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government to cooperate with the United Seamen's Service (a nonprofit, charitable organization incorporated under the laws of the State of New York) in the establishment and operation of facilities for United States merchant seamen in foreign areas, to promote the welfare of such seamen, essential to the overall interests of shipment of United States goods and supplies to such areas.

SEC. 3. Chapter 155 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 2604. United Seamen's Service: cooperation and assistance

"(a) Whenever the President finds it necessary in the interest of United States commitments abroad to provide facilities and services for United States merchant seamen in foreign areas, he may authorize the Secretary of Defense, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to cooperate with and assist the United Seamen's Service in establishing and providing those facilities and services.

"(b) Personnel of the United Seamen's Service who are performing duties in connection with the cooperation and assistance under subsection (a) may be furnished—

"(1) transportation, at the expense of the United States, while traveling to and from, and while performing, those duties, in the same manner as civilian employees of the armed forces;

"(2) meals and quarters, at their expense or at the expense of the United Seamen's Service, except that where civilian employees of the armed forces are quartered without charge, employees of the United Seamen's Service may also be quartered without charge; and

"(3) available office space (including space for recreational activities for seamen), warehousing, wharfage, and means of communication, without charge.

"(c) No fee may be charged for a passport issued to an employee of the United Seamen's Service for travel outside the United States to assume or perform duties under this section.

"(d) Supplies of the United Seamen's Service (including gifts for the use of merchant seamen, may be transported at the expense of the United States, if it is determined under regulations prescribed under subsection (a) that they are necessary to the cooperation and assistance provided under this section.

"(e) Where practicable, the President shall also make arrangements to provide for convertibility of local currencies for the United Seamen's Service, in connection with its activities under this subsection (a).

"(f) For the purposes of this section, employees of the United Seamen's Service may not be considered as employees of the United States."; and

(2) by adding the following new item at the end of the analysis:

"2604. United Seamen's Service: cooperation and assistance."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15549 would authorize certain departments and agencies of the Government particularly the Department of Defense, to cooperate with the United Seamen's Service. The United Seamen's Service is a nonprofit, charitable organization incorporated under the laws of the State of New York. Its purpose is to help U.S. merchant seamen, particularly in foreign ports.

The U.S. Government has historically supported merchant seamen in foreign ports. Normally, this support is provided under the supervision of the U.S. consulates. Since World War II, however, the United Seamen's Service has been pro-

viding welfare services to U.S. seamen in foreign ports. During World War II, services such as commissary privileges, PX, warehousing, transportation and communication facilities were provided by the Defense Establishment under emergency powers of the President. This legislation is required since the Executive order provided for this support has expired.

The proposed legislation is virtually identical to present law supporting the American Red Cross overseas.

Under the bill, personnel of the United Seamen's Service may be furnished transportation at Government expense in their performance of duties. Also, meals and quarters, available office and recreational space, warehousing, wharfage, and means of communication may be authorized.

The Secretary of Defense would have discretion to provide these services after a finding by the President that it is necessary in the interest of the United States.

There is no additional direct cost to the United States under this legislation. The cost of the United Seamen's Service is substantially borne by the personnel of the merchant marine and by contributions of interested private organizations and individuals.

The legislation is supported by the Defense and State Departments and by the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce. There was no opposition to the bill.

Your committee unanimously concluded, therefore, that this bill is desirable legislation to help U.S. merchant seamen in foreign ports and recommends that H.R. 15549 be enacted into law.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I notice in the report of the distinguished gentleman's committee that it says repeatedly that there is no direct cost to the U.S. Treasury, and indeed on page 4 it says there is no cost to this legislation, yet it says also, under an item on page 2 of the report, that the personnel of the United Seamen's Service will be transported at Government expense.

Also meals and quarters, office and recreational space, warehousing, wharfage, and communications that may be authorized. It just seems to one not familiar with this legislation that you cannot have it both ways. These things are very costly items of expense to the Government. If we are going to furnish them regardless of the merit of the bill, why do we on the one hand say there is no cost to the Government, and then on the other hand say that we will furnish all these services?

Mr. GARMATZ. Wherever there is space available for transportation, communications, warehousing, things of that sort, but only where there is space available.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, would these seamen then come under the same priorities of space-available transportation as regular Government employees within the intent of this bill?

Mr. GARMATZ. No. Not necessarily.

Mr. HALL. We would not again have a situation where State Department people, or summer students of Defense universities, were enabled to preempt transportation from GI's and their dependents on a space-available basis; is that correct?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is not correct.

Mr. HALL. One final question, if the gentleman will yield further: Is this the same fund that has been active politically and rather generous in support of some of its champions politically?

Mr. GARMATZ. No.

Mr. HALL. This is not the same fund?

Mr. GARMATZ. No.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARMATZ. I might tell the gentleman that there could probably be some considerable savings in providing these seamen with recreational facilities on shore, and not having to be paid overtime by staying on ship in these foreign ports.

Mr. HALL. I understand, but when it says meals, quarters, transportation, and office and recreational space, it does not say on a space-available basis, plus communications, it makes one wonder.

Now, does this mean, Mr. Speaker, that these people if they were carrying on duties in some foreign port would be able to utilize, for example, U.S. Navy or Department of Defense communications agencies means for messages, or transportation, and if so at what priority would they be?

Mr. GARMATZ. I still say it would be on a space-available basis.

Mr. HALL. In other words, it would go on the line only after priority traffic had been exercised by Department of Defense, Department of State, or other departments?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we establish this legislative intent, and I wonder if the gentleman's committee has a real estimation of the expense of this bill, even on a space-available or priority-available traffic basis?

Mr. GARMATZ. No, not at this time; and I cannot answer the gentleman in that particular.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Is there any other organization aside from the International Red Cross that the gentleman knows of that will get this kind of treatment in the matter of transportation, the elimination of passport fees, and so on, and so forth?

Mr. GARMATZ. Probably the USO or some organization of that sort.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman does not compare the services of those other organizations with those of the Red Cross. The Red Cross is a broad gage organization. It is not limited to seamen and aid to seamen in foreign ports or anywhere else.

Mr. GARMATZ. No, I would not.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman think that we are setting here some kind of precedent in the matter of treatment of an organization which provides the services only to one group of citizens of this country?

Mr. GARMATZ. No; this particular service was in existence during World War II and it is nothing new.

Mr. GROSS. Well, there are a lot of services that were provided during World War II that are not provided in so-called peacetime, I will say to the gentleman. I doubt if that is a very valid argument.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER).

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I salute the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Iowa for asking questions I think needed to be asked to clarify this situation.

This organization, the United Seamen's Service, is essentially like the USO, and these services with which we are dealing here are rendered only to seamen when they are in foreign ports. Seamen in such a situation have always been considered to be in a rather unique category of American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I join the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries (Mr. GARMATZ) in support of H.R. 15549, the United Seamen's Service Act.

Hearings before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee clearly established that the United Seamen's Service, a nonprofit, charitable organization, has filled an essential role providing services to U.S. merchant seamen in foreign ports in much the same way as the well-known USO provides services for military personnel.

During the Vietnam war, particularly in the build-up period, hundreds of American merchant ships spent weeks in port awaiting pier space to discharge. Had it not been for the efforts of the United Seamen's Service, the men serving aboard these merchant ships would have been compelled to remain on board ship during their entire stay in port, at great cost to the ship operators and to the U.S. Government.

The United Seamen's Service provides clubs, facilities, communication and transportation facilities, for merchant seamen while in foreign ports. These men are not eligible to enjoy USO facilities which are only available to military personnel.

H.R. 15549 will authorize the President to support the United Seamen's Service in the same manner that the U.S. Government now assists the USO. This legislation has the full support of the executive department and is an extremely worthwhile measure. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GARMATZ) has explained the provisions of the bill, and I see no need to repeat them at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge unanimous support for this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 15549, as amended.

The question was taken; and—two-

thirds having voted in favor thereof—the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to further the effectiveness of shipment of goods and supplies in foreign commerce by promoting the welfare of United States merchant seamen through cooperation with the United Seamen's Service, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE INCOME TAX WITHHOLDING FOR INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION EMPLOYEES

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10634) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salary of employees from withholding for tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 10634

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part I of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by redesignating section 26 as section 27 and by inserting before such section a new section as follows:

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING BY OTHER THAN RESIDENCE STATE

"SEC. 26. (a) No part of the wages or salary paid by any railroad, express company, or sleeping car company, subject to the provisions of this part, to an employee who performs his regularly assigned duties as such an employee on a locomotive, car, or other track-borne vehicle in more than one State, or who is engaged principally in more than one State, in maintaining roadways, signals, communications, and structures or in operating motor trucks out of railroad terminals, shall be withheld for income tax purposes pursuant to the laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of such employee's residence, as shown on the employment records of any such carrier; nor shall any such carrier file any information return or other report for income tax purposes with respect to such wages or salary with any State or subdivision thereof other than such State or subdivision of residence.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' also means the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 202(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by inserting after "Nothing in this part" a comma and the following: "except as provided in section 226A,".

(b) Part II of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by inserting after section 226 a new section as follows:

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING BY OTHER THAN RESIDENCE STATE

"SEC. 226A. (a) No part of the wages or salary paid by any motor carrier subject to the provisions of this part or by any private carrier of property by motor vehicle, to any employee who performs his regularly assigned duties as such an employee on a motor vehicle in more than one State, shall be withheld for income tax purposes pursuant to the laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of such employee's residence, as shown on the employment records of such carrier; nor shall such carrier file any information return or other report for income tax purposes with respect to such wages or salary with any State or subdivision thereof other than such State or subdivision of residence.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' also means any possession of the United States or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 4. (a) Part III of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by redesignating section 324 as section 325 and by inserting immediately after section 323 the following:

"FILING OF INFORMATION RETURNS OF OTHER REPORTS FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES WITH OTHER THAN RESIDENCE STATE

"SEC. 324. No water carrier or vessel operator shall file any information return or other report for income tax purposes with any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of residence of the employee concerned, as shown on the employment records of such water carrier or vessel operator, with respect to the wages or salary of any master, officer, or seaman who is a member of the crew on a vessel engaged in foreign, coastwise, intercoastal or noncontiguous trade or in the fisheries of the United States."

(b) The table of contents contained in section 301 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by striking out

"Sec. 324. Separability of provisions."

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 324. Filing of information returns or other reports for income tax purposes with other than residence State.

"Sec. 324. Separability of provisions."

SEC. 4. (a) Title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after section 1111 the following new section:

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WAGES AND SALARY OF EMPLOYEES FROM WITHHOLDING BY OTHER THAN RESIDENCE STATE

"SEC. 1112. (a) No part of the wages or salary paid by any air carrier to an employee who performs his regularly assigned duties as such an employee on an aircraft in more than one State shall be withheld for income tax purposes pursuant to the laws of any State or subdivision thereof other than the State or subdivision of such employee's residence, as shown on the employment records of such carrier; nor shall such carrier file any information return or other report for income tax purposes with respect to such wages or salary with any State or subdivision thereof other than such State of subdivision of residence.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' also means the District of Columbia and any of the possessions of the United States."

(b) That portion of the table of contents contained in the first section of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which appears under the heading "TITLE XI—MISCELLANEOUS" is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 1112. Exemption of certain wages and salary of employees from withholding by other than residence State."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS).

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill will remedy a problem which has increased in recent years with respect to requirements of some of the individual States that interstate common carriers withhold taxes for their employees. Under the bill only the State of a particular employee's residence would be allowed to require his employer to withhold State taxes. The bill is of importance to the employees and the employers of the railroad, motor carrier, water carrier, and air carrier industries. I believe that you can readily see what a burden it is on a carrier and also on its employees when you consider the number of States in which an employee works in a transcontinental aircraft. Substantially the same problem occurs in interstate bus or truck transportation or in rail services. The bill would do away with multiple withholding and income reporting requirements. It does not affect or attempt to affect the powers of the individual States to tax. It has the support of all of the affected industries and also of the employees of those industries. The hearing record reflects opposition from the Advisory Commission on Governmental Relations, the Department of Revenue of Alaska, the National Association of Tax Administrators, and the Multistate Tax Commission. Merchant seamen and fishermen were not included because under a separate law they are protected from the withholding of income by States. However, they were not protected from multistate requirements as to the reporting of their income. The bill sent to the desk includes an amendment which would remove the multistate requirements as to reporting by the employers of these seamen and thus bring them into a comparable position with that of other interstate transportation employees.

I urge that the Members vote for the passage of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10634, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to exempt certain wages and salaries of employees from withholding for income tax purposes under the laws of States or subdivisions thereof other than the State or subdivision of the employee's residence."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISING BOUNDARIES OF MINUTE MAN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13934) to amend the act of Sep-

tember 21, 1959 (72 Stat. 591) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise the boundaries of Minute Man National Historical Park, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13934

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 590) is amended by inserting "(a)" after the word "that" in the first sentence and adding two subsections, as follows:

"(b) Notwithstanding the description set forth in subsection (a) of this section, if the Secretary should determine that the relocation of Highway 2 by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts makes it desirable to establish new boundaries in common with, contiguous or adjacent to the proposed right-of-way for that highway, he is authorized to relocate such boundaries accordingly, and shall give notice thereof by publication of a map or other suitable description in the Federal Register: *Provided,* That any net acreage increase by reason of the boundary revision and land exchanges with the Commonwealth shall not be included in calculations of acreage in regard to the limitation set forth in subsection (a) of this section, but shall be in addition thereto.

"(c) Any lands added to the Minute Man National Historical Park, pursuant to subsection (b) may be acquired only if such acquisition can be accomplished without cost for land acquisition and, when so acquired, shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable thereto."

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the Act of September 21, 1951 (73 Stat. 590), is amended by (1) deleting "$8,000,000" and inserting "$13,900,000" and (2) deleting "$5,000,000" and inserting "$10,900,000".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 13934 is a bill which was cosponsored by the members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation. It authorizes certain changes in existing law with respect to the Minute Man National Historical Park.

The two changes which the bill encompasses are not complex:

The first deals with the boundaries of the historical park and amends existing law to permit the enlargement of the area if the lands are made available by the State, without additional cost to the Federal Government.

The second authorizes increased appropriations to complete the land acquisition program within the original boundaries of the park.

Taking these matters in reverse order, Mr. Speaker, let me briefly refresh the recollection of my colleagues with respect to this historical park. In 1959, the Congress considered and approved legislation authorizing the acquisition of up to 750 acres of land to be restored and developed as the Minute Man National Historical Park. Included within this park were some of the lands where the American Revolution began—Lexington, Concord, Lincoln, and Bedford.

As with other authorizations considered at that time, the Congress relied on information supplied by the National Park Service in determining how much money would be required for the land acquisition program. Unfortunately, the cost data supplied was not based upon reliable appraisal techniques and, as a result, the cost limitation written into the bill did not reflect the true value of the properties involved. This error has been seriously compounded with the passage of time so that today the remaining 144.37 acres of land will cost appreciably more than they would have had they been promptly purchased.

Although much of the land has been acquired with the $5 million authorized and appropriated, 58 properties containing 62 improvements remain unpurchased. It is expected that these properties will require an additional investment of $5.9 million and the increased authorization is limited to that amount. Naturally, the sponsors of the bill are anxious to complete this project—particularly in light of the role which this area will play in the bicentennial of our Independence.

It is unfortunate that it is necessary to consider this increased authorization ceiling, but I hasten to add that it was deliberately included in the original legislation in order to preclude the administering agency from exceeding the cost estimates upon which the original legislation was founded. Because the Congress has written appropriation ceilings into all of these authorizations, the cost estimates which have been presented to us in more recent years have proven to be much more reliable.

The second feature of this legislation involves the possible revision of the boundaries of the park. At the present time, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is proceeding with plans to relocate one of its State highways near the park boundaries. In anticipation of this action, this legislation provides that the park boundaries may be adjusted by the Secretary of the Interior; however, the bill as amended, requires that no additional Federal land acquisition expenditure be incurred as a result of these adjustments.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress recognized the national value of this historic area over a decade ago. While much progress has been made in acquiring and restoring the area in the ensuing years, the job is not yet complete. For this reason, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recommends the enactment of H.R. 13934 with the Committee amendments.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Colorado if the amendment offered by the gentleman cuts the cost of this bill, which now, according to the report, is approximately $14 million?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the gentleman will yield, the amendment which we have would make a total cost of the project of $13,900,000.

Mr. GROSS. That is the amendment? That is the total cost?

Mr. ASPINALL. That would be the total cost.

Mr. GROSS. Of which approximately $11 million is to be used for the purchase of lands and interest in lands?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is $10,900,000.

Mr. GROSS. And did the gentleman say that this involved the purchase of 730 acres, or some such amount?

Mr. ASPINALL. Originally it was set at about that amount. If my colleague will yield further, and as I said in my presentation, the amount that will be involved is approximately that amount, with 144.37 acres still remaining unpurchased, and that is where the additional cost comes.

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

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The total limitation in the bill is 770 acres, of which 145 acres is still to be acquired.

Mr. GROSS. Is the State of Massachusetts not making some contribution to this?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa will yield further, the State of Massachusetts has made contributions all along the line.

Mr. GROSS. Such as 730 acres of land?

Mr. ASPINALL. I do not believe they have made any contribution of acreage of land.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, under the authority of this present bill, the Commonwealth transferred to the Federal Government, National Park Service, several acres for relocation and redefinition of the boundaries.

Mr. GROSS. Several acres, s-e-v-e-r-a-l?

Mr. MORSE. Several acres; yes.

Mr. GROSS. Seven hundred and fifty acres is more than "several."

Mr. MORSE. There are 750 authorized. Most of those have already been acquired. There are only 140 remaining to be acquired.

Mr. GROSS. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts: Would this be considered as the Federal Government's expenditure in connection with the establishment of this national historic park?

Mr. MORSE. This is the total authorization that would be required. It is $10.9 million for land acquisition and $3 million for rehabilitation and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would not expect the Federal Government to be called upon to provide more money, except for the maintenance of the park?

Mr. MORSE. I am sure of that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield time to me?

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 13934, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise the boundaries of the Minute Man National Historical Park and for other purposes.

The purpose of this legislation is to

amend the act, establishing the Minute Man National Historical Park by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to revise the boundaries of the park to conform to the proposed relocation of State Highway Route 2, and by increasing the appropriation authorization for acquisition of land within the existing boundaries of the historical park.

Approximately 145 acres of lands within the existing boundaries of the park are yet to be acquired. This bill authorizes the appropriation of $5,900,000 to acquire these properties and will complete the acquisition program under the original legislation. The bill also provides that the revision of the boundaries as a result of the proposed highway relocation contemplates no land acquisition costs.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is necessary in order to protect the investment which the Federal Government has already made in this park. It may be costly, but the increased acquisition costs are the result of the overall problem of escalating land costs, in addition to unreliable estimates. Since the legislation will also complete our program in the Minute Man National Historical Park and round out the park development, I urge the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House (H.R. 13934) amends the act establishing the Minuteman National Historical Park. The park was created during the 86th Congress to commemorate the first battle of the American Revolution. Since it was authorized, more than 500 acres of land, several historic structures, and many other improvements have been acquired. The object of the park is to restore, to the extent possible, a small part of this historic region to its appearance in 1775 when the shots opening the Revolutionary War were fired.

In spite of the progress which has been made with the $5 million invested so far, eight important historic structures—valued at $942,200—and numerous other improvements located on about 125 acres of land remain unacquired. If the objectives of the park are to be achieved, this acquisition program must be completed and it should be completed as expeditiously as possible.

Like land values elsewhere, the value of these lands has increased over the years; consequently, the Government will have to pay proportionally more for these properties today than it did for the properties already purchased. This matter is further complicated by the fact that most of the remaining lands contain some improvements. The best cost estimates available to the committee indicate that $5.9 million more will be required to acquire these remaining properties.

The moneys for these acquisitions will, of course, be appropriated from the land and water conservation fund which the Congress created for this purpose. And it should be noted that the fund should be capable of meeting this need in the reasonably foreseeable future if the present administration maintains its interest in investing the money which the Congress has made available.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of those five or six areas which we have known would require further congressional attention. The situation here is similar to that which we encountered at Padre Islands National Seashore in Texas, Point Reyes National Seashore in California, and at Cape Cod National Seashore. We regret the necessity of bringing these projects before the Congress again, but we recognize the value of including these appropriation limitations when these authorizations are considered.

No one, I am sure, would contend that this significant historic area is unworthy of national recognition. It is already a popular unit of the national park system attracting more than a half million Americans annually and the number of visitors is bound to increase as we approach the bicentennial of our Independence.

Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to join the chairman of the full committee and my Massachusetts colleagues in supporting the enactment of H.R. 13934, as amended.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to revise the boundary lines of the Minute Man National Historical Park, with respect to protective and usage viewpoints, and further it seeks to remove the existing limitations on appropriations, which are now limited to $8 million for land acquisition and development.

There is a sense of real urgency with regard to Minute Man Park, in that it would be most desirable if the Congress would act now, in 1970, in order to complete this wonderful historical park in time for the Nation's Bicentennial Celebration, and also for Massachusetts in time for the special anniversary of the battle of April 19, 1775, by "the rude bridge, which arched the flood, where once the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard 'round the world."

Minute Man is an exceedingly popular park, as indicated by the number of visitors during 1969 when a total of 529,300 visitors toured the area. This number will increase as we approach the Nation's 200th birthday, and I would hope that the Congress, over the next 4 fiscal years would assist, as in the past, in acquiring the needed properties to complete Minute Man Park and have it ready for the great Bicentennial Celebration.

At a time when liberty and free government is under fire all over the world, and in our own country, it is all the more important that we stand firmly here and make sure that we defend and protect our security and rich heritage of freedom.

I respectfully submit to the Members of this House that action now on H.R. 13934 will do much to promote patriotic sentiment and assist the Nation and the American people in appropriately celebrating this great anniversary.

As I pointed out, you have helped us before with respect to this park, and the Cape Cod National Seashore, which I also initiated in the House, and I would like especially to express my warm appreciation and sincere thanks to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation (Mr. TAYLOR); and to the great leader of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, my esteemed friend, Chairman ASPINALL, who have gone out of their way, together with other members of the committee, to expedite this very important historical legislation.

I respectfully urge the House to pass this bill unanimously and sincerely thank the Members for their consideration and support.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13934, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the Act of September 21, 1959 (73 Stat. 590), to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to revise the boundaries of Minute Man National Historical Park, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PROGRAM FOR THE RESEARCH AND PROMOTION OF WHEAT

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 13543) to establish a program of research and promotion for U.S. wheat, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 13543

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Wheat Research and Promotion Act."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to enter into agreements with organizations of wheat growers, farm organizations, and such other organizations as he may deem appropriate to carry out a program of research and promotion designed to expand domestic and foreign markets and increase utilization for United States wheat and to carry out any other such program which he deems will benefit wheat producers in the United States. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall use the total net proceeds from the sale of export marketing certificates during the marketing year ending June 30, 1969, to finance the cost of such agreements, except that he shall provide for the issuance of a pro rata share of export marketing certificates for such marketing year to any producer eligible therefor under section 379c of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, who applies for such certificates not later than ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act. The Secretary is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to rise today in support of H.R. 13543, which would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with organizations of wheat-growers, farm organizations, and other organizations to carry out a program of research and promotion designed to expand domestic and foreign markets and increase utilization for U.S. wheat.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, contains basic provisions regarding export marketing certificates, from which this program would be funded. It requires that export certificates shall be issued to all persons equivalent to the number of bushels exported. The cost of such certificates per bushel to the exporter is to be that amount determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on a daily basis which would make U.S. wheat and wheat flour generally competitive in the world market, avoid disruption of world market prices, and fulfill the international obligations of the United States. These certificates are to be issued on a pro rata basis.

During the 1968–69 marketing year, the total value of wheat export certificates collected exceeded the total value of export subsidies paid by slightly over $4.2 million. Under existing legislation, the Secretary is required to distribute this accumulation pro rata to farmers who participated in the 1968 wheat program. Under present law, the Department does not intend to issue checks for less than $1, except upon request.

Mr. Speaker, the report on H.R. 13543 points out the serious problems the wheat industry now faces. In the past 20 years, annual flour consumption per capita has declined from 136 pounds to 112 pounds. A great deal could be done to reverse this deplorable trend. Recent developments in enrichment processes, flour blends, and new wheat products indicate there is expansion potential for wheat in the field of human nutrition. There are also exciting prospects for wheat utilization in industrial channels. Preliminary experimentation has shown that various wheat properties lend themselves to usage as wet and dry strength additives for paper and boxboard, as a substitute for carbon black in rubber manufacture, in the production of industrial alcohol—possible for use as a motor fuel additive, as a bonding agent in plywoods and other wood products, and in the production of protein film. In many of the instances mentioned, both in nutritional and industrial usage, basic research is well along and an acceptable product is available. The assistance needed now is in market testing or promotion, or in some cases additional research on the marketing of byproducts is needed in order to make the wheat utilization economically feasible.

There are other areas where producer efforts to support a comprehensive program for the relief and benefit of this industry are stretched woefully thin. Marketing research, promotional efforts such as the "Day of Bread" and public relations efforts on behalf of all agriculture; certainly these are central to the well-being of the wheat farmer and should be considered legitimate uses for such funding as this legislation would make available.

It is toward these ends that the instant bill is directed. It authorizes the Secretary to use the net proceeds from the sale of export marketing certificates during the marketing year ending June 30, 1969, to finance the costs of the agreements the bill authorizes. It does not authorize the use of these funds unless the producer fails to apply for them, and safeguards are taken that the funds so used would do so constructively.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily recommend passage of this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I shall be glad to try to answer questions any Member might have in mind with regard to the purpose of this program.

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

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

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, my only question is, what happens to the money which might not be used in this program? Will it revert to the growers? Will it revert to the General Treasury? Will it be used otherwise in the promotion of wheat?

Mr. PURCELL. Under this program all growers who have earned the right to have this money refunded to them will have 90 days to request that their money be refunded. The money which is left when that 90 days has expired would be handled by the Department. The Department would have authority, under the criteria established, to use the money by contract, dealing with organizations oriented toward the wheat producers.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman mean in the promotion of the use of wheat and its products?

Mr. PURCELL. Yes; as to the use of wheat. If when this is all done, the money has not all been used, then that money will revert to the Treasury.

Let me say, this is a one-shot deal. This is money which has accumulated now under circumstances which are not apt ever to develop again. We see no reasonable prospect of it ever developing again.

The report shows, as to some large number of participants, that 832,000 potential payees are involved, and 229,000 of these would receive less than $1.

Also, 186,000 would receive payments of $5 or more, 54,000 would receive payments of $11.60 or more, and 4,900 payees would receive payments of $58 or more. The Department indicated that it does not plan to have to write checks for less than $1. This is the purpose of it. It is to try to get benefits for all producers of wheat from this amount of money, namely, something over $4 million. This will not occur again. We think that the wheat producers whose money it is will get more benefits in the true sense of the word than by having to write several thousand 58-cent or 72-cent checks.

When it was passed unanimously out of the subcommittee, there was no objection from anyone, and the full committee passed it without objection.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Speaker, I want to say I appreciate his forthright and overt explanation.

I would like to say that I read and reread the committee report. I understood the small amounts of refunds involved and compliment the broad base, but nowhere could I find that first priority on the return of the money went to the individual contributor. As I understand it from his explanation, it will be so if they exercise that right within 90 days.

The rest of the gentleman's explanation has been very beneficial. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MAY).

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us is really the result of the excellent research and promotional activities of our wheat commissions in the major U.S. wheat producing States. Over the years, these 10 commissions—including especially those of my own State of Washington and the Pacific Northwest States—have put together an excellent record of achievement, and have clearly established that funds for research and promotion can be expended constructively and to good purpose.

The outstanding success of the wheat commissions in the areas of production research and overseas market promotion can be both supplemented and complemented through enactment of this bill to expand our national wheat research and promotional activities through utilization of the net proceeds of export marketing certificates accumulated during the 1968–69 marketing year.

As is pointed out in our committee report, recent developments in enrichment processes, flour blends, and new wheat products indicate that there is expansion potential for wheat in the field of human nutrition. And, there are also exciting prospects for wheat utilization in industrial channels.

Various wheat properties, it has been shown, lend themselves to usage as wet-and-dry-strength additives for paper and boxboard, as a substitute for carbon black in rubber manufacture, in the production of industrial alcohol—possibly for use as a motor fuel additive, as a bonding agent in plywoods and other wood products and in the production of protein films.

Basic research in many of these areas has already been completed, and the potential products need development, market testing or promotion. In some cases, additional research on byproduct marketing is needed in order to make the wheat utilization economically feasible.

Under this legislation, each producer would make the determination as to whether he wished to receive his pro-rata portion of the certificate pool, or allow it to be used for this type of research effort. He would be afforded a period of ninety days in which to request redemption of his certificates, and the decision would be an entirely voluntary, individual one on his part.

Enactment of this bill could result in

substantial benefit to the wheat industry of this Nation, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to give it their support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PURCELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 13543, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONTINUANCE OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15978) to amend section 2 of the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15978

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended, is amended by deleting "for fiscal year 1969, $5,000,000 in addition to the sums heretofore appropriated, for fiscal year 1970, $50,000,000 and for fiscal year 1971, $50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "for each of the fiscal years 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975, $60,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I shall take a little more time on this particular piece of legislation than on some of the other bills that have been before us this afternoon. I think that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is inclined to do the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation now before the House, providing for the continuance of civil government in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, involves a most serious obligation of the United States, to promote the political, economic, educational, and social development of these islands, and their inhabitants.

The genesis of this obligation evolves from our trusteeship agreement with the Security Council of the United Nations to act as the trustee and administering authority for this part of the world which is almost equal in total area, to the coterminus United States.

For the purpose of orientation, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, often called Micronesia, embraces three major archipelagoes in the Western Pacific Ocean. They are: the Caroline Islands, the Marshall Islands, and the Marianna Islands, exclusive of Guam. The trust territory comprises some 2,141 islands, scattered over 3 million square miles of ocean, with a total land area of 687 square miles, and supports a population of approximately 100,000 people.

Since 1947, the United States has exercised its responsibility as the administering authority of the strategic trust area. In 1951, this responsibility was transferred from the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Interior.

During the past 20 years, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has, in authorizing appropriations to carry on the civil government of the trust territory, been very responsive to administration authorization requests. In fact, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has increased the appropriation authorizations from a low of $7.5 million in 1961 to the $50 million level for fiscal 1971. Our committee has, at the same time, requested each administration to provide a balanced program of necessary capital improvements and public works relating to health, education, transportation, and communication, and other public functions in the trust territory, to insure that our obligation under the trusteeship agreement is carried out.

While there may be some criticism of our administration of the trust territory, I want to assure my colleagues that such criticism is not directed at the financial assistance provided by the Congress.

The legislation, H.R. 15978, now before you, provides a 5-year appropriation authorization for the continuance of civil government in the trust territory. The bill provides a $10 million increase in the appropriation authorization for fiscal 1971, from $50 million to $60 million and the bill authorizes the appropriation of $60 million for each of the fiscal years 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975.

The appropriation authorizations contained in this legislation were justified before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the administration on the basis of a 5-year planned, action-oriented program, to provide new impetus for the development of Micornesia. Approximately 40 percent of the total program will be in construction. This 5-year program only seeks to provide for the Micronesian people only those things which they can not provide for themselves—and those things which we here in this country take for granted—these things are: schools for children, access to medicine and medical care, reasonably safe and efficient ways to transport goods and people, a dependable communications system, secure title to property, clean potable water, treated sewage systems, electrical power and a growing economy.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, while endorsing this 5-year program is also attuned to the demands by some Micronesians for a stronger voice in the management and future of Micronesia. The committee is especially abreast of developments in the trust territory and, in particular, the Congress of Micronesia, concerning the future political status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. With respect to this emerging issue over the future political status of Micronesia, it will serve the best interests of the United States for the Committee on Appropriations of our Congress to carefully consider and monitor the implementation of this authorizing legislation, and to reconsider and reevaluate the level of Federal programs and expenditures in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is a myriad of problems and shortcomings which requires a government capable of meeting the educational, economic, political, and social needs of the people. For the United States, the basic challenge is to win the hearts and minds of the Micronesian people as they strive to conquer disease, ignorance, poverty, and acute hardship. This legislation authorizes the appropriations to meet that challenge in the trust territory.

Mr. Speaker, I support and urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass this legislation.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

I have no doubt that we will have to continue to support Micronesia. But I do question the wisdom of a 5-year commitment at the rate of $60 million a year.

I shudder to think of what the situation would be if within 5 years we got into a real financial crisis in this country and found ourselves compelled to cut back on the commitments in this area. I do question in the present financial situation that prevails the wisdom of a $300 million, 5-year commitment to Micronesia.

I fervently hope we do not have a financial showdown. But I think it would be a serious situation if we were compelled to cut back after having made this commitment and assured them that we were prepared to spend $300 milllion out there.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to my colleague, I can understand his concern. May I say also that if that should take place; that is, those things the gentleman suggests, we need that area in friendly hands and we need it properly developed. We need these people to be fit and friendly and we need them where they can be helpful as they were during the Second World War—very helpful to us. They are so widely scattered and the area is so difficult of administration and they have such limited facilities to keep them in such position of helpfulness.

I would say to my colleague, if what he suggests does happen, this authorization ceiling does not necessarily have to be the maximum, or the minimum, either one. That would be up to the Congress at that time as they take care of the appropriations. But the money is needed at the present time for the development that is projected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one quick observation?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. If we can win the hearts and minds of people around the world, and we have not been successful thus far despite having spent a couple of hundred billion dollars on foreign aid in an effort to do this. I shudder to think, I say again, of what will happen when we are compelled to drastically cut back in spending after having dished out Federal funds as though money was going out of style.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say again, I understand my colleague's concern.

These are our people. These are our friends. We want to keep them that way.

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

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

Mr. KYL. In further response to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, and in specific response to his comment regarding the length of time that we would be responsible, financially or otherwise to these islands, I would say personally I hope that we would have a great deal of responsibility for a long time, in fact in perpetuity.

Under the United Nations agreement which brings us into connection with Micronesia, we are supposed to be helping those people in leading them to a time when they can determine for themselves what their governmental and political status will be.

I hope that they do decide when the proper time comes on some kind of association with the United States as many other peoples of that area of the Pacific have. At the same time I know the chairman of the full committee—and I agree completely with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS)—is trying to guarantee these funds will be used wisely and as efficiently as possible. One of the serious problems we have had, as the chairman has suggested, is that when you try to do this job development on an annual basis, there is so much built-in inefficiency in a 12-month planning period, you just do not get the job done that you set out to do. At least now we should have some guidelines for wise expenditure of these funds.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15978, a bill to provide for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

This bill authorizes the appropriation of $300 million over a 5-year period to carry out the functions of the civil government in the trust territory. The bill authorizes an increase of $10 million for fiscal year 1971, from $50 to $60 million, and $60 million for each of the fiscal years 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975.

In Micronesia, the United States as the administering authority, is providing the whole range of public and private services at all levels of government which are necessary to a developing society in keeping with our objectives to bring the Micronesian people toward self-determination or independence on the basis of self-sufficiency. Involved in this program are approximately 100,000 people of six principal cultures and myriads of subcultures, scattered over 100 settled islands of separate little communities, spread over 3 million square miles of ocean.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is an area that was, and still is, in many places, devastated by World War II. Starting from the chaos of that war, the mission of the United States in the trust territory has been to create maximum self-sufficiency, adequate transportation and supply systems, an educational system, a health and medical care system, and an organized, functional government at every level. Our mission has also been to have this done to the fullest possible extent by the Micronesians themselves.

There is one basic conflict with our goals is administering the trust territory which is not clearly recognized and understood, and that is that the United States has vital national security interests in the trust territory. And, it must be clearly understood and recognized that the trusteeship agreement specifically permits the accommodation of those interests. Despite expressions to the contrary, the United States has not exploited that provision of the trusteeship agreement over the last 23 years.

The next few years will be most important in the history of the United States—trust territory relationships. These years will determine whether the people of the trust territory will continue a close relationship with the United States or seek some other status. What must be made clear during these years is that the United States will not be gouged, blackmailed, or wooed in protecting its own interests of national security or those of the people of Micronesia. The United States does not intend to engage again in military combat to gain freedom for the people of Micronesia and protect her own national security.

At the end of fiscal 1970, the United States has spent through direct appropriations $250 million in the trust territory. While our program in the trust territory has begun to move with the increased appropriations of recent years, the record of the United States does include some measurable achievement in many areas considering the magnitude of the task involved.

This legislation, H.R. 15978, provides a program of action through which the United States is demonstrating its responsiveness to Micronesian aspirations consistent with our national security requirements. In this respect this Country is keeping faith with the people of the trust territory and our obligations under the trusteeship agreement.

In view of recent actions by the Congress of Micronesia, I agree with the statement of the Chairman of the Full Committee, that the House Committee on Appropriations should carefully consider the implementation of this 5-year appropriation authorization and reevaluate the level of Federal expenditures in the trust territory. With the understanding that the House Committee on Appropriations will so act, I urge the rules be suspended on this bill, H.R. 15978, be passed.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his statement and also commend the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for advancing this legislation.

There is no doubt in my mind that the trust territories and the manner in which the United States handles Micronesia and other territories in the immediate future are going to have major significance as far as our ultimate success in maintaining and protecting American interests in the entire Pacific Basin. I believe the legislation before us today is a major step in the direction of giving that area the kind of attention that is long overdue.

I wholeheartedly support the legislation and look forward to working with the committee toward improving on what we have done today.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation, and as a proponent and sponsor of the legislation, I commend the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member of the committee, and my counterpart, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STEIGER) who have had so much concern and have worked so hard to bring this bill to the floor today.

There is no doubt in my mind that this is mandatory legislation, and no doubt also that it will be productive of a more coordinated and unified and organized policy toward the people of Micronesia.

This is the aim the chairman of the full committee and I and other members of the committee have had for a long time in trying to get the departments downtown to work together for a clear-cut policy on our problems in connection with Micronesia. We do not understate that problem. We recognize it, and although we are far removed from the area, we are closely joined with the people of the area in what is best for the people of Micronesia, because they are joined to our interest also.

Mr. Speaker, we have had commitments by several Presidents, and at the very least we have communicated to the people of Micronesia, by President Kennedy, that at least the health facilities within Micronesia would be in the foreseeable future at least equal to the standards in the continental United States. We have not reached that goal, and it is to keep that promise that this legislation is needed, in order for us to keep our commitment, and so the people of Micronesia can understand what we mean by a close confluence between Micronesia and America in terms of human progress.

This is needed legislation, and it is in our national interest, and I hope it will enable the United States to carry out what I believe to be well-organized efforts to bring about close association with Micronesia through the use of artful and humanitarian means that will

enable the people of that area to come to an understanding of what this association means.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, to have some part in bringing this important legislation before the House for consideration.

The bill, H.R. 15978, to provide for the continuance of civil government in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, is more than an appropriation authorization. It is legislation which provides a people-to-people program. A program of human beings sharing a community of interest and wealth. Even, more so, this legislation is evidence of our dedication to meet our obligation, under the provisions of the U.N. Charter and the trusteeship agreement. This legislation authorizes the funding of the programs which foster the educational, economic, political, and social development of the Micronesian people so that they will be ready for the opportunity to exercise their right of self-determination without fear of economic oppression or ignorance.

The purpose of H.R. 15978 is to amend the basic act providing for the continuance of civil government in the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, by increasing the appropriation authorization by $10 million for fiscal 1971, from $50 million to $60 million, and by authorizing the appropriation of $60 million for each of the fiscal years 1972, 1973, 1974, and 1975.

This 5-year appropriation authorization was recommended by the administration and continues the evolution of our basic policy in the trust territory of providing the necessary programs in communications, education, health, transportation, economic development, and increasing the involvement of Micronesians in their own government.

Despite some views to the contrary, the civil government of the trust territory is a government administered for the benefit of the Micronesian people. This government is unique in the sense that it must provide the whole range of Federal, State, local, public, and private services necessary for the education, economic, political, and social development of the people of the trust territory. This means, from building sewers to issuing passports—from building and operating schools to setting interisland surface freight rates—from providing legal services to maintaining public roads and buildings.

The 5-year appropriation authorization contained in this legislation is not a totally American program. This 5-year program is the product of joint participation of both, the people of Micronesia, through their elected representatives in the Congress of Micronesia and at local levels, and the High Commissioner and his staff. This development coordinating committee functioned at the request of the administering authority and devoted its efforts toward determining the best action-oriented program which will lead to the achievement of specific goals in the next 5 years.

This 5-year program is based upon a new impetus being given by this Administration to the development of Micronesia. In justifying this program, the Department of the Interior made it clear that a lower level of funding will stretch out the program, involve inherent increases associated with construction planning, and will compel the making of geographic priorities within the trust territory.

As a result of the Micronesian input into the planning of this program, the Micronesian people are looking forward to improving their health and education programs and facilities, developing a viable money economy in the next five years which requires land reforms and public works improvements, increasing their ability to communicate with each other and with the rest of the world, and increasing the number of Micronesians in high-ranking and responsible positions in their government.

Some highlights of this 5-year program are as follows: In the field of education.

a. Kindergarten education opportunity will be provided to 2,200 5-year-olds—none exists now.

b. All educable children of elementary age will be in school with age-in-grade 1 to 3 comparable to the United States with assurance of progressing on an age/grade accomplishment equivalency.

c. Eighty percent of elementary school graduates will enter high school and of these 90 percent will complete high school.

d. Vocational training to meet growing skill requirements will be met through prevocational training in secondary schools and at the Micronesian Occupational Center.

e. All new teachers will have 14 years of formal education compared with 11.1 years in 1969. Teachers will spend 10–15 percent of their time to compensate for pre-service training deficiencies.

f. Classroom construction costs and time will be reduced through use of simple pre-engineered designs using local labor and, where possible, indigenous materials.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES

The Ponape Teaching-Referral Hospital, district hospitals, and local dispersaries will be developed to adequately meet health needs—7.3 beds per 1,000 population.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

The transportation system will be improved to provide adequate service by: construction of 370 miles of roads; bringing all district airports to FAA standards; replacing interisland ships, and by improving harbors to eliminate lightering.

WATER, SEWERAGE, AND POWER

a. All district centers are to be served with potable water, adequate sewerage, and electric power for Government, commercial, and residential demands.

b. Outer islands will have small-scale community or home water storage facilities, sanitary devices for 95 percent of the population, and electric power for principal communities.

RESOURCE, COMMERCIAL, AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

a. Land rights and clear titles will be provided on 84,600 parcels of privately owned land, thereby identifying the public domain lands.

b. Economic growth will be accelerated.

Mr. Speaker, there are many observers and outside experts who continue to tell us what this Nation should be doing in the trust territory. While we are appreciative of these expressions, we are more in need of advice from those who have been there and know the people of Micronesia, and those who are more interested in providing the programs and financial assistance to improve the welfare of the people, and not those who are only interested in postulating the future political status of this area without having experienced firsthand its problems and shortcomings.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation and the program it authorizes will produce goodwill and better conditions in the trust territory. In this light, the future political status of the trust territory will determine itself.

I urge that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of our Union's westernmost State, closest to the Trust Territory of the Pacific, I rise in support of H.R. 15978, which would provide for the continuance of civil government for the trust territory.

Twenty-three years ago, the United Nations confidently placed the Micronesian Islands under the trust of the United States. In recent years we have read reports, which have become especially numerous in recent months, indicating that unparalleled progress and development has not characterized America's stewardship. In fact, what is most disturbing is the oft-repeated assertion that life of the islanders was better before the United States assumed trust responsibility.

The U.N. trust mandate charges the United States with responsibility for promoting the economic, educational, social, and political advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territory, toward self-government or independence. Yet we waited almost 20 years before making any serious attempt to replace roads, schools, electric power, and water facilities destroyed during the Second World War.

Moreover, the World Health Organization reports that very little has been done to control outbreaks of leprosy, amoebic dysentery, and gastroenteritis—diseases that have been almost eliminated in the United States.

In spite of this long history of neglect, citizens of the trust territory have the utmost esteem for the United States. Although not compelled to do so, many of their young men are serving in our Armed Forces and giving their lives in Vietnam. Micronesian citizens are constantly demonstrating their loyalty to the country to which they look for protection.

The largest island groups coming within the U.N. trusteeship are the Mar-

shalls, the Carolines, and the Marianas, except Guam. Altogether, the trust territory comprises 2,141 islands and extends through an area of the South Pacific equal to the Continental United States. The inhabitants number about 100,000.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15978 would help us to improve our civil administration in the trust territory of the Pacific Islands by increasing the appropriation authorization from $50 million to $60 million for each of the 5 fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1971.

The 5-year program will help the United States in fulfilling its pledge to promote the economic, educational, social, and political development of the people of Micronesia. Among the main goals of the 5-year program are:

First, improvement of health and education programs and facilities;

Second, development of a viable money economy requiring land reform and public works improvements;

Third, increasing the ability of the Micronesians to communicate; and

Fourth, bringing more Micronesians into high-ranking and responsible positions of government, and including the Congress of Micronesia and the district legislatures directly in the planning and budget process.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15978 will enable the United States to improve the nature and extent of its trust obligation in Micronesia. I therefore strongly urge a unanimous vote for the measure.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately after the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SAYLOR).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15978), as amended.

The question was taken; and—two-thirds having voted in favor thereof—the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill (S. 3479) to amend section 2 of the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the Senate bill increase the time element, increase the 5 years, and would it increase the amount of money?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the Senate bill is a 2-year authorization, and after very careful study, the House Committee decided that the 5-year authorization was the only kind of extension that we could honestly bring to the floor of the House. That is the time difference in the two bills—the 5 years in the House bill and the 2 years in the Senate legislation.

Mr. GROSS. But no difference as to amount?

Mr. ASPINALL. No.

Mr. GROSS. And the Senate bill would be then amended, increasing the time to 5 years?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is right.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 3479

A bill to amend section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 for fiscal year 1970, and $60,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1971 and 1972, to remain available until expended, to carry out the provisions of this Act and to provide for a program of necessary capital improvement and public works related to health, education, utilities, highways, transportation facilities, communications, and public buildings: *Provided,* That except for funds appropriated for the activities of the Peace Corps no funds appropriated by any Act shall be used for administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands except as may be specifically authorized by law."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASPINALL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3479 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 15978, as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A similar House bill (H.R. 15978) was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING FORT POINT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 18410) to establish the Fort Point National Historic Site in San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 18410

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve and interpret for future generations the historical significance of Fort Point in the Presidio of San Francisco, California, the Congress hereby establishes the Fort Point National Historic Site comprising the area depicted on the map entitled "Boundary Map, Fort Point National Historic Site, California", numbered NHS–POI–91,000 and dated July 1970, together with such adjacent lands as may hereafter be transferred, without monetary consideration, to the Secretary of the Interior by the Secretary of the Army. Such additional lands, which shall neither exceed ten acres of fast lands nor sixty-three acres of submerged lands, shall, when transferred, be added to the Fort Point National Historic Site and shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act: *Provided,* That no transfer of lands pursuant to this section shall be consummated until sixty days after the description, terms, and conditions of the proposed transfer have been forwarded to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the Fort Point National Historic Site in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et esq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461–467).

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated for development of Fort Point National Historic Site such sums as may be necessary, but not more than $5,250,000 (February 1970 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in support of H.R. 18410 as recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This bill establishes the Fort Point National Historic Site in California.

Fort Point is located in the Presidio of San Francisco. Unlike many of the other coastal forts around the country, it is readily accessible to the general public without undue interference with existing military activities. Being located, as it is, in San Francisco, this fort should serve not only the residents living in and near that major American city, but it will provide a significant attraction to the millions of tourists from all parts of the country who visit that city every year.

If enacted as recommended by the committee, H.R. 18410 will establish the historic site as of the date of its enactment. The members of the committee were concerned because the details of the agreement for the transfer of the necessary lands from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Interior were not sufficiently firm to assure the future of the site. As a consequence of this concern, it was determined that the historic site should be estab-

lished by the Congress to the extent that the two agencies had reached agreement and that the future enlargement of the site to include certain submerged and adjacent lands should be contingent upon a mutually acceptable agreement compatible with the purposes of this legislation. Sixty days before such an agreement is to be consummated, the details of the proposed transfer are to be transmitted to the Congress for review.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the committee are satisfied that the fort and the 29 acres of land on which it is located will make a suitable national historic site and that it will be capable of meeting the needs of the public in the immediate years ahead. The potential additions which the bill would permit are explicitly limited and would be necessary only to assure the integrity of the site and to accommodate the public when the visitor volume increases.

All of the lands immediately or potentially involved in this proposal are federally owned; consequenty, no land acquisition costs will be incurred. Other than annual operating costs, the only costs attributable to the project will be those associated with its rehabilitation and preparation for a large volume of visitors. It is estimated that development costs will total $5,250,000 and the bill limits the authorization to that amount. In this respect, the committee amended the cost limitation to reflect the maximum amount expected to be needed. The original appropriation ceiling contained in the bill did not include any expenditures anticipated after the first 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, that explains the nature and the purpose of H.R. 18410 very briefly. As chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I believe that the bill, as amended, is sound legislation and I recommend its approval to the Members of the House.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Again I thank the gentleman for yielding.

All the land for this project is to be donated by the Federal Government?

Mr. ASPINALL. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Yet there is $5,250,000 cost attached to this. The improvements within that area, must be in a sad state of disrepair, if it is going to cost $5,250,000 for rehabilitation.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is not in such a sad state of repair, but improvements are needed to get it ready for the use of the public.

Also, the approximately $2,190,000 is here as a contingent authorization, so that if the seawall which is present there needs rehabilitation, then the money will be available.

Mr. GROSS. If I may ask the gentleman, was this an area that the hippies and the yippies took over?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. The gentleman is thinking of Alcatraz, which was a former Federal penitentiary. This is not that area. This is an old fort. And might I say that it is one of two in the United States of a four tier construction, and, it is the only fort constructed as such on the Pacific coast.

Mr. GROSS. I thought they did stage some kind of a demonstration there. I am well aware of the demonstration and takeover of Alcatraz, but I thought there was another demonstration that was staged here, where they took this over for a short period of time.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to my good friend that I have been busy out in the beautiful land of the sun, Colorado, and if there had been anything like this, it did not get into our papers.

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

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

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. I would like to say to my good friend from Iowa that this is probably the least likely spot where the hippies or the yippies would be able to take over.

Mr. GROSS. I understand it is a military reservation, but that sometimes does not stop them from taking over. If I remember correctly, they invaded the Department of Justice in Washington and invaded other military installations of one kind or another.

May I ask the gentleman one other question? What is meant by "fast land"?

Mr. ASPINALL. I understand that is land that is completely attached to the shoreline.

I will be glad to yield to my friend from Iowa for an explanation of that.

Mr. GROSS. I have never seen the term before, fast land.

Mr. KYL. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. KYL. There is associated with this historic site area some submerged lands, and the fact is that the term "fast land" is used to distinguish the land which is always above water from that which is submerged.

Further to respond to the gentleman's question about the development cost, the main portion of $3.5 million would be for the development of roads, parking areas, trails, and viewpoints, as well as the construction of a visitor information station. Then there is an additional $1.9 million that would probably be needed to improve the existing seawall. There will also be some slope protection and landscaping done in connection with the project.

I would also like to add for general information this piece of land which we are making into a historic site here is among the very highest valued land in the United States. If this piece of land were put up for auction, the purchase price, I am sure, would be staggering. This is some of the most valuable land in the country.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield further?

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

Mr. GROSS. Is it more valuable than what they propose to do in Washington in trading the land near Shirley Highway adjacent to the Pentagon? I wonder if it is more valuable than that?

Mr. ASPINALL. May the gentleman in the well be excused from answering that question?

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 18410, a bill to establish the Fort Point National Historic Site in the city of San Francisco, Calif.

Fort Point is located on the south side of the entrance of San Francisco Bay, and near the south end of the Golden Gate Bridge. It was originally the site of an old Spanish fort in 1794, and in 1850, the area surrounding this site, commonly known as the Presidio, was declared a military reservation. The fort was reconstructed in 1853, and is one of the two forts constructed in this country with the arrangement of guns in multiple tiers. Thereafter, this fort and surrounding area, although part of the larger Presidio area, became known as Fort Winfield Scott.

This fort, like Fort Hunt and Fort Washington here on the Potomac River, and others throughout this country, represent the efforts of our forefathers in establishing the defenses and national security of this Nation. As such, Fort Point presents an outstanding opportunity to preserve this historic site. The fort has remained in relatively good condition because it has been within the confines of an active military reservation.

In 1960, the Fort Point Museum Association, an historic-minded nonprofit citizens organization in California, sought to begin the preservation of this historic site and leased some lands from the Department of the Army. They have restored a 2-acre area and operate the site as a military museum. Through the efforts of this association and without the advantages of national recognition, some 200,000 visitors each year have been able to see and enjoy this historic fort and site.

The bill, H.R. 18410, as amended by the committee, will establish a 29-acre historic site by transferring the lands from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior, with the potential addition of another 10 acres in the future.

Since the lands involved are federally owned, there are no land acquisition costs involved in this legislation. However, approximately $3,500,000 is needed for development and possibly an additional $1,900,000 to rehabilitate an existing seawall. The development planned will consist of roads, parking areas, trails, viewpoints, a visitor's information station, picnic areas and general repair and rehabilitation of the fort.

In my judgment, establishment of the Fort Point National Historic Site will provide a valuable addition to the nationally recognized historic sites across the Nation. These sites tell the story and history of this country and should be available for the public to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation before us to establish Fort Point as a national historic site. As a cosponsor of the legislation being considered, I am particularly gratified by the prompt action of the House on this matter.

This legislation will allow the preservation of what has been termed "the best remaining example of the surviving forts of the gold rush era." According to experts in this field, none of the surviving forts of that period can compare, architecturally, with Fort Point, and it remains as the best existing example of American military architecture at its highest level.

One factor alone, in my judgment, that dictates that Fort Point should be preserved as a national historic site; that is, its proximity to one of the Nation's major metropolitan centers—San Francisco.

Located at the entrance to San Francisco Bay, Fort Point is within easy reach of the several million residents of the Bay Area and, scenically, combines a view of San Francisco Bay, the Golden Gate Bridge, and Alcatraz Island.

Fort Point would be truly unique in that it would afford visitors an opportunity to view this vast panorama, as well as the port itself and its 110 years of history.

At present, the Fort Point Museum Association, a nonprofit organization, leases approximately 2 acres from the Army, including the fort itself, and just this past summer, welcomed its 300,000th visitor to the fort. This is truly an amazing statistic, since the fort is open only on Saturdays and Sundays. The National Park Service has estimated that this tremendous structure, in the heart of a major metropolitan area, will attract 600,000 visitors annually.

Since the land on which the fort is located currently is owned by the Federal Government, there are no acquisition costs involved with the project. There will, of course, be minimal cost to restore and operate the site. The legislation merely transfers the land from the Department of the Army to the Department of Interior and establishes it as a unit of the National Park Service.

Again, I strongly urge favorable and early congressional action on this legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, today we consider four bills originating in the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation and important to the history of our Nation. The first dealing with Minute Man National Historical Park in New England has already been passed. The one that we are now considering would make a historic site of an outstanding example of American military architecture in the State of California. The third deals with a battlefield in the Midwest and the fourth establishes a historic site in the South. It just happens that they are so distributed. All, we think, hold historic value for our Nation.

This is a time when we need to turn the spotlight on American history and remind our people of the events and sacrifices which made our Nation what it is today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the object of H.R. 18410 is to authorize the establishment of the Fort Point National Historic Site.

There are many persuasive arguments for preserving this fort as a part of the national park system. It is an outstanding example of American military architecture. Although it is not unique, it is one of only two forts built with four tiers of guns and it is the only major coastal fort on the west coast.

Thanks to the fact that it is located within an active military reserve, the fort has survived the wrecker's ball. In fact, even when the world-famous Golden Gate Bridge was constructed, its historic and architectural values were recognized and a special effort was made to save it from destruction. Now, this little American fort stands partially under the southern end of the bridge posing an extremely interesting contrast for people interested in the history of American architecture.

The structure is basically sound and unaltered, but some repairs, restoration, and refurbishing will be required to assure the safety of the visiting public and to provide for its proper interpretation.

Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess, a few members of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation had an opportunity to visit this site and discuss this legislation with the commanding officer of the Presidio. As a result of our meeting, we can advise the House that the Department of the Army fully supports H.R. 18410, as amended, and that the Army will cooperate fully in making this a meaningful historic area for the edification and enjoyment of the American people.

While we did not seek any commitments with respect to the possible future transfer of the submerged lands and adjacent lands, I feel confident that suitable arrangements will be agreed upon as the needs arise. There was no objection to the immediate transfer of the 29 acres and of the fort to the Interior Department.

As the chairman of the full committee mentioned, Mr. Speaker, no land acquisition costs are involved in this legislation. Under the terms of the bill, appropriations are limited to no more than $5,250,000, but all of this money will not be needed if the potential future transfers are not consummated and some of the costs attributable to the historic site may be reduced if both the Department of the Army and the Department of the Interior benefit from some of the improvements—such as roads, seawall and pier rehabilitation, and so forth. In any event, it is not contemplated that all of the development money will be requested or appropriated in the immediate years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I merely want to say that, having visited this proposed historic site, I am proud to have played a part in this legislation, because, I believe that a significant part of the story of the American Nation and her people can be told here. It is the kind of a place that makes one take stock in his country and realize that, in spite of all our problems today, it is still a great place in which to live—and its getting better all the time. H.R. 18410 will make it possible to tell what American life was like a century ago—I support it—and I urge its enactment.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 18410, which I introduced and which was coauthored by my distinguished colleague from San Francisco, Mr. MAILLIARD, and others, would establish the Fort Point National Historic Site in San Francisco, Calif.

I am grateful for the efforts of the chairman of the subcommittee which heard this bill, Mr. TAYLOR, and of the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Mr. ASPINALL, without whose assistance the creation of the Fort Point Historic Site would have been impossible.

The passage of this bill by the House will be welcome news to the Fort Point Museum Association and to all others who have worked so hard to make the Fort Point National Historic Site a reality.

This area represents a significant piece of American history. The construction of the fort was authorized by the Secretary of War, Jefferson Davis, in 1852. The building of the fort was supervised by 1st Lt. George Washington Custis Lee, son of Robert E. Lee.

The only block fortress built in the West, its granite blocks were transported more than 100 miles from the Mormon Island quarries, near Folsom, Calif.

The passage of this legislation will preserve Fort Point and this important bit of American history for posterity.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I am especially pleased that the legislation to establish Fort Point National Historic Site has finally reached the floor for consideration.

I gave the measure its first introduction to the House in July of 1967. Since then, it has experienced the usual ups and downs of the legislative process, including Senate passage in 1968 under the sponsorship of Senator Kuchel. Today the bill enjoys bipartisan cosponsorship by eight of your colleagues from Arizona, California, New York, and Puerto Rico.

We should note that setting aside old Fort Point as an historical site will have twofold significance. First, this move would provide for the conservation of valuable open space in the midst of the rapidly expanding San Francisco Bay Area metropolis. Second, the enactment of this legislation will insure the preservation of one of our Nation's unique historical sites.

I might also add that Fort Point has received considerable local support from the members of the Fort Point Museum Association. As a nonprofit educational group, its mission has been to establish Fort Point as a museum and to make its historical contents available to the public—a task which thas been successfully accomplished.

With its magnificent view from the southern base of the Golden Gate Bridge, and with its history dating from 1854, Fort Point will be an invaluable addition to our system of national parks monuments and historic sites.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge House approval for the bill H.R. 18410.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 18410, establishing the Fort Point National Historic Site in San Francisco, Calif. This bill, of which I am a sponsor along with seven of my colleagues, serves to preserve the most massive brick fortification to be erected on the west coast of North America. Constructed by the U.S. Army between 1854 and 1861 to guard the Golden Gate—the entrance to San Francisco Bay—it has long been abandoned for military use. But it remains a part of America's heritage which well deserves preservation.

It is especially gratifying that the House has the opportunity to vote for H.R. 18410, not only because of its worthy end and because I am a sponsor of this legislation, but also because this bill's principal sponsor is our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. BURTON). Having served in the House with him since his arrival in Congress, and having sat on the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with him, I have first hand knowledge of the dedicated commitment of the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON). His perspicacity, his legislative know-how, his enlightened views, and his voting record mark our distinguished colleague as one of the most valuable Members of the House. It is, therefore, an honor for me to cosponsor, with the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON), H.R. 18410.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 18410, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WILSON'S CREEK BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1160) to amend the act of April 22, 1960, providing for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, in the State of Missouri," approved April 22, 1960 (74 Stat. 76), is amended as follows:

(a) Strike out "Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park" in the title and in section 2 (a), and substitute "Wilson's Creek National Battlefield".

(b) Amend section 3 to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. For development of the Wilson's Creek National Battlefield, there are authorized to be appropriated not more than $2,285,000 (March 1969 prices), plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1160 is a bill introduced by our colleague from Missouri, Hon. DURWARD HALL. The basic objective of the bill is to authorize the appropriation of additional funds for the development of the unit of the National Park System presently known as "Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park." If enacted, the bill would also redesignate the area as "Wilson's Creek National Battlefield."

The establishment of this area was originally authorized by the 86th Congress. At that time, we included the usual provision limiting the amount authorized to be appropriated—the ceiling established totaled $120,000 of which not more than $20,000 was expected to be used for land acquisition. All of the lands in the battlefield, however, have been acquired and donated to the United States by the State of Missouri because of its keen interest in the historic confrontation which took place there in August 1861. It was at Wilson's Creek that many Union and Confederate soldiers saw their first and last battle of the Civil War and it was there that the future course of the State of Missouri was determined.

The battle which took place in those Missouri hills had a significant effect on the future course of the war and the events which occurred there should be fully interpreted for the visitors at the site. If H.R. 1160 is enacted, it is expected that a visitors center, a tour road, interpretive trails and footbridges, as well as other public use and interpretive facilities will be constructed. Naturally, all of these things require a substantial investment, so the bill must reflect their estimated cost. As recommended by the committee, H.R. 1160 authorizes the appropriation of $2,285,000—an increase of $2,165,000.

While this is an increased authorization, Mr. Speaker, I do want to emphasize that it contemplates a broader development program than we originally recommended in 1960 and that it does not reflect an erroneous cost estimate. In this case, the committee members feel that the additional investment is warranted; therefore, we recommend this new authority to accomplish the development program which will best serve the public interest.

In conclusion, I want to point out that the bill—like others that have come up from time to time—redesignates the area as a national battlefield. This designation will more appropriately reflect the principal feature of the area.

With that brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the Members of the House to approve the bill, as recommended.

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

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS Mr. Speaker, if I read the report correctly concerning this bill, the State of Missouri unlike most other States contributed 1,727 acres.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. Of course, there have been other States, such as the State of North Carolina and others that have likewise contributed large areas of land. It is because of this that I think you will be very much interested in this legislation and very charitable toward the increased cost of development.

Mr. GROSS. This is one of the virtues of this legislation, that the State of Missouri saw fit to purchase and turn over to the Federal Government the land necessary to create this national historic park.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, we have two very much desired proposed national park areas that we are holding up at the present time because the States involved do not see fit to cooperate to this extent.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman and thank him for yielding.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1160.

The purpose of this legislation is to amend the act authorizing the establishment of Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park by: First, increasing the amount authorized to be appropriated for land acquisition and development from $120,000 to $2,285,000, and second, redesignating the park as "Wilson's Creek National Battlefield."

Since this national park was established in the 86th Congress, because of its historical significance in the Civil War, the State of Missouri has donated 1,727.54 acres of land for this park. The result has been that the $120,000 appropriated by the 1960 act has been expended and additional funds are needed for development. The developments proposed include a battlefield tour road, interpretive exhibits, parking areas, battlefield trails, a visitor center with museum exhibits and administrative facilities.

In keeping with the specific designation of areas in the National Park Service, I support the redesignation of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park

as the Wilson's Creek National Battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), the author of the bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Mr. ASPINALL, and the chairman of their subcommittee on national parks and recreation, Mr. TAYLOR, for reporting H.R. 1160. Their assistance, as well as that of their committee's staff, has been invaluable.

H.R. 1160, as originally introduced, provided for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park. Basically, this bill provided for two things:

First It would redesignate the park as the "Wilson's Creek National Battlefield."

Second. It would authorize the appropriation of $2,514,000.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Interior submitted a favorable departmental report on May 28 of this year. In that report they concurred with the changing of the name to "Wilson's Creek National Battlefield," and made one modification in regard to the amount of the authorization. Their recommendation was that the amount of "$2,285,000" be substituted for the amount of "$2,514,000" that appeared in my bill. I certainly cannot quarrel with this alteration and have been more than willing to accept it.

Now Mr. Speaker, this legislation may appear as a routine matter, but to the people of southwest Missouri it constitutes the preservation of the site of one of the two most important military engagements fought west of the Mississippi during the Civil War. This battle, which took place on August 10, 1861, was ostensibly a victory for the Confederacy, but since they failed to pursue the Union retreat they were deprived of Missouri's food supplies, minerals, arsenal, and industry.

The fury and intensity of the events that day are briefly and concisely described in the National Park Service's pamphlet in the following manner:

General Lyon, leaving 1,000 troops in Springfield to guard his supplies, decided to make a surprise attack with 5,400 troops on the Southern camp early on the morning of August 10. Minutes before the battle started, a man was said to have galloped by on a mule warning residents of the area "Git back in yore homes! Thar's goin' to be a hell of a battle here in a few minutes!" There was.

For the next five hours the hills shook with what turned out to be one of the bloodiest battles of the Civil War. The fighting was at close range, frequently hand to hand. Though this was one of the first battles of the war and many of the troops had little training, on no battlefield of the War Between the States was there a greater display of courage and bravery. Officers, many of them West Point graduates and veterans of the Mexican and Indian Wars, led their men in person.

At times, the Federals would gain a few yards, only to see their gains erased by a counterthrust. The process would then be reversed. It was later reported in the official records of the Union and Confederate armies that, during the great fury of the battle, "some of the best blood in the land was being spilled as recklessly as if it were ditch water."

Though already wounded twice, General Lyon was struck by a rifle ball in the chest as he was trying to lead another charge. He fell from his horse into the arms of his orderly and gasped, "Lehman, I am killed." Later his body was carried by the Confederates to Ray's farmhouse, a mellowed and weather-beaten frame structure which still stands.

The losses were about equal on both sides. Approximately 16 percent of the total engaged were either killed or wounded. On Bloody Hill where most of the fighting took place, 25 percent of the men were either killed or wounded. The casualties at Wilson's Creek were greater than in any battle ever fought west of the Mississippi. After the battle, the ground was so covered with dead and wounded that one eyewitness later wrote, "one could have stepped from one man to another."

Quite a day, indeed. A battle that sired the future general officer, E. G. Sturges, and others.

When this project was initiated as a joint Federal-State project the State of Missouri agreed to purchase the land. This has now been done, in that the State has spent almost $700,000 for the acquiring of 1,730 acres. It is now time for us in Washington to fulfill our responsibilities by providing the money for a visitors' center with museum exhibits, a battlefield tour road, interpretive exhibits, parking areas, and battlefield trails. These proposed facilities will go far in accommodating and informing the increasing number of visitors that visit the park each year. In addition, these proposed improvements will serve as an inducement for more and more Americans to visit this historic spot. For the committee's information 41,619 people visited Wilson's Creek in 1968. This number increased to 47,314 persons in 1969. This shows the increasing interest in this historical site.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully hope that the House of Representatives will act favorably, in light of the fact that H.R. 1160 was unanimously approved by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and since the Department of the Interior recommended its passage.

Finally, let us fulfill our Federal obligations since the State of Missouri has fulfilled its obligations through land acquisition; since an increase of visitors tour the site, and most importantly since this legislation would be another important step in preserving our American heritage. It is living history for today's students.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise briefly to support the legislation, but more specifically to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), the author of the bill, for his presentation before the committee and his cooperation as we developed the legislation which was most commendable and which I think needs to be included in the RECORD.

He has championed the development of the Wilson's Creek National Battlefield Park, and his presentation before our committee, in advancing this legislation, was forceful, articulate, and detailed in content. The committee, as evidenced by the passage of the bill today, has responded, once again, to the very reasonable and responsible requests of our very able colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in 1960 the Congress authorized the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park in Missouri. At that time, it was thought that it should be protected for the edification and enjoyment of the people of the United States, but only a modest development program was contemplated. H.R. 1160, if approved, will enable the National Park Service to undertake a development program more consistent with the purposes for which this site was made a part of the national park system.

The State of Missouri has been most cooperative in assisting in this effort. The Wilson's Creek Battlefield Park Commission, a State agency, acquired title to all of the lands needed for the interpretation of the battlefield—approximately 1,727 acres—and it has donated them to the United States. This has made it possible for the National Park Service to utilize all of the $120,000 authorized and appropriated to construct an entrance road, to install certain public use facilities, and to conduct archeological research and site restoration.

A number of additional improvements are planned if H.R. 1160 is enacted. It is estimated that an effective interpretive program at the site will require an investment of $2,165,000 in addition to the $120,000 already expended. These costs are based on March 1969 construction prices. Because of the fact that these construction costs fluctuate, the bill provides that the authorization limitation may be adjusted in accordance with standard construction cost indices. This will enable the Park Service to complete the development program outlined during the hearings on the bill, even if construction costs require an expenditure beyond the amounts authorized.

In this regard, however, I want to call the attention of the Members to the language contained in our report which makes it absolutely clear that the administering agency is to advise the committee if it expects expenditures to exceed the limitation imposed by the bill. We expect to be informed of these price increases prior to the request for appropriations so that we will have an opportunity to comment on them. This language in the bill is a fairly recent innovation, Mr. Speaker. It should avoid the necessity of considering minor cost changes necessitated by changing prices, but it does not authorize the Park Service to change the development plan which it presented to the committee. In other words, it allows a measure of flexibility to accomplish the objective which we are authorizing, but major changes in the development plan, requiring an increased outlay, will still require a new authorization by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1160 merits the support of the Members of the House and I recommend it to my colleagues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 1160, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ANDERSONVILLE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, GA.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 140) to authorize the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 140

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to provide an understanding of the overall prisoner-of-war story of the Civil War, to interpret the role of prisoner-of-war camps in history, to commemorate the sacrifice of Americans who lost their lives in such camps, and to preserve the monuments located therein, the Secretary is hereby authorized to designate not more than five hundred acres in Macon and Sumter Counties, Georgia, for establishment as the Andersonville National Historic Site.

SEC. 2. Within the area designated pursuant to section 1 of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, transfer from any Federal agency, or exchange lands and interests therein for the purposes of this Act. When an individual tract of land is only partly within the area designated, the Secretary may acquire the entire tract by any of the above methods to avoid the payment of severance costs. Land so acquired outside the designated area may be exchanged by the Secretary for non-Federal lands within such area, and any portion of the land not utilized for such exchanges may be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.). In exercising his authority to acquire property by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within such area, and in exchange therefor he may convey to the grantor of such property any federally owned property in the State of Georgia under his jurisdiction which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The values of the properties so exchanged either shall be approximately equal, or if they are not approximately equal the values shall be equalized by the payment of cash to the grantor or to the Secretary as the circumstances require. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal property designated for the purposes of the national historic site may, with the concurrence of the head of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred, without a transfer of funds, to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior shall administer the Andersonville National Historic Site in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461–467).

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated not more than $363,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than $1,605,000 (March 1969 prices), for development, plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indices applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

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

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

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

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the bill now before the House is H.R. 140 by our colleague from Georgia (Mr. BRINKLEY). It provides for the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site.

It may seem strange to some people that the Congress would consider legislation to designate a place which is infamous in the annals of history as a national historic site, but the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs recognize the historic significance which this prison camp, and others like it, played in the course of our history. Like Ford's Theater and all of the national battlefields in the country, Andersonville was a place of great tragedy. Like other Civil War prison camps established by both the North and the South, Andersonville was overcrowded and plagued by disease and starvation. The inhuman conditions which existed there were not unique in those times, and unfortunately have not been uncommon elsewhere in the decades that have followed.

No other place comparable to Andersonville exists in this country today. The existing prison park contains the corners, gates, and outline of the stockade and memorials mark the loss of men from Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. By making this relatively small area a national historic site, we memorialize not only those who sacrificed their lives at this place and time, but the thousands of men from all parts of the country who have perished as prisoners of war.

Mr. Speaker, if enacted, H.R. 140 will create a national historic site comprising approximately 500 acres of land. Almost half of this is federally owned—211 acres—and will be transferred to the Department of the Interior without cost, the remainder—294 acres—will be purchased at an estimated cost of $362,000. Development of the area, which will include the construction of an interpretive center, walking trails, picnic areas, and the restoration of the landscape is expected to require an additional $1,605,000 over a 5-year period.

I particularly want to call the attention of the Members of the House to one of the amendments recommended by the committee. As has been our usual practice, we recommend that the amount authorized to be appropriated be limited to the amounts which we were told would be needed to effectuate this legislation. In recent times we have imposed these limitations on both land acquisition and development funds. Because of the fact that construction costs fluctuate from time to time and because the construction activities are often spread across a period of several years, it seems appropriate to provide some measure of flexibility with respect to development moneys. Consequently, the committee is recommending that the development cost limitations be tied to standard construction cost indices. This means that to the extent that the development of a particular facility increases or decreases in accordance with these indices, the authorization fluctuates accordingly. This language is not intended to authorize the administering agency to substantially alter its development program and thereby cause an increase to be incurred—that action would require additional legislation.

In exercising its oversight authority, the committee expects to be fully advised of all circumstances which may cause this escalator clause to be implemented. To the extent possible, we expect to be informed of this fact before any binding commitments are executed and, most certainly, we expect to be advised of the necessity for funds above the amounts specified before any additional appropriations are requested. It is with this understanding that the committee included this language in the legislation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that the Andersonville National Historic Site is undoubtedly a nationally significant place. The events which occurred there may not represent our finest hour, but they are a part of the history of this Nation which we must recognize, which we must try to understand, and from which we should learn.

The members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considered this matter carefully and we recommend the enactment of the bill, as amended.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. I should note something that I neglected to point out earlier, and that is the coincidence of having passed the preceding bill to establish the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park in the district of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL). This is today his birthday. He refuses to divulge his age, but says he is 39 and still counting. I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri on his birthday and thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say in reply to my colleague from Iowa that I saw the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), before the session began today and asked of him charity and peace, and extended to him all good wishes on this day—his natal celebration.

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given

permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 140, the bill to authorize the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site in the State of Georgia.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate not more than 500 acres of land for the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site in Macon and Sumter Counties in the State of Georgia. The bill also authorizes the acquisition of 294 acres of privately owned lands at an estimated cost of $362,000 and $1,605,000 for development. The additional 201 acres are already in Federal ownership including an 84-acre prison park and a 117-acre national cemetery which are presently administered by the Department of the Army.

The story told here at Andersonville, Ga., and its relationship to the Civil War and the struggle of this Nation to achieve its manhood deserve national recognition. While there still are some people who do not wish to recognize the cohesive and unifying effect of that internal and bitter struggle, there is no single event in the great history of this Nation which portrays so vividly the frailties of human beings and the determination and wisdom of those who sought to preserve a more perfect Union. The result has been the growth and development of this Nation as a world power unforeseen in the previous history of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 140, by Representative JACK BRINKLEY, authorizes the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site in the State of Georgia.

The story which this historic site can tell the visiting public is an important one. In many ways, it is an unpleasant one because it evokes a story of pain and suffering almost beyond imagination. But a far more important story can be told at Andersonville than the gory details of disease and malnutrition that stalked many of the crowded prison camps of the Civil War period.

Many places in the national park system have been set aside as a tribute to the contributions of Americans who have helped to make this Nation what it it, but there is no area comparable to Andersonville. Here the contributions of American prisoners-of-war can be told. Andersonville is the last remaining Civil War period site where that aspect of our history can be explained.

As contemplated by the bill, Mr. Speaker, the historic site would include the old prison camp and the Andersonville National Cemetery. It is expected that the National Park Service will acquire the lands needed to connect these two areas and that the acquired grounds will be restored, as nearly as possible to their natural condition. Of the lands included in the site, 211 acres are already federally owned and the Department of the Army endorses their transfer to the Interior Department for this purpose. The remaining 294 acres of land are privately owned and will be purchased or acquired, if possible by exchange.

Proper development of this area is extremely important if it is to accomplish its mission. I am confident that the National Park Service will utilize its talented personnel so as to make this area a meaningful memorial not only to those imprisoned there, but also to the patriots who have struggled—at home and abroad—and suffered the anguish and loneliness of captivity.

The enactment of H.R. 140 is highly appropriate, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues in the House to approve it.

(Mr. BRINKLEY (at the request of Mr. TAYLOR) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the author of the legislation which would authorize the establishment of the Andersonville National Historic Site, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, the gentleman from North Carolina, for the excellent manner in which he has presented this legislation today. Also, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the full Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado, and all other members of the committee, for holding hearings and reporting favorably on this bill which I believe, on its merits, has so much national appeal.

It would seem to be right and proper to establish this site in order to honor the memory of the men who gave their lives for the preservation of the Union but who sleep in the soil of their then alienated countrymen. From personal observation, I can attest to the inspiration of the monuments erected to their memory by the States from which they come.

As Members of this august body know, Andersonville Prison was the largest and most publicized of the prison war camps, and is the only Civil War prison site in the Nation physically in existence and still untouched by urban growth. It has been my privilege to work very closely with local citizens in their attempts to develop this site into a proper historical memorial, and I sincerely believe that these efforts have much merit and are of great national interest. I feel certain that this site, when developed, will be an outstanding point of interest and will attract many, many thousands of visitors each year. A large population is within an easy day's drive of the site and this includes significant portions of Alabama and northern Florida. It is located approximately 60 miles south and west of Macon, Ga., approximately 120 miles south of Atlanta and approximately 50 miles south and east of Columbus, Ga. Interstate 75 runs approximately 25 miles east of Andersonville and the site is also easily accessible to other main road connectors and hence readily available to all of our Nation's citizens.

This legislation has been enthusiastically supported by all of the local communities in the area and attested to by written resolutions and letters of endorsement from local city governments and also from the Governor of the State of Georgia, the Georgia State Department of Industry and Trade, the State historical commission, and local chamber of commerce which were presented at the committee hearings on this proposal.

I have some excellent photographs with me showing several monuments erected by States whose sons fought with the Union. These again attest to the interest and reflect the strong national appeal of Andersonville. I would be happy for you to come by and look at these touching photographs and observe them more closely.

I commend the National Parks Service for developing a plan for this site which will offer the untold overall prison story of the Civil War, as well as the role of the war camp history, and wish to strongly urge your approval of this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 140, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 18306, INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1179

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. 18306) to authorize United States participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund by the General Accounting Office, 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 Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendments under the five-minute rule by chapters instead of by sections. It shall be in order to consider without intervention of any point of order the amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now printed on page 8, line 6 through line 10 of the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. 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, this resolution provides for an open rule. As those who listened will know from the reading of the resolution, the rule provides the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule by chapters instead of by sections.

The waiver of points of order is to a section which provides for an alternate Executive Director for the Inter-American Development Bank. We were told in the Rules Committee that the provision was not germane, and that is why we granted the waiver.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, there is no controversy whatsoever on the rule. I, therefore, reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has adequately explained the rule and the reason for the waiver of points of order.

As far as the bill is concerned, the purpose of the bill is to increase our quotas and subscriptions to several international financial institutions. Rather than report several bills, as has been the case in the past—one for each such institution—the committee has combined them all in one bill.

The bill provides for congressional approval for a U.S. contribution of $100,000,000 to the Asian Development Bank's consolidated special fund. This contribution will be made in three installments: in fiscal 1970, $25,000,000; in 1971, $35,000,000; in 1972, $40,000,000. Our contribution would be in the form of noninterest-bearing letters of credit.

Loans from the special fund are for high priority development projects in emerging nations. Interest rates range from 1½ to 3 percent with repayment periods of up to 40 years. Projects assisted deal with land irrigation and development, transportation and highway development, and power transmission projects.

The bill authorizes the U.S. Governor to the International Monetary Fund to agree to an increase of $1,540,000,000 in the U.S. quota to the Fund. Our representative is also authorized to agree to an increase of $3,000,000,000 in capital stock of the World Bank. The U.S. share of the increase would be $246,100,000, of which 10 percent would be immediately paid in and the remaining 90 percent would be subject to call as needed. On both these actions, prior to voting for such changes, our Governor to the International Monetary Fund must have congressional approval.

Of the $1,540,000,000 increase in the U.S. quota in the Fund, 25 percent, or $385,000,000, is payable in gold. The balance will be paid in the form of a letter of credit held by the Fund.

The International Monetary Fund, established in 1946, is used by the nations of the world to adjust their trade balances and assist them in overcoming shortrun fiscal and monetary difficulties in their balance of payments. The United States last used its resources in 1964–66. The increased quotas agreed to by the bill are equal to about 25 percent of the current quotas. Nations generally will be called on to increase their contribution by some 25 percent, based upon a formula. U.S. participation will be increased by 29.8 percent. Upon payment of this increased quota, nations will receive their full quota under the new special drawing rights program, a new international asset for settling trade balances and balance of payments outlays.

At the same time, the World Bank is seeking to increase its capital stock by $3,000,000,000. The U.S. share, based on formula, is $246,100,000. Again, congressional approval is required before the U.S. representative can agree to the increase. Only 10 percent of the increase must be immediately paid in; the remaining 90 percent is subject to be called as required.

The bill also provides for increasing the resources of the Inter-American Development Bank by authorizing an increase of the capital stock of the Bank by $2,000,000,000. Member nations will then subscribe to their proportionate share of such new stock. The share of the United States is $823,520,000. Of this total amount $673,520,000 will remain callable by the bank at some future time. The remainder, $150,000,000 will be paid into the Bank in three annual payments of $50,000,000, beginning in fiscal 1971. The United States will also contribute $1,000,000,000 in three annual payments to the Fund for special operations of the Bank.

The first payment, due in fiscal 1971, is $100,000,000. The balance will be paid in two equal payments of $450,000,000 each in 1972 and 1973.

The committee report emphasizes that the total actual cost to the U.S. Treasury of this legislation will probably not exceed $1,270,000,000, and that this total cost will be spread out over many years.

The bill authorizes a GAO audit, subject to control by the Secretary of the Treasury, of the operations of the exchange stabilization fund, a device within the Treasury for handling financial dealings with foreign countries. In order to insure that such operations remain confidential, the Secretary is given authority to remove from GAO audit any matter he determines to be internationally significant. Regular audits will still be carried on, as currently provided by statute, by auditors of the Treasury Department.

Finally, the bill requires that the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policy, in its annual report to the Congress, shall include a statement with respect to each loan made by the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank. This statement must state the position of the U.S. representative with respect to each loan, and how such loan will benefit the people of the recipient country. With respect to member nations of the Inter-American Development Bank, such report must also state the measures taken by each country to reduce its military expenditures and to strengthen democratic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PATMAN. 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. 294]

Abbitt	Feighan	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Fish	O'Konski
Alexander	Flood	O'Neill, Mass.
Anderson, Ill.	Flynt	Ottinger
Anderson, Tenn.	Ford, Gerald R.	Passman
	Foreman	Pelly
Barrett	Friedel	Pepper
Beall, Md.	Fulton, Tenn.	Philbin
Bell, Calif.	Gallagher	Podell
Berry	Gilbert	Powell
Biaggi	Goldwater	Price, Tex.
Blatnik	Hagan	Riegle
Boland	Halpern	Robison
Brock	Hanna	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Mich.	Hansen, Wash.	Roudebush
Buchanan	Hastings	St Germain
Burton, Utah	Hébert	Sandman
Bush	Helstoski	Schadeberg
Button	Henderson	Scherle
Cabell	Hicks	Scheuer
Carey	Holifield	Schneebeli
Casey	Keith	Sebelius
Chisholm	King	Sisk
Clark	Kleppe	Springer
Clay	Kuykendall	Steed
Collins	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.
Conyers	Landrum	Stephens
Corbett	Long, La.	Stokes
Cowger	Lowenstein	Stratton
Crane	Lujan	Symington
Daddario	Lukens	Taft
Davis, Wis.	McCarthy	Talcott
Dawson	McCulloch	Thompson, Ga.
de la Garza	McEwen	Thompson, N.J.
Diggs	MacGregor	Tunney
Dingell	Madden	Watson
Donohue	Mann	Welcker
Dowdy	Meeds	Wold
Downing	Meskill	Yates
Edwards, La.	Michel	Zion
Fallon	Mollohan	Zwach
Farbstein	Monagan	
Fascell	Morton	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 303 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 18306) to authorize U.S. participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the exchange stabilization fund by the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill, H.R. 18306, with Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 18306 would provide increases in the resources of four great multilateral institutions, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. Chairman, immediately after the House met today the Speaker of the House read a message to him from the President of the United States in which it was stated, and I will read the first paragraph, and only parts of the others:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is now pending before the House a bill of vital importance to the international economic and financial interests of the United States. H.R. 18306 authorizes increased U.S. participation in four multilateral financial institutions: The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank.

On page 2 it says:

Passage of the legislation is essential

To maintain United States leadership in international monetary affairs and to avoid a substantial and continuing loss in our share of allocations of Special Drawing Rights beginning on January 1, 1971;

To enable other countries to subscribe to almost $2 billion of World Bank capital stock and to carry out a policy of maintaining equity in Bank and Fund subscription which we have strongly advocated in the past;

To allow us to participate with other developed countries in the peaceful development in Asia;

To join with our Latin American neighbors in an effort to speed economic and social progress.

The last paragraph says:

This legislation has my full support. I believe that the national interest will be served by passage of H.R. 18306, and I strongly urge prompt and favorable action by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. Chairman, first, H.R. 18306 would allow the United States to participate in a 35-percent increase in the quotas of the International Monetary Fund. Our share would be $1,540 million to be paid one quarter in gold and the remainder in the form of a letter of credit. This quota increase would be a monetary transaction and would not involve any budgetary outlay.

The International Monetary Fund is the institution through which free world countries conduct their monetary affairs and lies at the center of international economic relations. Each country's balance of payments encompasses the full range of its economic and political relations with other nations—trade, travel, investment, military spending, and foreign aid. The international monetary system links national payments positions, and hence the domestic economies of all countries. It must function smoothly if world trade, international investment and political relations among nations are to prosper—particularly since imbalances inevitably arise as some countries temporarily spend more abroad than they earn, while others correspondingly earn more than they spend.

The proposed quota increases in which this bill would authorize U.S. participation are required to expand the Fund's resources to match today's increased levels of world trade and capital movements. The size of Fund quotas determines a country's drawing rights, the ability to use the exchange resources of the Fund, and also the amount of Special Drawing Rights which a member is entitled to. It is clearly to our advantage to ensure that the Fund's supply of exchange resources is maintained at an adequate level. Further, failure to accept our quota increase would mean we would receive $135 million less in SDR allocations on each of the next two allocation dates, January 1, 1971, and January 1, 1972.

H.R. 18306 would also authorize the United States to vote for a $3 billion increase in the authorized capital stock of the World Bank and to subscribe to $246.1 million of the capital stock of the Bank, 10 percent of which would be paid in and the remainder of which would be callable in the unlikely event of a default by the Bank on its obligations. The U.S. subscription would represent 11 percent of the total $2,222 million to be subscribed by 75 members. The increases in subscriptions to the World Bank are designed to parallel the increases in quotas in the Fund. Countries which have increased in economic strength beyond the average have been assigned quota increases in the Fund beyond the general level of 25 percent by which all quotas are to be increased. The subscriptions to the Bank are designed to reflect in the Bank the shifts in economic strength which are thus reflected in quota increases in the Fund. This policy of parallel increases in the Bank to reflect changes in position in the Fund is one of long standing, but this is the first time that the United States has been asked to take such a special increase.

The World Bank is the sister institution of the Fund and stands as the premier multilateral institution in the field of development finance. It has set the pattern and standard for other multilateral development finance activities. The World Bank finances its loan operations primarily through borrowing in the world's capital markets. This borrowing is backed by the Bank's callable capital which can be called in the event of a default by the Bank on its debt obligations. The Bank has an excellent credit standing and borrows at near government rates. It relends these borrowed funds at rates and on terms which reflect its own borrowing costs and repayment obligations.

The largest outlay which H.R. 18306 would authorize would be for the Inter-American Development Bank. This is appropriate in light of the special importance Latin America has for this country and our traditional close relationship with our neighbors to the south. Our contributions to the IDB would be of three different types, paid-in capital, callable capital, and a contribution to the Fund for Special Operations.

The IDB has an ordinary lending window, like the World Bank, which makes loans on conventional terms. Like the World Bank, the IDB has paid-in capital and callable capital, the latter to be used as backing for borrowing in the world's capital markets. The IDB has borrowed successfully in the United States, Europe, Canada, and Japan. In addition, short-term bonds have been placed with central banking agencies in Latin America. H.R. 18306 would authorize a U.S. contribution of $150 million to the paid-in capital of the IDB payable in three equal annual installments and a subscription of $673.52 million to the callable capital of the IDB, to be subscribed half in fiscal year 1971 and half in fiscal year 1973, but payable only in the event of a default by the Bank on its obligations. These subscriptions to paid-in and callable capital will enable the IDB to accelerate its lending from ordinary capital resources.

The IDB also has a soft loan facility known as the Fund for Special Operations or the FSO. Loans from the FSO are made on concessional terms for projects of an infrastructure nature which do not generate immediate cash flows and to countries which cannot afford the foreign exchange burden of conventional repayment schedules and rates. The bill would authorize a U.S. contribution of $1 billion to the FSO payable $100 million in fiscal year 1971 and $450 million in each of the following 2 years. The immediate budgetary impact of these payments will be mitigated by the letter of credit payment procedure planned for the cash contributions authorized by this bill. In lieu of cash the United States will pay in nonnegotiable, noninterest-bearing letters of credit. There is no budgetary impact at the time these letters of credit are issued. The banks, once they have received these letters of credit, may make loan commitments against them. Actual cash is transferred by the United States as needed to pay presented bills of contractors and suppliers. The Banking and Currency Committee report on H.R. 18306 estimates that through the use of this letter of credit procedure, the budgetary impact of this bill will be $35 million in fiscal 1971, $68 million in fiscal 1972, and $155 million in fiscal 1973. The remaining impact will be spread into future years.

Another aspect of this bill which deserves emphasis is the fact that the multilateral approach serves to mobilize other countries' resources in the development effort. In particular, with regard to the Fund for Special Operations that fact can be dramatically illustrated. For every $2 the United States is putting up, Latin American countries will put up $1. Contrast this to the situation when the IDB was just getting underway. Taking the Social Progress Trust Fund and the FSO together the U.S. put up $11 for soft

loan resources for every $1 contributed by Latin American countries. In the 1964 contributions this ratio was reduced to 8 to 1, in 1965 to 5 to 1, and in 1967 to 3 to 1.

Finally, H.R. 18306 would authorize a contribution of $100 million to the soft loan facilities of the Asian Development Bank.

The Asian Development Bank is the regional development bank of Asia. It is truly an Asian bank. Its regional members have contributed a majority of the resources and the United States has only a 20-percent share of $200 million, being matched in ordinary capital contributions by Japan.

The limited nature of U.S. participation is appropriated in view of the strength of Japan and its ability to contribute substantially to development efforts. At the time, U.S. participation, while not dominant, serves to manifest our interest in the peaceful development of Asia.

The contribution to the Asian Development Bank which would be authorized by this bill has built-in features which will insure that others do their fair share. The bill provides that the U.S. contribution may not be the single largest contribution nor may it constitute more than half the funds provided by all countries to the Special Funds of the ADB.

Payment would be made in the form of nonnegotiable, non-interest-bearing letters of credit so that, again, the budgetary impact will be deferred.

The Asian Development Bank, founded in 1966, is young, but it has already demonstrated its ability to handle resources effectively and channel them into the necessary development of Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that multilateral development finance institutions are deserving of increasing levels of support. They serve to effectively mobilize both public and private resources for the development process. They provide technical expertise and a forum for the exchange of ideas between donor and donee states. The International Monetary Fund, too, needs continued support and increased resources to carry out its vital functions. It has come to play the leading role in the free world's monetary affairs. H.R. 18306 takes into account these factors while insuring that our participation is kept at levels which we can afford. I strongly urge its passage.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Well, it is very fascinating to hear the gentleman from Texas say that this is not going to cause any outflow of capital from the United States. I do not know of any reason why we should have this bill here if that is what it means. This bill is meaningless if it does not mean an outflow of capital supplied by the taxpayers.

I am particularly interested at this moment in the timing of all of the propaganda in favor of this bill. The message from the President that came in today—the demand that this bill be passed before somebody takes off on a junket to Europe—and all that sort of thing.

I would not be surprised, before the afternoon is over, to hear that there are unidentified submarines lurking off our shores or unidentified planes in the sky as a crisis reason for passing this legislation, which is going to add a huge burden to the already bad financial situation in this country.

I never cease to be amazed by statements that the House can approve bills such as this one, to provide more than $3 billion of additional financing for international institutions. Yet it is not going to cost a stinking dime.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PATMAN. May I say to the gentleman that did not, at least I did not intend to say to the gentleman, that it would not cost us a dime. If I made that statement, I was in error. I said that for this fiscal year the cost, the investment, will not run more than $35 million. It is allocated in a way in subsequent years that there will not be any hardship on our country.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. May I ask first, is this an increase, and if it is, over last year's authorization, how much is the increase; and, second, does this add to the total U.S. debt, and, if so how much?

Mr. PATMAN. The esteemed and most able and competent gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is the chairman of the subcommittee that handles this particular legislation. I know he is prepared to cover that. I do not wish to duplicate his answer at this time.

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

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, how much money are we going to put into this whole business? Did I not hear the gentleman say that the bill is for some $1,500,000,000?

Mr. PATMAN. Ultimately—in part, yes—but over a long period of time.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) will allocate that the way it should be allocated according to the bill.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will yield further, I understood that the gentleman read part of a letter from the President asking for this expenditure.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYS. This is the same President who says that we cannot afford more money for education; is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAYS. And he is the same President who says we cannot afford more money to clean up our streams; is it not—and the same President who says we cannot afford more money for air pollution; is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, to an extent.

Mr. HAYS. But we can afford $1,500,000,000 to put in these banks where even the employees, as I understand in one instance, can borrow money from them without very much security, if any.

It seems to me if the President is worried about balancing the budget and about priorities, he does not show much indication of it here. I do not think anyone who has the interest of the United States at heart ought to vote for this.

Mr. PATMAN. This will be fully discussed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve the remainder of my time and yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) such time as he may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 18306 authorizes U.S. participation in increases of the resources of four multilateral financial institutions: the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank. One of these institutions, the Fund, is concerned with financial relationships among nations, the other three with development lending.

Our participation in these institutions brings important advantages to the United States. We must continue and sustain this record of success.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

These are the basic provisions of the bill:

First. It would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Fund to consent to an increase of $1,540 million in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund and authorize an appropriation for that purpose.

Second. It would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote for a $3 billion increase in the capital stock of the Bank, subscribe to 2,461 additional shares of the Bank's capital, and authorize an appropriation of $246.1 million for this purpose.

Third. It would extend existing legislation by allowing the U.S. Governor of the Fund to vote for allocations of Special Drawing Rights to the United States in any future basic period in an amount equal to the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund.

Fourth. It would authorize the United States to subscribe to an increase of $823 million to the Ordinary Capital of the Inter-American Bank, and to pledge $1 billion in contributions to the Bank's Fund for Special Operations, as well as authorize appropriations for these purposes.

Fifth. It would authorize the United States to enter into an agreement with the Asian Development Bank providing for a U.S. contribution of $100 million to the Special Funds of the Bank and to authorize appropriations for this purpose.

Since World War II the United States has been a prime mover in the free world's international financial institutions. Our initial involvement was based on the conviction that the partnership of nations forged for the needs of war should be continued for the works of peace. The success of these endeavors can be seen in the growth they have achieved and the outstanding records of accomplishment they have compiled.

The Fund, at the end of its first full year of operation had 44 member nations

and resources of $6.5 billion. By the end of 1969 it had grown to a membership of 115 nations and resources of $21.3 billion.

The Fund has recently assumed additional responsibilities in administering the new Special Drawing Rights. It is the primary institution for multilateral cooperation in international monetary matters.

The World Bank had a total of $7,670 million of authorized capital subscribed by June 30, 1946. Today it has $23 billion of subscribed capital. Through the end of calendar year 1969 the Bank had signed agreements providing for loans of over $13.4 billion, of which $9.9 billion had been disbursed. Recently the Bank has greatly increased its lending activities in line with expanding opportunities for the productive use of capital in the developing countries. Loan agreements committing over $1.8 billion were concluded between July 1, 1968, and December 31, 1969.

Alongside the original organizations, the Fund and Bank, have grown up others with specialized roles or specialized geographic areas of focus—the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Development Association and the Asian Development Bank.

By serving the world well, these institutions have served the United States, because only in a world of growing economies and expanding trade can we in this country continue to enjoy the fruits of our own economy. The progress and prosperity of the United States are inextricably intertwined with the progress and prosperity of the rest of the world.

ADVANTAGES OF MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS

The principal advantages of multilateral financial institutions are burden-sharing and economic expertise.

Through these institutions other developed countries share with the United States the cost of providing development assistance, as other nations have grown in economic strength, our share of the financial cost has declined. Looking at the record since 1945, we can see a steady reduction in the percentage of financial participation of this country. This is a major advantage for the United States.

In the Fund the United States had 34.37 percent of the initial proposed total of Fund quotas. Today the United States has 24.17 percent of Fund quotas. If the pending quotas increases become effective, the percentage will decline to 23.16 percent.

In 1945 the United States subscribed to almost 35 percent of the original proposed subscriptions of the World Bank. The present U.S. subscription is 27.53 percent. It will decline to 26.04 percent if the pending increases in the resources of the Bank become effective.

Looking at the Inter-American Development Bank in the early 1960's, the first years of the Bank, for every $1 of Latin American money the United States contributed $11 to the soft loan resources of the Bank. In 1964 the ratio was $1 to $8, in 1965 $1 to $5, and in 1968 $1 to $3. Under the provisions of this bill, this ratio would be further reduced to $1 to $2.

In the Asian Bank, we have just under 20 percent of the total capital, and Japan has an equal share.

To illustrate the burden-sharing involved in this proposal, I point out that other countries will be committing over $3.7 billion to the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank. In the World Bank other members will subscribe $2 billion, and in the Inter-American Development Bank replenishment, the Latin American countries will contribute $1.6 billion. In the Asian Development Bank $159 million has already been pledged by other contributors.

In addition to the sharing of the financial burden of development financing, so that we do not carry all of the cost ourselves, the multilateral approach assures that lending judgments will be made on strictly economic grounds. Multilateral institutions bring together under one roof experts from all over the world. They minimize the political and ideological complications which can distort the assistance relationship.

Burden-sharing and the economic expertness help us get the most for our money.

BUDGETARY IMPACT

Let us now turn to the budgetary impact of H.R. 18306.

It is useful to keep in mind the distinction between the functions which are served by the International Monetary Fund and by the other institutions with which this bill deals. This distinction is important to an understanding of the limited budgetary impact of this bill. The other multilateral financial organizations to which the United States subscribes capital are development lending organizations. The Fund is a reserve pool in which funds are deposited and from which funds in the form of needed foreign currencies may be withdrawn. Thus, the Fund quota increase represents a monetary transaction with no budget outlay involved. The President's Commission on Budget Concepts described United States transactions with the Fund as "monetary exchanges through which the United States receives international reserve assets," and recommended that, "subscriptions, drawings, and other transactions reflecting net changes in the U.S. position with the International Monetary Fund should be excluded from budget receipts and expenditures." The Fund portion of the bill will not result in budgetary expenditures.

Moreover, only a part of the contributions to the development lending institutions will involve budgetary outlays.

The bill would authorize the United States to subscribe to $246 million of the capital stock of the World Bank. But, only 10 percent, $24.6 million, will be paid in to the Bank and thus entail a budgetary outlay.

The remaining amount, $221.4 million, represents callable capital which can be called only if needed to meet the Bank's obligations. On the strength of callable capital, the Bank borrows in the private capital markets of the world the funds which it needs to carry on its lending operations. These borrowings have mobilized private capital in the development effort and have reduced the need for Government aid contributions. The Bank has operated in this manner since its inception and has set the pattern for other development lending institutions. There has never been a call on capital. The chances are remote that there ever will be.

The same analysis applies to the Inter-American Development Bank. The bill would authorize a subscription of $673.5 million to callable capital and $150 million to paid-in capital. Only the $150 million of paid-in capital involves a budgetary outlay. The callable capital will be used as backing for public borrowing and may be called only if needed to meet the Bank's obligations. The likelihood of such a call is remote.

Thus, a total of $2.4 billion of the commitments contained in this bill will not result in budgetary costs.

Other provisions mitigate the expenditure effect of the remaining $1.3 billion of commitments. The letter of credit method of payment will be used by the United States in order to minimize the budgetary impact of those parts of the bill which involve budgetary outlays. The bill authorizes the following budgetary outlays: $24.6 million to the World Bank in fiscal year 1971; $60 million for fiscal year 1970–1971, and $40 million in fiscal year 1972 to the Asian Bank, and $150 million in fiscal year 1971 and $500 million in each of fiscal years 1972 and 1973 to the Inter-American Development Bank.

These commitments are made in the form of letters of credit, so that loan obligations can be made but these letters of credit will not be drawn upon by the recipient institutions for immediate cash outlays. A cash outlay will occur only when funds are needed to meet a contractor's or supplier's bill.

Through the use of this mechanism, the total budgetary impact of this bill is estimated at $35 million in fiscal year 1971, $70 million in fiscal year 1972, and $155 million in fiscal year 1973. The remainder will be stretched out over a number of additional years. The limited nature of the immediate budgetary impact of this bill is an important consideration in its favor.

I now turn to the reasons for the proposed subscriptions contained in each of the titles of this bill.

THE IMF

The quota increase in the fund will allow us to keep our position of leadership in the fund. Since quota size determines the amount of Special Drawing Rights which a member receives upon an SDR allocation, if we take no action on this bill the United States will receive $130 million less in SDR allocations on each of the next two allocation dates, January 1, 1971, and January 1, 1972, than we would receive if the bill were passed.

Moreover, quota size determines voting power as well as SDR allocations. If all members except the United States accept their quota increases, our voting power

would decline from the present 21.40 percent to 17.13 percent.

Third, we will receive increased drawing rights in the Fund in exchange for our quota increase. If other members subscribe to their increases as expected, the Fund will obtain $3.28 billion of the currencies of the other industrialized nations. The Fund will be better equipped to supply currencies, and the United States will have increased rights to draw currencies.

THE WORLD BANK

The proposed increases in capital subscriptions in the World Bank are designed to parallel the special quota increases in the Fund. Since the founding of the World Bank and the Fund, it has been a general principle that countries receiving special increases in their Fund quotas increase their subscriptions to the capital of the World Bank by a commensurate amount. The United States has in the past strongly supported this policy of parallel contributions on the ground that it results in a fairer sharing of contributions to the capital of the World Bank. It has, in the past, resulted in increased subscriptions of $3.5 billion. On the occasion of the present increased subscriptions, 74 other countries will be subscribing over $2 billion. The U.S. share is only 11 percent of the total increased subscriptions. It is clearly in our interest to take our share of this increase.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Chapter 1 of H.R. 18306 authorizes the U.S. Governor of the Asian Development Bank, the Secretary of the Treasury, to enter into an agreement with the Bank providing for a United States contribution of $100 million to the Bank. The United States contribution is to be used to finance high-priority development projects and programs in developing member countries of the Bank, with emphasis on projects and programs in Southeast Asia.

The Asian Development Bank was established in 1966 as a result of an Asian initiative to foster economic growth and cooperation in the region of Asia and the Far East.

The Bank now has 35 members and $1,004 million subscribed capital. It has 21 regional members, three of them developed—Japan, Australia, and New Zealand—and 14 nonregional members, including the United States, Canada, and 12 European countries.

In its 3 full years of operation, the Bank has maintained increasing levels of activity. It has made commitments of $163,083,000 for 32 loans to 13 countries. It has undertaken 24 technical assistance projects in 12 countries, and a number of important regional activities.

The rate of growth of the Bank's lending activities is expected to continue. In its first year of operation, 1967, the Bank organized itself. In its second year of operation, 1968, loan commitments were $42 million. In 1969, they were $98 million. New loan commitments in 1970 are expected to total more than $200 million.

The purpose of the Special Funds operations of the Asian Development Bank is to provide financing for high priority development programs and projects in Asia on concessional terms where necessary to supplement the development financing which the Bank now provides from its Ordinary Capital resources. The process of economic development requires the financing of infrastructure and other long term projects which are essential to economic growth, but which do not yield financial returns early enough or high enough to service loans made on conventional terms. Many of the member countries of the Bank do not otherwise have the capacity to finance the needed projects through conventional loans. The Bank cannot furnish this needed financing out of its ordinary resources.

The Republics of China and Korea, both members of the Bank, are good examples of Asian countries which have benefited from concessional financing of the type envisaged for the Special Funds operations of the Bank. Less than two decades ago, both countries suffered the same relative level of poverty as the poorer countries of South and Southeast Asia. Benefiting from concessional assistance, both China and Korea have experienced high rates of economic growth in recent years. The primary objective of U.S. foreign assistance programs has long been to raise less developed countries to a level of self-sustaining economic growth. It is to this end that the Special Funds operations of the Asian Development Bank are dedicated.

H.R. 18306 authorizes the appropriation of $100 million to the Special Funds resources of the Asian Development Bank in three annual installments of $25 million, $35 million, and $40 million. The U.S. contribution will be used only for high priority loans made on concessional terms and for technical assistance credits made on a reimbursable basis. Consistent with the goal of shared participation in the funding and operations of the Bank, H.R. 18306 stipulates that the total U.S. contribution to the Special Funds shall at all times constitute only a minority of the total Special Funds resources of the Bank.

The proposed contribution will have only a minimum effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments situation. The funds may be expended by the Bank only for the procurement of U.S. goods and services, unless the U.S. Governor, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, determines that procurement elsewhere would materially improve the ability of the Bank to carry out the objectives of its special funds resources and would be compatible with the international financial position of the United States. Several contributors to the special funds have already made their funds available for procurement in other member countries.

Six countries have already offered contributions to the Bank's special funds in the total amount of $159.45 million. Japan has offered $100 million, of which $40 million has been made available and $30 million is budgeted for 1970. Canada has pledged $25 million over 5 years, of which $15 million is now available. Denmark has provided $2 million. The Netherlands has provided $1.1 million and pledged another $7.2 million. In addition, at the Bank's third annual meeting, held at Seoul, Korea, on April 9–11, 1970, Australia offered $9.75 million over 3 years and the United Kingdom offered £6 million—$14.4 million—over 4 years. Other countries have also indicated the possibility of contributions in the future. We should act now to join with these countries in building a strong, long-range concessional lending facility within the Bank.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

H.R. 18306 also enables the United States to participate in its share of the proposed increases in the ordinary capital and Fund for Special Operations resources of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Specifically, the legislation authorizes the U.S. Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank, the Secretary of the Treasury, to vote in favor of the resolution to increase the Bank's authorized capital stock by $2,000,000,000, and upon adoption of such resolution, to agree on behalf of the United States to subscribe to an additional 82,352 shares of the Bank's authorized capital stock, with respect to which $150 million will be paid in and $673,520,000 will be callable.

Second, it would authorize him to vote in favor of the resolution to increase the resources of the Fund for Special Operations by the equivalent of $1,500,000,000, and upon adoption of that resolution, to agree on behalf of the United States to pay to the Fund for Special Operations the sum of $1,000,000,000.

In addition, the bill authorizes the appropriation of the sums necessary to make these commitments.

These sums would enable the Bank to implement its plan to increase total lending by 50 percent or more over the next several years, from a current annual level of $600 million to $900 million or higher.

Although great emphasis has been placed by the Bank on the need to mobilize internal savings for development, internal savings will fall far short of development needs.

Approval of this replenishment proposal is thus essential to enable the Bank to meet its target, and, indeed, to continue its lending programs past 1971. The status of the ordinary capital or "hard currency windcw" of the Bank is such that by the end of this year, the hard currencies will be insufficient to carry on another full year of operations even at current levels, approximately $200 million a year, let alone reach its new target level of $300 million a year. A similar situation exists in the Bank's FSO or "soft" loan resources, which will be inadequate to meet anticipated loan commitments for calendar year 1971. The new resources will permit a progressive increase in the FSO lending from last year's rate of $400 million to about $600 million a year by 1973.

While the sums called for by this new replenishment are substantial, the impact of this authorization request on the U.S. budget will be substantially less than the authorization figure, and will be spread over a period of years.

First, the callable capital subscription, of $673.5 million, is a guaranty standing behind Bank borrowings, and it is not expected to result in any ex-

penditure now or in the future. Half would be subscribed in fiscal year 1971, and the other half in fiscal year 1973. Second, the paid-in portion of our capital subscription will be paid in equal annual installments of $50 million, beginning in fiscal year 1971, and will be in the form of a letter of credit, upon which draw-downs are not anticipated until fiscal year 1972. In this manner, this $150 million expenditure is expected to be spread over a number of years beyond 1973.

Finally, the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations would be paid in three annual installments at a rate of $100 million in fiscal 1971, and $450 million in each of the following 2 years. As with the paid-in subscription, budgetary outlays would be deferred by use of the letter-of-credit method of payment, so that actual cash outlays would extend over a number of years well beyond fiscal 1973. There will be no budgetary costs in fiscal year 1971, $48 million in fiscal year 1972, and $125 million in fiscal year 1973.

The commitment by the Latin Americans has been greatly increased both in the amount of resources they are willing to commit to their own development, and in the steps they have agreed to take to make these increased resources do the most good.

First, the Latin members of the Bank have increased their share of the replenishment of FSO resources by 67 percent, with a total of $500 million, compared with $300 million in the 1967 replenishment. This represents a continued increase in their share of the FSO. The relative proportion of United States to Latin contributors has declined progressively, from 5 to 1 in 1964, to 3 to 1 in 1967, and now to 2 to 1, in the proposed replenishment.

Second, two more countries, Chile and Colombia, have agreed, along with Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Venezuela, to make up to half their contributions to the FSO available for lending to other member countries. This step further increases the usefulness of Latin American local currency subscriptions.

Third, the Latins have endorsed a policy statement giving the least developed countries of the region a first priority claim on FSO resources, evidencing further intraregional cooperation.

Fourth, it was agreed that loans made out of the proposed new resources for the FSO be repayable in the currencies lent, instead of local currencies. By requiring repayment of dollar loans with dollars, the FSO will, over the long run, become a truly revolving fund.

Fifth, the Bank's Governors cited sound national economic policies and satisfaction overall economic performance as the determining factors in Bank assistance.

Finally, a Committee of Governors has been formed to study the matter of admission of developed countries not presently members of the Bank. This committee will report its recommendations by the end of the year. Specifically, the Committee will be studying such items as the possibility of dropping the requirement that new Bank members belong to the Organization of American States, and the possibility of creating a separate class of stock to be subscribed by new members.

Adoption of such a proposal would be a step toward increasing and regularizing the flow of resources to the Bank from other developed countries, while at the same time maintaining the regional character of the Bank.

Over the short span of a decade the Inter-American Development Bank has developed from a fledgling institution to the primary multilateral channel for the flow of development resources to Latin America. It has been highly successful in raising substantial funds in the world capital markets.

In just 10 years of operation, the IDB has lent $3.5 billion for Latin American development, for projects involving a total investment of nearly three times that amount. Roughly one-third of this sum has gone for high-priority agricultural development projects. Over half a billion dollars have gone to industrial and mining projects, and a similiar amount for transportation and communication projects. Substantial sums have also been provided for electric power, water supply, housing, and education.

While the sums included in this replenishment are large, the commitment of Latin Americans to their own development justifies confidence that these funds will serve both the development aspirations of Latin America and the United States interest in a viable and prosperous inter-American system.

OTHER PROVISIONS

The bill also contains a provision for a GAO audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund, except for matters considered "internationally significant" by the Secretary of the Treasury. There is no reason why the ordinary administration of the Fund should continue to be consumed from the Controller General's contingency.

It also contains a specific reporting requirement on how loans made by multilateral lending institutions benefit the people of the recipient countries, as well as on military expenditures and democratic institutions of recipient governments in Latin America.

The Banking and Currency Committee expects the Secretary of The Treasury, and the various U.S. Executive Directors of the international institutions, to have it currently and continuously informed, in writing, of what is going on. This has not been done in the past. From now on, it will be done.

H.R. 18306 will be a major benefit to the United States. It will assure the continued vitality of a unique and highly successful adventure in international cooperation. These institutions represent what mankind can achieve through cooperative endeavor. They have combined almost universal membership, with decisionmaking based on financial participation. They have performed well. They have earned our continued support.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. I had a man come to my office the other day, an American, who is an employee of the Asian Dovelopment Bank. He told me that the Asian Development Bank is a bank run by Japanese for the benefit of the Japanese—to the exclusion of any American business at all. He says that if it does not accrue to the advantage of Japan and directly to the Japanese, the loan is not made.

Do you know anything about that? Is not the director a Japanese?

Mr. REUSS. I am very glad to respond to the gentleman's question. The director of the Asian Development Bank is an Asian, a Japanese, Mr. Watanabe.

Mr. HAYS. How much money do they put into it, the Japanese?

Mr. REUSS. The Japanese put in considerably more money than the United States, and under the terms of this bill, the U.S. contribution must be less than that of Japan.

Furthermore, the U.S. contribution, which will be no more than $100 million over a period of years, has to be spent in the United States. That provision is written into the law, and it may only be departed from if the National Advisory Council on Monetary Affairs—which, as the gentleman knows, consists of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of State, the Eximbank, Federal Reserve, and the Secretary of Commerce—only if the National Advisory Council determines that the U.S. balance of payments will not suffer.

So while it is true that Japan plays a big role in the Asian Bank, that is good, not bad. I think it is fine that we are getting others to bear what should properly be their share of the burden, and if we can get the Japanese in Asia assuming a large scale development role, I think that is one of the more hopeful signs. I think the gentleman will agree.

Mr. HAYS. I agree they ought to assume all of it, because we are taking care of their national defense for them free of charge. They are not contributing anything. They are barring our manufactured products from Japan, and at the same time they are flooding our markets with their products.

Can the gentleman be specific and tell me how many dollars they are putting in and how many we are putting in?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, I will be very specific. The Japanese contribution is $100 million, of which $40 million has been made available and $30 million is budgeted for 1970. The top U.S. contribution, the amount authorized, is $100 million. But unless the Japanese put in some more, we cannot expend even that.

Mr. HAYS. How much have they put in?

Mr. REUSS. We, the United States, have put in to the special funds of the Asian Bank, which is what we are talking about, zero. The Japanese have already put in $70 million, so they are $70 million ahead of us.

Let me hasten to add that I wish it were twice that amount. I wish they were $140 million ahead of us.

The gentleman has said many things that need to be said about Japan's role, and particularly about Japan's attitude toward American investments and

Japan's general trade attitude. But in terms of the Asian Bank, I submit that our diplomatists have done an excellent job in compelling burden-sharing on the part of Japan.

Mr. HAYS. Let me see if I understand the gentleman correctly. Is the gentleman saying that we have not put any money into this bank at all so far?

Mr. REUSS. Oh no. What I said was that we have not put anything into the Fund for Special Operations of the Asian Development Bank, which is the only thing in this bill relating to the Asian Development Bank. When the Asian Development Bank was founded back in 1966, this country, along with 20 other countries, made its initial capital contribution. That capital contribution is mainly to enable the bank to do what the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank, have done—borrow in world bond markets for its so-called hard window. Just as the World Bank has a soft window, the IDA, and just as the Inter-American Development Bank has a soft window, the Fund for Special Operations, earlier the Social Progress Trust Fund, so the Asian Development Bank feels that it must have a soft window where loans on concessional terms can be made. But our American contribution must be paid back in dollars.

Mr. HAYS. Let me ask the gentleman one question. I appreciate the education the gentleman is attempting to give me about this on the Asian Bank, but I would like to have a kind of simple question answered: How many dollars have we got in it, and how many dollars have the Japanese got in it? That is mainly what I want to know.

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

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

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the total contribution of the United States since the inception of the Bank was the original contribution, $200 million, which was one-fifth of the total capitalization of the bank. The Japanese made their contribution identically.

Mr. HAYS. In other words, we put in as much as they did, but they are running the show?

Mr. STANTON. It is questionable whether they are running the show. It is the first time the Japanese have ever contributed to the international organization.

Mr. HAYS. The Japanese in this instance remind me of the old fellow who thought he was on his deathbed, and he called in this three sons and said:

> Boys, you know money is a pretty important thing in this world. I do not know what it is going to be in the next world, but I want each of you to promise that if I die, each of you will come to the coffin and say a prayer and put in $1,000, just in case.

They all promised.

When he died, the oldest son went up to the coffin and said his prayer and put in his $1,000. And the second son did the same thing, said his prayer and put in his $1,000. Then the third son went up and said his prayer and put in his check for $3,000 and took out the $2,000 in change. That is about the way the Japanese operate, as far as I can tell.

Mr. REUSS. The trouble with the gentleman from Ohio, if he will listen, is that really he has picked the wrong target. The Asian Bank is the one international institution in the world in which somebody else, in this case the Japanese, is putting in more than Uncle Sam. There are plenty of good targets around for the gentleman, but I really do think this is not a good one.

Mr. HAYS. If there is a better target around on what they are doing in international trade than the Japanese, with their national policy by which they are manufacturing articles and selling them below cost in this country, and charging their own people a profit, I do not know what that target would be. I think they are a prime target, and as the gentleman said, I am saying some of the things that ought to be said, and there ought to be people in the administration saying these things. We have carried them around on our back long enough.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman is saying some things that probably ought to be said. The trouble is, he is saying them about the wrong bank and the wrong country.

An Asian is the Managing Director of the Asian Development Bank. It is also true that Mr. Herrera, a Chilean, is the Managing Director of the Inter-American Development Bank. It is also true that a Frenchman, Mr. Schweitzer, is head of the International Monetary Fund, and an American, Mr. McNamara, is head of the World Bank. But I do not think in an international agency we can always insist that an American be head of everything. This is one of the points of sharing.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will yield, I would not insist on that at all. It may be significant, but the gentleman keeps saying, "an Asian." There are many other Asians besides the Japanese, and there are many other Asians who need it worse than the Japanese do. I would not mind if he were a Malaysian or an Indian or someone from Taiwan, or the gentleman may name it, because there are many other places out there. But there is no country that needs it certainly as little as the Japanese do.

Mr. REUSS. We will try an Indian on the gentleman from Ohio and see how he likes it.

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

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that the vice president of the Asian Development Bank is an Indian?

Mr. REUSS. That is true. I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed that out.

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

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I want some information and some education too.

The money that is put up in the underdeveloped countries to develop these nations, the money that is loaned to this bank and others, including the IMF and the Inter-American, is mainly loaned to the underdeveloped countries. Is that right?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct.

Mr. DENT. It is for the purpose of creating industry and for the purpose of developing agriculture?

Mr. REUSS. I think the central purpose of development aid has got a number of facets to it. Politically, it is hoped in the long run that countries which make a little economic progress will develop moderate governments. Economically, it is hoped—and there is some reason for the hope—that they will be customers for our foreign trade exports.

Mr. DENT. Right at that point, that answers my question.

Mr. REUSS. There is also the humanitarian aspect.

Mr. DENT. But that answers my question. Who does the gentleman think are the customers of Japan? Are they the developing countries that this money is being spent in?

Right at this moment, Japan does not have enough labor to meet the demand for the goods they have to send to the United States; so they have no room for industry because they have no labor, and they are developing their own industry in other countries. In doing so, they are producing for themselves, so that they can ship back out into the world stream, where the higher wages are paid.

They are being barred pretty much in the Common Market, but they are not barred in the United States.

Let me tell the gentleman something that happened in one of the other funds; I believe the Inter-American one. Right when certain South American countries were taking our fishing ships, our California fishing fleets, 200-some miles out in the ocean, we loaned them $500 million to build their fishing fleet.

For goodness' sake. Is there someone in this Government who has a blueprint, hidden in some dusty hall, with a little light which only shines now and then, a blueprint of the United States pinpointed for destruction? No one could make the mistakes we are making unless we had a blueprint, unless somebody were directing it. One cannot make that many mistakes.

And this is one of them.

Mr. REUSS. I believe that any blueprint which exists—and I am not aware of one—must be in the possession of the President of this country, Mr. Nixon, whose attitude at least on this bill has been very forthright and very favorable.

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

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

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to get back to the facts on this.

A question was raised about the Asian Development Bank, as to the millions of U.S. dollars involved. The total subscription was $1.4 billion. Our part was $200 million. Japan's part was $200 million. France was $25 million; Canada was $25 million, Italy was $20 million, Germany was $34 million, and there were other countries. Many, many countries in the Asian area subscribed. There were

likewise 15 which subscribed from outside the Asian area. Their total subscription was $380 million. The regional countries subscribed $624 million.

Mr. Watanabe became the head of the Asian Development Bank through the votes of those who are participating in the bank development. He is an extremely capable banker. He has a fine reputation. He was chosen for that work.

We have no hook on any employees of that bank, nor does anybody else, to my knowledge, from my own investigation.

Of the total paid in subscription of $100 million, the United States has paid $50 million in cash. I am talking about our subscription. We paid in $100 million of the $200 million. $50 million was in cash, and the other $50 million was in noninterest bearing letters of credit in five equal annual installments.

Therefore, assuming no present utilization of our letters of credit, the maximum potential cost to our balance of payments has been $50 million through August of 1970.

This is the type of organization we have been trying to encourage, one where there is major participation by the other countries and we are not the one left holding the bag, having actually put in all the money, as has happened in the past.

It is a very wholesome step forward. It is working out. It will develop further.

I just wish we would look completely at the facts as they are coming up. I do not want to hide anything, I know, and I do not believe anybody else on the committee does.

In the time allocated to me, and the time I allocate, since I control the time on this side, I hope to tell of the participation and how we are involved.

As a matter of fact, the total amount of money involved in this bill, for us to be called upon for U.S. participation, is $35 million in 1971, $70 million in 1972, and $155 million in 1973.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman.

I would point out, on the subject of the Asian Development Bank, that in its first 3 years of operation up to date it has made 32 loans to 13 countries and has undertaken 24 technical assistance programs in 12 countries. In every one of those projects, in every loan and technical assistance project, this was done with the entire approval of the U.S. Executive Director and Governor. This was not anything that Mr. Watanabe imposed on the United States, but was something that the United States fully concurred in.

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

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. On that point, I was looking over the types of loans made by the Asian Development Bank up to now, and it totals $163 million. I was trying to find out when any of these loans were made to expand Japanese industries in these various countries. For instance, in Ceylon there was a tea factory modernization loan for $2 million. There was a Colombo port tanker established for $2.6 million. In the Republic of China, the country that we are promoting, fostering, and trying to save, the Asian Development Bank loaned for a petroleum refinery $10 million and established a deep sea fishery for $10 million, which is not the $500 million that has been mentioned. Also, for an aluminum plant there was some $2.67 million. Continuing on, in China there was $18 million spent for a freeway to obtain mass transportation there.

In Korea—and many Members of this House have been in Korea to see what is being done there—we know that they are making a remarkable recovery. The Seoul-Inchon Expressway, which many of us have ridden on, was created with a bank loan of $6.8 million. The Korea cold storage industry is being facilitated with a loan of $7 million. An express company is being organized for $7.5 million. A medium industry bank has been organized and provided with $10 million in capital.

I have just a few more.

In Maylaysia, I do not know what the influence of Japan is on Maylaysia, but in Maylaysia they have a water supply project which has been loaned $7.2 million. There is a palm oil mill which has been loaned $2.8 million. There is a port expansion which has been fostered with $5 million in loans and an electrical supply installation which has received $3.1 million.

In Pakistan now, a development bank to develop industries there has been loaned $10 million.

In the Philippines a development corporation to develop industry there received $5 million.

In Singapore the Development Bank of Singapore received $10 million.

In Thailand the Industrial Finance Corp. of Thailand received $10 million.

Of course, it is conceivable that these development finance corporations may make loans to industries which may favor Japan. None of us know that. But I would say that the loans have been made to developing countries, as far as I am concerned and from what I can read and observe, without reasonable relationship to the fact that they might promote Japanese industry.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has made an awfully good point. If someone wanted to make a good anti-Asian Development Bank speech, the place to do it would be in the Japanese Diet. That would be the place to complain about the fact that Japan is the leading contributor to the Asian Development Bank and that the result of some of these contributions will be that the poorer countries in Asia begin to develop their own resources.

Let me now point out a very progressive development that has occurred in recent years in all of these international agencies, namely, the U.S. participation grows, as a percentage of the total, ever less onerous to the United States.

For example, at the start of the International Monetary Fund the United States had 34 percent of the quotas; today it is 24 percent; and under the bill it will be reduced to 23 percent.

In the World Bank we started out with 35 percent of the burden of the subscriptions. Now it is down to 27 percent, and it will be down to 26 percent under this bill.

In the early 1960's, when we started with the Inter-American Development Bank, for every $1 of Latin American money we put in $11 into the soft loan resources of the bank. This ratio has progressively gone down from 1 to 11 to 1 to 8, to 1 to 5, to 1 to 3 by 1968, and under this bill it will go down to 1 to 2. So that the burden sharing has become ever less onerous to the United States, which is indeed as it should be.

I would mention, finally, those provisions of the bill which do not relate to actual participation in the financial operation of these institutions, but relate certain overall principles and policies.

One which I would call to the attention of the Members is the provision that from here on out, there will be a GAO audit of the half billion dollar Exchange Stabilization Fund of the Treasury, except for internationally delicate operations.

Members were surprised—and not entirely pleased—to learn that a number of years ago the Exchange Stabilization Fund, without a by-your-leave from Congress, bought a villa over in Tokyo for our Treasury representative. I am not suggesting that there was any hanky-panky in connection with that villa, but the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) will be happy to know that in this bill we make it clear that we want the General Accounting Office to audit those expenditures of the Exchange Stabilization Fund just like any other expenditures. I do not anticipate that there will be many things in this bill which will bring the flush of joy to the cheeks of the gentleman from Iowa, but this one certainly will.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. That is an after-the-fact operation; is it not?

Mr. REUSS. Yes; although a special study was made of that villa in Tokyo deal, which is spread forth in the record for the benefit of the gentleman from Iowa, and for other Members. And I would say that it is high time that we blew a whistle on this, and called for audits. I hope that the gentleman from Iowa can find it within him to give a gentle pat on the back to the Committee on Banking and Currency for bringing this kind of a hard-nosed amendment into this legislation.

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

Mr. REUSS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GROSS. I thought the gentleman when he started talking on the subject of the villa in Japan was going to talk about the situation right here on the gentleman's doorstep, the building of a multi-million-dollar country club right out here on the edge of the District of Columbia, which the gentleman from Iowa talked about a couple of years ago.

Now, how much more under this bill is going to be used to build plush country clubs for the International Monetary Fund in this or some other country? How much more of it is going to be used for this purpose? Has the gentleman from Wisconsin ever seen that plush layout out there?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, I have.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman played golf out there?

Mr. REUSS. No. As the gentleman should know, the expenses of that country club are borne by the members of it, who are from the Fund and the Bank.

The reason for the country club is that many of the delegates and members of the Bank and the Fund are from countries other than so-called caucasian countries, and they like to play golf much like caucasians do. But they found they could not make it in the country clubs that now fringe the city of Washington.

So I think that there is a special history there. However, I will say to the gentleman, we have set up genuine GAO auditing controls, and I can assure the gentleman that there will be no more country clubs.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman's assurance can be taken at full value.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman and I will work together on this, and at the first sign of a country club, we will sound the tocsin.

Mr. GROSS. I am just surprised that the House Committee on Banking and Currency did not move in and stop the construction of this country club out here, that is apparently, as he says, constructed for the purpose of taking care of the visiting Poobahs. I think the gentleman will find that there are a lot of people around here who find it possible to go out and enjoy all the benefits of this wonderful country club out here on the outskirts that costs the International Monetary Fund, I do not know how many millions of dollars. I am surprised that the committee did not go into this business of the construction of this club.

Mr. REUSS. We did go into it. If the gentleman will read the record, he will find that his name is mentioned by me when I demanded that the full account be spread on the record. It is in the record and I reiterate what I said a moment ago.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Is it true that the employees of the World Bank who are American citizens and who live in the Washington area pay no income tax on their salaries?

Mr. REUSS. I believe that the U.S. employees of the international financial agencies are not exempt from the U.S. income tax, through I am not sure.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. How on earth, if the gentleman can tell me, can that be explained? Here is a man who lives in Washington, D.C., and who works in Washington, D.C., for the World Bank and earns his salary here and he pays no income tax.

Mr. REUSS. I would recommend to the gentleman that he consult with the House Committee on Ways and Means, which has jurisdiction over tax matters, if he thinks this is an unfair loophole that ought to be plugged. I have not examined it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I do not think it—I know it.

Mr. REUSS. This is something for the House Committee on Ways and Means that the gentleman can take up with them.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I know of a man who had a job with our Committee on Appropriations who retired and went out there and took a job with the World Bank—at a pretty good salary—and he pays no income tax.

Mr. REUSS. While the gentleman is at it, he might take up matters like the $3,000 exemption from income tax of the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Wisconsin and all the rest of us. Maybe we should wipe out all loopholes, and I will join with the gentleman in a loophole-plugging foray.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman mentioned the $3,000. I think something ought to be done about that because a Congressman comes down here and spends $6,000—and you cannot tell me that they are living here for $3,000 a year because I know better than that—he could not. But if the businessman spends $10,000, he can deduct it all—but you could not say that Congress was being discriminated against.

What I really wanted to ask you about, I am pleased to hear you say there are going to be no more country clubs. But I wonder if you could go a little bit further and tell them to just get rid of everyone of them and put the money back.

Mr. REUSS. If the gentleman from Ohio will arrange for the membership of the polygot members of the Bretton Woods Country Club in Chevy Chase and Kenwood and Burning Tree and the Congressional and others, I will pledge him my best efforts to compel through the U.S. Director——

Mr. HAYS. I will do better than that.

Mr. REUSS. I will pledge him my best efforts to compel, through the U.S. Director, the prompt sale by the Montgomery County sheriff of the Bretton Woods Country Club.

Mr. HAYS. I will do better than that. I will suggest that they work a little and not play golf so much. I do not find time to do it while I am here and I do not think that they, whose salaries we are paying, should. You will find them out there all days of the week—Monday afternoon, Tuesday afternoon, Wednesday afternoon—you name it.

Somebody once said, "What would you get if you crossed an employee of the International Bank with a baboon?" The answer is that you would get a baboon that plays golf every afternoon.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman from Ohio, as always, is too puritanical. Simply because he denies himself these simple pleasures does not mean that international civil servants should do so also.

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

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to make a brief comment on a point about the income tax situation of international organizations. I think the Members should bear in mind that since the nationals of other countries do not pay income tax, it would be, in a sense, a discrimination against the nationals of the United States if, as employees of the same organization, they would have to pay income tax.

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has a point. As I have said, these tax matters are for the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman from New York that he had better check into the laws of some of the other countries, because a good many countries require their nationals to pay the national income tax no matter who they work for.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Impersonally, then, there are a good many people in Government, including Members of Congress, who are segregated. We do not have our income taxes paid. The gentleman from New York, (Mr. BINGHAM) says that they would be discriminated against. If you want to raise the issue of discrimination, why segregate us?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the time situation, and in view of the fact that questioners seem momentarily to have exhausted themselves, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require at this point.

I wish to speak today in support of H.R. 18306, a bill which authorizes U.S. participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, and which was reported out favorably by the Committee on Banking and Currency on July 14 of this year. This bill would authorize the United States to increase its quota in the International Monetary Fund, and would provide for a related adjustment in the U.S. capital subscription in the World Bank. Furthermore, it would authorize the United States to contribute to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank as well as provide for an increase in our subscription to that Bank's paid-in and callable capital. The bill also provides for a U.S. contribution to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank.

I wish to discuss more specifically each proposed U.S. contribution and what I believe to be cogent reasons why—in the case of each particular institution—the best interests of the United States would be served by adoption of this bill. However, before proceeding further, I wish to emphasize the benefits of multilateral economic cooperation.

As the Committee on Banking and Currency stated in its report, this is the first time that a bill has been reported to the House which contains authorization requests for four multilateral financial institutions. The multilateral nature of the institutions concerned in this bill is representative of the ever-growing

recognition among nations since 1945 of the importance of and, indeed, necessity for international and multilateral frameworks within which to accomplish those economic goals which individual nations wish to achieve but are unable to effectively accomplish within the limitations inherent today in national, unilateral endeavors. It is my firm belief that in the area of economic development assistance multilateral financial institutions represent a highly effective instrument for promoting the economic development of less developed nations, in a manner which is also most advantageous from the standpoint of the best interests of the United States.

A major advantage of multilateral development institutions is the fact that the burden of providing development assistance can be shared with other developed, as well as less developed member countries. For example, as applied to the present proposal—

The U.S. contribution of $100 million to the ADB's Special Funds resources must also remain a minority share of all such contributions and never constitute the largest single contribution of any country. Other countries have already put up $160 million.

Our share of the World Bank capital stock increase is only 11 percent. Our subscription is $246 million. Other countries will subscribe almost $2 billion.

The Latin American members of the IDB will put up the equivalent of $1 for every $2 put up by the United States in the FSO. This represents a 67-percent increase in the Latin contribution to the Fund for Special Operations over the last replenishment.

Another significant advantage is that multilateral development institutions are able to provide for an allocation of assistance on the basis of development need, rather than from political considerations. The fact that national political motivations are thereby minimized allows these institutions to bring international influence to bear on recipient countries so that they follow acceptable and effective development policies. This influence is all the more effective given the fact that the recipient countries are themselves members of the institutions involved and have a stake in their operations.

As mentioned previously, these multilateral institutions are effective instruments for the pooling of resources. They are also able to pool knowledge and expertise in connection with development problems on a degree which no single country could obtain.

These institutions allow for the coordination of development activities in various countries and regions so that scarce development resources are not lost through needless duplication of projects. Through the use of multilateral institutions, the benefits of preinvestment studies and other preliminary technical undertakings can be made available for followup projects.

For all of these reasons, it is clear that multilateral development institutions are a highly effective means by which the economic development of less developed countries can be promoted in a framework favorable to U.S. interest.

Returning to H.R. 18306, I would like to briefly summarize the authorization requests provided for in this bill with reference to the particular institutions which would benefit from them. Chapter 1 of H.R. 18306 authorizes the U.S. contribution of $100 million to the consolidated special funds of the Asian Development Bank. The contribution would be payable in three annual installments of $25 million, $35 million, and $40 million. The bill requires that the U.S. contribution to the Asian Development Bank's special funds be used to finance loans on concessional terms and technical assistance on a reimbursable basis for high priority development projects and programs in deveolping member countries.

The Asian Development Bank was established in 1966 to finance economic development in and among the developing countries of Asia. With the addition of France, the Bank has 35 members which have subscribed to over $1 billion of authorized capital. The Bank has already committed over $163 million for 32 loans in 13 countries. It has also undertaken 24 technical assistance projects in 12 countries, along with a number of important regional activities. New loan commitments in 1970 are expected to total more than $200 million.

In addition to these ordinary capital operations, the Bank has already begun significant "soft window" or special funds operations. Contributions of almost $160 million have already been promised by other Bank members, of which almost $60 million has already been made available to the Bank. Since June of 1969 the Bank has made eight concessional loans from its special funds resources totaling about $25 million to seven Asian countries to finance projects ranging in nature from irrigation and land development to highways and power transmission.

The U.S. contribution of $100 million would not only directly help to supply the Bank with needed special operations resources, but would also encourage contribution by other Bank members. For instance, it is expected, and in fact required under the terms of H.R. 18306, that the U.S. contribution be matched dollar for dollar by Japan.

Chapter 2 of H.R. 18306 is concerned with the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. It authorizes an increase of $1.54 billion in the U.S. quota in the IMF as part of a general increase in Fund quotas. The U.S. quota increase is a monetary transaction between the United States and the Fund and involves no budgetary expenditure. The Fund has proposed the general increase in quotas to provide for sufficient growth in its conditional credit facilities to keep pace with the rising volume of world trade and output. This rapid growth in world trade and output has also necessitated a more rapid growth in international credit facilities. Chapter 2 would also permit the United States to vote for new allocations of special drawing rights or SDR's by the Fund up to the congressionally authorized U.S. quota in the Fund in each period in which such an allocation is proposed.

Chapter 2 also authorizes an increase of $246 million in the U.S. subscription to the World Bank, the forerunner of all of the multilateral development institutions which I have discussed today. Consistent with long-established policy, the Executive Directors of the Bank have recommended special increases on the part of members of the Bank so that their relative quotas in that institution remain equal to their quotas in the Fund after completion of the latter's currently proposed increase in quotas. Only 10 percent of the U.S. special increase, or less than $25 million, must be paid in. The remaining 90 percent will be callable capital and would not result in a budgetary outlay unless called upon by the Bank to meet a debt obligation.

The World Bank was founded over 25 years ago and, since the reconstruction of Europe, has operated primarily in the developing nations of the world. Through the end of 1969, agreements providing for loans of over $13.4 billion had been concluded, of which almost $10 billion has been disbursed. The greater part of the Bank's loans has been designed primarily to help provide developing countries with needed infrastructure, although the Bank has also sought to foster an economic climate favorable to private investors through loans to local development finance companies.

The World Bank has established itself as a highly effective instrument for the promotion of economic development with an unparalleled reputation for excellence. It has been able to borrow substantial sums in the world capital markets on the basis of its sound capital structure. The paid-in portion of the U.S. contribution would serve directly to supplement the resources available to the Bank on the one hand. While, on the other hand, the callable portion of the U.S. contribution—which constitutes 90 percent of the total contribution to the Bank and which would involve no budgetary expenditure—would enable the Bank to generate funds in private markets for its development lending programs.

Chapter 3 of H.R. 18306 deals with the proposed U.S. contributions to both the capital stock and the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank. The Bank was established by the members of the Organization of American States in 1959 to promote the economic development of the less developed countries in the Western Hemisphere in a spirit of self-help and mutual cooperation. In its first 10 years of existence, it made 187 loans from ordinary capital totaling almost $1.3 billion. The Bank's Fund for Special Operations is used for the financing of high-priority development and infrastructure projects on concessionary terms. One hundred and eighteen loans have been made from the Fund for Special Operations, accounting for nearly $1.6 billion.

The results of this lending are even more significant than the statistics. During the decade of the sixties the Bank directly contributed to the welfare of one out of every four Latin Americans and indirectly benefited far more. The Bank accomplished this through the broad-based lending and technical assistance

support which it has provided—at the local, national, and regional levels—for Latin America's own efforts to improve all aspects of its social and economic development in a 10-year period which coincided with the first development decade of the United Nations and the first decade of the Alliance for Progress.

H.R. 18306 authorizes an increase in the U.S. callable capital obligation to the Bank's ordinary capital resources of $673.5 million, which would involve no budgetary expenditure. The proposed U.S. paid-in capital subscription of $150 million would be payable in a letter of credit in three annual installments, which would only be drawn as needed over a period of years.

Finally, this bill would authorize a U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of $1 billion, payable in one installment of $100 million and two annual installments of $450 million. Again, these installments would be paid in the form of letters of credit and would be drawn down only over a period of years.

I strongly urge that the House give its support to the proposed U.S. participation in the increase in resources of these multilateral financial institutions. This bill has the firm support of the President and the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies. The proposed contributions have been based on a careful analysis of the economic development needs of the less developed countries participating in these organizations and on the ability of these multilateral institutions to effectively utilize the contributed funds to meet those needs.

The fiscal problems of the United States have also been considered in drafting this proposed legislation. The estimated budgetary impact of the total contributions authorized by this bill amount to only $35 million in fiscal year 1971, and to $70 million and $155 million in fiscal years 1972 and 1973, respectively.

I strongly feel that multilateral development institutions can serve well the economic development needs of the less developed nations. These institutions can accomplish the goal of economic development with a minimum of burden and expense on the United States. For these reasons, I recommend that the House adopt H.R. 18306 so that the highly effective efforts of these institutions can continue at an even greater pace in the decade of the seventies. The benefits of their undertaking will accrue to all nations.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the enactment of H.R. 18306. Technological advances in communication and transportation during this century have brought the nations of the world together as a true community of nations. They have awakened new ambitions and new hostilities among people all over the globe. Consequently, they present new challenges to those nations which can and do exercise leadership roles in the everlasting quest of mankind for a better way of life.

The United States emerged from World War II as the strongest bastion of freedom on the globe and for 25 years has shouldered the burden which that strength imposed upon us. Despite the fact that we have stumbled now and then; that some programs have been less successful than we might have wished; and despite the fact that we have sometimes demonstrated the understandable awkwardness of novices to international affairs, our efforts have, nonetheless, been commendable and, on balance, highly successful. Today, we see a world in which prosperity, economic strength, and freedom prevail in key nations on every continent.

Nevertheless, there remain many nations where prosperity and economic strength are virtually unknown and in many of these, freedom is in jeopardy. The very technology of which I spoke has increased the demands for progress in less developed nations.

At the same time, it has become increasingly apparent that the United States alone cannot carry the full burden of international aid. Badly needed domestic programs can be deferred only so long in the interest of assisting others. Recognizing this, the President has made it clear throughout the world that while the United States is willing and anxious to continue assistance to the underdeveloped nations, we expect other developed nations of the world to share this burden with us. That message has been repeated by our delegates to the international financial institutions and is reflected in the legislation before us today.

Multilateral financial institutions are the keystone on which we must build a program of cooperative international assistance for undeveloped nations. Through these institutions, the responsibility for progress is shared by those providing the aid and those receiving it. From our point of view, this offers distinct advantages. Foremost among these is that the drain on our financial resources is reduced as other developed nations take on a share of the burden. While it has been necessary in some instances to maintain or increase the actual dollar amount of our subscriptions as convincing evidence of our expressed willingness to assist, these actions have been accompanied by responses from other nations resulting in a reduction of our proportionate share of the contributions. In other words, by a convincing expression of our interest, we have stimulated new and greater efforts from other nations.

I cannot overemphasize the value of the shared responsibility inherent in the multilateral approach. Pressures upon a borrowing nation for greater political or economic stability as a condition for a loan are better received and far more effective when applied by a panel of one's peers than by a single nation which sometimes appears too domineering. Furthermore, such a panel is better able to assess the need for developments of various types within its sphere of nations than are we alone, and better able to convince recipients that they should pursue efforts which may be coordinated on a hemispheric basis.

H.R. 18306 proposes authorizations of slightly in excess of $3.7 billion. But of that amount, $2,435 million will never be spent in the sense that we ordinarily think of spending; $1,540,000,000 is callable capital which facilitates the borrowings of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Inter-American Development Bank. Of the total, only $1,275 million represents an actual outlay of funds of which only $103 million is expected to be spent during the next 2 fiscal years.

In effect, what I am saying is, that while it appears we are presenting a bill for very substantial amounts of money with this consolidated measure, a close examination of it will show that by the expenditure of quite modest sums, we are participating aggressively in a worldwide program that has proved more effective as a weapon against tyranny than the multibillion-dollar efforts in Southeast Asia.

The second point I want to emphasize is that the amounts we are requesting represent less as a percentage of the totals being subscribed for these organizations than in the past. The President and our delegates to these organizations have made it quite clear that while the United States is willing to assist underdeveloped countries, we expect other developed nations which believe in freedom to share this burden with us. These multilateral financial organizations offer what is probably the best method yet devised for such a cooperative effort and they are working well.

For example, the Asian Development Bank will have 35 members when France is formally accepted. Of its authorized capital, $1,004 million has been subscribed. The U.S. subscription is only about one-fifth of that—$200 million. This amount has been matched by Japan. Of the 21 regional members of the Asian Development Bank, only three—Japan, Australia, and New Zealand—are classified as developed nations, but 14 nonregional members are classified as developed. These include the United States, Canada, and 12 European countries. Thus, you can see that of the 35 members of the Asian Development Bank, 17, or approximately one-half, are developed nations who are sharing with the United States the task of providing adequate financing needed for national improvements in the underdeveloped nations of Asia.

Although we have no shooting war in South America, it is obvious from the kidnapings, coup d'etats, guerrilla activities, and sometimes chaotic political activities, that the battle for men's minds goes on there too. As with the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank is a cooperative effort. While the $1 billion requested in this bill is the largest single expenditure requested, it too is less in proportion to other nations' contributions than previously. Whereas our contribution was three times that of the other members, it has now been reduced to a 2 to 1 ratio and will probably drop further. Canada, for example, is seeking admission as a member, and other nations who will probably never be eligible

for membership in the Inter-American Development Bank, are making funds available to it.

Our subscriptions of callable capital to the Inter-American Development Bank are important for they provide an element of security which facilitates the Bank's borrowings in other nations. The Bank has moved aggressively in its search for funds in other nations. During August, for example, the Bank sold $4 million of bonds in Norway and $27.3 million of bonds in Germany. This brings the Bank's borrowings to a total of $838.3 million. Of this, $405 million has been borrowed from U.S. investors—$355.7 million from nonmember countries, and $77.6 million through short-term borrowings primarily in Latin America. The Bank has now borrowed funds in 16 different nations around the globe. They are Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

But this is not the limit of international cooperation. In addition to these borrowings, the Bank administers a variety of special development funds for Canada, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the Vatican, and Norway. None of these countries is eligible, at present, for membership in the Inter-American Development Bank, but their confidence in the Bank is such that they have elected to utilize it as an administrative vehicle for specialized foreign assistance.

Mr. Chairman, I belabor these aspects of the cooperative nature of this program because I believe they are too little recognized by the American people, and even by some here in Congress. The multilateral financial institutions to which we belong have provided the most effective device in history for a truly international economic assistance program. American citizens can be proud of the leadership our Nation has provided in the development of these institutions. They can be confident that our continued participation is only undertaken in cooperation with other nations who will share the burden with us.

As Mr. WIDNALL said in the letter he addressed to his colleagues:

> As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I have followed closely our participation in these institutions. I know the excellent work they have done and the opportunity they present for fairly sharing the burdens of providing development assistance. The detailed hearings that were held on H.R. 18306 have assured me that the proposed new commitments are vitally necessary for the institutions to continue their successful programs. I am convinced that these contributions will be carefully and efficiently used to promote our national objectives.
>
> This is a good bill. I strongly urge all my colleagues to give it their support.

Mr. Chairman, I join with Mr. WIDNALL in urging the Members of the House to support this legislation.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the International Monetary Fund was established at the conclusion of World War II, with the strong support of the United States, to provide for effective international monetary cooperation, to regulate exchange rates, and to promote balanced growth of both domestic economies and international trade. At the end of its first full year of operation, the Fund had 44 members and resources amount to $21.4 billion in regular quotas, to which must be added $5.4 billion in unutilized borrowing arrangements with the Group of Ten, the ten largest industrial members.[1] These resources are made available temporarily in the form of purchases of foreign currencies against a member's own currency to enable the purchasing member to finance balance-of-payments deficits without resort to measures destructive of national or international prosperity, in the form of either unduly harsh domestic policies or such measures as import restrictions. Such purchases must normally be reversed, or repaid, within a 3-to-5 year period.

Such drawings from the Fund have greatly increased in recent years. Of the total aggregate drawings from the Fund of $22.3 billion in its 23 years of operations, 36 percent have taken place in the less than 3 years since the end of 1967, and 57 percent have occurred in the 5½ years since the end of 1964. These facts are related to two features of the international monetary scene of recent years: the rapid growth in international trade and in other international transactions, and the extremely sharp expansion in recent years in the international mobility of capital. An important aspect of these sharp increases in use of the Fund by its members in recent years has been the much greater recourse to it by major industrial countries when faced with balance-of-payments difficulties, in part because of the greater mobility of capital. Thus, not only have the United Kingdom and France made very large use of the Fund in the past several years, but Germany—at the end of 1969—and Italy—June-July 1970—have also at times of stress obtained foreign currency from the Fund under their automatic rights to draw.

The United States, too, has made drawings from the Fund that at the time assisted in the financing of the U.S. foreign deficit and reduced gold conversions by other countries. From February 1964 through March 1968, the United States made a number of drawings which totaled $1,840 million. During the same period, purchases of U.S. dollars from the Fund by other members were occurring, which served to reverse U.S. drawings. As a result, the maximum U.S. drawings outstanding were $964 million at the end of 1966. The U.S. drawings were fully repaid by the end of 1968, and the United States had a net creditor position with the Fund of $1,164 million at the end of July 1970.

The Fund has recently assumed important additional responsibilities in creating and administering the new special drawing rights, a separate facility designed to create reserve assets for its member nations to supplement traditional reserves of gold and foreign exchange. At the beginning of this year, $3.4 billion in special drawing rights were created to the credit of 105 members that had become participants in the new facility. Under a decision taken last October by the Fund's Governors, additional special drawing rights of $3 billion will be created at the beginning of 1971 and 1972. Transactions in these new reserve assets have been proceeding smoothly, and some $561 million of SDR's have changed hands in the 8 months since the system began operations.

The Fund is steadily growing in influence and importance as the primary institution for worldwide multilateral cooperation and action in the international monetary sphere.

Under the proposed legislation, the United States would be authorized to increase its quota in the Fund by $1,540 million from the present quota of $5,160 million to $6,700 million. This, together with the necessary appropriation legislation, would enable the United States to participate in a generally applicable quota increase recommended last December by the Fund's Executive Directors and approved by the Fund's Governors in February of this year. The overall quotas in the Fund would increase from the present $21.4 billion to $28.9 billion under this exercise, or by 35 percent. The increase proposed for the United States amounts to a rise by 29.8 percent.

There have been two general increases in the quotas in the Fund, one by 50 percent in 1959 and a second by 25 percent in 1965. In each case, a certain number of selective increases were also recommended. In the present exercise, the quota increases recommended by the Executive Directors consist of increases of 25 percent or more for nearly all member countries. A major effort is also being made to readjust quota sizes to reflect recent developments in the international economic situation, and for that reason selective adjustments have been recommended for 75 countries. Among the largest increases, ranging beyond 50 percent, are those for Belgium, France, Italy, and Japan. This is the first time the United States is to have a selective increase.

In recommending the increases mentioned, the Fund took account of the fact that the growth in world trade has been in excess of 50 percent in the 5 years since the last general quota increase, and some other types of international transactions, in particular volatile movements of capital, have grown still more sharply. These high rates of growth bring with them the likelihood that countries will to a correspondingly greater extent experience balance of payments difficulties from time to time of the type for which recourse to the Fund is appropriate.

The United States will need to pay 25 percent of the quota increase, or $385 million, in gold. This payment, however, will result in an increase by the same amount in freely, quickly and automatically available U.S. drawing rights at the Fund. These automatic drawing rights are shown in the statistics of both the

[1] Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden, United Kingdom, United States.

Fund and the United States as reserves; hence, there will be no loss of reserves, but only a change in their composition.

The remainder of the quota increase, $1,155 million, will be paid by a letter of credit which will be drawn upon by the Fund when it has needs for U.S. dollars to meet requests for drawings in this form. Although both portions of the payment for the quota increase must be appropriated, neither portion will result in budgetary expenditure; instead, these transactions are treated for fiscal purposes as an exchange of claims, reflecting the fact that they result in valuable drawing rights on the Fund for the United States.

Other countries are likely to some extent to buy gold from the United States in order to make the required gold payment to the Fund in implementing their quota increases. However, I am glad to say that permanent and fully satisfactory arrangements have been made by the Fund to offset completely any U.S. gold losses that may arise from this source, up to as much as $700 million, which is expected to be adequate.

The Fund has been an outstandingly successful international organization within its sphere of competence. It deserves our full support in the form of approval of the proposed legislation. It should not be forgotten that, in the future as in the past, the United States itself may find it useful and appropriate to make use of balance of payments financing from the Fund; the proposed quota increase will raise the amount that could be drawn from the Fund in such conditions. Finally, members should be aware that the amount in the new special drawing rights that each member will receive on January 1, 1971, and January 1, 1972, will be based on its quota at these times. If the United States were to delay implementing its quota increase beyond the end of this calendar year, while all other members placed their recommended quota increases in force, the United States would receive $130 million less in special drawing rights than it will with the new quota in force. Thus, the implementation of the proposed quota increase will not cost the United States any of its reserves and will add to our borrowing potentialities in the Fund, should we need to make use of them, while failure to implement the quota increase before the end of this calendar year would result in the permanent loss to our reserves of $130 million in special drawing rights.

For all these reasons, some of broad national interest and some of the most specific self-interest, we should support the proposed quota increase in the Fund.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY).

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

I would like to say a few words about how the development banks use their callable capital to raise money for lending in the world's capital markets, thereby mobilizing private capital in the development effort and reducing the need for governmental contributions.

The World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank all have callable guarantee capital as part of their capital structure. Subscriptions to callable capital represent contingent liabilities which can be called only to meet the banks' debt obligations. I would like to emphasize that our subscriptions to callable capital will not result in budgetary outlays except in the event of a call. The likelihood of calls by any of these institutions is remote.

Borrowings in the world's capital markets on the basis of this callable capital have been substantial. For each of the three institutions the amounts of callable capital and borrowing outstanding are as follows.

In the World Bank, our callable capital is $5,715 million, other nations' callable capital is $15,044 million. Against this callable capital there were, as of February 28, 1970, gross borrowings of $8,237 million and net borrowings of $4,442 million. Net World Bank loans were $13,394 million.

In the Inter-American Development Bank our callable capital as of December 31, 1969, was $817.6 million, other nations' callable capital was $1,076.2 million. Against this callable capital there were gross borrowings of $881.6 million and net borrowings of $767.4 million. Inter-American Development Bank loans out of ordinary capital resources were $1,294.1 million.

In the Asian Development Bank our callable capital is $100 million, other nations' callable capital is $389 million. As of April 1, 1970, the Bank had borrowed $20 million. By December 31, 1969, the Bank had approved loans from ordinary capital totaling $117.7 million.

H.R. 18306 would authorize an additional U.S. subscription of $221.49 million of callable capital to the World Bank and $673.52 million of callable capital to the Inter-American Development Bank. Other countries will increase their callable capital by $1,975.9 million in the World Bank and $879.03 million in the Inter-American Development Bank.

The use of private borrowed capital by the development banks has two important favorable aspects for us: First, it takes a significant part of the burden off the U.S. Government and other countries for official aid contributions; and, second, through borrowing outside the United States, other currencies are used to finance development. The development banks in recent years have increased their borrowings outside the United States. During fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1967 the World Bank conducted 36 percent of its net borrowing outside of the United States. In fiscal year 1968 that figure rose to 51 percent and in fiscal year 1969, 77 percent of net borrowings, $540 million, was raised outside the United States. Cumulative net borrowings by the Inter-American Development Bank outside the United States have risen from 17.4 percent in 1964 to 48.9 percent in 1969 when the outstanding net amount of non-U.S. borrowing stood at $374.9 million. Asian Development Bank borrowing has to date been done wholly outside the United States.

H.R. 18306 will help the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank to continue to mobilize private capital for the development process.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MIZE).

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the legislation before us.

H.R. 18306 authorizes the United States to participate in the increase in capital of the World Bank. The U.S. share would amount to $246.1 million of which only 10 percent, or $24.6 million, would be paid in. The remaining $221.5 million would be in the form of callable capital, which will not involve a budgetary expenditure—except in the very unlikely event that the Bank is unable to meet its debt obligations out of its reserves.

The increase in the U.S. subscription is part of an increase in the capital subscriptions of 75 member countries in amounts corresponding to the increase considered special—above 25 percent—in their increased quotas in the IMF. It is a longstanding practice to take parallel action in the Bank on special increases in the Fund to reflect the relative economic strength of the member countries. It serves also to maintain a relative alinement in voting strength of members in the two institutions.

While this is the first U.S. subscription increase on such a basis, it has significant advantages for the United States from a burden-sharing point of view. The U.S. increase of $246 million represents only 11 percent of the $2.2 billion total of special increases being subscribed by 75 members. This will reduce the U.S. share of the total subscriptions to the Bank from 27.48 to 26.04 percent.

The capital thus provided will facilitate Bank borrowings in world capital markets—the Bank's primary source of new funds. It will enable the Bank to continue its activities at a high level.

In the past the United States has strongly and consistently supported the policy of parallel action by member countries on special increases in the two Bretton Woods institutions. The Bank has benefited greatly from this policy, receiving over $3.5 billion in special subscriptions. Since it is now for the first time proposed that the United States accept a special increase in its Fund quota, it is appropriate that we continue our support of this policy by taking a special increase in our subscription to the Bank. The special increases of the United States and 74 other countries will provide new resources to the Bank during a period when the Bank's need for new funds to sustain a rising volume of operations is increasing. Our favorable action on this bill would demonstrate effective U.S. leadership in support of a significant expansion of multilateral assistance on a burden-sharing basis favorable to the United States.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to the budgetary impact of H.R. 18306.

This is the first time we have considered contributions to four multilateral financial institutions at one time. There is authorized to be appropriated $1,540 million for the International Monetary Fund, $246.1 million for the World Bank, $100 million for the Asian Development Bank, and a contribution of $1 billion to the fund for special operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, as well as a subscription of $823 million to the ordinary capital of that Bank. However, H.R. 18306 contains features which very substantially lessen the budgetary impact of the expenditures involved. I would like to explain these features because I think they are extremely important to the House in the consideration of this bill and figure prominently among the favorable aspects of the bill.

First, with regard to the International Monetary Fund, $1,540 billion outlay, it should be explained that the bill will involve no budgetary outlay. This is because an increase in our quota is basically a monetary transaction—an exchange of assets. The quota increase is partially subscribed in gold—$358 million—and partially in the form of a dollar letter of credit—$1,155 million. We receive equal value from the Fund for these commitments. Our quota increase will entitle us to receive automatic rights to draw on the Fund either immediately in the form of gold tranche drawing rights or subsequently whenever our dollar letter of credit is actually drawn down. The President's Commission on Budget Concepts described our transactions with the IMF as "monetary exchanges through which the United States receives international reserve assets," and recommended that "subscriptions, drawings, and other transactions reflecting net changes in the U.S. position with the International Monetary Fund should be excluded from budget receipts and expenditures."

Thus, although H.R. 18306 authorizes the appropriation of $1,540 million for the Fund, this appropriation will have no impact whatsoever on the Federal budget. The United States receives full value in return in the form of international reserve assets.

Second, with regard to the World Bank, H.R. 18306 authorizes the appropriation of $246.1 million for the payment of the new U.S. subscription. However, it should be noted that only 10 percent of this amount, $24.6 million, is payable to the Bank at this time. The remainder, $221.5 million, is callable if needed to meet the obligations of the Bank. The likelihood of such a call is very remote.

Third, the budgetary impact of the proposed $100 million contribution to the Asian Development Bank will be spaced over time. H.R. 18306 authorizes the appropriation of $25 million for fiscal year 1970, $35 million for fiscal year 1971, and $40 million for fiscal year 1972.

However, there is a more important point. These installment commitments will only be drawn as needed to make payments to suppliers and this spreads the financial impact of our contribution over a substantial period of time.

This situation results from the fact that the U.S. contribution to the special funds of the Asian Development Bank will be in the form of non-interest-bearing letters of credit. The letters of credit will allow the Asian Development Bank to make commitments to borrowers. However, the Bank will not make expenditures of these funds until borrowers have actual bills from contractors and suppliers. It is only at such time that the United States will pay out cash against the letters of credit. Thus, the budgetary impact of this contribution will be distributed over a considerable time period.

It is estimated that the ADB special fund contribution will result in budgetary outlays of $10 million in fiscal year 1971, $20 million in fiscal year 1972, and $30 million in fiscal year 1973.

Fourth, the proposal to increase the resources of the Inter-American Development Bank has similar budget impact reducing features. First, $673.5 million takes the form of an increase in our callable capital subscription. As in the case of the World Bank subscription, an increase in our callable capital has no budgetary impact. Callable capital serves as the guarantee behind the Bank's borrowings in private capital markets. It is callable and will not result in expenditures unless the Bank needs it in order to pay off its borrowings. Neither the World Bank nor the IDB has ever made a call and such a call can be regarded as an extremely remote possibility.

The subscriptions to the Inter-American Bank contain two amounts that will have to be paid in: $150 million to the paid-in capital of the Bank and $1 billion to the Bank's fund for special operations. These payments will be spread out over a number of years. The callable capital is payable in three annual installments of $50 million. The fund for special operations contribution is payable in one installment of $100 million and two annual installments of $450 million.

Again, as in the Asian Bank subscription, there is a further mitigating factor. Each of the installments due to the Bank will take the form of a letter of credit. These letters of credit will not be drawn upon until the Bank actually needs funds for operations. As a result, it is estimated that the proposal to increase the resources of the Inter-American Bank will have no budgetary impact in fiscal year 1971, a $48 million impact in fiscal year 1972, and a $125 million impact in fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, it can be seen from this detailed explanation that H.R. 18306 is a fiscally responsible measure. The subscription to the International Monetary Fund and the callable capital subscriptions to the World Bank and the Inter-American Bank will have no budgetary impact. Thus, $2.4 billion of commitments contained in this legislation will not result in budgetary expenditures.

Of the remaining $1.3 billion in expenditures, the budgetary impact will be spread over a number of years. Thus, in voting on this bill, Members of this House should be fully aware that its total cost in fiscal year 1971 will be $35 million, in fiscal year 1972 the cost will be $70 million, and in fiscal year 1973 the cost will be $155 million. The remaining cost will similarly be spread out over a number of years, although it is not now possible to estimate the specific amounts in each year.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that this measure is fiscally responsible. I urge that the membership of this House give it their support.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as the debate has already shown, this authorization is needed so that the United States may contribute to four international financial institutions. These contributions, it has already been pointed out, will represent only a small fraction of the amounts to be contributed by other countries.

Perhaps the only unusual feature of this bill is that authorization is to be provided in this one bill for contributions to four multilateral institutions. As a result it might seem as if unusually large U.S. contributions are being authorized. This is not the case, though there are certain additional amounts to be authorized, above the level of support currently being provided.

As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) has pointed out, these financial institutions are an increasingly important element in the economic development of lesser developed countries. For that reason it is especially important that the House give this bill approval today.

As a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs I feel regret that the Banking and Currency Committee has formal jurisdiction over the activities of these multilateral financial institutions. Actually, our support, and the level of our support, represents a very real contribution in the field of foreign policy.

Thus, this is an area which is of common interest to more than one committee of Congress. In closing, let me offer my congratulations to the House Banking and Currency Committee for their action in reporting out this bill.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 18306.

Mr. Chairman, today this Congress is being called upon to pass legislation, which along with provisions for other international financial institutions, proposes a $100 million contribution to the soft-lending window of the Asian Development Bank, known as special funds.

The Asian Bank is the most promising new regional institution to appear in Asia in many years. Dedicated to concrete objectives, it has gone about the business of organizing itself and developed its lending program in a sensible and workmanlike way. In a landscape littered with organizations that spend most of their time talking, it stands out as an entity which operates effectively.

It also strikes me as an organization which reflects the present-day situation in which the United States no longer has the resources to take the commanding lead as we have in the past. In a capi-

talization of a billion dollars, we have only a fifth, the same as the Japanese. Western Europe, Canada, and Australia have almost a third. This time these countries have faced up to the responsibilities that their new wealth is giving them and have contributed their proper share. Japan especially is now beginning to take on the role that its situation as one of the fastest growing economies on earth gives it.

The Bank opened its doors late in 1966. By early 1968, it had made its first loan. In 1968, it lent almost $100 million and this year it looks as if it will make commitments for a much higher level of lending. Most of these credits have come from the ordinary capital of the Bank on fairly hard terms—the current rate of interest is 7½ percent. The Bank has patterned itself on the World Bank where the bulk of the funds for hard lending come from bond issues guaranteed by its members. It has already sold bonds in Germany and Austria.

But just as the World Bank and the Inter-American Bank have discovered, not all the countries having worthwhile projects can accept hard terms. The International Development Association was attached to the World Bank and the Fund for Special Operations to the Inter-American Bank to make softer loans.

In the Asian Bank, the soft-loan window is called special funds. Other donor countries have already taken the lead in making contributions. Japan has offered $100 million and Canada, Britain, Australia, the Netherlands, and Denmark, together are now contributing another $60 million.

The Bank has proven itself as an effective institution. Other donors have shown their willingness to make their fair shares available. We should join with them.

(Mr. BROWN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. WIDNALL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I am deeply impressed, Mr. Chairman, by the way in which the Inter-American Development Bank has, in less than 10 years of operation, become one of the most respected and important financial institutions concerned with economic development. I am deeply gratified at the major accomplishments of its lending policies and programs.

The United States has always viewed the Latin American region as one of immense importance and we have through the Inter-American Development Bank, as well as the Social Progress Trust Fund, which is administered by the Bank, and the Alliance for Progress, invested a great deal of time and money in the economic and social development of the region. I believe the accomplishments already achieved, and certain significant steps to be taken in connection with the currently proposed increase in the Bank's resources, demonstrate that the investment has been and will continue to be a very wise and productive one.

Bank loans already extended will improve, or bring into production for the first time, over 6 million acres of land, build or expand 4,038 private industrial enterprises, construct or improve over 20,000 miles of highways and roads, provide over 6 million kilowatts of electric power generating facilities, build or expand over 3,000 city and rural water systems and sewage systems, modernize, expand or improve 94 universities and 465 technical institutes and vocational schools, to mention some of the most significant development prospects.

Although much still needs to be done if our Latin American neighbors are to achieve higher and more stable rates of growth, reduce high rates of unemployment and underemployment, and reduce high rates of population growth, there are well grounded reasons to believe that a higher and more stable rate of growth should be attainable during the 1970's. First, the process of planning and programing development in the Latin American countries is reaching higher levels of efficiency through institutional improvements, the adoption of more adequate development policies, and, above all, a higher priority by governments to the problems and objectives of development. Second, a higher priority is being given by the private sector to industrial production for export, rather than import substitution, which is in turn accelerated by a third factor, progress toward regional integration. Wider markets and economies of scale should result in a much more efficient use of capital resources invested in the region.

The Inter-American Development Bank plays a central role in this process; not only is it the principal vehicle of channeling external assistance needed to fund a growing stock of investment projects, in the Latin American countries, but is also one of the primary instruments in achieving better development policies and programs, and better allocation of the resources and energies of these developing countries, which have significantly improved their capacity for development.

It is extremely important that we give our full support to continued efforts by the Bank in this direction.

Moreover, the Bank has committed itself to even greater involvement in the stimulus of regional cooperation and administrative reforms in Latin American countries. The policy initiatives which were approved at the recent annual meeting of the Board of Governors provides several examples of which I mean.

First, the Bank's governors endorsed a strengthened statement regarding the importance of sound national economic policies and satisfactory overall economic performance as factors in determining the character and amount of Bank assistance.

Second, the Latin countries have endorsed a policy statement giving the least developed countries of the region a first priority claim on resources of the Fund for Special Operations.

Third, two more countries, Chile and Colombia, have agreed, along with Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Venezuela, to make up to half their contributions to the Fund for Special Operations available for lending to other countries.

Fourth, to further emphasize their commitment to more rigorous standards of mutual self-help, the Latin American members have agreed to a further increase in their relative share of the contributions to the Bank's FSO resources, and to repayments of loans made from the new FSO resources in the currencies lent, instead of in local currencies.

Thus, the Latin American countries, with the guidance and encouragement of the IDB have resolved to put increased effort and provide more of their own resources in developing the region. This trend is very encouraging; for example, the Latin American members have increased their relative share in each succeeding replenishment of the Fund for Special Operations. In the process, the U.S. share has been reduced from 5:1 in 1964, to 3:1 in 1967, and in the current replenishment proposal, to 2:1.

In addition, a committee of the board of governors is currently studying the possibility of removing certain legal bars to the admission of additional developed nonmember countries, which would further spread the financial burden while providing additional funds needed to accelerate regional development.

The Inter-American Development Bank has come a long way in a very short time. It is probably the single most important factor in shifting the focus in Latin American economic and social development back to the individual developing countries. That is where the primary responsibility lies; and it is only through initiatives and cooperative efforts on the part of the Latins themselves, that they can truly accomplish their development goals.

For these reasons, I strongly urge passage of H.R. 18306, containing authority for participation by the United States in its share of the proposed increase in resources of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ).

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

Since we are engaged in a protracted conflict with communism and its program of subversion, terrorism, revolution and military aggression all over the world, including a full-scale war in Vietnam, it is intolerable that we should turn over billions of dollars of our financial assets to international monetary agencies which in turn make it available to our enemies. This is every bit as objectionable as direct foreign aid to them.

In light of the impending Communist take-over in Chile, the House should take particular note of the report which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of September 11 on the World Bank's business-as-usual attitude toward this disasterous prospect.

> The World Bank says Allende's victory won't alter its lending policies for Chile. Officials note that socialist Yugoslavia is one of the bank's best customers.

If Chile's would-be Communist dictator and Tito's Yugoslavia are to be among the World Bank's best customers, we should stop patronizing it altogether. There can be no justification for making our capital available to those who are committed to our destruction.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Chairman, this bill

H.R. 18306 calls for a scandalous international boondoggle of U.S. taxpayers' dollars. Not just for one, but for four international banks. Over a billion dollars down the drain at a single throw.

One wonders when the working people of America are going to tire of having their substance drained off so that a bunch of international bankers can play Santa clause around the world. Small wonder that American prestige and confidence continue to slip the world over. How could any foreigner have respect for a country or people who continue to get hoodwinked into falling for such a Pandora's box?

If this bill is passed into law, the people's tax money will continue to subsidize world revolution—conveniently labeled progress and overcoming obsolete existing institutions—as we behold a new one-world intellectual aristocracy, promoted into power and spheres of influence because they have been chosen as cooperative by the international banking cartel.

In fact, from the pleading in the debates here, the new world citizens, the international banker, and his employees are immune from taxation on the premise that they are entitled to diplomatic immunity like the citizens of a sovereign nation. A new breed of international untouchables—self-governing, self-disciplining, and deciding what is best for the American people as they dole out our money. This must be what is meant by the third world government—an invisible government that exists in the banking circles only so long as the American taxpayers dollars hold out.

There have been many efforts to justify this outlandish outlay but none of the usual opponents of the military-industrial complex—the ABM, the South Vietnam military budget, or even the payment limitations on the Nation's wealthy farmers have protested this massive payoff to the international bankers nor explained how it can benefit the average American citizen. No one has dared to mention where under the U.S. Constitution authority is found to tax the productive American to give to an international body to subsidize world socialism? Such authority may exist under the United Nations Charter or some other international organ such as the Bretton Woods Agreement, but it is nonexistent, even by a Supreme Court interpretation, under the Constitution of the United States.

In my district, the term "international banker" is a dishonorable term—and "four international banking organizations" would be scandalous. My constituents sent me here to represent them under my oath to support the Constitution of the United States. I intend to cast their vote in their best interest by rejecting H.R. 18306, which would authorize U.S. increased participation in the International Monetary Fund by $1,540 million, the World Bank by $246.1 million, the Asian Development Bank by $100 million, and the Inter-American Development Bank by $673.5 million.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill, according to the rule, by chapter.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Chapter 1.—AMENDMENT OF ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Sec.
1. Amendment of Asian Development Bank Act.

§ 1. Amendment of Asian Development Bank Act

The Asian Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 285–285h) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 12. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the United States Governor of the Bank is authorized to enter into an agreement with the Bank providing for a United States contribution of $100,000,000 to the Bank in three annual installments of $25,000,000, $35,000,000, and $40,000,000, beginning in fiscal year 1970. This contribution is referred to hereinafter in this Act as the 'United States Special Resources'.

"(b) The United States Special Resources shall be made available to the Bank pursuant to the provisions of this Act and article 19 of the Articles of Agreement of the Bank, and in a manner consistent with the Bank's Special Fund Rules and Regulations.

"SEC. 13. (a) The United States Special Resources shall be used to finance specific high priority development projects and programs in developing member countries of the Bank with emphasis on such projects and programs in the Southeast Asia region.

"(b) The United States Special Resources shall be used by the Bank only for—

"(1) making development loans on terms which may be more flexible and bear less heavily on the balance of payments than those established by the Bank for its ordinary operations; and

"(2) providing technical assistance credits on a reimbursable basis.

"(c)(1) The United States Special Resources may be expended by the Bank only for procurement in the United States of goods produced in, or services supplied from, the United States, except that the United States Governor, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, may allow eligibility for procurement in other member countries from the United States Special Resources if he determines that such procurement eligibility would materially improve the ability of the bank to carry out the objectives of its special funds resources and would be compatible with the international financial position of the United States.

"(2) The United States Special Resources may be used to pay for administrative expenses arising from the use of the United States Special Resources, but only to the extent such expenses are not covered from the Bank's service fee or income from use of United States Special Resources.

"(d) All financing of programs and projects by the Bank from the United States Special Resources shall be repayable to the Bank by the borrowers in United States dollars.

"SEC. 14. (a) The letters of credit provided for in section 15 shall be issued to the Bank only to the extent that at the time of issuance the cumulative amount of the United States Special Resources provided to the Bank (A) constitute a minority of all special funds contributions to the Bank, and (B) are no greater than the largest cumulative contribution of any other single country contributing to the special funds of the Bank.

"(b) The United States Governor of the Bank shall give due regard to the principles of (A) utilizing all special funds resources on an equitable basis, and (B) significantly shared participation by other contributors in each special fund to which United States Special Resources are provided.

"SEC. 15. The United States Special Resources shall be provided to the Bank in the form of a nonnegotiable, noninterest-bearing, letter of credit which shall be payable to the Bank at par value on demand to meet the cost of eligible goods and services, and administrative costs authorized pursuant to section 13(c) of this Act.

"SEC. 16. The United States shall have the right to withdraw all or part of the United States Special Resources and any accrued resources derived therefrom under the procedures provided for in section 8.03 of the Special Funds Rules and Regulations of the Bank.

"SEC. 17. For the purpose of providing United States Special Resources to the Bank there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for fiscal year 1970, $35,000,000 for fiscal year 1971, and $40,000,000 for fiscal year 1972, all of which shall remain available until expended."

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first section down to page 5, line 7, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman mean the first section or the first chapter?

Mr. PATMAN. The first chapter. Chapter 2 commences at line 8, page 5.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to see if I can get on the record what this bill really means in terms of a commitment on the part of the United States.

I have before me a letter from the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee (Mr. WIDNALL) in which he says:

This legislation includes authorization requests for four international financial institutions—the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank. The largest single item—$1,540,000,000—is to increase the United States quota in the International Monetary Fund. Subscriptions to the three development banks are also proposed in the amount of $246,100,000 to the World Bank—

I assume that is in addition to the $1,540,000,000—

$100 million to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank—

I assume that also is in addition to the $1,540,000,000—

and $1,820,000,000 to the Inter-American Development Bank.

I assume that too, is in addition to the $1,540,000,000.

If this is correct, we have a commitment before us in this bill of $3,709,000,000 or approximately that amount. Am I correct, or are the figures something else?

Mr. WIDNALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIDNALL. You are correct.

Mr. GROSS. So it is $3,709,000,000 at a time when we have not the slightest idea of how we can avoid national bankruptcy. We know that inflation has not been stopped; and we know we are headed for a financial crisis in this country unless someone gets hold of the rudder and steers a radically different course.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he considers this another form of foreign aid?

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon—do I consider it what?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That the gentleman considers this another form of foreign aid?

Mr. GROSS. Of course it is another form of foreign aid—it cannot be anything else but foreign aid wearing a different kimono.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield further to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from Iowa recalls that when we had the foreign aid appropriation bill on the floor of the House that the committee report showed that since 1946 this country has spent $199 billion in foreign aid?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Now, this amount would put it above $200 billion?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; that is right. Far above $200 billion.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. And that is more than half the national debt of $400 billion.

Mr. GROSS. As far as I am concerned, the gentleman could not be more right.

Then the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. WIDNALL) goes on to say, in his letter:

It is important to stress that H.R. 18306 is fully consistent with the President's program of fiscal restraint.

Well, I apparently do not know anything about restraint. If this is fiscal restraint, I wish somebody would tell me the meaning of the word restraint.

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

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

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would read the balance of that paragraph in which I explain the statement that I made as to fiscal restraint.

Mr. GROSS. I will let the gentleman from New Jersey put it in the RECORD on his own time. It does not change what the gentleman said, and I quote him once more:

It is important to stress that H.R. 18306 is fully consistent with the President's program of fiscal restraint.

I do not know what the gentleman can make out of that by any other application he may elect here this afternoon.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert in the RECORD a copy of my letter.

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

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 9, 1970.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: H.R. 18306, the International Financial Institutions bill, is scheduled to be debated on the House floor on Monday, September 14th. This legislation was proposed by President Nixon and is an essential part of his legislative program.

This legislation includes authorization requests for four international financial institutions—the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank. The largest single item—$1,540 million—is to increase the United States quota in the International Monetary Fund. Subscriptions to the three development banks are also proposed in the amount of $246.1 million to the World Bank, $100 million to the Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank, and $1.82 billion to the Inter-American Development Bank, of which $1 billion is for that bank's Fund for Special Operations and $823 million is for an increase in its capital subscriptions.

It is important to stress that H.R. 18306 is fully consistent with the President's program of fiscal restraint. First, the proposed IMF quota increase is a monetary transaction and does not involve a budgetary expenditure. Second, of the total subscriptions, $895 million is a contingent liability in the form of callable or "guarantee" capital subscriptions to the World Bank ($221.5 million) and the Inter-American Development Bank ($673.5 million), which is not expected to result in any expenditure. Third, the appropriations authorized by H.R. 18306 are to be spread out over a period of three years (FY 71–73), and actual cash outlays will be spread out over a considerably longer period, since the bulk of the appropriated payments will be made initially by letters of credit which will be drawn upon only as funds are needed for development projects. Estimated cash outlays under the bill for fiscal years 1971, 1972, and 1973 are $35 million, $70 million, and $155 million respectively. Additional material is enclosed which further explains the provisions of the bill.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee I have followed closely our participation in these institutions. I know the excellent work they have done and the opportunity they present for fairly sharing the burdens of providing development assistance. The detailed hearings that were held on H.R. 18306 have assured me that the proposed new commitments are vitally necessary for the institutions to continue their successful programs. I am convinced that these contributions will be carefully and efficiently used to promote our national objectives.

This is a good bill. I strongly urge all my colleagues to give it their support.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL.

H.R. 18306—FACT SHEET

1. *H.R. 18306*—This bill combines authorization requests for four multilateral financial institutions: a quota increase in the International Monetary Fund, and contributions to three development banks—World Bank*, Asian Development Bank, and Inter-American Development Bank. The obligations involved are distinctly different, part is a monetary transaction, part is guarantee capital, and part will result in expenditures over a period of years.

2. *International Monetary Fund Quota Increase*—The largest single item—$1,540 million—is to increase the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund. *It is a monetary transaction which does not involve budgetary expenditure.* If the U.S. quota is not increased, our international leadership will be seriously impaired and our future share of allocations of Special Drawing Rights will be reduced, beginning with a $130 million loss in 1971. Other countries will be increasing their quotas by $6.1 billion.

3. *Contribution to Development Banks*—New commitments are proposed of $246.1 million to the World Bank, $100 million to the Asian Development Bank special funds and $1.82 billion to the Inter-American Development Bank of which $1 billion is for the Fund for Special Operations and $823 million is for an increase in Ordinary Capital subscriptions. Of these subscriptions, *$895 million takes the form of increases in callable capital subscriptions to the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank which are not expected to result in any expenditure.*

(A) *Budgetary Impact*—The appropriations authorized by H.R. 18306 for the development banks will be spread out over a period of three years (FY 71–73). Actual cash outlays will be spread out over a considerably longer period since the bulk of the appropriated payments will be made initially by letters of credit which will be drawn upon only as funds are needed for development projects. *Estimated cash outlays under the bill for fiscal years 1971, 1972 and 1973 are $35 million, $70 million, and $155 million respectively.*

(B) *Contributions by Others*—Other countries will be committing over $3.7 billion to the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, and Inter-American Development Bank. In the Inter-American Development Bank replenishment the Latin American countries will contribute $1.6 billion, in the World Bank other members will subscribe $2 billion and in the Asian Development Bank $159 million has already been pledged by other contributors.

(C) *Reasons for U.S. Contributions*—It is now time to capitalize on the advantages—burden sharing, impartial expertise, high standards of economic performance—and the expanded capabilities of these institutions.

Asian Development Bank—In its first three years in operation the Asian Development Bank has shown itself to be a soundly conceived and well run regional development institution. The Bank has given clear evidence that it can formulate and execute programs efficiently to promote the development of the countries of the region. Delay on the part of the United States would be interpreted as lack of the support for the Bank and could result in a serious setback for the Bank's operations at a time when it is gathering momentum and demonstrating its ability to play a key role in the development of Asia.

Inter-American Development Bank—The Inter-American Development Bank has established itself as a primary instrument for helping hemisphere nations to achieve their economic and social development objectives. Approval of a new replenishment of both Ordinary Capital and Fund for Special Operations resources of the Bank is necessary in order to continue its leading role and to provide for the increased need for development financing.

---

*International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

World Bank—The United States has strongly supported the policy of parallel action by member countries on special increases in the two Bretton Woods institutions. Since it is now for the first time proposed that the United States accept a special increase in its Fund quota, it is appropriate that we continue our support of this policy by taking a special increase in our subscription to the Bank. U.S. legislation is needed to bring this subscription increase into effect and to allow other countries to subscribe over $2.0 billion in new resources.

REDUCTION IN U.S. SHARES IN CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT LENDING INSTITUTIONS

The percentage of U.S. participation in the development lending institutions over the years has been declining because of an increasing ability on the part of other nations to share the development burden. Below are set forth some figures illustrating this trend.

WORLD BANK (IRBD)

In 1945 the U.S. subscribed to almost 35% of the original authorized capital of the World Bank. The present U.S. subscription is 27.53% and will decline to 26.04% if the pending increases in the resources of the Bank become effective.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION (IDA)

The initial U.S. subscription to IDA in 1960 was $320,290,000 or 43.12% of the total contributed by industrialized countries. The U.S. percentage of the first replenishment in 1964 declined to 41.6%. Our share of the second replenishment in 1969 was 40%. While the U.S. percentage share declined, the total amounts involved increased so that in the second replenishment other nations pledged $720 million as compared to the U.S. pledge of $480 million.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (IDB)

Ordinary Capital: The U.S. share of Ordinary Capital in the IDB has remained relatively constant, declining from an initial 43% to the present 42.4%. There has been a substantial decline, however, in the U.S. share of contributions to the soft loan facilities of the IDB.

Soft Loan Facilities—Funds for Special Operations—Social Progress Trust Fund: Taking the resources of the FSO and the SPTF together the ratio of initial U.S. participation to Latin American participation was 11 to 1. In 1964 the ratio was reduced to 8 to 1, in 1965 to 5 to 1, and in 1967 to 3 to 1. Under the pending bill this ratio would be further reduced to 2 to 1.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK (ADB)

The authorized capital of the Asian Development Bank is $1.1 billion. Of this amount $978 million has been subscribed. The U.S. subscription of $200 million represents 20.45% of the total and is matched by that of Japan.

CALLABLE CAPITAL IN THE DEVELOPMENT LENDING INSTITUTIONS

The World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and Asian Development Bank all have as part of their capital structure callable capital. Subscriptions to callable capital represent contingent liabilities which can be called only to meet the banks' debt obligations and will not represent budgetary outlays except in the event of a call. The likelihood of calls by any of these institutions is remote. The banks use this callable capital as a guarantee for borrowings in the world's capital markets to obtain funds for development lending. These borrowings mobilize private capital in the development effort and have reduced the need for governmental aid contributions.

For each of the three institutions the amounts of callable capital and borrowing outstanding are as follows:

WORLD BANK

U.S. callable capital: $5,715 million

Other nations' callable capital: $15,044 million

Gross borrowings as of June 30, 1969: $7,574.8 million

Borrowings outstanding as of June 30, 1969: $4,081 million

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

U.S. callable capital: $817.6 million

Other nations' callable capital: $1,076.2 million

Gross borrowings as of December 31, 1969: $881.6 million

Borrowings outstanding as of December 31, 1969: $767.4 million

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

U.S. callable capital: $100 million

Other nations' callable capital: $389 million

Borrowings as of April 1, 1970: $20 million

Financial commitments provided by H.R. 18306

[In millions]

Contingent liability in form of callable "guarantee" capital:	
World Bank	$221.49
Inter-American Development Bank	673.52
Total	895.01
Proposed expenditures:	
World Bank	$24.61
Asian Development Bank	100.00
Inter-American Development ordinary capital	150.00
Fund for special operations	1,000.00
Total	1,274.61
Monetary transactions: International Monetary Fund	1,540.00

ESTIMATED BUDGET IMPACT

The above commitments are estimated to result in a budget impact over the next three fiscal years as follows:

	Fiscal year—		
	1971	1972	1973
Asian Development Bank	10	20	30
World Bank	25	0	0
Inter-American Development Bank	0	48	125
International Monetary Fund	0	0	0

World Bank—One installment of $246.1 million in FY 1971.

Inter-American Development Bank-Ordinary Capital: Callable—two installments of $336.7 million in FY 1971 and FY 1973. Paid in—three installments of $50 million in FY 1971, 1972 and 1973.

Inter-American Development Bank-Fund for Special Operations—one installment of $100 million in FY 1971 and two installments of $450 million in FY 1972 and 1973.

Asian Development Bank—two installments of $25 million and $35 million in FY 1971 and one of $40 million in FY 1972.

International Monetary Fund—one installment of $1,540 million in FY 1971.

FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS PROVIDED FOR BY H.R. 18306

[In millions of dollars]

	Contingent liability in form of callable guarantee capital	Proposed year expenditure	Estimated budget impact			Appropriations		
			Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972	Fiscal year 1973	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1972	Fiscal year 1973
World Bank	[1] 21.49	24.61	24.61			246.1		
Inter-American Development Bank:								
Callable capital	[1] 673.52					336.7		336.7
Paid-in capital		150.00		15	30	50.0	50	50.0
Fund for special operations		1,000.00		33	95	100.0	450	450.0
Asian Development Bank		100.00	10.00	20	30	60.0	40	
International Monetary Fund						[2] 1,540.0		
Total	[1] 895.40	1,274.61						

[1] Does not involve a budgetary outlay except in unlikely event of call.
[2] Represents a monetary transaction only. No budgetary outlay involved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this legislation comes up today, as I said before, in a manner that is most intriguing. I wonder why?

Can it be that the Secretary of the Treasury is on his way, or will soon be on a junket to Copenhagen for a meeting of the international Bankers, and he insisted that at least one body of the Congress give approval to this legislation before he went over so he would be equipped with $3,709,000,000 of the U.S. taxpayers' money in order to demonstrate the good faith of the people of the United States. Is this what this is all about?

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

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

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

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

Mr. PATMAN. I would like to state that the hearings on this bill were completed in July and that it passed the bill by practically a unanimous vote. An application was made for a rule, and a rule was granted at least 4 or 5 or 6 weeks ago, and we have been ready ever since. It is not a matter of coincidence; it is a matter of not being able to get clearance through the leadership—and the leadership has had problems also, they had matters that they felt were more important and more urgent at the time, but they got to this matter just as soon as they could get to it. It just happened that we got to it today. There was no coincidence as far as the President's letter was concerned. Everybody knew he was for the bill.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is operating on my time. Let me say to the gentle-

man that, whether by coincidence or not, the fact is that the House is going to vote one way or another today. I hope it will vote this latest raid down—but it is going to vote today on this proposition. And if it is approved the Secretary of the Treasury will be equipped, will he not, with the approval of one House of the Congress to dish out $3,709,000,000 of the overburdened taxpayers' money of this country?

He will be able to go over and say to the bankers assembled in Copenhagen or wherever this deal is to be held, that he has at least partial approval of this kind of a handout of the taxpayers' money.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. It was certainly not withheld for the purpose of passing it or bringing it up just before the International Monetary Conference in Copenhagen. There was no such intent at all. We wanted to bring the bill up 6 weeks ago. We would have been glad to bring it up, but the program was such that we could not. There was a recess coming up.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that we should equip the Secretary of the Treasury or anyone else with $3,709,000,000 when he goes on a junket to Europe to demonstrate the good faith of the American people?

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think it has as serious a connection or as important a connection as the gentleman outlines here at all. It is just a matter of being for the bill or against the bill. The gentleman is against it and I am for it. The President is for it. I happen to be for it and other Members are against it and for the bill. Let every Member express his own wishes and vote his own independent judgment. That is all we expect.

Mr. GROSS. If we pass legislation of this kind then we might as well forget from here on out any thought of stopping inflation in this country. We might as well forget all about inflation, interest rates, and all the rest because we are down the drain financially speaking.

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

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

Mr. DENT. Of course, what the shouting is all about is the fact that they are going to sit down in conference and are going to create more stock in the Bank and the Fund budget. As I understand the Bretton Woods agreement, the only way they can create more stock or vote, by a representative of a U.S. designee or representative, both for the creation of more stock in either one of the funds, is if the stock is increased without any further increase in the subscription of the United States of America.

If the United States of America does not subscribe for more participation, they can increase all the stock they want. But if we are going to pay and be involved in an increase in our subscription, then our representative must and cannot vote under the law unless we are absolved from any further increase in subscription. The purpose of the $1 billion is to do exactly that.

Mr. GROSS. We ought to be getting out of these commitments. We ought to be cutting them down instead of enlarging them. We have no business increasing them around the world as this bill does. We do not have that kind of money available and we are in deep trouble.

Mr. DENT. I did not, as you well know, and I suppose most of you had, in the first couple of years. I do not know how I made the mistake afterward. But I voted in favor of this legislation after the first couple of years that I was a member. But, in the face of the present situation in this country and in the face of the very serious situation in this country, much more serious than most of the Members of the Congress, I believe, honestly have any idea of what it is, because we are able so far with the props built into our economic system such as social security and unemployment and adjustment assistance and many of the other State laws that have been passed, in helping people—we do not quite understand what has happened to us. We are fast becoming a colony. A colony to all of the world in that we are providing the raw materials and we are providing the know-how and we are providing the money—and they are providing the products. We cannot exist without the providing of the products.

Mr. GROSS. I disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, only mildly in the use of words. He said, "props" when he should have said "crutches."

Mr. DENT. They are turning into crutches. They were intended as props against American economic weaknesses and not international economic weaknesses. When we use them now they are no longer props, but they are exactly what you said they are—they are crutches.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his comments and I conclude by saying that if there is any fiscal responsibility left this bill should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 2.—INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Sec.
21. Amendment of Bretton Woods Agreement Act.
22. Amendment of Special Drawing Rights Act.

§ 21. Amendment of Bretton Woods Agreements Act

The Bretton Woods Agreements Act (22 U.S.C. 286–286k–2) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 22. (a) The United States Governor of the Fund is authorized to consent to an increase of $1,540,000,000 in the quota of the United States in the Fund.

"(b) In order to pay the increase in the United States quota in the Fund provided for in this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $1,540,000,000, to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 23. (a) The United States Governor of the Bank is authorized (1) to vote for an increase of $3,000,000,000 in the authorized capital stock of the Bank, and (2) if such increase becomes effective, to subscribe on behalf of the United States to two thousand four hundred and sixty-one additional shares of the capital stock of the Bank.

"(b) In order to pay for the increase in the United States subscription to the Bank provided for in this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $246,100,000 to remain available until expended."

§ 22. Amendment of Special Drawing Rights Act

Section 6 of the Special Drawing Rights Act (22 U.S.C. 286q) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States vote to allocate in each basic period Special Drawing Rights under article XXIV, sections 2 and 3, of the Articles of Agreement of the Fund so that allocations to the United States in that period exceed an amount equal to the United States quota in the Fund as authorized under the Bretton Woods Agreements Act."

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter 2 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to chapter 2? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 3.—INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Sec.
31. Amendment of Inter-American Development Bank Act.

§ 31. Amendment of Inter-American Development Bank Act

The Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283–283n) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 18. (a) The United States Governor of the Bank is hereby authorized to vote in favor of the two resolutions proposed by the Governors at their annual meeting in April 1970 and now pending before the Board of Governors of the Bank, which provide for (1) an increase in the authorized capital stock to the Bank and additional subscriptions of members thereto and (2) an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations and contributions thereto. Upon adoption of such resolutions the United States Governor is authorized to agree on behalf of the United States (1) to subscribe to eighty-two thousand three hundred and fifty-two shares of $10,000 par value of the increase in the authorized capital stock of the Bank of which sixty-seven thousand three hundred and fifty-two shall be callable shares and fifteen thousand shall be paid in and (2) to pay to the Fund for Special Operations an initial annual installment of $100,000,000 and two subsequent annual installments of $450,000,000 each, in accordance with and subject to the terms and conditions of such resolutions.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, the amounts necessary for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury of (1) three annual installments of $50,000,000 each for the United States subscription to paid-in capital stock of the Bank; (2) two installments of $336,760,000 each for the United States subscription to the callable capital stock of the Bank; and (3) one annual installment of $100,000,000 and two annual installments of $450,000,000 each for the United States share of the increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Bank."

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter 3 be considered as read,

printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 22, insert "(a)" before "The."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 8, after line 5, insert the following:

"(b) The first sentence of section 3(b) of the Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283a(b)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: 'and an alternate Executive Director'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to chapter 3? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 4.—AUDIT OF EXCHANGE STABILIZATION

Sec.
41. Annual report.
42. Audit by General Accounting Office.

§ 41. Annual report

The last sentence of section 10(a) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 822a(a)) is amended to read: "The Secretary of the Treasury shall annually make a report on the operations of the fund to the President and to the Congress."

§ 42. Audit by the General Accounting Office

Section 10(b) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 822a(b)) is amended by striking out "not be subject to review by any other officer of the United States." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that the fund shall be audited by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General of the United States may by regulation prescribe. Except for information determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be of an internationally significant nature, there shall be furnished to the Comptroller General such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of the Exchange Stabilization Fund as he may from time to time require; and the Comptroller General or any of his representatives shall, for the purpose of securing this information, have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the United States Government (other than records, reports, files, or other papers containing information determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be of an internationally significant nature) that pertain to the operations and financial transactions of the fund and are necessary to facilitate the audit.".

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter 4 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the question occurred to me—and I was negligent in not asking the gentleman when I had the floor a few moments ago—what is the salary of Robert Strange McNamara as Chairman or President of the World Bank?

Mr. PATMAN. It can be ascertained, but I do not have it right now. It is a good salary, I hope.

Mr. GROSS. A good salary?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; because it is for a good cause.

Mr. GROSS. Fifty or sixty thousand dollars a year?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know, but it is easily ascertainable.

Mr. GROSS. Would it be tax exempt or tax free?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think any of the salaries of people working for international organizations are taxed by any country, and it would certainly be unfair to tax ours. We have gone into that question a number of times.

Mr. GROSS. So the answer is that he gets an unstated salary, as far as the gentleman is concerned, say, $50,000 or $60,000 a year, tax free; is that correct?

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

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

Mr. REUSS. That salary is not tax free. It is subject to the U.S. income tax.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying he pays a tax and is then reimbursed by World Bank funds for the tax. Is that what the gentleman from Wisconsin is saying?

Mr. REUSS. No; that is not what the gentleman from Wisconsin is saying. What the gentleman from Wisconsin is saying is that the President of the World Bank, Mr. McNamara, pays the United States an income tax just as you and I do.

Mr. GROSS. Reimbursement is the way they handle it in some of these international organizations.

Now, I would like to come back to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN). In the gentleman's opinion is Mr. McNamara doing a better job than he did as Secretary of Defense?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not passing on that.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas said McNamara was doing a good job. I was wondering if it was a better job than he did as Secretary of Defense, because he did a terrible job as Secretary of Defense, in my opinion.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be interesting to clear up two points. One is whether these people do or do not pay taxes. We have been told two different things here today.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the employees of the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Bank, and the International Monetary Fund—the U.S. employees do pay U.S. income taxes. There was some ambiguity in the record, but I am informed they do pay U.S. income taxes.

Mr. HAYS. Has the gentleman been informed of this?

Mr. REUSS. I have been informed of this by the Assistant General Counsel of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, are they reimbursed out of the various funds?

Mr. REUSS. They are not reimbursed out of the various funds. However, their salaries are computed with the idea that they are paying a U.S. income tax, just as everybody else's salaries are computed with that amount in mind.

Mr. GROSS. I do not agree with that at all—that the salaries of other Federal employees make a specific allowance for Federal income taxes in their computation.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I have been able to get this answer, which I trust is a correct one. Could the gentleman from Texas tell us the salary of the Japanese gentleman who heads up the Asian Development Bank?

Mr. REUSS. If the gentleman will yield, I will endeavor to find that out very quickly and tell the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. I should have thought that was something the gentleman would have on hand, when he is asking the Congress to vote a billion and a half dollars, when we cannot afford to clear up the air, and when we cannot afford to clean up the streams, and when we cannot afford more money for schools and education. That will be very interesting.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will excuse me, I will find out.

Mr. HAYS. If the gentleman will do that while I am still talking, I think if I may say so, it would be a very interesting list, and I am sure somebody will compile it, of the people who voted to sustain the vetoes for domestic programs the other day, who are now turning around, on the very next substantive vote we have after the recess, and voting to spend a billion and a half to allow Mr. Watanabe to hand out loans to his clients for the benefit of Japanese industry, because I have it on good authority that no one gets a loan, as I said earlier—and maybe we ought to have a quorum call, so all Members would know about it—from the Asian Development Bank unless it is going to help Japan directly or indirectly.

I have been as internationally minded as anybody else in this House for many, many years, but I think if we are so short of money that we cannot afford to educate our children for fear of unbalancing the budget, then we cannot afford to put any more money into the pot this year. We have a great deal in, and if this is such a bad year, maybe this is the wrong year to bring up this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The question that is

raised has been raised for 10 years. Every time these agencies have had a bill before this House, the same question comes up, and it is not really so germane now.

Mr. HAYS. It is pretty germane, because we just had the two vetos. The gentleman remembers that, does he not?

Mr. PATMAN. I remember that. I voted to override both of them.

Mr. HAYS. So did I, and the gentleman remembers the reasons for them. Maybe the timing of the gentleman is bad, Mr. Chairman, and maybe the President's timing is bad.

Mr. PATMAN. We have different reasons.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I see the gentleman from Wisconsin has returned. I hope the little 2- or 3-minute filibuster was ample.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, please do not call that a filibuster, because those sentiments came from my heart. I was really making a speech that I hoped would change a vote or two.

Mr. GROSS. Filibuster sentiments can come from the heart.

Mr. HAYS. I am glad to hear that, because I thought in filibusters they just said anything to take up time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin got the information I sought a few minutes ago?

Mr. REUSS. I did the best I could. I have part of the answer. By the time I am through perhaps I will have the full answer.

The salary of Mr. Herrera, President of the Inter-American Development Bank, is $35,000 with a $10,000 expense account. I will let the gentleman know about Mr. McNamara and Mr. Schweitzer.

Mr. GROSS. Is that $10,000 spent on his own accounting? I assume it is.

Mr. REUSS. My guess is it would be about like our $3,000 stay in Washington, the congressional income tax deduction, an affidavit. It is probably about the same.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman a question. He said that the salaries were paid with a view to covering the Federal income tax, the salaries paid to the officials.

Mr. REUSS. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. Would salaries be paid, for instance, to officials of the International Monetary Fund, with a view to covering the dues and green fees to the so-called Bretton Woods Country Club?

Mr. REUSS. No, I should not think so.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would not think that?

Mr. REUSS. No, any more than the salary of a corporate president is paid with a view to covering whatever he may want to do in his spare time.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. Since we are talking about this country club again, do Members know what occurred to me, what was suggested to me by I will not say whom? It is that the diplomats in this country from other countries who come from, to use the words of the gentleman from Wisconsin, a great polyglot of nations, do not have their own private country club, and seem to get along pretty well. What makes these employees of the bank so special that the taxpayers of the United States have to finance a country club for them? Can anybody answer that question?

Mr. GROSS. I am waiting for an answer.

Mr. REUSS. While the gentleman is waiting, another good question which I believe needs to be asked is: Why should the proprietor of the Bretton Woods Country Club have singled out golf players? There may be employees and officers who like to play tennis. There may be those who like to go hiking.

Mr. GROSS. They have tennis courts and swimming pools.

Mr. REUSS. I believe there is a serious question as to the provision of those facilities. I believe they might have done a fairer job if they had taken care of those who for discriminatory reasons were not enabled to get into a Washington club. I believe they could have arrived at it in some better way.

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

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

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman talks about discriminatory reasons. Can I get in the Bretton Woods Country Club, or is it just for employees?

Mr. REUSS. Knowing the gentleman's persuasive nature, I would not be surprised if he could.

Mr. HAYS. Then can you get into it?

Mr. REUSS. No.

Mr. HAYS. That answers the question. In other words, it is a discriminatory organization itself.

Mr. GROSS. Segregated.

Mr. HAYS. Only employees of the bank can get in it, I imagine; is that right?

Mr. REUSS. Bretton Woods is under the control of the Fund. I understand they let employees of the Bank in, so it is discriminatory except for banking.

Mr. HAYS. All right; so we finance it.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 8, line 19, strike the word "the".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chapter 5.—ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

§ 51. Annual report

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policy shall include in its annual report to the Congress (1) a statement with respect to each loan approved by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank, the position taken by the United States representative, and a discussion of how each loan will benefit the people of the recipient country, and (2) a statement on steps taken jointly and individually by member countries of the Inter-American Development Bank to restrain their military expenditures, and to preserve and strengthen free and democratic institutions.

Mr. PATMAN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that chapter 5 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point. That is the remainder of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REUSS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REUSS: At the end of the bill add the following:

"Chapter 5.—EMPLOYEE BENEFITS FOR UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVES

"§ 52. Employee benefits

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Executive Directors and Directors and their alternates, representing the United States in the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank, shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, each be eligible on the basis of such service and the total compensation received therefor, for all employee benefits afforded employees in the civil service of the United States. The Treasury Department shall serve as the employing office for collecting, accounting for, and depositing in the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, Employees Life Insurance Fund, and Employees Health Benefits Fund, all retirement and health insurance benefits payments made by these employees, and shall make any necessary agency contributions from the fund established pursuant to section 10(a) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 822a(a)). This section shall be effective as of December 14, 1966."

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

This amendment is a simple technical amendment. It is requested by the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Charls E. Walker. It is acceptable, I believe, to Members on both sides of the aisle.

What it does is to take the three U.S. executive directors of the International Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank, respectively, and correct a legislative omission in the civil service retirement laws which, as they are presently written, do not entitle these three members to civil service retirement protection. They are in effect Treasury employees. They are subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. It is unfair that they should not have the rights of other civil service employees.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this amendment would be adopted.

I may say, for the benefit of the gen-

tleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Ohio, that I have now received another bulletin. The salary of Mr. McNamara of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is $50,000.

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

Mr. REUSS. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KAZEN. Would the gentleman tell me whether or not the other employees or the employees from other countries have any employee benefits?

Mr. REUSS. They have in each country their own retirement program.

Mr. KAZEN. As an organization in and of itself as a bank, does it have any employee benefits?

Mr. REUSS. Oh, yes. The bank itself has a retirement program for its international civil service.

Perhaps I did not make it clear. This amendment of mine does not apply to the international employees of the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, or the Asian Development Bank but applies to the U.S. executive directors who work for us; that is, for you and for me, and not for the international institutions.

Mr. KAZEN. These directors do not have any employee benefits from the organizations they belong to?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct, because they do not belong to these organizations but belong to the United States just as the Secretary of the Treasury does.

Mr. KAZEN. The thrust of my question was are we giving them additional benefits here?

Mr. REUSS. The answer is unequivocally no. The benefits they will get under this amendment will be their exclusive retirement benefits.

Mr. KAZEN. In other words, they get no benefits by virtue of their positions now?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct.

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

Mr. REUSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I have just been handed a draft of this amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin submitted. I did hear the Clerk read it, of course. Did I understand him to say (a) all of the benefits are retroactive to December 14, 1966, and (b) that there is a special fund established to pay for the retirement and health insurance and other necessary benefits by agency contribution?

Mr. REUSS. There is no language in the amendment remotely like either point just raised by the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. This is a participating benefit and it is not retroactive?

Mr. REUSS. There is no language as to retroactivity. All it means, I would say to the gentleman from Missouri, is that these three men, our U.S. executive directors, would be entitled from here on out to participate in the retirement program of the U.S. Civil Service. I presume that there would be an element of retroactivity in it in that their total U.S. civil service and military service, if any, would be counted. But there is no language such as the gentleman just alluded to in the amendment.

Mr. HALL. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) do they participate by paying in to this fund now, and from the time of retroactivity and hence forward, or is it paid for them by the fund, or a separate fund, under the amendment?

Mr. REUSS. As I read the amendment, they would start paying now, and their benefits would accrue as of the time on which they started their payments.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman did submit the amendment himself?

Mr. REUSS. I submitted it on behalf of the Under Secretary of the Treasury, and I would say to the gentleman from Missouri that it was prepared in the Under Secretary's office. It has been submitted to both sides. I do not believe that any of these three men will get anything that they are not entitled to, and have not paid for.

Mr. HALL. The question of entitlement is a matter of personal opinion or reflection. All I want to know is in cold black and white: do they participate in their own retirement benefits as all civil servants do, or as we do, even more than civil servants do; or as anyone else might be expected to do in a pension or retirement benefit program?

Mr. REUSS. The answer is yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I now have, for the benefit of the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Ohio, the salary of the third and last international agency official, Mr. Watanabe, the President of the Asian International Bank, who receives an annual salary of $40,000.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. How about McNamara?

Mr. REUSS. I said that Mr. McNamara receives $50,000 a year.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 18306) to authorize U.S. participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the exchange stabilization fund by the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1179, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. WYLIE

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WYLIE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WYLIE moves to recommit the bill H.R. 18306 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 140, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

YEAS—177

Adams	Evans, Colo.	McDade
Albert	Findley	McDonald, Mich.
Annunzio	Fish	McFall
Arends	Foley	Macdonald, Mass.
Aspinall	Ford, Gerald R.	Mailliard
Ayres	Ford, William D.	Marsh
Belcher	Fraser	Mathias
Biester	Frelinghuysen	Matsunaga
Bingham	Fulton, Pa.	May
Blackburn	Gallagher	Mikva
Boggs	Gettys	Miller, Calif.
Bolling	Giaimo	Minish
Bow	Gibbons	Mink
Brademas	Gilbert	Minshall
Brasco	Gonzalez	Mize
Broomfield	Gray	Moorhead
Brotzman	Green, Pa.	Morgan
Brown, Calif.	Griffiths	Morse
Brown, Mich.	Gubser	Morton
Burke, Mass.	Gude	Mosher
Burton, Calif.	Hamilton	Moss
Byrnes, Wis.	Hanley	Murphy, Ill.
Carey	Hansen, Idaho	Nedzi
Cederberg	Harrington	Nelsen
Celler	Harvey	O'Hara
Chamberlain	Hathaway	Patman
Cleveland	Hawkins	Patten
Cohelan	Heckler, Mass.	Perkins
Conable	Helstoski	Pickle
Conte	Hogan	Pike
Corbett	Holifield	Poff
Corman	Horton	Price, Ill.
Coughlin	Hosmer	Pucinski
Culver	Howard	Quie
Cunningham	Johnson, Calif.	Railsback
Daniels, N.J.	Johnson, Pa.	Rees
Davis, Wis.	Kastenmeier	Reid, Ill.
Dellenback	Keith	Reid, N.Y.
Denney	Kluczynski	Reuss
Dulski	Koch	Rhodes
Dwyer	Kyl	Riegle
Eckhardt	Kyros	Rivers
Edwards, Calif.	Leggett	Robison
Eilberg	Lloyd	Rodino
Erlenborn	McClory	Rooney, N.Y.
Esch	McCloskey	
Eshleman		

Rosenthal	Steed	Widnall
Rostenkowski	Steiger, Wis.	Wiggins
Roth	Sullivan	Williams
Roybal	Symington	Wilson, Bob
Ruppe	Teague, Calif.	Wilson, Charles H.
Ryan	Tiernan	Winn
Sandman	Udall	Wright
Scheuer	Ullman	Wydler
Schwengel	Van Deerlin	Wyman
Shriver	Vander Jagt	Young
Smith, Iowa	Vanik	Zablocki
Smith, N.Y.	Vigorito	
Stafford	Waldie	
Stanton	Whalen	

NAYS—140

Abernethy	Flowers	Natcher
Adair	Fountain	Nichols
Addabbo	Frey	Obey
Alexander	Fuqua	Olsen
Anderson, Calif.	Galifianakis	O'Neal, Ga.
Andrews, Ala.	Garmatz	Passman
Andrews, N. Dak.	Gaydos	Pettis
Ashbrook	Goodling	Pirnie
Baring	Green, Oreg.	Poage
Bennett	Griffin	Preyer, N.C.
Betts	Gross	Price, Tex.
Bevill	Grover	Pryor, Ark.
Blanton	Haley	Purcell
Bray	Hall	Quillen
Brinkley	Hammer-schmidt	Randall
Broyhill, N.C.	Harsha	Rarick
Broyhill, Va.	Hays	Roberts
Burke, Fla.	Hechler, W. Va.	Roe
Burleson, Tex.	Hull	Rogers, Fla.
Burlison, Mo.	Hungate	Rooney, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Hunt	Rousselot
Caffery	Hutchinson	Ruth
Camp	Ichord	Satterfield
Carter	Jacobs	Saylor
Clancy	Jarman	Schmitz
Clark	Jonas	Scott
Clausen, Don H.	Jones, Ala.	Shipley
Clawson, Del	Jones, N.C.	Sikes
Collier	Jones, Tenn.	Skubitz
Colmer	Karth	Slack
Cramer	Kazen	Smith, Calif.
Daniel, Va.	Kee	Snyder
Davis, Ga.	Langen	Stubblefield
Delaney	Latta	Stuckey
Dennis	Lennon	Taylor
Dent	Long, Md.	Thomson, Wis.
Derwinski	McClure	Waggonner
Devine	McKneally	Wampler
Dickinson	McMillan	Watts
Dorn	Madden	Whalley
Duncan	Mahon	White
Edmondson	Martin	Whitehurst
Edwards, Ala.	Mayne	Whitten
Evins, Tenn.	Melcher	Wolff
Fisher	Miller, Ohio	Wyatt
	Mills	Wylie
	Myers	Yatron
		Zion

NOT VOTING—112

Abbitt	Farbstein	Murphy, N.Y.
Anderson, Ill.	Fascell	Nix
Anderson, Tenn.	Feighan	O'Konski
Ashley	Flood	O'Neill, Mass.
Barrett	Flynt	Ottinger
Beall, Md.	Foreman	Pelly
Bell, Calif.	Friedel	Pepper
Berry	Fulton, Tenn.	Philbin
Biaggi	Goldwater	Podell
Blatnik	Hagan	Pollock
Boland	Halpern	Powell
Brock	Hanna	Reifel
Brooks	Hansen, Wash.	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Ohio	Hastings	Roudebush
Buchanan	Hébert	St Germain
Burton, Utah	Henderson	Schadeberg
Bush	Hicks	Scherle
Button	King	Schneebeli
Cabell	Kleppe	Sebelius
Casey	Kuykendall	Sisk
Chappell	Landgrebe	Springer
Chisholm	Landrum	Staggers
Clay	Long, La.	Steiger, Ariz.
Collins	Lowenstein	Stephens
Conyers	Lujan	Stokes
Cowger	Lukens	Stratton
Crane	McCarthy	Taft
Daddario	McCulloch	Talcott
Dawson	McEwen	Teague, Tex.
de la Garza	MacGregor	Thompson, Ga.
Diggs	Mann	Thompson, N.J.
Dingell	Meeds	Tunney
Donohue	Meskill	Watson
Dowdy	Michel	Weicker
Downing	Mizell	Wold
Edwards, La.	Mollohan	Yates
Fallon	Monagan	Zwach
	Montgomery	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Berry against.

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Friedel against.

Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Hébert against.

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

Mr. Anderson of Illinois for, with Mr. Montgomery against.

Mr. Biaggi for, with Mr. Flynt against.

Mr. Boland for, with Mr. Hagan of Georgia against.

Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Stephens against.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Dowdy against.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Casey with Mr. Kleppe.

Mr. Ottinger with Mr. Bell of California.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Weicker.

Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Burton of Utah.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Beall of Maryland.

Mr. Mann with Mr. Landgrebe.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Collins.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Tunney with Mr. Sebelius.

Mr. Henderson with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. King.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Brock.

Mr. Cabell with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Roudebush.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Cowger.

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Button.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Reifel.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Monagan with Mr. Lujan.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. Hicks with Mr. Stokes.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Conyers.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Fascell with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Wold.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Crane.

Mr. Meeds with Mr. Clay.

Mr. Chappell with Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Watson.

Mr. McCarthy with Mrs. Chisholm.

Mr. Podell with Mr. Goldwater.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Halpern.

Mr. Lowenstein with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Taft with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Lukens with Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

Mr. Schneebeli with Mr. Pollock.

Mr. O'Konski with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Michel with Mr. Schadeberg.

Mr. Scherle with Mr. Mizell.

Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin with Mr. Talcott.

Messrs. YATRON, CARTER, and GOODLING changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF CHAPTER AND SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of H.R. 18306 as passed the House, the Clerk may correct chapter and section numbers.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 16900, TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 16900) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year 1971, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 91-1447)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16900) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 21, 23, 24, and 25.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 15, 19, 22, 26, 27, 28, 30, and 31 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,080,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$137,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "$36,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$221,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$655,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$42,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$162,335,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$62,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,508,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$657,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 29.

TOM STEED,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
JEFFERY COHELAN,
GEORGE MAHON,
HOWARD W. ROBISON,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
JACK EDWARDS,
FRANK T. BOW,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
GALE W. MCGEE,
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
GORDON ALLOTT,
HIRAM L. FONG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16900) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of the secretary

Amendment No. 1. Appropriates $9,660,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Federal Law Enforcement Training Center

Amendment No. 2. Appropriates $1,080,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,113,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of customs

Amendment No. 3. Authorizes purchase of fourteen passenger vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of thirty-seven as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4. Authorizes purchase of four police-type vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of twenty-seven as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5. Increases the limitation for purchase of police-type vehicles from $400 above the general purchase price for standard passenger type vehicles as proposed by the House to not to exceed $800 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that this increase in limitation is for the purpose of enabling purchase of vehicles, when authorized, with adequate police-type equipment, including air-conditioning where warranted.

Amendment No. 6. Appropriates $137,000,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $135,500,000 as proposed by the House and $137,085,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of the mint

Amendment No. 7. Appropriates $19,600,000 for salaries and expenses, instead of $18,000,000 as proposed by the House and $19,663,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Internal Revenue Service

Amendment No. 8. Appropriates $26,096,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9. Increases the limitation for temporary employment to $36,000,000 instead of $35,500,000 as proposed by the House and $36,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10. Appropriates $221,500,000 for revenue accounting and processing instead of $220,000,000 as proposed by the House and $222,239,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11. Increases the limitation for purchase of police-type vehicles from $400 above the general purchase price for standard passenger type vehicles as proposed by the House to not to exceed $800 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that this increase in limitation is for the purpose of enabling purchase of vehicles, when authorized, with adequate police-type equipment, including air-conditioning where warranted.

Amendment No. 12. Appropriates $655,000,000 for compliance activities instead of $645,000,000 as proposed by the House and $660,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

U.S. Secret Service

Amendment No. 13. Increases the limitation for purchase of police-type vehicles from $400 above the general purchase price for standard passenger type vehicles as proposed by the House to not to exceed $800 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that this increase in limitation is for the purpose of enabling purchase of vehicles, when authorized, with adequate police-type equipment, including air-conditioning where warranted.

Amendment No. 14. Appropriates $42,300,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $44,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the amount agreed upon should be adequate due to the lapse of time and consequent slippage in fiscal year 1971 programs.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Administration and regional operation

Amendment No. 15. Increases the limitation to $100,000 for confidential information and services as proposed by the Senate instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16. Appropriates $162,335,000 instead of $161,000,000 as proposed by the House and $163,670,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Research, development, and engineering

Amendment No. 17. Appropriates $62,000,000 instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House and $65,675,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Operations

Amendment No. 18. Appropriates $6,508,000,000 instead of $6,500,000,000 as proposed by the House and $6,517,138,00 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19. Changes the reference to the Bureau of the Budget to its new title of Office of Management and Budget as proposed by the Senate.

Transportation

Amendment No. 20. Appropriates $657,000,000 instead of $655,000,000 as proposed by the House and $659,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Building occupancy

Amendment No. 21. Appropriates $255,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $259,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Plant and equipment

Amendment No. 22. Increases the limitation for purchase of police-type vehicles from $400 above the general purchase price for standard passenger type vehicles as proposed by the House to not to exceed $800 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that this increase in limitation is for the purpose of enabling purchase of vehicles, when authorized, with adequate police-type equipment, including air-conditioning where warranted.

Amendment No. 23. Appropriates $217,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $219,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Postal public buildings

Amendment No. 24. Appropriates $269,825,000 as proposed by the House instead of $252,825,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the Department should proceed with all firm projects funded in this bill without further delay.

TITLE III—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Expenses of management improvement

Amendment No. 25. Restores language stricken by the Senate making funds in this account available until expended.

Office of management and budget

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27. Change the reference to the Bureau of the Budget to its new title of Office of Management and Budget, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

United States Tax Court

Amendment No. 28. Appropriates $3,288,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Amendment No. 29. Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment appropriates $1,650,000 for the protection of visiting foreign dignitaries attending the observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISION

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31. Change title and section numbers as proposed by the Senate.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1971 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with com-

parisons to the fiscal year 1970 total, the 1971 budget estimate total, and the House and Senate bills follows:

	Amounts
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	$2,793,537,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1971 (including $1,938,000 not considered by House)	3,046,693,000
House bill, fiscal year 1971	2,971,702,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1971	3,018,079,000
Conference agreement [1]	3,004,711,000

[1] Includes $1,650,000 in amendment No. 29 reported in technical disagreement.

Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1970	+211,174,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, (as amended), fiscal year 1971	−41,982,000
House bill, fiscal year 1971	+33,009,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1971	−13,368,000

TOM STEED,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO,
JEFFREY COHELAN,
GEORGE MAHON,
HOWARD W. ROBISON,
SILVIO O. CONTE,
JACK EDWARDS,
FRANK T. BOW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

REQUEST TO MEET TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I see the distinguished minority leader present in the Chamber, and I wish to make a unanimous-consent request while he is present. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today that it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow, and that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Wednesday.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE ROBERT TAFT, JR.

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

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, as president of the Republican 90th Club, it is my privilege to act as spokesman for 58 Members of this body who were elected in 1966, either for the first time or after a temporary absence from the House. We have many distinguished Members in the club, but none more distinguished than the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT TAFT, JR. He has played a leading role in our activities ever since we organized as a club shortly after arriving here in January 1967. I know of no Member of Congress, young or old, more respected by his colleagues nor more deserving of that respect. In addition to his many other responsibilities and achievements, he has been rendering truly outstanding service as chairman of the House Republican Research Committee. I am personally very grateful for the opportunity to have worked on one of the task forces organized by that committee under his leadership.

The members of the 90th Club have greeted the news of BOB'S candidacy for the other body with mixed emotions. Our deep regret at his impending departure from the House has been counterbalanced by our realization that few Americans have ever been so highly qualified to serve in the Senate through character and experience.

We have, therefore, tried to express our strong admiration for our good friend, BOB TAFT, JR., in the following resolution passed at a recent meeting of the 90th Club, which I now include at this point in the RECORD:

A RESOLUTION

Whereas Members of Congress and other public officials are looked upon to provide innovative thought and decisive judgment concerning the welfare and destiny of our country; and

Whereas the concept of revenue sharing typifies the end result of such thought, and is indicative of a desired partnership between the federal government and the states which form this national government; and

Whereas the case for revenue sharing was initially presented by a Republican Coordinating Committee Task Force on the Functions of Federal, State and Local Governments, under the chairmanship of Congressman Robert Taft, Jr.; and

Whereas, this country has been confronted with a growing rate of crime which has caused many Americans to live in constant fear, and that leadership and positive legislative programs to combat crime effectively and to make our streets safer have been consistently offered by Robert Taft, Jr; and

Whereas the House Republican Research Committee has concerned itself with many of the vital issues confronting our country today, and has conducted in depth research into each of these areas, with the result being information which has been extremely valuable to all Republican Members of Congress; and

Whereas the Research Committee Task Forces studied the issues concerning fiscal responsibility, draft reform, minority employment, agriculture, research resources and population, education and training, international trade, labor law reform, social security and human needs, transportation and urban affairs; and

Whereas The Chairman of the House Republican Research Committee, Robert Taft, Jr., was one of the seven elected members of House leadership, and this position is an indication of the respect which is placed in Mr. Taft by his colleagues, and is a further example of his legislative skill and political prowess;

Now therefore be it recommended that the 90th Club hereby highly commends the Honorable Robert Taft, Jr. for his valuable and faithful leadership as a member of Congress.

WILEY MAYNE,
President, 90th Club.

Signed at Washington, D.C., this 4th day of August 1970.

PAUL N. MCCLUSKEY, JR.,
Secretary, 90th Club.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH SOLDIERS DAY CELEBRATION

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

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. On August 9, 1970, I was the principal speaker at exercises commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Polish Army Veterans Association, District 10, and Post 12 and its ladies auxiliary. On that occasion the various organizations assembled unanimously adopted a resolution, which it is my pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

Today, the 9th day of August, 1970, the following Resolution was unanimously adopted at exercises commemorating the 50th Anniversary of the Polish Soldiers Day Celebration, under the co-sponsorship of the Polish Army Veterans Association, District 10 and Post 12 and its Ladies Auxiliary.

Whereas, we, citizens of the United States, former Soldiers and veterans of the Polish Army which fought valiantly alongside the Allied Forces during the 1st and 2nd World Wars for your freedom and ours, pledge allegiance and loyalty to the United States of America and to those ideals for which it stands.

Now therefore be it resolved that we call upon our Representatives and Senators in the United States Congress to bestow to the Veterans of the Polish Army in recognition of their heroic deeds on behalf of the free world in the past world conflicts the benefits that are bestowed upon the Veterans of the Services of the United States.

And be it further resolved that we pay homage to General Wladyslaw Anders, a fearless soldier, an inspirational leader who assured himself a place in history with his heroism and brilliant command at the great battle of Monte Cassino, who this year passed away in London.

Respectfully submitted,

ROMAN LANISCKI,
Commander, Polish Army Veterans, Post 12.

FRANCIS PRAWDZIK,
Commander, District 10, Polish Army Veterans.

EDMUND PAWELEC,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.

PRESIDENT CUTS WHITE HOUSE STAFF

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are all concerned with reducing Federal spending, it is gratifying to note that President Nixon has set a personal example in this regard by cutting back the size of the White House staff.

As evidence of this saving, I refer to a letter to the editor in Sunday's Washington Post from Mr. Caspar Weinberger, Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget. In his letter, Mr. Weinberger points out that the President's budget request for the White House Office for fiscal 1971 constitutes a reduction of 28 employees and a consequent saving of more than $650,000 from the previous year.

Mr. Weinberger also points out that the President has ended the practice of previous administrations of detailing full-time employees to the White House Office staff from the departments and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the President deserves much credit for this achievement. I in-

clude Mr. Weinberger's letter in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 13, 1970]

WHITE HOUSE ON STAFF EXPENSES

An article appearing in your paper recently left the impression that the White House was doubling its staff in fiscal year 1971. Such an impression would be not only unfortunate, but quite incorrect.

The appropriation requested for the White House Office for fiscal year 1971 is in fact a decrease from the actualities of fiscal year 1970 both in personnel and in funds. For fiscal year 1970 the appropriation for the White House Office was $3,940,000, with another $2,500,000 appropriated for special projects. In addition, personnel detailed to the White House Office from the departments and agencies under authority of law resulted in basic compensation costs to those departments and agencies at the rate of $2,820,000. Thus, the 1970 level of operation was in excess of $9,200,000, involving 576 employees.

The President, when preparing the 1971 fiscal year budget, decided to discontinue the use of the special projects fund and personnel details from other agencies to augment funds available for the regular White House Office staff. He has thereby adopted a policy of bringing all regular employees of the White House directly onto the White House payrolls. This seemed to the President a more honest way of presenting the full cost of the White House operation.

Therefore, the budget request for fiscal year 1971 is for 548 employees, and funds in the amount of $8,550,000 for the White House Office. This is a substantial *decrease* of more than $650,000 in funds, and 28 in personnel—a lesson that should certainly not be lost on those who have attacked the President without benefit of the facts.

CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Deputy Director, Office of Management and Budget.
WASHINGTON.

BIPARTISAN ACTION ON PRESIDENT NIXON'S BILLS

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is need for bipartisan action in Congress to meet major national problems. I urge Democrats to help seek "a history of progress all of us can share" by taking action on bills singled out Friday by President Nixon.

On Friday, September 11, the President of the United States sent this body a detailed indictment for legislative inaction on a host of basic reforms. The President's language was calm and closely reasoned but necessarily detailed in the facts he set forth.

In a time of extreme domestic unrest when both the liberal community including university students and faculties and certainly the so-called silent majority are calling for government reform to deal with a score of problems, the Democratic Congress has simply refused to act. Crime, control of drug abuse, manpower training, education, social security, foreign trade legislation, environmental cleanup, and many more problems for which President Nixon has proposed reform measures, have met with opposition and indecision from the Democrats on Capitol Hill.

Congress has even refused to approve legislation to protect our children from obscene mailings.

Adjournment is close at hand. As the President said, "we cannot wait for politics." The President has done his part. He has proposed reforms to do what must be done. Now it is up to Congress. History will record that result. We should seek a history of progress all of us can share.

FOREIGN TRADE ACT OF 1970

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it appears that in the very near future we will be faced with the question of considering the Foreign Trade Act of 1970 as reported by the Ways and Means Committee, H.R. 18970.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this bill is a radical departure from our past foreign trade policy and one that brought about vigorous dissent by many members of the Ways and Means Committee when it was finally reported shortly before the August recess. I intend to appear before the Rules Committee and ask for a modified closed rule so that members may have an opportunity to express their opinion about this trade policy. I propose to ask the Rules Committee for the granting of a rule that would allow a motion to strike that provision of title I that ties the President's hands on oil import quotas.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, this oil importation quota program now costs the American consumer, according to the President's own task force, about $5 billion per year.

I also intend to ask for a rule that will grant permission to strike title 4. This is the Domestic International Sales Corporation proposal which appears to me to be nothing more than a tax loophole. It will cost American taxpayers about a billion dollars a year.

I also intend to ask for a rule that would grant motions to strike the mandatory quotas in title 2 on textiles and garments. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the President has only very reluctantly supported trade quotas for the textiles and garment industry. It seems to me that these quotas would be highly inflationary. The textile and garment industry have wholly failed to prove a case for import quotas.

I also will ask for a provision in the rule to allow the striking of provisions of title 2 that relates to mandatory import quotas for the shoe industry. This again is another highly inflationary matter, and even the President and his Commission that studied this industry, turned down the industry's request for this trade protection, saying that this industry did not warrant the drastic remedy of quotas.

The modified closed rule that I will seek will give each Member an opportunity to vote as he wishes on this most important bill, and not have to suffer the ridiculousness of voting either for or against a bill that he has had no opportunity to amend.

The following is a copy of the rule I propose to ask the Rules Committee to grant when I appear before the committee on Tuesday, September 15:

H. RES. —

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. 18970) to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed eight hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except (1) an amendment to strike out section 104, (2) amendments to exempt all textile articles from the quota provisions of title II, (3) amendments to exempt all footwear articles from the quota provisions of title II, (4) an amendment to strike out title IV, and (5) amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of general debate, but the said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 13934, to revise the boundaries of Minuteman National Historical Park, which was passed by the House today.

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

There was no objection.

TO CREATE A HEALTH SECURITY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the following Members of the House and myself: Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CELLER, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ECKHARDT, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. REID, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN, I introduce for appropriate reference the Health Security Act, to create a comprehensive national health security program, through a system of national health insurance, will make health care

services available to all residents of the United States. We commend this bill to our colleagues in the Congress for favorable consideration.

The American people today face a crisis in health care of appalling proportions. The American people know that they have a right to quality health care, but they know, too, that for most people the availability and delivery of such care is virtually nonexistent today. We are offering a health security act that will convert that right from fiction to reality.

The program we envision is borrowed from no other nation, though we recognize that we are the last of the major nations to acknowledge our responsibilities in a national policy for comprehensive health care for all our citizens. It discriminates neither in favor of nor against any segment of our population, though we recognize with shame our enormous neglect of those who have most needed and deserved the best health care we could have afforded.

The Health Security Act proposes that we shall use the mechanism of national health insurance as a means of bringing about a rational system for the delivery of personal health services in a manner that is consistent with American needs, and creates an American system of health care for all our people.

Good health is a vital need, personally and nationally. Good health requires good health care. Yet, despite that dedication, great efforts and enormous expenditures, good health care is not actually available to millions of Americans. At the same time, we are using a substantial share of our national economic resources for medical care; we are confronted by costs which are rising steeply but yet not effecting improvements; the inadequacy of health care resources intensifies; and our rates of sickness, disability, and mortality—already far behind the potentials of modern health care—are getting no better and may be getting worse.

I will not burden you with a repetition of the vital statistics, so often repeated in the public information media and in the professional literature—statistics which show how little progress we have been making in recent decades toward the prevention of illness or of premature mortality, whether measured against our own past or against the vital statistics of other countries.

Nor will I burden you with a recital of what almost every family knows through its own worries and frustrations and disappointments. The average family lives in dread of illness and disability, and for good reason. The path to seeking medical care is confusing, frightening, and expensive. This dilemma is not confined to the poor, the elderly, or the disabled. It is understood just as clearly by the professional worker earning $12,000 a year whose child requires a $30,000 hospitalization—not unusual for an accident or prolonged illness—and who discovers his expensive insurance pays about 60 percent of the bill. It is understood by residents of our 157 rural counties without a single physician. It touches every community in this country.

Nor will I burden you with the recounting of the distress among the providers of health care. We all know the dedication of the health profession, the commendable efforts of the hospitals and other institutions, the support of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies and personnel. And we are familiar with the limitations under which they try to meet the national need for health care, and the technological progress through research and application which has made medical care at its best in the United States second to none in the world. We also know that the best is not adequately available.

The problems of manpower shortages, lack of organization and spiraling costs have been measured and analyzed many times. The problems are well known; it is the purpose of our program to provide realistic solutions. Fortunately, the underlying causes of our health care deficiencies are manageable—though not all at once or without great effort and commitment.

The three causes of crisis underlying all the rest can be simply stated: First, the national shortages of health manpower and institutions; second, rising costs which price medical care beyond reach; and third, inadequacies in the organizational system for the availability and delivery of medical care.

These three basic causes are so intimately interrelated one with another that if we would meet the health care needs of the Nation we must attack simultaneously on all three fronts. We must insure that we have the needed health manpower, hospitals, and other institutions; we must insure the underwriting of the unavoidable costs, while also keeping these costs within reasonable bounds; and we must encourage the development of a system which provides for efficient use of the manpower and institutions and for ready and effective availability of health services to our population.

I would emphasize the importance and the urgency of simultaneous attack on all three. Production of more health manpower or more hospitals or other institutions without improving financing and organization would at best be an exercise in futility toward dealing with needs, or at the worst would invite disastrous problems of costs. Merely trying to solve the problems of steeply rising costs by pouring more purchasing power into the medical-care channels will perpetuate a system characterized by consumer impatience, seller's monopoly, inefficiency, lack of accountability—all of which can only lead to further dissipation of resources.

Attempts to deal with the organizational system in isolation have no hope of success as decades of largely futile public and private efforts have demonstrated. Instead, we propose a comprehensive program, balanced and well-proportioned, on an evolutionary basis. And we propose that at every point we shall provide for professional and administrative protections and controls to safeguard the essential ingredient of good quality in the health care services.

Every discussion of the health care problem is, unavoidably, heavily concentrated on the costs of medical care, which have been climbing twice as fast as other consumer costs, and this continues. Between fiscal year 1960 and fiscal year 1969, health care expenditures as a whole went up from $26 billion to $60 billion, rising as a percentage of gross national product from 5.3 to 6.7 percent. Personal health care expenditures, the major part of the total, rose from $23 billion to $53 billion—from 4.9 to 5.8 percent of GNP. For the fiscal year just closed, the total expenditures were probably about $65 billion, 6.8 percent of GNP.

In the four fiscal years 1966 to 1969 inclusive, the national expenditures for personal health care, exclusive of the net costs fo private insurance, went up from $183 to $256 per capita. The most recent Consumer Price Index—CPI for July 1967—shows that medical care prices are still rising at nearly twice the rate for all items in the consumer's "market basket."

Despite massive sale of private health insurance, most of the expenditure for personal health services must still be borne out-of-pocket at the time of illness or as a debt thereafter. The reason is that nearly all private health insurance is partial and limited, covering in the aggregate only about one-third of the private costs and leaving nearly two-thirds to be paid outside the framework of insurance. Private health insurance, through a thousand private insurance carriers competing with each other, and through a bewildering array of insurance policies, can do no more than this to ease the burdensome impacts of medical care costs on American families. Nothing less than a national commitment of resources can deal with the need for adequate insurance against the costs of medical care. The health security bill makes this commitment.

It will be readily recognized that the proposed financing, starting with actual levels of expenditure, is not concerned primarily with new costs. On the contrary, the program effects mainly a rechanneling of money already being spent, in order to use it more effectively. Health security expenditures would replace large expenditures already being made by people generally, by employers, by voluntary agencies, by the Federal, State, and local governments, and would relieve State and local governments of various expenditures which they are finding burdensome. For instance, for fiscal 1970, the Medi-Cal program cost my own State of California $485 million. Had the Health Security Act been operative in 1970, the estimated savings to California in this program would have been $291.4 million. Since local property tax pays part of the State's Medi-Cal bill, the savings to homeowners would have been substantial.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to outline briefly the major aspects of the health security program.

First, the health security program does not envisage a national health service in which Government owns the facilities,

employs the personnel, and manages the finances. On the contrary, it intends a partnership of the public and private sectors: Governmental financing and administrative management; joined with private provision of the personal health services through private practitioners, institutions, and other providers;

Second, the health security program would be effected through a process of gradualism, moving on an evolutionary course from what we have and where we are toward the goals we would attain; and

Third, the more or less comprehensive health services to be covered by the health security program would be financed on a budget basis, with reasoned provision of necessary funds from the pool of national resources, and with containment of the hitherto unlimited expenditure demands on the national resources, and with containment of the hitherto unlimited expenditure demands on the national economy.

The benefits of the health security program would be available, with only minor exceptions, to all persons resident in the country beginning with the middle of the program's third year of operation. Eligibility would not require either an individual contribution history or any means test.

The benefits are intended to embrace the entire range of personal health services required for personal health, including services for the prevention and early detection of disease, for the care and treatment of illness, and for physical rehabilitation. With only four exceptions, there are no restrictions on needed services, no cut-off points, no coinsurance, no deductibles, and no waiting periods. The four exceptions are dictated by inadequacies in existing resources or in management potentials, with respect to skilled nursing home care, psychiatric care, dental care—this benefit starts with those who are under age 15, and extends to others gradually—and covered medicines and appliances.

The health security program recognizes the necessity of moving rapidly and dramatically to increase the Nation's resources for the delivery of health services. Therefore the program will earmark a fixed percentage of the Health Security Trust Fund as a Resources Development Fund. The money will be used to strengthen the Nation's resources of health personnel and facilities and its system of delivery of health services, in order to enable the providers of services to meet the demands placed upon them when health security benefits become available.

Providers would be compensated in full, agreeing not to charge individuals for covered services. Hospitals and other institutional providers would be paid on the basis of approved prospective budgets. Independent practitioners—physicians, dentists, podiatrists, and optometrists—may be paid by various methods which they may elect: by fee-for-service or by capitation payments, or in some cases retainers or stipends, and by combination methods. Comprehensive health service organizations may be paid by capitation or by a combination of this method and methods applicable to payment for hospital and other institutional services. Other independent providers—for example, pathology laboratories, radiology services, pharmacies, providers of appliances—would be paid by methods adapted to their special characteristics.

The financial and administrative arrangements are designed to move the medical care system toward organized programs of health services, utilizing teams of professional, technical, and supporting personnel. Earmarked funds would be available to support the most rapid practicable development toward this goal. Federal law would supersede State statutes which restrict or impede the development of group practice operation. Thus, the program would undertake to do what it can toward assuring the availability of covered health services and not merely contributing further strains on overburdened resources.

The health security program includes various provisions to safeguard quality of care. The program would establish national standards for participating individual and institutional providers. Independent practitioners would be eligible to participate upon meeting licensure and continuing education requirements. Specialty services would be covered if, upon referral, they are performed by qualified persons. Hospitals and other institutions would be eligible for participation if they meet national standards somewhat more exacting than in medicare, and establish required utilization review and affiliation arrangements.

With respect to the problems of health manpower shortages, health security intends to supplement established Government programs. It would give incentive and continuing supports to comprehensive group practice organizations for the efficient use of personnel in short supply and for the progressive broadening of services. It would provide support funds for education and training programs for personnel especially needed for covered services, and support stipends to students and trainees—especially for those disadvantaged by poverty, membership in minority groups, and so forth. It would also provide special financial and other supports for the location of needed health personnel in both urban and rural shortage areas.

Various Federal health programs would be superseded, in whole or in part, by health security. Since all persons including those 65 and over would be covered by the program, medicare under the social security system would be terminated. Federal aid to the States for medicaid would also be terminated except to the extent that, and for so long as, services under that program are broader than under health security. As with medicaid, so also with other Federal programs which may be broader than health security. However, our bill does not undertake to revise the provisions for personal health services under the Veterans' Administration, temporary disability, or workmen's compensation programs.

The administration of the health security program is designed to concern itself with the availability of services, the observance of high quality standards, and the containment of costs within reasonable boundaries. Policy and regulations would be established by a five-member full-time board, appointed by the President—with Senate confirmation—for 5-year rotating terms and not more than three members from one political party, and serving under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary and the Board are charged to coordinate the operation of the program with other health related programs of the Government. A statutory National Advisory Council would participate with the Board on general policy, the formulation of regulations, and the allocation of funds, its members having 4-year rotating terms and including representatives of providers and of consumers—the latter in majority. Administration would be effected through the Department's regional offices and would be mainly operational in health subareas, with advisory councils on matters of administration at each such level. Through its regulations, the Board would guide performance under the program; it would coordinate various activities with the State and regional planning agencies; it would provide an accounting of activities to the Congress; and it would engage in studies and projects for evaluation and for progressive improvements of operations.

The financial operations of the program would be managed through a Health Security Trust Fund—similar to the Social Security Trust Fund. Income to the fund would derive from three sources: 40 percent from Federal general revenues; 35 percent from a 3.5 percent on employers' payrolls; and 25 percent from a 2.1-percent tax on individual income up to $15,000 a year, whether from wages, self-employment, or other sources—nonearned income. Employers may pay all or part of employee health security tax and would be expected to preserve obligations under private—collective-bargaining—agreements. Each year, the Board—with the participation of the Advisory Council—would make an advance estimate of the amount available for expenditure—to pay for services, for program development, and for administration—and would make allocations to the several regions. These allocations would be subdivided among categories of services and designated for the health subareas, with participation by the advisory councils. Advance estimates, constituting the program budgets, would be subject to adjustments, as may become necessary, in accordance with guidelines in the act. The allocations to regions and to subareas would be guided initially by the latest available data on current levels of expenditures; thereafter they would be guided by the program's own experiences in making expenditures and by evidences of need toward meeting the program's obligations and objectives, equitably throughout the Nation.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the Health Security Act we submit to the Congress and to the people of the United States differs

from all previous proposals for national health insurance. It is not just another proposal for insurance. It is not merely an extension of medicare by stages to everyone. It is not an ill-conceived open ended design for pumping more dollars into a chronically strained "nonsystem." It is not simply a bigger categorical program for the production of manpower and facilities without creating a system to employ them.

Our program will build for the residents of this country a rational system of national health security. The funds which we as a people can afford to provide will finance and budget the essential costs of good medical care. Simultaneously we will strengthen our capacity to deliver health services, and make good health care available and reliable without financial hardship for all families and individuals in the Nation.

We take cognizance of the fact that organized medicine shares our concern that America faces a crisis in health care. We know that our goals are the same—to provide adequate health care services for all Americans. We would hope and expect organized medicine to make a substantial contribution in setting up the mechanism for the health security program so that its long years of experience and the expertise of its members would be made available for the effective functioning of the program. As lay groups, the various advisory boards and advisory councils established under the Health Security Act would, I am sure, want to rely heavily on the cooperation and advice of organized medicine so as to insure that the highest possible quality of medical care is available to everyone and that an equitable distribution of available funds is maintained.

We expect that the introduction of the bill and consideration of its companion legislation that has already been introduced in the Senate will spark the most intensive public debate on this subject in 20 years. There are now several various legislative proposals for national health insurance before the Congress. We hope that in the course of public discussion and congressional debate each of these will be examined thoroughly, and that clarifications and improvements in each approach will emerge. We hope that the public will insist that proponents of each bill prove that the system they propose is capable of assuring the availability and quality of care as well as providing a sound mechanism for its financing.

We are confident that the Health Security Act can meet these tests.

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

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and hopeful today as I join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) in introducing the National Health Security bill.

I am pleased that this proposal has been so thoroughly and competently studied and drafted, and is now before both Houses of Congress. I am hopeful that both chambers will schedule full and complete hearings on this measure in the very near future so that we may enact this vitally needed piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly enthused about this bill because it would add a most vital, and so far missing, ingredient to our Nation's health program; that is, it would establish a system in what is now a chaotic mess.

The current amount of waste and needless duplication of effort, expensive machinery, experts and specialists costs this National almost 25 cents of every dollar spent on health care. Out of a national expenditure of $63 billion in 1969, $14 billion was wasted.

Such colossal waste committed by a nation possessing such expertise in conquering disease cannot be tolerated. A nation which can deliver men to the moon, but which cannot deliver adequate health services to all of its people, is, I submit, a nation whose medical program needs serious restructuring.

We were able to place men on the moon because an adequately funded organization followed a carefully studied plan designed to achieve the mission it set out to accomplish. We are unable to provide adequate health care to all our citizens not because we lack the funds, but because we lack the carefully studied plan designed to achieve that mission. The National Health Security program offers such a plan.

I am pleased to note that the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) has introduced a similar bill in the Senate and has scheduled hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which he chairs. I respectfully urge the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to likewise schedule hearings at an early date. There is much work to be done before the public will understand this bill. Most of our work will be in dispelling fears and false conceptions, and explaining exactly what the bill does do and how it works.

This Nation can no longer continue to fall behind the other nations of the world in the incidence of infant mortality and childbirth fatalities, nor in life expectancy rates. These basic health care categories are examples of the real problem—bringing health care, with the knowledge and facilities we possess, to the people who need the care.

The waste and inefficiency prevalent in the health care nonsystem today contributes largely and directly to the everrising cost of health care. Too many of our citizens find that a serious illness ruins them financially. Too many of our citizens do not seek the medical attention they need because they cannot afford the care or fear the excessive costs.

I do not criticize any of our doctors, who continue to do an outstanding job. They continue to be, I believe, the finest corps of physicians in the world. Nor do I fault them because of the excessive cost of the system. It is common knowledge that many doctors, not only because of their Hippocratic Oath, but because of their dedication, will gladly treat an ill but nonpaying patient. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has published the figures on the distribution of the medical care dollar for personal health care expenditures for the years 1950, 1960, and 1969. The share of the dollar which goes to the physician has actually declined in those years from 25 cents in 1950 to 24 cents in 1960 to 23 cents in 1969.

Private health insurance has been given a chance to prove itself and it has proved that it cannot solve the problem. In its current state, private health insurance is very expensive, too, expensive for most Americans. It is also incomplete, covering only a portion of most illnesses, particularly the expensive ones. It is not used by many persons.

A program of national health insurance working under the guidelines the Committee on National Health Insurance has devised can and will provide for the health care of every American.

The proposed program will provide not only for the payment of the costs of illness, but will emphasize preventive care, will provide sufficient facilities and personnel, and will provide the incentives for the supply and efficient employment of facilities and trained personnel, and thereby assure that the health needs of the Nation are met.

In closing, I would be remiss if I failed to mention the initiator of this program, the late Walter Reuther. His lifelong dream was to assure adequate health care to all Americans. Only his untimely and tragic death in a plane crash prevented him from proposing the program which has now been introduced in both Houses of Congress. It is high tribute to him that such a carefully thought out and practical program has been written and introduced. It is now up to us, the Members of Congress, to complete the tribute to this great national leader by enacting the program for which he laid the foundation.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his support and I look forward to his help as this legislation goes through the legislative process.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN).

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) for taking up this great cause which our former colleague, the Honorable Cecil King, also of California, carried for so long in the committee on which the gentleman from California (Mr. CORMAN) now serves.

I do hope that although there is no practical possibility of enactment of this legislation by this Congress, that it will be reintroduced early in the 92d Congress under the gentleman's leadership and that we shall not be so long in enacting this splendid and long-needed piece of legislation as we were in enacting medicare.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely thank the gentleman for his support.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, today I

am cosponsoring the Health Security Act along with several of my colleagues in the House. This far-reaching legislation will provide for a program of national health insurance as well as strengthen and improve the organization and delivery of health care services.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have long been aware of the present health crisis facing this Nation. The high costs of medical services coupled with a projected medical manpower shortages warrants the attention of this Congress on the problems of the availability and delivery of health care services.

The Health Security Act represents a major innovative step in our health care system. It would combine the Federal, public, and private sectors of the economy into improving health care. This act would provide for qualified health care services for all citizens as well as provide for highly qualified medical personnel. The organization, financing, and delivery of health care services would be managed under this act in such a manner in order to avoid the presently projected national health disaster.

The Health Security Act is vastly superior to all present health insurance plans. In 1969 Americans paid approximately $63 billion out of their pockets for health care services. Experts have maintained that $14 billion of that figure is waste. Hospital costs have gone up 100-percent faster than the cost of living. It has been projected that unless some attempt is made to alleviate this condition of rising medical costs, Americans will be paying twice the costs for health insurance in 1975 as they paid in 1969.

Today it was reported in the Washington Post that the President has asked officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to draft a proposal that would be designed to make Americans the healthiest people in the world. Americans spend more for health care services than any other nation in the world yet America ranks 13th in infant mortality among the industrialized nations, seventh in maternal mortality, 11th in life expectancy for women and 18th in life expectancy for men. Although Americans have been spending more in the area of health care, the above data clearly indicates that our citizens are not receiving adequate treatment.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, the late Walter Reuther was among the first to see our failing health care needs. In November of 1968 Mr. Reuther announced the formation of the Committee of One Hundred for National Health Insurance. This committee was charged with the responsibility of creating a national health insurance plan that would make maximum use of the political, economic, and social framework of this Nation.

This bill that I am cosponsoring today is based on the recommendations of this committee. The distinguished members of the Committee of One Hundred are to be commended for their intensive research and deliberations that took into consideration the views of all groups involved in health care, that is professional associations, labor, government, private institutions, and consumer organizations.

The Health Security Act represents a new chapter in the history of health care in this Nation. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to give a point by point detailed analysis of this legislation as this has been ably done today by my colleague from California (Mr. CORMAN).

The Health Security Act would establish a program designed to serve all citizens who need health care services. Through a system of national health insurance, this program would guarantee the orderly and budgeted delivery of services as well as provide for incentives that would greatly generate improvements in both the organization and delivery of health care services.

This act would emphasize the maintenance of health as well as the treatment of illness. Benefits from this program that will become available by July, 1973 will include preventive medicine, the care and treatment of illness, and medical rehabilitation. A five-man Health Security Board, under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, will establish national standards for participating individuals and institutions and will be assisted by regional and local advisory councils.

This national health insurance program will be funded through a Health Security Trust Fund similar to the Social Security Trust Fund. Funds for this national health insurance program will be obtained from three sources: 40 percent from Federal revenues; 35 percent from a 3.5 percent employer's tax; and 25 percent from a 2.1 percent tax on individual incomes up to $15,000 a year. Taxation for this plan will become effective as of January 1, 1973, with the plan's benefits becoming available by July 1, 1973. This health plan will be gradually phased in and funded on a budgeted basis. All health services will be included with the exceptions of limitations on nursing home cases and psychiatric care as well as denial services that will gradually be phased in.

One of the major provisions of this plan is that there will be three separate sections established under the Health Security Trust Fund—a Health Service Account, a Health Resources Development Account and an Administration Account.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of a Health Resources Development Account is significant in that the Health Security Board will emphasize future health needs as well as present ones.

Provisions will be made in that 5 percent of the Health Security Trust Fund will be used for the recruitment and training of providers of medical services as well as the enlargement and improvement of such organizations and institutions furnishing health care services. A continual strengthening and expansion of medical personnel and institutions will be the key to a gradual national health care delivery system that will insure essential medical services for all our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Health Security Act will not create new Federal expenditures but will merely rechannel those funds that are now being spent on medical services in a more efficient and less costly manner. This plan will improve medical services without additional costs and will give all Americans more adequate health care.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the Congress to give serious attention to the Health Security Act. I realize that there is not sufficient time during the remainder of this session for the Congress to fully act on a bill of this magnitude. However, given the deteriorating health care system in our Nation today I would urge the Congress to make this legislation one of the top priorities of the 92d Congress.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, once again the United States has fallen victim to its own chronic short-sightedness. Again we are failing to anticipate a deteriorating national condition that is fast becoming a serious cause of unrest within our society. Like our disregard of the causes of violence in our cities and the causes of our deteriorating criminal justice system; like our ignoring the millions who go hungry in our country while others feast; like our disregard of the economic and social conditions of minorities in our cities—ignoring warnings that education and housing must improve; so, too, have we disregarded a momentous burden our society has placed on the poor, the disabled, the senior citizen, I speak of the high cost of staying healthy.

Because of high rates they cannot pay; millions of Americans have been unable to afford the medical attention and care on which their lives and their children's lives depend.

Private health insurance companies do little to alleviate the cost situation. Given the high rates, the average consumer purchases only partial coverage. In 1968, of the 180 million Americans under age 65, 20 percent had no hospital insurance, 22 percent had no surgical insurance, 34 percent had no inpatient medical insurance, 57 percent had no insurance for doctors' office visits or home visits, and 61 percent had no insurance against the cost of drug prescriptions. One of the most serious gaps in private insurance is that low-income Americans have the least coverage. Sixty-four percent of families with incomes of less than $3,000 and 43 percent of families with incomes between $3,000 and $4,999 are without hospital insurance, while only 8 percent of families with incomes of $10,000 or more are not insured. Millions of people live in fear of the ever present possibility of serious illness and its financial repercussions.

Decades ago, Americans realized the profound effect an inadequate education would have on the life of every citizen; not only in regard to his future job opportunities, but in regard to his attitude to the American ideal of equal opportunities; realize this, our State and local governments made provisions for every American to receive a free public education. Today we must also realize that inadequate health care of millions of Amer-

icans has repercussions throughout the structure of our society that reach not only into the spirits of human beings, but are intermeshed with the present social programs of this country. A man incapacitated by an illness that could have been arrested at an earlier stage, becomes a burden to society. He is the victim of an illness that will affect his family life, his children's lives, and his outlook toward a society that has placed him on the welfare rolls.

Mr. Speaker, with all the medical technological expertise the United States possesses; with all the excellent medical facilities and well-trained physicians at our disposal, the fact cannot be ignored that this country does not possess a well-coordinated, efficient program for health care. The United States is the only major industrial nation in the world that does not have a national health service or program of national health insurance. With all our advances, we rank 13th among industrial countries in the death rate of infants during the first year of life; the mortality rate of nonwhites being twice that of whites, seventh among industrial countries in the percentage of mothers who die in childbirth; nearly five times as many nonwhites as white mothers dying, and 18th in the life expectancy of males and 11th for females.

The United States lacks the necessary manpower and facilities to effectively treat all those who need intensive treatment. One of the most unbelievable, yet real parodoxes of America's health care resources—hospitals, physicians, dentists, nurses, nursing homes, equipment—is that some are overused, some are underused, and many are inefficiently used. Too many people are hospitalized when they could be treated on an out-patient basis, simply because people have health insurance which pays for their hospital bills but not out-patient bills. Survey statistics show that consumers who belong to group practice prepayment programs—which provide extensive out-patient treatment—use 25 to 50 percent less hospitalization than people covered by commercial hospital insurance plans.

It is clear that the problem has reached monumental proportions. The indicators are staring us in the face. It is impossible to turn our backs on them because they exist in every large city and small town in this country. Poor health care is another piece of kindling that is part of what may very well become a funeral pyre for our society if we continue to ignore the profound interrelationships of all of these problems that beset this country.

I emphasize that the program proposed by my colleague (Mr. CORMAN), is not one that encourages a national health service in which the Government owns the facilities and pays the personnel, but one that proposes a partnership between the public and private sectors. This bill provides some far-reaching, concrete answers to alleviate the specific health care problems. First, it establishes effective organization and delivery of health care to all residents of the United States with special emphasis on teams of professional, technical, and supporting personnel. Accordingly, the program will provide funds for special training of physicians, dentists, and other health workers needed for this program, and will apply financial incentives to stimulate the movement of health manpower to medically deprived areas, while providing adequate compensation to the individuals who furnish the health service.

With the adoption of this program, we will be lifting an insurmountable burden from millions of family heads. The Health Security Act will control the mounting costs of health care by incorporating efficient organization and training of personnel, with efficient utilization of hospital and out-patient facilities. I believe this program's enactment is a necessity if we are to think of ourselves as an enlightened society. I hope we are so enlightened.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to have this opportunity to join with my esteemed colleague from California, Hon. JAMES C. CORMAN, in urging strong and immediate support for a comprehensive universal health care plan for all the people in this Nation. I wish to commend the distinguised gentleman for requesting this Special Order to focus attention on the pressing needs facing the health care system in America. I share his conviction that, as elected spokesmen of the American people, we have a vital responsibility for promoting measures which will ensure the health and well-being of all our citizens. Indeed, we have neglected for too long what noted authorities in this country are calling a "health care crisis of major proportions."

Each day our attention is drawn to new and alarming statistics all of which point to the same inescapable conclusion—that this Nation's huge annual investment in health care services is not yielding essential dividends in terms of improved or prolonged life for millions of Americans. In recent years, we have been spending ever-increasing amounts of public and private moneys in pursuit of good health. In fiscal year 1969 alone, we spent as a nation $60.3 billion on health care services, a total outlay which registered a 12-percent increase over the previous year's expenditures.

Yet vast numbers of Americans have yet to feel the benefits of these huge expenditures. Ninety-six million citizens, almost half our population, suffer from chronic ill health. And this condition of chronic ill health is not, as many of us might suppose, limited to the population over 65. More than 72 percent of the population between 45 and 64 have chronic health conditions resulting in limitations on their ability to hold down employment, keep house, further their education, or otherwise participate actively in the vigorous development of our society.

As Americans, we lay claim to the notion that we have one of the highest standards of living in the world. But, indeed, if this is so, why is it equally true that in a majority of the indexes used to compare health standing among the nations of the world, the United States does not even rank among the top ten? Why do we lag behind 13 other countries in terms of infant mortality, behind 15 other countries in overall life expectancy, behind 20 other countries in incidence of heart disease?

In recent years, our Government has recognized that it must expand its commitment to bettering the health of our people. Public sources now account for over one-third of our national health expenditures. A diverse pattern of over 100 public programs have been developed to provide adequate medical care to our country's citizens. And yet it is still a sorry fact that, in spite of our spending, in spite of our myriad of public and private health programs, we are simply not doing the job.

The ever-growing economic burdens of medical care costs restrain many people from seeking those very services which would promote and maintain their health. We are appalled to discover that increasing numbers of people hesitate to consult a physician or obtain other forms of basic medical attention until the initial complaint or ailment has reached a stage where costly and extensive therapeutic treatment is required.

And Americans are disturbed that when they do seek out medical care, they frequently encounter difficulty in obtaining a physician or point of entry into the health care system, must often wait long hours for private consultations, endure hurried and impersonal attention by overburdened medical personnel.

Several years ago, a number of concerned individuals intimately involved in the Nation's health care system decided that the time had arrived when decisive and far-reaching action was needed to avert a total collapse of health services. Under the leadership of the late Walter Reuther, a man of tremendous foresight and courage, the Committee of One Hundred for the National Health Insurance was set up to consider ways in which this imminent breakdown of health care services could be averted. We owe this outstanding group a profound debt of gratitude for their formulation of a program designed to revitalize our health care system and make available to all Americans the health services they so richly deserve.

The health security program, as embodied in the legislation introduced today by the gentleman from California, the Honorable JAMES CORMAN, and in H.R. 19050, which I introduced into this Chamber on September 9 of this year, is the fruit of the labors of this Committee of One Hundred. As my able colleague has already explained, the health security program would establish a system of universal health insurance providing comprehensive health care for anyone living in the United States. The program would be equitably financed through contributions from employers, employees, the self-employed, and general tax revenues. Important aspects of the program center around a reorganization, a redirecting of the basic resources in our present health care system. Incentives have been built into the program to eliminate duplication and fragmentation of services, to increase efficiency, and thus curtail rising medical costs.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of the program is contained in its very

name—"health security"—for this legislation would insure that every American would no longer feel the anxiety of medical care costs, would no longer encounter barriers to needed health services. Through this program we would enable all Americans to share in the achievements of medical science.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague from California (Mr. CORMAN) for arranging this special order on the need to provide for a national program of health insurance for all of our citizens. I am pleased to have introduced legislation (H.R. 19072), the National Health Security Act, to implement such a program when the House returned from its recess on September 9, and I am encouraged by the number of Members in the House who also recognize the merit of this legislation.

Despite our affluence as a nation and our world leadership in the development of new medical knowledge and methods, we lag substantially behind a great many other nations in our ability to provide health care to our people. It is widely realized that the United States ranks 13th among the nations of the world in infant deaths; 18th in the life expectancy of men; and 11th in life expectancy of women.

In more personal terms, thousands of American families face the frustration, worry, and pain that grow out of their inability, for any one of a variety of reasons, to obtain the full range of medical services they need at a reasonable cost in time, effort, and resources. In many rural areas, families must travel many miles to reach medical help and, in emergencies, often do not reach it in time. The figures show that medical care is particularly inadequate for members of minority groups, who suffer from twice the rates of infant mortality and deaths in childbirth, for example, as whites. In our largest cities, even many citizens who can afford the rising prices of hospital care find available doctors booked months in advance, hospital beds unavailable, and public health facilities overwhelmed with patients. Thousands of Americans cannot overcome these deplorable obstacles, and so are deprived of a right we have long endorsed as a Nation—the right to adequate health care.

It is no exaggeration, then, to say that we face a national health care crisis. As I see it, this crisis is a result of three related conditions: First, an appalling and increasing shortage of health care professionals and facilities; second, inadequate organization of our existing health care resources to permit maximum delivery of health care services, and third, insufficient funds to cover the costs of providing adequate health care to every American.

The bill my colleagues and I have introduced—the national health security bill—is designed to attack each of these separate elements of our health care crisis over the next several years through a national health insurance program.

It has been under formulation since 1968 by the Committee of One Hundred for National Health Insurance—a group of distinguished Americans and health experts led by the late Walter Reuther, Dr. Michael E. DeBakey, Mrs. Mary Lasker, Mr. Whitney M. Young, Jr., and U.S. Senators KENNEDY, YARBOROUGH, COOPER, and SAXBE.

This legislation has been made necessary by the evident failure of existing Government health care assistance programs and private insurance plans to overcome the inadequacies I have cited. Existing health insurance programs are geared to the costs of curing sickness, not of maintaining and assuring health. They provide remedial, not preventive care. And they do at best a partial job of that. It is estimated that as many as 34 million Americans have no private health insurance at all. In 1968, private health insurance benefits met only about a third of the private costs of health care, leaving the remainder to be paid by the patients—many of whom thought they were well covered by their insurance.

The National Health Insurance program envisioned by this legislation to meet these problems involves no Government ownership of health facilities. It involves no Government employment of health personnel or Government management of health systems. Rather, it provides for a closer partnership between the medical professions and the Government covering a full range of health services. Under this plan, the Government will provide gradually increasing funds and administrative resources which will be made available to private health practitioners and institutions, enabling them to better meet the health needs of all Americans.

A special effort has been made in this legislation to assure that it will not simply further overburden our already overburdened health care system. Special provisions have been included that earmark funds to insure expansion of medical care capacity as the number of Americans covered under the national insurance program expands.

Special care has been taken, too, to see that standards of medical care are not sacrificed as care is expanded. The program establishes national standards more exacting than under the current medicare program for participating medical professionals and institutions.

To improve the organization of available medical resources, the program suggests a system of financial incentives encouraging, for example, greater use and development of group medical practices. By using incentives rather than directives, fuller support and participation of the medical professions is likely.

The program will be financed through a health security trust fund derived from three sources: 40 percent from Federal general revenues, 35 percent from a tax of 3.5 percent on employers' payrolls, and 25 percent from a 2.1 percent tax on individual income up to $15,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, if examined and enacted with all possible promptness by the Congress, can bring all Americans under a program of national health insurance beginning in 1973. I want to commend the excellent work of the Committee of One Hundred in developing this program. I think it is a comprehensive bill. I think it is a bill that combines great vision and idealism with hard practicality. I think it is a bill that deserves the careful study of every Member of Congress and every American who is concerned about the health care problems we face and who is dedicated, as I am, to providing better assurances that each and every American has the kind of opportunity to preserve his health and cure his ills that is presently enjoyed only by a privileged minority of Americans.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in introducing the Health Security Act providing for the establishment of a comprehensive health care program for our country's people. The bill gives us the legislative means for realizing the health security program developed by the Committee for National Health Insurance, a committee of 100 members founded in 1968 by the late Walter Reuther, then president of the United Auto Workers. One of the committee's three vice chairman, Mrs. Albert D. Lasker who has been a national leader in health care matters, resides in my congressional district.

When established to develop a national health care program, the committee was directed not simply to select from other countries the best health care program that could be found for adoption in the United States, but rather to develop a new program which would take advantage of our own medical resources and advancements and, while harmonizing with existing medical institutions, would correct the system's deficiencies. The committee observed this mandate and has produced an extraordinarily sound program: one that will meet today's challenge of high medical costs and the shortage of health manpower and institutions and one that will promote the maintenance of good health as well as the treatment of illness. It will pay for medical care for all Americans: not just the poor or elderly or those who can afford medical insurance premiums. It will make available to all persons comprehensive preventive, treatment, and rehabilitative services. And through its Resources Development Fund and the establishment of national standards for practicing individuals and institutions, it will monitor the quality of medical care received by all Americans.

Getting sick today has become so expensive that a single illness can burden a family for years with monumental medical bills. Health costs per person have more than doubled in the past decade. While in 1960 each American was spending an average of $128 for health care; in 1969 he spent $270. A great portion of this cost is reflected in the rise of patient care in a hospital: in just 5 years this cost has risen 80 percent—from $37.58 per day in 1964 to $67.69 in 1969, and in New York City's private hospitals this cost has reached $100 a day.

Added to the galloping costs of medical care is the inability of health insurance companies to cover the costs of illness.

While Americans pay an estimated $12 billion a year to health insurance companies, they are having to pay two-thirds of the medical costs out of their own pockets.

TODAY'S "SICK CARE," NOT "HEALTH CARE"

One of the most important consequences of today's high cost of medical care and the limitations of insurance coverage, is that medical care for most people is limited to "sick care" and not "health care." Often people do not seek preventive care, and instead wait for an illness to develop before obtaining medical attention. It is interesting to note that the Committee of 100 found only about half as many operations were performed on persons participating in a prepaid group practice plan as in a private insurance plan providing for only hospitalized care.

FREEDOM FROM CRIPPLING COSTS/FREEDOM TO OBTAIN MEDICAL CARE

What the health security program will do is free people from the fear of crippling costs of illness and disability. It will free people to obtain good medical care and to live in good health.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that it is urgent that we do something about the state of the public's health. While our medical technology and sciences are second to none in the world, the health of our people is not at the top of the list. American men rank 18th in the world in life expectancy, giving Swedish men, who rank first, an additional 5 years of life. The United States is 15th in infant mortality, with infant mortality for nonwhites being twice that of whites. And in maternal mortality we are seventh with twice as many American mothers dying during childbirth as in Sweden.

In short, under our present medical system, the people of this country are not receiving the maximum benefits of today's medical sciences: we are not getting health care to the people. This is due to the high costs. But, it is also due to inefficiency in the administration of medical services—an inefficiency that becomes more critical each year with the increasing shortage in health care facilities and professionals.

Opponents of a comprehensive national health care program will argue that it will cost too much. But when analyzed, we will find that, in fact, it will cost no more than what we are paying now and in the long run it will cut costs because of increased efficiency in the delivery of services and increased productivity of a more healthy public. The Committee of 100 estimates that had the program been in operation in 1969, the total cost would have come to $37 billion, or approximately $200 per person. This is not $37 billion in new money but rather the rechannelization of funds that are now being spent by government agencies, insurance companies, and individuals.

The Health Security Act provides that commencing July 1, 1973, all medical services would be paid for out of a Health Security Trust Fund—to be much like the Social Security Trust Fund. There would be three contributors: the general Treasury which would provide 40 percent of the fund; employers through a payroll tax would provide 35 percent; and individuals, 25 percent. The Government appropriation and the taxes on individuals and corporations would be determined by a Health Security Board. Estimates now place the employer payroll tax at 3.5 percent, with individual salary earnings up to $15,000 a year being subject to a tax of 2.1 percent.

ILLNESS IS A NATURAL DISASTER THAT MERITS GOVERNMENT HELP

Mr. Speaker, every major industrial nation in the world now has a national health care program except the United States. We have been reluctant to change our health care institutions in great part because of their past success; but let us not let past successes doom us to failures in the future. The time for change has come—in fact we already are late in making the needed adjustments to the demands of modern medicine whose advances, while often are lifesaving, are also very expensive. Illness at any age is a natural disaster; in other instances of natural disaster our Government has assumed a responsibility to assist individuals in meeting economic hardships.

I think that our colleagues would agree that no price can be attached to good health; the opportunity for good health is something that no society can in good conscience deny any individual. It may be true that those who have the good fortune of not suffering an illness will have to pay more in dollars under the Health Security program than they would today. But is it right to let those who have the misfortune of illness to also suffer from the hardships of today's medical costs?

I commend the Health Security Act to our colleagues, and I urge that we begin immediately to obtain its approval so that a solid administrative foundation can be established throughout the country for its proposal commencement in 1973.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Health Security Act.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my office working on a matter very important to my district when the vote was taken on H.R. 18306. Had I been present for the vote I would have voted "nay."

DANGEROUS SPECIAL DRUG OFFENDER SENTENCING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. POFF) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, when the House debates H.R. 18583, the drug control bill, I will offer the amendment printed at the foot of my remarks.

It will be seen that my amendment deletes nothing from the committee bill. Rather, it adds two new sections to the law enforcement section of the bill. The amendment is a supplement to the "continuing criminal enterprise" portion of the committee bill. Together, they will constitute a twofold attack upon the repeat offender, the professional offender, the truly dangerous criminal without whom the unlawful drug culture is this country would collapse.

The text of my amendment is as follows:

DANGEROUS SPECIAL DRUG OFFENDER SENTENCING

On page 88 after line 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 509. (a) Whenever an attorney charged with the prosecution of a defendant in a court of the United States for an alleged felonious violation of any provision of this title or title III committed when the defendant was over the age of twenty-one years has reasons to believe that the defendant is a dangerous special drug offender such attorney, a reasonable time before trial or acceptance by the court of a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, may sign and file with the court, and may amend, a notice (1) specifying that the defendant is a dangerous special drug offender who upon conviction for such felonious violation is subject to the imposition of a sentence under subsection (b) of this section, and (2) setting out with particularity the reasons why such attorney believes the defendant to be a dangerous special drug offender. In no case shall the fact that the defendant is alleged to be a dangerous special drug offender be an issue upon the trial of such felonious violation, be disclosed to the jury, or be disclosed before any plea of guilty or nolo contendere or verdict or finding of guilty to the presiding judge without the consent of the parties. If the court finds that the filing of the notice as a public record may prejudice fair consideration of a pending criminal matter, it may order the notice sealed and the notice shall not be subject to subpena or public inspection during the pendency of such criminal matter, except on order of the court, but shall be subject to inspection by the defendant alleged to be a dangerous special drug offender and his counsel.

"(b) Upon any plea of guilty or nolo contendere or verdict or finding of guilty of the defendant of such felonious violation, a hearing shall be held, before sentence is imposed, by the court sitting without a jury. The court shall fix a time for the hearing, and notice thereof shall be given to the defendant and the United States at least ten days prior thereto. The court shall permit the United States and counsel for the defendant, or the defendant if he is not represented by counsel, to inspect the presentence report sufficiently prior to the hearing as to afford a reasonable opportunity for verification. In extraordinary cases, the court may withhold material not relevant to a proper sentence, diagnostic opinion which might seriously disrupt a program of rehabilitation, any source of information obtained on a promise of confidentiality, and material previously disclosed in open court. A court withholding all or part of a presentence report shall inform the parties of its action and place in the record the reasons therefor. The court may require parties inspecting all or part of a presentence report to give notice of any part thereof intended to be controverted. In connection with the hearing, the defend-

ant and the United States shall be entitled to assistance of counsel, compulsory process, and cross-examination of such witnesses as appear at the hearing. A duly authenticated copy of a former judgment or commitment shall be prima facie evidence of such former judgment or commitment. If it appears by a preponderance of the information, including information submitted during the trial of such felonious violation and the sentencing hearing and so much of the presentence report as the court relies upon, that the defendant is a dangerous special drug offender, the court shall sentence the defendant to imprisonment for an appropriate term not to exceed twenty-five years and not disproportionate in severity to the maximum term otherwise authorized by law for such felonious violation. Otherwise it shall sentence the defendant in accordance with the law prescribing penalties for such felonious violation. The court shall place in the record its findings, including an identification of the information relied upon in making such findings, and its reasons for the sentence imposed.

"(c) This section shall not prevent the imposition and execution of a sentence of imprisonment for life or for a term exceeding twenty-five years upon any person convicted of an offense so punishable.

"(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the court shall not sentence a dangerous special drug offender to less than any mandatory minimum penalty prescribed by law for such felonious violation. This section shall not be construed as creating any mandatory minimum penalty.

"(e) A defendant is a special drug offender for purposes of this section if—

"(1) the defendant has previously been convicted in courts of the United States, a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a territory or possession of the United States, any political subdivision, or any department, agency or instrumentality thereof for two or more offenses involving dealing in controlled substances, committed on occasions different from one another and different from such felonious violation, and punishable in such courts by death or imprisonment in excess of one year, for one or more of such convictions the defendant has been imprisoned prior to the commission of such felonious violation, and less than five years have elapsed between the commission of such felonious violation and either the defendant's release, or parole or otherwise, from imprisonment for one such conviction or his commission of the last such previous offense or another offense involving dealing in controlled substances and punishable by death or imprisonment in excess of one year under applicable laws of the United States, a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a territory or possession of the United States, any political subdivision, or any department, agency or instrumentality thereof; or

"(2) the defendant committed such felonious violation as part of a pattern of dealing in controlled substances which was criminal under applicable laws of any jurisdiction, which constituted a substantial source of his income, and in which he manifested special skill or expertise; or

"(3) such felonious violation was, or the defendant committed such felonious violation in furtherance of, a conspiracy with three or more other persons to engage in a pattern of dealing in controlled substances which was criminal under applicable laws of any jurisdiction, and the defendant did, or agreed that he would, initiate, organize, plan, finance, direct, manage, or supervise all or part of such conspiracy or dealing, or give or receive a bribe or use force in connection with such dealing.

A conviction shown on direct or collateral review or at the hearing to be invalid or for which the defendant has been pardoned on the ground of innocence shall be disregarded for purposes of paragraph (1) of this subsection. In support of findings under paragraph (2) of this subsection, it may be shown that the defendant has had in his own name or under his control income or property not explained as derived from a source other than such dealing. For purposes of paragraph (2) of this subsection, a substantial source of income means a source of income which for any period of one year or more exceeds the minimum wage, determined on the basis of a forty-hour week and fifty-week year, without reference to exceptions, under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1062, as amended 80 Stat. 838), and as hereafter amended, for an employee engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and which for the same period exceeds fifty percent of the defendant's declared adjusted gross income under section 62 of the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 (68A Stat. 17, as amended 83 Stat. 655), and as hereafter amended. For purposes of paragraph (2) of this subsection, special skill or expertise in such dealing includes unusual knowledge, judgment or ability, including manual dexterity, facilitating the initiation, organizing, planning, financing, direction, management, supervision, execution or concealment of such dealing, the enlistment of accomplices in such dealing, the escape from detection or apprehension for such dealing, or the disposition of the fruits or proceeds of such dealing. For purposes of paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection, such dealing forms a pattern if it embraces criminal acts that have the same or similar purposes, results, participants, victims, or methods of commission, or otherwise are interrelated by distinguishing characteristics and are not isolated events.

"(f) A defendant is dangerous for purposes of this section if a period of confinement longer than that provided for such felonious violation is required for the protection of the public from further criminal conduct by the defendant.

"(g) The time for taking an appeal from a conviction for which sentence is imposed after proceedings under this section shall be measured from imposition of the original sentence.

"(h) With respect to the imposition, correction, or reduction of a sentence after proceedings under this section, a review of the sentence on the record of the sentencing court may be taken by the defendant or the United States to a court of appeals. Any review of the sentence taken by the United States shall be taken at least five days before expiration of the time for taking a review of the sentence or appeal of the conviction by the defendant and shall be diligently prosecuted. The sentencing court may, with or without motion and notice, extend the time for taking a review of the sentence for a period not to exceed thirty days from the expiration of the time otherwise prescribed by law. The court shall not extend the time for taking a review of the sentence by the United States after the time has expired. A court extending the time for taking a review of the sentence by the United States shall extend the time for taking a review of the sentence or appeal of the conviction by the defendant for the same period. The taking of a review of the sentence by the United States shall be deemed the taking of a review of the sentence and an appeal of the conviction by the defendant. Review of the sentence shall include review of whether the procedure employed was lawful, the findings made were clearly erroneous, or the sentencing court's discretion was abused. The court of appeals on review of the sentence may, after considering the record, including the entire presentence report, information submitted during the trial of such felonious violation and the sentencing hearing, and the findings and reasons of the sentencing court, affirm the sentence, impose or direct the imposition of any sentence which the sentencing court could originally have imposed, or remand for further sentencing proceedings and imposition of sentence, except that a sentence may be made more severe only on review of the sentence taken by the United States and after hearing. Failure of the United States to take a review of the imposition of the sentence shall, upon review taken by the United States of the correction or reduction of the sentence, foreclose imposition of a sentence more severe than that previously imposed. Any withdrawal or dismissal of review of the sentence taken by the United States shall foreclose imposition of a sentence more severe than that reviewed but shall not otherwise foreclose the review of the sentence or the appeal of the conviction. The court of appeals shall state in writing the reasons for its disposition of the review of the sentence. Any review of the sentence taken by the United States may be dismissed on a showing of the abuse of the right of the United States to take such review.

"SEC. 510. No limitation shall be placed on the information concerning the background, character and conduct of a person convicted of an offense which a court of the United States may receive and consider for the purpose of imposing an appropriate sentence under this Act.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation. There are four times more TV sets in the United States than any other nation in the world. There are over 89 million television receivers in the United States compared to 22 million in Japan, the second-ranked nation.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN L. McCLELLAN TO BLUECOATS, INC., AKRON, OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the Bluecoats organization of Summit County was created in 1959 by a volunteer group of citizens who were concerned with the well-being and morale of the uniformed protective services of our country.

The objective of the organization is to maintain funds to provide financial aid to the wives and dependents of policemen, firemen, and deputy sheriffs who become disabled or who lose their lives in line of duty.

I am very proud of my membership in this very fine group from Summit County, Ohio. Other cities have similar organizations.

These men whom we serve are almost daily risking their lives on our behalf. The concern that we show them cannot help but raise their morale. This is particularly beneficial during a period when they have been under physical attack by

some of the very people whom they are trying to assist.

Last Thursday, the Akron Bluecoats had their annual dinner at the Portage Country Club. The principal speaker at the banquet was a man who has done more for law and order than almost any other man in our history. Through the hearings that he has conducted and the legislation that he has initiated, he has slowed up the activities of organized crime.

I am speaking, of course, of U.S. Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN. I have valued the friendship of this great man and have followed his leadership in this most important field.

As I sat listening to his speech at the Akron Bluecoats' dinner I felt that my colleagues would be very interested in his remarks. I wish to associate myself with his commendation of our police forces.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN'S remarks follow:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN

We are now in the midst of a perilous period in our nation's history. Our country is in trouble; it is confronted with real dangers.

The greatest threat to our survival is not reposed in the missiles and bombs or in the armed might of any foreign foe. Although there is danger from that source—and I do not minimize it—our capacity and power of retaliation have served so far as an effective deterrent to any direct military attack upon us by any would-be aggressor. If we will continue to maintain a posture of defense adequate to repel such an attack, it is unlikely that any overt attempt will ever be made from without to conquer or destroy our country by force of arms.

I believe the greatest and more immediate danger to our national security stems from the criminal and subversive activities of enemies within.

More than 100 years ago, Abraham Lincoln said, "if danger ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad." He further said, "if destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher; as a nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide." History confirms that great nations are never conquered from the outside unless they become corrupt and subverted from within.

The wave of criminal behavior and the unrelenting assaults now being made on our society and constituted authority are moving us toward the brink of chaos and anarchy. These assaults have reached such momentum and gravity that they now compel urgent and profound national concern.

Lawlessness, violent dissension, and moral decay which pervade our land today have reached dimensions that portend open rebellion against society and the rule of law. The unprecedented rise in crime and the steady decline in effective law enforcement during the past decade present a most forbidding record—a record that is a reproach to our nation and to our modern civilization.

Crimes of rapacity and violence have spread until they blanket our nation. There is no sanctuary—no refuge—to which the citizen can repair for safety and for protection from criminal depredations.

Crimes today are committed everywhere with virtual impunity—in the streets and alleys, in our schools and churches, and in our homes and market places. Crime is in no way related to geography; it knows no boundaries. This growing rebellion against the rule of law threatens our internal security and endangers the survival of our country.

If, for the next 10 years, crime increases at the same rate that it has during the past decade, we will be inundated with an epidemic of lawlessness—the devastation and ravages of which the structure of our society cannot withstand and which the sovereignty of our government cannot survive.

Just as street crime is a threat to the security of our persons and property, equally menacing is the threat of organized crime to the stability of our economic system and to the integrity of government. So entrenched, cold-blooded, and powerful are the forces of organized crime that they have created outside of the law a veritable parasitic government that feeds like a leech on all segments of our economy and society.

* * * * * *

The decade of the sixties ended with crimes of violence up 131 percent. The decade of the seventies has been ushered in with a rash of diabolical and senseless bombings directed at government buildings, at public officials, and at educational, religious, and free enterprise institutions.

Some 5,000 bombings have occurred in the United States during the past 18 months. More than 1,200 of these were with high explosives bombs; the others were with incendiary devices. These bombings caused the deaths of at least 45 persons, injured more than 400 others, and resulted in property damage in excess of $25 million.

In addition to these actual bombings, some 35,000 bomb threats have been made. Some of these threats and bombings were, of course, committed by individual fanatics whose varied motivations possibly cannot be established. But, we know that many were incited and carried out under the direction and leadership of well-organized militant groups with malicious intent to commit sabotage and to instill fear and terror in the people and in the official "establishment" in the cities and communities where they occurred. I am convinced that many of these violent assaults are a phase of training for guerrilla warfare which self-styled revolutionaries are planning and intend to wage against our free society and constituted government.

These characteristic revolutionary tactics have also been resorted to by rioters and protestors to support causes, to protest alleged grievances, and to impose inordinate, unlawful, and non-negotiable demands. In fact, threats, violence, and blackmail are now instruments of common use to compel government, public officials, and our free institutions to be subservient to the will and demands of the anarchist and the mob.

There are those, too many, who seek to excuse and mitigate actual civil disobedience and crimes committed in the name of protest and dissent. But, violence and other unlawful acts are unacceptable and intolerable instruments for the advocacy of causes or as weapons of protest against rules of society or laws with which one disagrees.

Dissent is a precious right—a right that we all acknowledge and defend. But legitimate dissent does not warrant or excuse acts of arson, bombing, or violence to the property and person of another. Such actions wilfully perpetrated are crimes, and the dissenters and protestors who resort to such violent acts are law violators and should be dealt with swiftly and severely.

The right of dissent and protest does not carry with it a grant of privilege or license to violate the law or to interfere with or obstruct the legitimate rights of others.

* * * * * *

Today, the lawbreaker, in all categories—including the habitual criminal and the organized crime offender—enjoys greater immunity and protection than ever before. Only about one person out of every 20 who commits a major crime is ultimately convicted and punished. And, when they are punished, seldom are the sentences imposed commensurate with the gravity of the crimes committed.

This soft-sentencing practice is an important factor in the ever-widening gap between lawlessness and law and order. Lenient sentencing has definitely crippled the war on crime. Rising recidivism tells us that rehabilitation is seldom achieved. Upward of 75 percent of those arrested today are repeaters.

This gap is further widened by the growing inability of our police to solve many major crimes. While the overall-rate of crime was rising by 148 percent during the last 10 years, the rate of crime clearances, that is, crimes solved by law enforcement officials, declined by 32 percent.

Inordinate delays from time of arrest and indictment until trial are a mounting obstacle to the administration of justice. Most regrettably, many of these delays are occasioned by technicalities associated with "new rights" and procedural requirements that have been imposed by the Supreme Court on trial processes in criminal cases. As a result, in many jurisdictions, the criminal case docket has become so congested that it takes from a year to two years—and longer—to bring a serious criminal case to trial. During the long period of waiting for the trial to begin, the accused is usually free on bail with the opportunity to resume his criminal activities, and, too often, many do just that.

All of this stands in sharp contrast to the English system where the time from arrest to time of trial averages only six to eight weeks and another 30 to 60 days to final disposition on appeal. Obviously, there is urgent need to speed up the processes of justice and provide for quicker trials and final disposition of criminal cases.

Mr. Chief Justice Burger, in his recent State of the Judiciary address to the American Bar Association, underscored this problem and noted that it now takes twice as long as it did 10 years ago to dispose of criminal cases from indictment to sentence. This prolonged time is frequently compelled by reason of the "new rights" and technicalities to which I have just referred—and particularly to those associated with confessions, identifying witnesses, and evidence seized by the police.

I firmly believe that some Court decisions have been a contributing factor to the deterioration of law enforcement. And, I think it is unfortunate that the Supreme Court during this era of rising crime and turbulence has overruled and repudiated sound court precedents of long-standing and has reinterpreted and given strained construction and new meaning to many parts of the Constitution.

The Court has *contrived* "new constitutional rights" for the accused which have altered numerous evidentiary rules and law enforcement procedures. Many of these changes have served to make the police officer's job increasingly difficult and more dangerous.

My views on the effect of these Court decisions are shared by others—including past and present members of the Court itself. In 1967, Mr. Justice Harlan, in his dissenting opinion in *Berger vs. New York*, stated:

"Newly *contrived* constitutional rights have been established without any apparent concern for the empirical process that goes with legislative reform."

Later, when I used the word *"contrived"* in referring to certain rulings of the Court, I was taken to task by some of the liberal press and commentators. But, obviously, I did not originate the application of that terminology to Supreme Court decisions. A

member of the Court itself is apparently the author of it.

In reading many dissenting opinions of members of the Court, I find that they often use much harsher and more incisive language in criticizing the Court's opinions than I have ever used in commenting on the Court's precedent-shattering decisions.

Mr. Justice Harlan in that dissenting opinion further said:

"The Court has more and more taken to itself sole responsibility for setting the *pattern* for criminal law enforcement throughout the country."

Now, let us take a brief look at that "pattern" bearing in mind that the written Constitution has not changed—not one word of it. The meanings of its words have simply been unwisely reinterpreted by the Court and given new applications, in many instances, to overrule previous decisions and many sound precedents of long standing and to change the law of the land.

Statistics dramatically portray the picture. Out of 123 federal criminal cases decided by the Supreme Court—with a written opinion—during the past 10 years, 68 or 55 percent of them were reversed. Out of 146 state criminal cases so decided by the Supreme Court during that same period of time, 114 or 78 percent of them were reversed. That "pattern"—that record—it seems to me, leaves much to be desired, for I can hardly believe that our Federal Circuit Judges and our State Supreme Court Judges, respectively, are that unqualified and incompetent as to warrant such wholesale reversal of their decisions.

Two new members—including a Chief Justice—have been appointed to the Court within the last year. In due time, no doubt, other changes on the Court will occur. I am encouraged that the changes thus far are for the better.

As evidence of this, it is significant to note that during the last term of the Warren Court (1968–69) the Court heard and decided 26 appeals in criminal cases. The government—the prosecution—won only eight (or 31 percent) of them; 18 (or 69 percent) of them were reversed. Quite in contrast, during the first term of the Burger Court (1969–70), the Court heard and decided 29 appeals in criminal cases. The government—the prosecution—won 18 (or 62 percent) of these. Percentagewise, this represents 100 percent improvement over the previous year under the Warren Court.

This marked improvement certainly gives promise that the judicial pendulum is beginning to swing back towards a better balance of justice as between the rights of the criminal and the protection of society. This change may well indicate that the activism and false liberalism which so often characterized some of the Court's decisions during the past few years are diminishing and hopefully are being abandoned.

* * * * *

Although some of the Court's decisions may have frustrated and weakened law enforcment, they certainly are not the basic causes of criminal behavior.

Many socio-economic factors can be identified as causes of crime; such as poverty, overcrowded living conditions, unemployment, lack of education, broken homes, exposure to violence in movies and on television, drug addiction, and many others. These causes do exist in varying degrees. They, of course, should receive the attention of both government and society and should be removed or ameliorated wherever possible. In fact, the Federal Government is now spending some $40 to $50 billion annually on programs directed to problems in those areas.

But, some of these factors are too often magnified and exaggerated as major causes of crime. For, today, we have greater affluence and less poverty in America than ever before. We have better housing, more conveniences, and greater educational and economic opportunities than ever before. We had much, much less crime half a century ago—even a quarter of a century ago—when poverty was far more prevalent than it is now. And, certainly, we cannot blame poverty, overcrowded living conditions, unemployment, and such other factors for the lawless behavior and rioting of college students or for the revolutionary bombings and violent activities of such organizations as the Black Panthers, and the Students for a Democratic Society and their bomb-throwing offspring, The Weatherman.

I believe the major cause of crime and lawlessness with which we are today afflicted is more basic and goes deeper. It stems primarily from the failure of the homes, the schools, and the churches to instill into our youth high ideals and standards of moraltiy and decency and a stronger sense of citizenship obligation.

These are the institutions where discipline, respect for authority, concepts of individual responsibility, and a sense of duty to God, to country, and to our fellowman are first instilled into the hearts of minds of our children. The void created by these failures is too often filled today with an attitude of disrespect, permissiveness, cynicism, and a callousness that borders on nihilism. Unfortunately, however, those would-be nihilists of this generation offer no constructive alternative. They offer only disruption, chaos, anarchy, and destruction.

* * * * *

In addition to authorizing and funding many programs to remove or ameliorate those social and economic factors that are often cited as causes of crime, the Congress is also enacting new laws to improve and strengthen our law enforcement processes and procedures.

In 1968, Congress enacted the Omnibus Safe Streets and Crime Control Act. Title I of that Act provides for federal financial assistance to states and units of local governments. We appropriated $63 million for that purpose in 1969, $268 million for Fiscal 1970, and we will appropriate $480 million for Fiscal 1971. Within the next three to five years, this appropriation item is expected to exceed $1 billion dollars annually. It will be another four or five years before this program will come into full fruition, but by reason of this federal assistance, we will soon have better trained, better equipped, and more efficient law enforcement officials throughout the nation.

Title III of that Act provides for court-authorized and carefully controlled use of wiretaps and electronic surveillance. This Title of the bill was bitterly contested in the Senate but finally adopted by an overwhelming vote of 68 to 12. The opposition contended that this Title would legalize promiscuous snooping and the invasion of privacy of American citizens. These fears and predictions have in no way materialized. The former Attorney General, as you know, spurned this Title of the Act and refused to use it. Fortunately, however, the present Administration is making forceful and effective use of it.

During the first 18 months of this Administration, 136 court orders have been procured for wiretapping or electronic surveillance. One hundred thirty-three of these were executed. Of that 133, 121 were successful and productive, resulting in 419 arrests and 325 persons being indicted to date. Results achieved from only just a few of those court-approved wiretaps are:

(1) 124 pounds of heroin worth $8 million were seized.

(2) Two separate numbers rackets rings opearting in 60 different locations in Midwestern States were broken up with the seizure of gambling records and paraphernalia and $50,000 in cash.

(3) A half million dollars worth of stolen bonds was recovered.

(4) Plans for murder and a bank robbery were overheard which alerted officials and enabled them to prevent the murder and to apprehend the robbers and recover the stolen money immediately following the robbery.

(5) In the Nation's Capital, the police made a successful raid recovering large quantities of drugs and arrested 44 individuals, including a lawyer, a policeman, a real estate agent, a dentist, a wholesale distributor of drugs, and two members of the Mafia who imported the drugs.

(Incidentally, members of the Cosa Nostra or other organized crime groups were involved in all of these operations.)

Thus, the effectiveness of this statute in the war on organized crime is now firmly established. And, to date, contrary to predictions, there has not been reported a single instance of abuse or misuse of the authority and the power that the Act confers.

* * * * *

On January 23rd of this year, the Senate passed by a record vote of 73 to 1, S. 30, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1969. Since that time, 22 Senators who were absent and not voting have announced their support for the measure. It deals primarily with evidence-gathering and trial processes in organized crime cases. Among other things, it revamps the grand jury system, permits the securing of testimony in certain instances over the objections of self-incrimination, permits the taking of depositions of witnesses who may be in danger of reprisals, provides new anti-gambling measures, provides for the application of anti-trust type remedies to organized crime's infiltration of legitimate businesses, and provides for increased punishment for habitual, professional, and organized crime offenders.

Notwithstanding Attorney General Mitchell has termed this bill "one of the most imaginative and comprehensive proposals to combat organized crime ever introduced in the Congress"; notwithstanding many of the provisions of the bill were recommended by the President's Crime Commission; notwithstanding the bill has the endorsement of the National Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Counties, National Association of Chiefs of Police, and the American Bar Association; and notwithstanding this law is urgently needed; the bill has been languishing in the House Judiciary Committe now for more than seven months. The public interest and the safety and protection of American citizens require that the House process and pass this measure without further procrastination and delay.

Incidentally, the same forces who fought the wiretap and electronic surveillance provision of the Omnibus Crime Bill are today bitterly opposing S. 30. These forces were wrong when they fought the Omnibus Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, and they are just as wrong now in opposing this Organized Crime Control Act.

The passage of this bill means that the Congress will have given a new chest of modern tools—effective tools—to law enforcement agencies with which to protect society from the violence and depredations of professional criminals. Certainly, its enactment will greatly increase the probability that the professional gangsters and racketeers, the illegal narcotic distributors, and the members of organized crime rings and gambling syndicates will be apprehended, tried, convicted, and punished for their nefarious crimes.

The Senate, I am proud to say, has fully measured up to and met its responsibility. The Administration favors and is strongly supporting the bill. The American people

have a right to ask and to expect the House of Representatives to act promptly and favorably in adding these vital new weapons to the arsenal of law enforcement.

* * * * *

Our sheriffs and their deputies, our policemen on the streets, and, quite frequently, our municipal firemen are on the front line of resistance to criminal assaults. They are the primary target of the law violators, the subversives, and the revolutionaries. They are required to do their jobs in an atmosphere of growing resentment and hostility. They are our firing line defenders who must bear the brunt of verbal abuse and physical attacks of those who are seeking to undermine and destroy our system. They are compelled to endure the epithet, "Pigs," and the vile profanities and obscenities that ring in their ears. It is they who are expected to sustain and bear without retaliation the vulgar insults of the vandal, the arsonist, and the rioter and then be subjected to a false and malicious charge of "police brutality." It is they who under trying circumstances and ordeal must keep their "cool." In other words, they are expected to keep their heads when all about them are losing theirs and blaming them for the disorders and violence at hand.

To the dedicated, courageous, and faithful police officers of our nation, we all owe a heavy debt of gratitude. That debt is an obligation that law-abiding citizens can only partially pay by giving to them unstinting cooperation, moral support, and good will.

Time is running out. We must restore law and order in America. To do this, we must make available to our law enforcement agencies all legal weapons that can be fashioned within the framework of the Constitution. We must stop pampering the perpetrators of violence, stop coddling criminals, and stop condoning crime. I believe that the right of the citizen to be safe transcends the right of the criminal to be free. We can never have safe streets and safe homes, nor will our free institutions be secured, until we get the anarchists, the habitual criminals, and other felons off the streets and in the jails where they belong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALPERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the catastrophic events in recent days in the Middle East give all of us cause for great anxiety and concern. The outlook is dark and grim. The showdown is here and our Government can no longer make the mistakes of the past.

Israelis are disillusioned because it is now clear that the United States was not adequately prepared to monitor the cease-fire as closely as it promised Israel it would. The Egyptian-Soviet axis brazenly violated the standstill and positioned many SA–2 missiles in the prohibited 32-mile zone west of the Suez. The new sites are within 11 miles of the canal and the Egyptians may now aim at Israel planes 12½ miles east of the canal.

Indeed, many now suspect that Egypt accepted the cease-fire to gain a breathing spell for her army and to mass materiel and manpower, in preparation for military and diplomatic pressures to force Israel's capitulation to ultimata when the 90-day truce ends.

I would like to outline six steps that should be taken immediately by the United States.

One. The United States must demand that the United Arab Republic and Soviet missile troops withdraw new weapons systems installed in the area of the Suez Canal in violation of the 90-day cease-fire. The United States was the initiator of this cease-fire and gave Israel solemn assurances that Israel's security would not be compromised. Yet, these assurances proved worthless when Russian-Egyptian missiles were moved forward in violation of the standstill agreement. This step must be taken to lend credibility to the U.S. role on the eve of the visit to the United States of Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir who is due here this week, September 17.

Second. The United States must move at once to rectify the present imbalance which menaces Israel and encourages the Arab to continue belligerency. This should be done by the grant of arms and provision of easy credit long-term loans covering other arms. Phantom jet aircraft should be delivered immediately from existing reserve stocks of the U.S. Air Force in West Germany. So should the latest electronic countermeasure devices to cope with the missiles. It is also essential that Israel receive the best available American tanks, improved Hawk missile systems, and other arms without delay. This is the least that the United States can do to balance the new situation created by the Soviet Union in addition to the deterioration of the situation in Jordan and Lebanon. It is the only way to deter even more volatile Arab aggression.

Third. The time has come to advocate a United States-Israel defense pact. Since Soviet troops now confront Israel at the Suez Canal, the risk of miscalculation is apparent. To deter the Russians from incorrectly assessing American intentions, it is essential that the United States spell out in contractual form the commitment of our country not to permit the Soviet Union to unleash its own forces against Israel. This may avert Russian involvement that may escalate and lead to world war III and the nuclear destruction of the world.

Fourth. The United States must respond vigorously to Arab hijacking. In addition to placing armed guards aboard American commercial aircraft, we must dramatize to the Arab states that we will not tolerate collaboration with the terrorists. Oh, sure some Arab regimes disavow the acts of terrorists. But they are just as responsible for the devastation wrought by the so-called liberationists. They allow terrorists camps and commando training to flourish openly in their lands and allowed them to flaunt their threats and attacks on Israel. So, when Egypt and Lebanon plead innocent to responsibility for the hijackings they are just as guilty as the actual perpetrators. We should discontinue all flights to Beirut and Cairo. We should deny admission to the United States to the aircraft of any nation that serves nations that harbor pirates. We should embargo delivery of airliners ordered here by Arab states.

Fifth. We should propose an international convention at the Hauge to draft a treaty or unlawful seizure to provide the apprehension, prosecution or extradition of hijackers and make any nation that collaborates or harbors air pirates as violators of international law subject to appropriate sanctions.

Sixth. A congressional joint resolution should be offered to insist that all passengers on American ships and aircraft be afforded the full protection of the American flag regardless of the religion and nationality of such passengers. Such resolution would provide for all measures necessary, including use of military force, to rescue persons hijacked or kidnapped when they enjoyed the protection of the American flag aboard U.S. aircraft or ships.

The time for talking about these proposals is past. We must act now.

INVITATION FOR ACTION AGAINST ORGANIZED CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the people of this country, who shoulder the burden of the billion dollar a year cost of organized crime, and whose mental and emotional suffering at the hands of the crime lords cannot be measured in dollars and cents, I have today filed a discharge petition on House Resolution 1169. This resolution will provide for 4 hours general debate. It will provide an opportunity for every Member to vote on meaningful legislation for dealing with the nationwide problems of organized crime.

If this petition attains the necessary 218 signatures, it will bring to the floor our bill, H.R. 18279, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970. This bill is essentially and substantially the same as the bill S. 30, which passed the Senate and has been before our Committee on the Judiciary since January. All of my colleagues who have done their homework are familiar with the provisions of that bill.

This is the first time in my years here that I have sponsored a discharge petition. But the need for the legislation to which this petition is attached is so great, the conditions which it would help correct need correction so badly and the hour of this legislative session so late as to justify drastic procedures if they are necessary for dealing with the far-reaching effects of the multiple sins committed by organized crime rings against the people of this Nation.

In the past 2 years we have passed and then improved and enlarged upon legislation for dealing with crime in the streets. I am confident that establishment of the Law Enforcement Assistance Agency and increasing its funding for the various responsibilities bestowed upon LEAA will go far toward reducing the number of robberies, muggings, burglaries, and other crimes of local and regional nature.

But that fine law does not go nearly far enough. It does little if anything at all to strike at the sophistication of the big business of organized crime, which has branch operations and ruthless representatives and practitioners in nearly every city and town in the country. It is

this kind of crime that has supported the horrendous growth of the drug traffic that is wrecking the lives of countless thousands of young people. This is the only form of crime that can finance and run widespread, syndicated gambling and loan sharking operations that take away the earnings of America's working people. This is the form of crime that puts together and executes complex schemes for wrecking small- and medium-sized banks, or it can and does invade the ranks of legitimate business for acquiring a facade behind which its far-reaching illegal activities can be masked. It is such forms of crime to which the provisions of my bill are directed.

I ask my colleagues to join me in signing this petition, which will enable us, as their Representatives in Congress, to respond to the cries of innocent victims in our home districts and all across the Nation for legislation with which to fight the insidious growth and effects of organized crime.

As I pointed out in the beginning, my bill is similar to the bill S. 30. About the only major difference is that I have eliminated the special grand jury provisions contained in title I of the Senate-passed bill. It has been asserted by those who say they are reluctant to see S. 30 clear the Judiciary Committee, that many of its provisions are of questionable constitutionality. May I once again point out that their concern is for the constitutional rights of those individuals whose past histories and relationship to the evidence at hand bring them under suspicion and perhaps arrest for crime against the community. And may I assert as strongly they will give us the crime bills which the Senate has sent over to them.

The people may criticize the Senate for its lateness in handling the money bills for fiscal 1971, which began 10 weeks ago. But the people will forgive and no real harm will have been done when we pass continuing resolutions for financing the Government, as we have done so many times in recent years.

But if there is no action for dealing with organized crime, then the people will also criticize the House, but they will not forgive us. And we will be solely to blame for the continuing drug addictions, the new addictions, and the loss of life and wrecked homes attributable to this segment of crime. The continuing prosperity of extortion rackets, graft in high places in Government, and all the other divisions of organized crime's great department store chain will be the gift of our inaction.

The July 1970 issue of the Reader's Digest, page 71, carried a comprehensive, factually documented story of how the Mafia's power, greed, and ruthlessness nearly ruined one of America's largest industries, the 4,700-store A. & P. food chain. With murder, arson, and other unprincipled devices as their tools, organized crime laid siege to this company in their efforts to force the stocking of an inferior Cosa Nostra made detergent. The final paragraph of that article is as follows:

That Mafia mobsters using extortion, labor racketeering and outright violence have been able to bring the world's largest food retailer to the brink of disaster demonstrates the grave imbalance in our system between criminal conspirators and law enforcement. Yet, for over a year, the House Judiciary Committee has bottled up the Senate-passed Organized Crime Control Act earnestly requested in 1969 by President Nixon.

The article tells its readers that a letter to their Congressman demanding as possible that for much too long the pendulum in this matter of constitutional protection has swung in the wrong direction. If it is impossible for a committee of this Congress to find an equal balance between the constitutional rights of criminals and those accused of crime and the rights of those who are victimized or threatened by criminal activities, then I must cast my lot on the side of crime's victims and potential victims.

In the case of the accused, there is the protection of a vast judicial network, extending all the way to the Supreme Court. But for the victim or potential victim under our present laws, there is nothing but physical and mental suffering and financial loss and disaster while crime's overlords bask in the freedom provided them through the quibbling over constitutional rights. So I put it to you, my fellow colleagues who represent the people of the United States: Do you want to continue the protection provided for the crime masters of the country through our failure to act, or will you sign this petition even if it entails the risk of shifting the balance of constitutional protection from the criminal to his victim?

In the other body last month a colloquy occurred between the majority and minority leader on their legislative accomplishments. In the spirit of fairness, the majority leader said:

The Members of the House must be given credit (in the timeliness with which appropriations bills have been passed), although in all candor we should point out that the Senate is way ahead of the House insofar as crime, drug and pornographic legislation is concerned.

The minority leader responded:

I would say with great respect that the other body (the House) should have acted on the crime bills because the need is great and the opportunity exists to do something about coping with the high incidence of crime.

Perhaps when Members of the other body go back to the people they will find that the people are worried—they will discover that this fear is real, that the need is great and the necessity is urgent; so that perhaps action before the House adjourns will be helpful. The article concludes with these words:

For until law enforcers' pleas for more manpower and legal weapons are heeded, no American family is beyond the reach of Mafia muscle.

There is an element of extreme emergency in the filing of a discharge petition. But there is extremeness in the pleas of frightened Americans all over the country in their justifiable fears over the growth of crime. There is a tone of urgency or rather emergency in their pleas for relief from this plague. Your signature on discharge petition No. 8 will be a positive response to the country's demands for better law enforcement and and the improvement in handling of criminal cases.

ANGKOR WAT IN PERIL

(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, the danger to Angkor Wat remains unabated. As recently as September 10, the New York Times reported that Communists and Cambodian Government troops were involved in a day-long battle near Angkor Wat, and that, and I quote:

13 Cambodian soldiers and at least 13 enemy soldiers had been killed in the fighting at the Angkor temples.

It was on July 16 that I first called the attention of this House to the fact that the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict, which would affect Angkor Wat and protect it, if abided by, has not been submitted by the President to the Senate for ratification. Since that time, I have again been in correspondence with the White House on this subject and would like to supplement the information of this House by setting forth that correspondence.

The reason given by the White House for not submitting to the Senate the Hague Convention for ratification is, and I quote: "because of certain military and security considerations raised by the Department of Defense." That the White House would offer such a reason for not submitting the convention is most alarming. Fifty-eight countries other than the United States have ratified the treaty. Is it not important that we lead in this matter, not only from the point of view of saving worldwide architectural and cultural treasures from despoliation and destruction during the course of war but also from the point of view of simple morality governing our relations with other countries.

I urge the Members of this House and the public at large to write to the President requesting him to immediately submit the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict to the Senate for ratification. Not to do so places this country in the same immoral position now held by North and South Vietnam, namely, the disregard for the protection of monuments of great and earlier civilizations threatened with destruction.

Correspondence follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 21, 1970.

Hon. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: This is in further response to your letter concerning the security of Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom in Cambodia and the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

We have now looked into the matter more carefully. The Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict was signed at the Hague on May 14, 1954 by 51 countries including the United States. The Convention and accompanying Protocol entered into force on August 7,

1956. At present, some 58 countries have become parties to the Convention by ratification or accession.

The United States played a prominent role in the formulation of the Convention. The Convention is based on the principle that cultural property is entitled to the respect similar to that accorded by civilized nations to citizens, prisoners of war, medical personnel and hostages and designed to minimize the risk of destruction of cultural property. However, the United States did not submit the Convention to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification because of certain military and security considerations raised by the Department of Defense. The advisability of submitting the Convention for the advice and consent of the Senate has been reviewed periodically since 1957 by the Secretaries of Defense without any change of position.

In practice, since the promulgation of General Order No. 100 in 1863, the United States military forces have been legally bound to protect cultural property in the event of armed conflict. For example, we are parties to the Hague Convention of 1899 and 1907 respecting the laws and customs of war on land and the Hague Convention of 1907 respecting bombardment by naval forces in time of war (IX), and the 1935 Washington Pact for the Protection of Artistic and Scientific Institutions and of Historic Documents (Roerich Pact). The Army Basic Field Manual (FM 27–19) on the rules of land warfare specifically forbids the destruction or seizure of any property "unless such destruction or seizure be imperatively demanded by the necessities of war."

In the hostilities in the Middle East and Cambodia, the U.S. Government officially supports the efforts of UNESCO and private organizations to protect cultural property under the Hague Convention. U.S. military forces involved in the Cambodian action had been instructed to avoid damaging cultural, religious and historic documents and buildings. We recognize the monuments at Angkor Wat and other Khmer monuments as major treasures of humanity as well as of the Cambodian people.

In view of the foregoing, it is not believed that it would be in the interest of the United States Government at this time to submit the Hague Convention to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification or for the United States Government to ratify the Convention. There have been no material changes in circumstances since the last consideration was given to it in 1963.

If you believe there is any other information I can provide on this matter, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 25, 1970.

Hon. WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I have your letter of August 21st and I appreciate your giving such care in looking into the matter of the Hague Convention's approval, but I found your conclusion to be something of a nonsequitur. For several paragraphs you outlined the various treaties we have signed giving protection to the world's art treasures as well as military policies generally forbidding the destruction or seizure of such properties. But, you conclude by saying, "In view of the foregoing, it is not believed that it would be in the interest of the United States Government at this time to submit the Hague Convention to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification or for the United States Government to ratify the Convention."

I fail to find an argument against its ratification other than your brief statement that the Convention has not been submitted to the Senate for ratification "because of certain military and security considerations raised by the Department of Defense"—on which you elaborated no further. It can hardly be a surprise that the Defense Department would resist a restriction of their military freedom, just as it has a propensity for keeping outdated trivia under "top secret" classification. But, such resistance should be examined in the broader diplomatic as well as military context, and the protection that our ratification would effect for the temples, not through arms but through the force of worldwide public opinion. Surely, if 58 countries other than the United States have been able to ratify the treaty, it cannot be so incumbering that it would imperil our troops or country's security.

I should appreciate your advising me what "military and security considerations" the Department raised—and I would urge that further consideration be given to this matter.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI WILL NOT TOLERATE CAMPUS VIOLENCE

(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, when I attended the University of Missouri, college was an opportunity to prepare for a useful and rewarding life. Those of us who had this opportunity felt an obligation to use it constructively.

We did not go to college to avoid the draft or to live off of our parents or just to postpone our entry into the world of business or the professions. We did not go to college to interfere with the rights of others to learn or with the duty of the faculty to teach.

Today thousands of students who attend college for constructive purposes rather than destructive ones, who study to improve our society and way of life, not to destroy or mutilate it, are back on campuses in my native State of Missouri.

These serious students are not going to be harried and intimidated by the radical, violent minority of students and hangers-on who have caused other universities to grind to a halt.

Dr. John C. Weaver, president of the University of Missouri, which has campuses at Columbia, Kansas City, Rolia, and St. Louis, has sent his alumni a letter with enclosures which describes a fair, firm and commonsense program of dealing with campus disruption and violence.

As valuable guidance for others faced with this problem I am making Dr. Weaver's letter and the accompanying statement a part of my remarks at this point:

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI,
September 5, 1970.

DEAR ALUMNUS: As an alumnus of the University of Missouri you will be interested in having some specific facts regarding plans to see that the University performs its function of providing quality education.

As you know, colleges and universities throughout America in recent months and years have been caught up in a swirl of problems and controversies which have led to protests, demonstrations and sometimes violence.

In light of the serious difficulties experienced by many other colleges and universities, we believe citizens have a right to be proud of the record achieved so far at the University of Missouri by the students, faculty, administration and Board of Curators. While there have been some instances of minor dissent and threatened disruption on our campuses in recent years, the University has continued its normal operations without violence and without major disturbances.

It is our purpose and desire, as I am sure it is yours, that the University do everything possible to maintain orderly campuses that will provide a proper educational atmosphere. To accomplish this purpose we are taking three steps:

(1) We reaffirm the position outlined by me and adopted by the Board of Curators on June 30, 1968. The full text of that statement is attached.

(2) Also attached is a statement of University policy on dissent and protest adopted by the Board of Curators at its meeting on September 5, 1970, including the responsibility of the faculty on holding classes; giving of grades only for work accomplished; and adherence to the academic calendar with no recess for political activity or protest.

(3) At my request each campus has established a council composed of students, faculty, administrators and members of the Board of Curators to make plans for preventing disruption or violence and to act in an advisory and communication capacity in case some disruption actually occurs.

I am sure you understand that there are persons who are not members of the student body or staff of the University who may attempt to cause interference with the operation of the University. We shall take appropriate measures to deal with these people within the best of our ability and resources.

The University needs and solicits your understanding and support. Anything you can do to help in seeing that these policies are understood or in preventing disruption will be a major contribution to the educational process of the University of Missouri. I am sure I can depend upon you to do everything possible.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. WEAVER,
President.

STATEMENT BY DR. JOHN C. WEAVER, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, AS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF CURATORS, JUNE 30, 1968

The University of Missouri will at all times defend the right of free expression of opinion, including the right of peaceful assembly. The University will, indeed, guard this right in behalf of all persons associated with the institution and will not tolerate actions by any individual or group that would seek to restrict the appropriate freedoms of any other individual or group. The University will not allow any unauthorized occupation of University facilities, nor will it permit any interference with its normal and regular activities. Discussion of issues within the University will in no circumstances be conducted under any form of duress. Attempts at unacceptable building occupation or interference with University business will be dealt with in a manner necessary immediately to relieve the situation. Any faculty, students or employees engaged in such activities, will face immediate suspension and may suffer ultimate dismissal.

STATEMENT ON PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES, PROTEST, AND POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

(Approved by the University of Missouri Board of Curators on September 5, 1970)

In a community of learning, willful disruption of the educational process, destruc-

tion of property, and interference with the rights of other members of the community will not be permitted.

Academic and administrative procedures of this University provide for prompt and appropriate disciplinary action against those who abuse such rights as provided in the statement by the President regarding student demonstrations adopted by the Board of Curators on June 30, 1968. That statement as well as the Standard of Conduct and Rules of Procedure in Student Disciplinary matters is available to all students.

Classes will continue as usual throughout the campaign and election. There will be no recess from the normal and routine operations on any of the campuses and already approved academic calendars will be fully maintained on each campus.

We endorse the statement submitted August 26, 1970, suggested by a special committee of the Inter-campus Faculty Council charged by the President with the development of a statement on faculty responsibility, as follows:

"The Board of Curators and the Faculty affirm their intention of keeping the University of Missouri in full operation throughout the coming academic year. The Board expects that the faculty will meet their professional obligations in accordance with already existing regulations and principles of academic responsibility regarding the meeting of classes and the awarding of grades and credit.

"The Board of Curators hereby charges the faculty to re-examine and re-affirm its professional responsibilities and to develop procedures for dealing with cases in which those responsibilities are not fulfilled. We ask that this task be completed with full faculty consultation and with reasonable speed.

"Until each campus develops a full set of procedures for dealing with alleged violations of professional ethics, the Board charges each campus faculty governing body to establish immediately a temporary group for handling such cases as may arise."

The Board of Curators recognizes that any definition of faculty responsibility developed by a faculty group or groups on any campus must provide that the initial and primary responsibility for the effective function of the academic unit, including disciplinary action, resides in the administrative officers of the department, division, school or college.

Students, faculty, administrators and employees who are not in sympathy with the basic philosophy expressed herein and do not intend to abide by the rules and regulations of the University should not attend the University nor become associated with the institution nor continue to be associated with the University.

The University of Missouri is a land grant institution. I know that it is fashionable in some self-proclaimed intellectual circles to sneer at land grant colleges as "cow colleges."

Recently, a university in the East held an orientation program to inform its students on how to conduct themselves and to obtain an education at that institution. As a part of this official program an invited speaker was an attorney, William M. Kunstler, who tours the country inciting violence when he is not defending those accused of criminal acts. Mr. Kunstler has defended among others the so-called Chicago Seven where defendants and their counsel sought with some success to degrade the process of justice and turn a courtroom into a carnival.

Mr. Kunstler told the students that "burning the ROTC buildings" is a part of free speech guaranteed by our Constitution. Press accounts do not indicate that this outrageous statement was challenged either by the president of the university or by any member of its law faculty.

This muddle-headed approach to higher education is in sharp contrast to the sensible rules and guidelines in effect at the University of Missouri. I believe that many of my fellow Members will agree with me and also with the academic leadership at the University of Missouri that arson is not an essential ingredient of freedom of speech.

America has traditionally looked to public education to train our young to make democracy and the American way of life a living refutation of those who advocate dictatorship and repression.

The abuse of freedom that is officially nurtured on some campuses endangers this tradition and imperils our society.

I am proud to say that the public universities of my State are still producing enlightened citizens who carry the torch of freedom rather than the torch of anarchy.

As a matter of fact, Missouri does have an outstanding college of agriculture. We are proud of the State's dairy industry, but it should be added that the university pioneered in journalistic education and is currently pioneering in an innovative medical education program. It has long striven for academic excellence as well as to provide the opportunity for a higher education to the sons and daughters of State who cannot afford to attend expensive private schools.

I would suggest that those education administrators who condone violence or wring their hands helplessly might be helped by learning about the standards of conduct set by my alma mater.

Finally, at a time when some bureaucrats in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare seem bent on pouring a bottomless coffer of grants and other funds into institutions which harbor violence and give academic credit for the kind of "education" picked up on the streets and alleys of the slums and in jails and penitentiaries, we in Congress might appropriately ask why more is not done for the institutions of higher learning whose faculty and student body are composed of loyal, hard-working patriots.

Some may consider it old-fashioned to go to college to learn and to attend an institution which puts evolution ahead of revolution, but I am proud to be among those who say that America needs more, not fewer, institutions such as the University of Missouri.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S CONTRACT COMPLIANCE PROGRAM A FAILURE: THE McDONNELL-DOUGLAS CONTRACT

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, when the military procurement authorization bill was before the House, I offered an amendment requiring that prior to the awarding of any contract under that bill, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights would have to approve it as being in conformity with Executive Order 11246, which prohibits discrimination on the part of all Federal contractors and requires that they take affirmative action to hire, employ, and promote employees without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin. My amendment also provided that there be conformity with Executive Order No. 11375, which expands coverage to discrimination on account of sex.

That amendment was defeated. It was defeated despite the record of ignorance, negligence, and even willful disregard of the Executive orders which have so characterized Defense Department contracts. It was defeated despite the fact that the Defense Department is the largest contractor within the Federal Government, and that its effective implementation of these Executive orders would constitute a veritable revolution in civil rights.

As I said on the floor that day, enforcement of the equal employment opportunity program by the Department of Defense was deficient with regard to three textile firms early last year—Dan River Mills, Burlington Industries, and J. P. Stevens & Co. It was deficient with regard to the Department of the Navy's award of $128 million worth of contracts to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Co. of Pascagoula, Miss. It was deficient with regard to the implementation of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co. plan.

I also referred in my speech in support of my amendment to the McDonnell-Douglas Aircraft Corp., which had been awarded a contract to build the F–15 jet fighter. Unfortunately, I could not disclose at that time the full extent of my knowledge regarding the company's affirmative active plan, and could only note that preaward contract procedures had not been followed in order to insure full compliance with equal opportunity standards.

But the facts concerning the McDonnell-Douglas contract situation are now public. On August 27, the Washington Post carried a story headlined "Anti-Bias Plan Called Deficient." This story reported the findings of the staff of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights regarding the McDonnell-Douglas affirmative action plan. I will include this newspaper article in the RECORD, so that it may be read in full.

Actually, the Washington Post's story is mild, for while mentioning some of the deficiencies in the McDonnell-Douglas plan, it fails to quote from what can only be described as a devastating conclusion by the Commission's staff. I am including the full text of the report of the staff of the Civil Rights Commission with this statement and so will not attempt to detail the deficiencies which it pointed out. I would like, however, to quote from the report's conclusion, because this, more starkly, more compellingly, and more distressingly than anything I could say reveals the duplicity in the Defense Department's administration of a program mandated by Presi-

dential order and by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The conclusion states:

Judged in terms of what reasonably could be expected of the management of the McDonnell Douglas Corporation, its affirmative action plan is extremely disappointing . . .

The completeness and clarity with which contractors are required to commit themselves to compliance with Executive Order 11246, would be no less than in other aspects of contract performance. Measured by this standard, also, the plan is inordinately vague, leaving far too much to future determination or to Company discretion.

I want to particularly emphasize the following paragraph of the conclusion for, with brevity and clarity, it offers indisputable support for the amendment which I offered to the military procurement authorization bill this past May:

There is no justification for the Department of Defense permitting serious, and remediable, deficiencies such as those described above, in the affirmative action plans of McDonnell Douglas or of other defense contractors.

The very serious nature of the McDonnell Douglas affair is compounded by the fact that the McDonnell-Douglas affirmative action plan was among the first negotiated and approved by the Defense Department under the detailed affirmative action plan requirements promulgated by the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance—the supposed overseer of the contract compliance program—on January 30, 1970 (41 C.F.R. 60–2)—9 days before the McDonnell-Douglas Corp adopted this plan. Again, I quote from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights' staff memorandum to highlight the seminal importance of this particular affirmative action plan:

These deficiencies are especially significant if, as is understood to be the case, the Department of Defense proposed to use the McDonnell Douglas plan as a prototype in bringing the affirmative action plans of all other defense contractors into conformity with detailed affirmative action plan requirements promulgated by OFCC on January 30, 1970 (41 C.F.R. 60–2).

It is the height of hypocrisy to provide $20 billion to buy missiles and aircraft and tanks for the Pentagon, when the hundreds of thousands of blacks, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and American Indians who serve in our Armed Forces and who will man this equipment, cannot even receive the Federal Government's protection in assuring equal employment opportunity in those plants and facilities manufacturing this materiel.

It is particularly ironic that the very company which has implemented this particular paper affirmative action plan will receive $370 million on its F–15 jet fighter contract under the military procurement authorization bill. We have millions for weapons, but not even administrative dedication to fairness for those who might, given the opportunity, obtain a job in defense contractors' plants.

The point of my presentation of this material is to make very clear that the contract compliance program has, so far as the Department of Defense is concerned, been merely a sop for the economically oppressed. Substantively, it is a shell. And this is unconscionable.

The news report from the Washington Post, and the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights staff, follow:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1970]

ANTI-BIAS PLAN CALLED DEFICIENT

The staff of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has found "serious deficiencies" in the latest plan of McDonnell Douglas Corp. for eliminating discrimination in employment practices.

The plan was submitted and approved by the Defense Department office of contract compliance last February after a commission hearing in St. Louis last January disclosed short-comings in an earlier plan.

The commission staff report, forwarded to the Defense Department, said the new plan represents a significant step forward but fails to present enough specific information to permit the contractor's obligations to be effectively enforced.

The plan, the report said, fails to provide current and projected racial employment totals for each job classification in its St. Louis area facilities.

It fails, the report said, to set goals and commitments beyond Feb. 1971, although significant increases in employment due to the company's multi-billion dollar contract for F15 fighter planes are not projected until 1975 and later.

Appraisal of hiring and upgrading goals is made difficult, the staff said, by failure to give position descriptions and salaries for various job classifications.

The plan further, it said, makes no commitments to seek modification of union security agreements.

In job training, the commission staff said the plan fails to make adequate commitment to upgrade minority employees at lower levels of employment.

STAFF MEMORANDUM: CRITIQUE OF MCDONNELL DOUGLAS CORPORATION, AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PLAN OF FEBRUARY 9, 1970[1]

The Commission's St. Louis hearing, held January 15–17, 1970, disclosed that the McDonnell Douglas Corporation's then current affirmative action plan, applicable to its facilities in the St. Louis area, in many respects failed to meet the requirements of regulations (41 CFR 60–1) issued by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC) under Executive Order 11246. Principal deficiencies of the plan included the following:

(a) There was no analysis of minority group employment, as required by OFCC regulations;

(b) the plan did not provide in detail the specific steps to be taken to achieve equal employment opportunity, as required by OFCC regulations;

(c) the plan did not provide specific goals and time tables for bringing more minority group persons into areas where there are presently few employed, as required by OFCC regulations; and,

(d) the plan did not provide for an acceptable sensitivity training program, as required by Department of Defense contract compliance officials following their earlier reviews of the Company program.

---

[1] Deletions were made from original text to preserve the confidential status of unreleased portions of the McDonnell Douglas Corporation's Affirmative Action Plan. These deletions are indicated throughout the text by three asterisks.

The text contained in brackets, indicates the response to the Commissions' criticisms, as quoted from a June 5, 1970 letter of Arthur Fletcher, Assistant Secretary of Labor to John H. Powell, Jr., General Counsel, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

McDonnell Douglas Corporation submitted a new affirmative action plan to the Department of Defense on February 9, 1970.

The new plan corrects, in varying degrees, each of the deficiencies of the old plan outlined above. The new plan makes specific openings projections, and establishes numerical minority hiring and upgrading goals, for each job classification. In addition, the plan outlines several training programs which the Company will institute in order to increase hiring and upgrading goals, for each job classification. In addition, the plan outlines several training programs which the Company will institute in order to increase hiring and upgrading of minority employees.

While the plan does represent a significant step forward—principally in the specificity of its minority hiring goals and the upgrading programs it establishes—it also should be recognized that the plan has a number of serious deficiencies. These are itemized and discussed below. These deficiencies are especially significant if, as is understood to be the case, the Department of Defense proposes to use the McDonnell Douglas plan as a prototype in bringing the affirmative action plans of all other defense contractors into conformity with new detailed affirmative action plans of all other defense contractors into conformity with new detailed affirmative action plan requirements promulgated by OFCC on January 30, 1970 (41 CFR 60–2).

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPANY GOALS

Section V of the plan * * * sets out minority hiring and upgrading goals—in terms of the number of minority hires and upgradings which will be sought for each job classification. The plan also gives the number of projected openings for each job classification.

(1) A principal purpose of a plan of affirmative action is to set out a program and timetable, for overcoming patterns of minority underutilization (see 41 CFR 60–2.11 (a),(b)). *Appraisal of the adequacy of the plan's hiring and upgrading goals is made difficult by the plan's failure to provide current and projected racial employment totals for each job classification.* In the absence of current and projected racial employment figures, the plan discloses neither the magnitude of existing minority underutilization in each job classification, nor the extent to which such underutilization will be corrected if stated goals are attained. Moreover, since the company states that employment will continue to decline for several years * * * the Company's progress in correcting patterns of underutilization has to be appraised in terms of the racial employment picture which is to result from the combined effect of layoffs and goals.

[The . . . concern of the Commission is that goals and timetables do not extend through 1975. This provision of the agreement was established pursuant to Sec. 60–2.24 of Order No. 4, which does not include such an extended period of time, as it would be difficult to accurately forecast employment needs five years in advance. However, it has been established that McDonnell-Douglas will annually review and amend its goals to incorporate the changing employment situation.]

(2) Not only does the plan fail to state the extent of minority underutilization projected to remain after one year (as noted in preceding point 1), *the plan fails to indicate what further progress the Company proposes to make in subsequent years towards correcting such patterns of minority underutilization. The plan fails to set goals, or present commitments or guidelines for the setting of goals, beyond February, 1971.* This is a particularly significant omission in view of the fact that overall increases in employment, due to the multi-billion dollar F–15 contract, apparently are not projected to

occur until 1975 and subsequent years. Furthermore, this omission makes it extremely difficult to appraise the adequacy of the Company's affirmative action training programs. The plan does not relate such programs (most of which are also open to white employees) to the levels of minority utilization, by job category or classification which the training programs are supposed to achieve.

[A . . . concern is that in the agreement, the company's hiring and upgrading goals were difficult to appraise, and they did not include current and projected racial employment totals for each job classification. This has been amended, with such data having been submitted to the Defense Department and made an addendum to the agreement.]

(3) *Appraisal of the adequacy of the plan's hiring and upgrading goals is made difficult by the plan's failure to give position descriptions and salaries for the various job classifications for which goals are set.* OFCC regulations state that a table of job classifications is part of the affirmative action program the contractor is required to keep on file (41 CFR 60–1.40(a),(c)). The absence of this information seriously hampers appraisal of the significance of specific minority hires or upgrading projected, and also makes it difficult to determine how many minority employees might be eligible for upgrading into positions for which openings are projected.

[The . . . concern of the Commission is that the agreement does not include position descriptions and salaries to various job classification. This data is routinely obtained during the course of the compliance review and is provided to the investigator at that time.]

(4) *While the plan projects continuation of layoffs, which—as the plan acknowledges—in the past have had a major impact on newly-trained and newly-hired minority personnel, the plan makes no specific commitment to seek modification of union security agreements or otherwise to lessen the impact of layoffs on minority employees.* The plan does union-management meetings to discuss obstacles to equal employment opportunity * * * but expresses no commitments on the issue of layoffs. Particularly in the absence of overall racial goals or projections for each job classification, this omission seriously undermines the plan as a commitment on the part of the Company to increase levels of minority utilization.

[. . . , although the plan projects layoffs, it has no commitment to modify union security agreements or otherwise relieve the impact on minority employees. Modification of the union security agreement was not included because the investigation identified no "affected class" and because employee layoff is based on continued length of service.]

(5) *Appraisal of the adequacy of the plan's hiring and upgrading goals is made difficult by the plan's failure to provide a complete statement of projected openings by job classification.* A distinction is made, in the plan's projection of job openings, between "new openings" and "openings by attrition" (i.e., by normal quits, retirements, deaths, etc.). * * * *the case of the manufacturing division, and of most other units of the Company, the plan gives the distribution of openings by job classification only for "new openings." The plan therefore does not enable one to determine in what job classifications the majority of openings will arise.* The reason for this omission is unclear, inasmuch as breakdown by job classification of all openings, including openings by attrition, is provided for at least one division—the engineering division * * *.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

(6) *In the entry-level training for which it provides, the plan fails to provide specific commitments, in terms of numbers of trainees, length of training or the period over which the Company will continue the programs.* Such specific commitments concerning entry-level training, at least as to the numbers of trainees and the duration of training, are an indispensable element in the commitment of the Company to a program and timetable for correcting patterns of minority underutilization. Indeed, while several new entry-level programs are called for in the plan, the Company is not specifically committed under the plan to *any* overall increase in the amount of entry-level training achieved. It may be noted that (in contrast with some other affirmative action steps described in the same section of the plan) the plan does *not* call for an increase in the level of Company participation in the National Alliance of Businessmen program for training of the "hard core" unemployed, nor in the Company's "highly successful" * * * Summer Training Employment Program.

(7) The plan's largest upgrading program is one which, each year for five years, will train * * * personnel in the bottom three categories of employment (laborer, service worker, operative), with the aim of enabling the trainee to "qualify for placement" in the next higher category * * *. The Program apparently contemplates upgrading all of the * * * employees * * * who are currently in these three categories. *In the case of employees in the service worker category, accounting for over 28% of the Company's black employees (but only 3% of the Company's white employees), the commitment of this program is to "upgrade" the employee to the level of unskilled laborer—after a year of training, for which the employee may have to wait three or four years.* The commitment of this program to minority employees at the lower levels of employment is inadequate, as to both the extent of upgrading targeted and the length of time many employees may have to wait before the training opportunity is available.

(8) The plan provides several other upgrading programs. The plan states that each year * * * employees will be selected for a two-year program designed to qualify the trainee to become an assistant foreman. In addition, (other) * * * employees each year will be trained to qualify for salaried administrative positions. In the case of these two programs, * * * the plan (i) contains no express commitment actually to promote (or to give priority in promotion to) trainees successfully completing training and (ii) opens the training programs to white employees. (The plan does recite that the Company recognized a particular obligation to train "disadvantaged and minority employees" * * *.) In addition, as noted in point 2 above, the plan does not set minority hiring and upgrading goals beyond February, 1971. *Accordingly, the plan leaves the Company free unilaterally to determine the extent to which the "assistant foreman" and "administrative position" upgrading programs in fact will be used to promote minority employees to these positions.*

HOUSING

The plan acknowledges that the fact that minority group residential areas are 12 to 15 miles distant from the Company's principal facilities "has been, and continues to be, an obstructive factor in recruitment," and presents "a serious transportation problem".

(9) The plan states that the Company will increase past efforts to "work closely with real estate agencies, subdivision developers and financial institutions, and individual homeowners where necessary, to help our minority employees find suitable housing." However, the plan fails to provide a specific program which would achieve this result. This lack is particularly significant in view of the fact that these real estate and financial interests—with which the Company is to "work closely"—have in the past furthered, or at least failed to correct, segregated housing patterns in St. Louis County. *The plan should make provision for active monitoring by the Company to assure that apartment owners, real estate brokers and others with whom the Company deals, take affirmative steps to open the housing market to minority persons. The plan also should commit the Company to such steps as affirmatively inventorying the housing needs and preferences of current or potential employees, providing legal advice or—where necessary—continuing legal representation for minority employees in connection with housing problems, renting or purchasing housing for employees, and encouraging the development of low and moderate income housing in the area of its plants.*

(10) * * *

REVIEW OF JOB REQUIREMENTS

(11) The Company is to review all position descriptions and manning qualifications to insure they involve no inadvertent discrimination * * *. *This review * * * should be expedited greatly, particularly for the jobs into which blacks are most likely to be moving.*

RECRUITMENT

(12) *While the plan provides that all minority recruitments sources are to be used by the Company, the plan omits to state that job description and manning requirement information—especially important in recruiting employees for skilled positions—is to be furnished to recruitment sources.*

(13) Efforts to contact prospective minority employees are described generally, without quantification. For example, no indication is given of the extent to which recruitment at schools or colleges of high minority enrollment will be carried out. Nor are there clear commitments (apart from McDonnell Aircraft Astronautics) *** to recruit heavily outside the St. Louis area. *The plan should be sufficiently specific about recruitment efforts at least to permit a determination whether such recruitment efforts are to be increased significantly over prior years.*

SENSITIVITY TRAINING

(14) The plan does provide for continuation of general training sessions which have been provided in the past for supervisory personnel, including a "sensitivity" training component * * *. However, in view of the importance of this matter, *it is a serious omission that the plan does not make clear how this sensitivity training is to be strengthened, in terms either of its duration, or improvements in program content.*

CONCLUSION

It is appreciated that the McDonnell Douglas affirmative action plan was negotiated under pressure of time. It would be a serious mistake, however, to set the standard for affirmative action programs on the basis of what a contractor and compliance officials can put together in a week or two of intensive activity.

Judged in terms of what reasonably could be expected of the management of the McDonnell Douglas Corporation, its affirmative action plan is extremely disappointing. Most of the criticisms outlined above consist in the failure of the plan (i) to set forth certain current or projected racial employment information or goals; (ii) to plan and describe training programs on a quantified basis; or (iii) to incorporate all relevant affirmative action techniques which are available—especially those which have been used successfully by other employers. All these deficiencies can be remedied simply by applying the needed time and skills of Company management to the development and formulation of this plan.

By the same token, it is essential that the Department of Defense, and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, assure that affirmative action plans are sufficiently specific and informative to permit the contractor's obligations under the plan to be effectively monitored and enforced. The completeness and clarity with which contractors are required to commit themselves to compliance with Executive Order 11246, would be no less than in other aspects of contract performance. Measured by this standard, also, the plan is inordinately vague, leaving far too much to future determination or to Company discretion.

There is no justification for the Department of Defense permitting serious, and remediable, deficiencies such as those described above, in the affirmative action plans of McDonnell Douglas or of other defense contractors.

[In the other areas about which the Commission is concerned—training, housing and transportation, recruitment services and sensitivity training—the company's commitment is adequate and meets the standards for compliance.

[In addition, indications are that the company is operating in "good faith" to execute its affirmative action agreement to achieve equal employment opportunity.]

JUDGE J. DANIEL FINK

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, Judge J. Daniel Fink, who sat on the civil court of the city of New York passed away. A distinguished member of the bar and of the bench, Judge Fink served as a judge for 13 years—first as a municipal court judge, and then as a judge on the civil court when the two were merged.

Judge Fink was an asset to his community and to his city. His philanthropic activities were well-known. He served as an overseer of the Jewish Theological Seminary and as a trustee of Congregation Shaare Zedek. The former head of the council of organizations of the American Jewish Congress and the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York, he had served, also, as vice president of the Young Men's Philanthropic League.

The city of New York, my congressional district—of which Judge Fink was a resident, and his community will miss him. As a lawyer, as a jurist, and as a person, he contributed much.

To his widow, Mrs. Barbara Fink, to his daughter, Mrs. Marilyn Gerber, his sister, Mrs. Beatrice Brenner, and to the rest of his family, I want to extend the condolences of myself and of Mrs. Ryan.

Following is the obituary which appeared in the July 19 edition of the New York Times, and which records the loss of Judge J. Daniel Fink:

[From the New York Times, July 19, 1970]

DANIEL FINK DIES; CIVIL COURT JUDGE

Judge J. Daniel Fink of the City Civil Court died Friday in Beekman-Downtown Hospital, after a long illness. He was 65 years old and lived at 390 West End Avenue.

Judge Fink was born in New York and graduated from Fordham Law School. He first practiced law with the firm of Olcott, Olcott & Glass and later independently.

In 1956 he was elected on the Democratic ticket from the Fifth Manhattan District to the Municipal Court, which was later merged in the Civil Court. He was re-elected in 1966.

Before becoming a judge he had served on a bill-drafting commission of the Legislature.

He was an overseer of the Jewish Theological Seminary and a trustee of Congregation Shaare Zedek. He had formerly headed the council of organizations of the American Jewish Congress and the United Jewish Appeal of Greater New York, and had served as vice president of the Young Men's Philanthropic League.

In 1960 he received a brotherhood award of the National Business and Professional Council, Inc.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Barbara Fink, for many years Democratic co-leader of Manhattan's Fifth Assembly District North; a daughter, Mrs. Marilyn Gerber, and a sister, Mrs. Beatrice Brenner.

A funeral service will be held today at 2 P.M. at the Riverside, Amsterdam Avenue and 76th Street.

IMPEACHMENT OF ASSOCIATE JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 10, pages 28091 to 28096 inclusive, and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 21, pages 29755 to 29759 inclusive, I have inserted for the information of all Members certain legal memorandums concerning the impeachment process as it relates to the Federal Judiciary. I am inserting herewith another exchange of arguments in this important debate between Mr. Bethel Kelley of the Detroit law firm in Dykema, Gosset, Spencer, Goodnow, and Trigg, independently prepared at my request, and Judge Simon H. Rifkind, attorney for Associate Justice William O. Douglas:

LAW OFFICES DYKEMA, GOSSETT,
SPENCER, GOODNOW, & TRIGG,
Detroit, Mich., September 1, 1970.

Re the impeachment process.

HON. GERALD F. FORD, JR.,
The Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORD: You have asked us to review and respond to the August 18, 1970, letter from Judge Rifkind to Representative Celler regarding the "Kelley memorandum". The Rifkind letter concludes that the position advanced in the Kelley memorandum is historically and legally untenable and that it "is so radically subversive of cherished American principles . . . that it must not be allowed to prevail." (Page 2 of the Rifkind letter).

In order to properly answer Judge Rifkind's charge, we must reiterate and reemphasize the position of the Kelley memorandum. Our conclusion was that a violation of the Judicial Tenure provision of the Constitution, which does not necessarily constitute criminal behavior, is remediable by removal from office under the Impeachment clause. We defined "impeachable judicial misbehavior" as conduct on the part of a judge which is so grave as to cast substantial doubt upon his judicial integrity and the integrity of the entire federal judiciary. Any other interpretation of the Kelley memorandum must necessarily involve a misreading of that document and a misunderstanding of the conclusion we reached.

Judge Rifkind attempts to avoid the conclusion of the Kelley memorandum by claiming that it was "addressed to the irrelevant question whether impeachment is to be confined to *indictable*" offenses. He asserts that he is merely proposing that impeachment will lie only for "criminal conduct". The distinction is illusory. "Criminal conduct", by definition, is a violation of the criminal law; a violation of the criminal law, by definition, is an indictable offense.

Judge Rifkind attempts to weaken the impact of the Kelley memorandum by attacking the efficacy of its scholarship. He criticizes the memorandum for its failure to make reference to the records of the Constitutional Convention or to the *Federalist Papers*. In the first place, the Kelley memorandum, on page 12, does refer to that portion of the debate in the Constitutional Convention upon which Judge Rifkind rests his position. Secondly, the authorities contained in the Kelley memorandum themselves refer to the original sources in their interpretation of the Constitution. Thirdly, references to the Constitutional debates and the *Federalist Papers* shed little light on the subject. Nowhere in those two authorities is the precise question involved in the present debate discussed. The only discussion in the debates concerned the substitution of the term "high crimes and misdemeanors" for the term "maladministration"; there was no debate as to the meaning of the former term. In No. 79 of the *Federalist Papers*, Hamilton discussed the independence of the judiciary. Nowhere in that paper did he indicate that the judges would not be removable for misbehavior. He merely commented that mental or physical inability would not be impeachable because of the difficulty of ascertaining whether a judge was mentally or physically incompetent. Rifkind points to the fact that Hamilton states that impeachment is the only method of removal of federal judges. This language is not contrary to the Kelley memorandum; rather it supports the basic position that violation of the Judicial Tenure provision must be impeachable to give meaning to that provision.

Judge Rifkind also attacks the scholarship of the Kelley memorandum by claiming that it quoted the Seventh Article of Impeachment against Judge Ritter out of context by not including references to the specific acts of wrongdoing. The language was definitely not taken out of context; the entire import of the Seventh Article was its allegation that the continued course of conduct was such gross misbehavior to warrant impeachment. A careful review of the Senatorial Opinions filed in that case conclusively establishes that conviction was indeed based on that premise. It is indeed strange for Judge Rifkind to charge the Kelley memorandum with misquotations when Judge Rifkind's original memorandum contained the assertion that Senator Elihu Root, in the Archbald case, supported his position when, in fact, the same Senator Root sponsored the resolution to print, as Senate Document No. 378, the Brown article which takes the same position as the Kelley Memorandum.

Judge Rifkind attempts to show that the Congressional precedents do not support the Kelley memorandum by claiming that every judge who was convicted of impeachment was charged with "high crimes and misdemeanors." This argument places form over substance. It is true that every charge was formally labelled a "high crime and misdemeanor;" however, the debates clearly show that Congress did not subscribe to the definition of that term given by the Rifkind Memorandum. Indeed, it is the position of the Kelley memorandum that the definition of that term includes violations of the Judicial Tenure provision.

Judge Rifkind's most serious charge is that the position of the Kelley memorandum "tramples key provisions" of the Constitu-

tion, namely the First Amendment,[1] the *ex post facto* clause, the separation of powers and the independence of the judiciary. Nothing in the Kelley memorandum would sustain such an assertion. As to the First Amendment, the Kelley memorandum did not argue that protected speech could be the subject of impeachment proceedings. In fact, the Kelley memorandum recognized that the Chase case correctly established the precedent that impeachment would not lie for the expression of a judge's philosophy as found in his decisions. As to the *ex post facto,* clause, Judge Rifkind has never really expressed how the position advanced by the Kelley memorandum would violate that clause. To the contrary, when a Federal Judge accepts his office, he knows that the term of his office is for good behavior. He knows that a violation of that good behavior is a violation of his oath of office. Removal based upon such a violation could not be considered the *ex post facto* application of impeachment powers.

Judge Rifkind's concern that the position of the Kelley memorandum would violate the separation of powers and the independence of the judiciary is unfounded. The Constitution, by giving Congress power to remove federal judges, already violates those concepts in their technical meaning. Indeed, the impeachment power is designed as a check upon the power of the judiciary. Too restrictive of an interpretation of the impeachment power would upset the delicate balance of power established by the Constitution. Furthermore, the framers of the Constitution never intended that the judiciary should be absolutely independent.

In conclusion, nothing in the original Rifkind memorandum nor the Rifkind letter of August 19, 1970, alters the conclusions reached in the Kelley memorandum. Indeed, we are even more convinced of the validity of the position of the Kelley memorandum and that the correct interpretation of the Constitution is that expressed in that document.

Sincerely,

BETHEL B. KELLEY.

PAUL, WEISS, GOLDBERG, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1970

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Judiciary Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In his address to the House of Representatives on April 15, 1970, Mr. Gerald Ford announced his view that an "impeachable offense is whatever a majority of the House of Representatives considers [it] to be at a given moment in history."

Under date of August 5, 1970, Mr. Ford addressed a letter to you to advise you that he had obtained the opinion of Mr. Bethuel E. Kelley, a Michigan lawyer, to support his view. "The Kelley memorandum" was at Mr. Ford's request published in the Congressional Record on August 10.

Mr. Ford's definition of an "impeachable offense" means that judges serve at the pleasure of Congress. This is so utterly destructive of the principles of an independent judiciary and the separation of powers, that I could not believe that convincing historical support could be found for so radical a proposition.

Now that I have read the Kelley memorandum I am more than ever convinced that Mr. Ford's view is historically and legally as untenable as it is mischievous.

The Kelley memorandum should, however, be welcomed as a contribution to an exceedingly important debate. Mr. Ford's preoccupation with the radical definition of "impeachable offense" makes it clear that the real objective of those who have launched an attack on Justice Douglas is to establish that Federal judges can be impeached whenever a temporary legislative majority finds them wanting in "good behavior" as at that moment defined.

I had thought this proposition was laid to rest in 1787 when the Founding Fathers expressly rejected it, and that it could hardly be resurrected after the unsuccessful effort by the Jeffersonians in 1805 to remove all Federalist Justices on just such a theory. But the notion persists, and is so radically subversive of cherished American principles—separation of powers, the independence of the judiciary, freedom of speech, and the impermissibility of *ex post facto* determinations—that it must not be allowed to prevail.

* * * * *

On May 18, I furnished the Subcommittee with an extensive and fully documented legal memorandum on the grounds provided in the Constitution for impeaching Federal judges. I there noted that the Constitution itself confines impeachment to "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors," that at the Constitutional Convention the Founding Fathers—led by James Madison—expressly rejected a proposal to make judges impeachable for "misconduct" or "maladministration," and that Madison explained that the proposal was rejected because "so vague a term will be equivalent to a tenure during the pleasure of the Senate."

My memorandum noted that Thomas Jefferson, in his Manual of Parliamentary Practice, had conspicuously omitted the "good behavior" clause in enumerating the constitutional provisions bearing on impeachment. And I referred to Alexander Hamilton's candid explanation in the *Federalist Papers* that the authors of the Constitution deliberately confined impeachment to serious crimes even at the price of allowing unfit judges to remain on the bench—in order to protect the independence of the judiciary.[1]

I observed that Congressman Livermore of New Hampshire had stated in the very first Congress—without dissent from Members who had helped draft and ratify the Constitution—that Federal judges serving "during good behavior" could only be removed "on conviction of some crime." I referred the Subcommittee to the historic argument of Senator Stone in 1802 that only clearly defined crimes, and not less serious lapses from good behavior, could be the basis for impeachment of judges. He stated, and was not disputed, that "the words of the Constitution" would not justify impeachment of a judge who misconducted himself but did not commit "Treason, Bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." I pointed out that such early constitutional authorities as Justice Wilson, one of the important draftsmen of the Constitution, and Justice Story agreed with this view. And I noted that these materials, particularly the Stone speech, had led Assistant Attorney General Rehnquist on April 9, 1970, to testify before a Senate Subcommittee that impeachment was not a remedy available for enforcing *noncriminal* lapses from good behavior.

I then reviewed each of the judicial impeachments in our history, noting that in *every* instance the Articles of Impeachment adopted by the House had charged "high crimes and misdemeanors," that in *every* such case there was in fact alleged a violation of previously defined law, and that the House had adhered to this standard even when it allowed itself to be a party to the shameful attempted purge of Justice Chase.

Finally, I reminded the Subcommittee that to impeach for alleged noncriminal lapses from good behavior would raise the most serious problems with respect to separation of powers, *ex post facto* determination, and freedom of speech. No canon of construction permits a reading of the impeachment clause which would violate these even more fundamental provisions of the same document. I advanced the opinion that an independent judiciary will not long survive such an interpretation.

* * * * *

Nothing in the Kelley memorandum detracts from the arguments submitted by me on May 18. It does, however, call to mind the following points:

1. There appears to have been a problem of communication between Mr. Ford and his attorney, for the Kelley memorandum is largely addressed to the irrelevant question whether impeachment is to be confined to *indictable* "high crimes and misdemeanors." We do not suggest that the criminal conduct which would constitutionally permit impeachment must be such as to require "indictment." Indeed, the constitutional reference to "misdemeanor" suggests otherwise, for in the federal system not all "misdemeanors" require indictment. The proper question is not whether an *indictable* crime must be shown, but whether a judge may be impeached for conduct which had not previously been defined as *unlawful,* and which is not of a sufficiently grave nature to warrant the appellation *"high* crimes and misdemeanors."

2. It is exceedingly strange that in a memorandum purporting to examine "the basic source material" for an interpretation of the Constitution there is no reference to the records of the Constitutional Convention, to the *Federalist Papers* which are widely regarded as the next most authoritative interpretative aid, or to statements by men who played a role in the drafting and ratification of the Constitution itself.

My May 18 memorandum was guilty of no such omissions. Citing chapter and verse, it demonstrated that the debates at the Constitutional Convention, Hamilton's essays in the *Federalist Papers,* and statements by such contemporaries as Jefferson, Congressman Livermore, Senator Stone and Justice Wilson decisively refute the notion that Federal judges may be removed from office when a temporary legislative majority concludes that they have not met the majority's then definition of "good behavior."

---

[1] The concern expressed in the Rifkind memorandum for freedom of speech for the judiciary is strangely at odds with the restraint that would be imposed on those members of Congress who have been critical of the judiciary. In the Rifkind letter to the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee of May 18, 1970, it is stated: In short, those who have attacked this great man of American law ought carefully to examine Canon 9 of the ABA's Code of Professional Responsibility which warns that "a lawyer shall not knowingly make false accusations against a judge" Rifkind would deny to members of Congress critical of the judiciary not only First Amendment protection for their expressions, but also the protection afforded by Article I, section 6 of the Constitution which provides that as to members of Congress "for any Speech or Debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other Place."

[1] Contrary to Mr. Ford's present view that Article III's "good behavior" clause adds an additional ground for impeaching Federal judges, Hamilton wrote in 1788, in an essay which helped to secure ratification of the Constitution, that the impeachment provision in Article II is "the only one which we find in our own Constitution with respect to our own judges." And he explained that "An attempt to fix the boundary between the regions of ability and inability, would much oftener give scope to personal and party attachments and enmities than advance the interests of justice or the public good."

These essential source materials leave no room for the curious argument that the "good behavior" clause of Article III was intended to define additional grounds for impeaching Federal judges, grounds concedely not applicable to nonjudicial officers. At the Constitutional Convention, efforts to add an impeachment provision to enforce the "good behavior" clause failed, and both Hamilton and Jefferson excluded Article III from any applicability to the impeachment process.

3. Even with respect to the single source which the Kelley memorandum does examine—past impeachment proceedings[2]—the results are extraordinarily shaky. The author is forced to concede that the attack on Justice Chase was fought on the ground that impeachment was available only for violations of clearly defined laws, not to enforce the "good behavior" clause, and that the strict constructionists prevailed. Likewise, he is forced to concede that during the Peck impeachment, James Buchanan stated that the Chase case had settled the proposition that a judge could only be impeached for violating a clearly defined rule of law.

The Kelley memorandum is then compelled to fall back upon the claim that in the 20th century standards have loosened and that in several cases, particularly those involving Judges Archbald and Ritter, judges were impeached and convicted on charges which amounted only to *noncriminal* lapses from good behavior.

The Archbald and Ritter cases prove no such proposition. In both cases, as in every other impeachment voted by the House in our Nation's history, the Articles of Impeachment charged the commission of "high crimes and misdemeanors," and allege specific criminal conduct. Although one of Judge Archbald's prosecutors later wrote a law review article attempting to expand the impeachment power, there contending that Archbald had been impeached despite the absence of criminal conduct, during the proceeding he and others saw the case in a quite different way. The House Managers, for example, resisted a motion to dismiss in the Senate by insisting that "the said articles do severally set forth impeachable offenses, high crimes, and misdemeanors as defined in the Constitution. . . ."

And Senators Elihu Root and Henry Cabot Lodge explained that they had voted to convict Archbald on several counts of securing money and other favors from litigants in his court because each such instance was a "high crime and misdemeanor." They explained they had voted to acquit on those counts which were not shown to be "high crimes and misdemeanor."

Judge Ritter was charged with six specific counts of criminal conduct, including "corruptly and unlawfully" receiving kickbacks, the "high misdemeanor" of practicing law while on the bench, willful evasion of federal income tax, and conspiracy in champertous foreclosure proceedings. Indeed, Ritter admitted the underlying facts and defended himself on the ground that he lacked the requisite criminal intent. The House impeached him on each of these charges and on a seventh blanket charge which did not add less serious, noncriminal charges—bad behavior—but expressly incorporated the more specific charges of crime. A majority, short of the necessary two-thirds, voted to convict Judge Ritter on each of the specific charges, while two thirds agreed that he had committed at least one criminal offense and voted to convict on the blanket charge incorporating the specific allegations of criminal conduct. In the face of these facts, the Kelley memorandum asserts that Judge Ritter was impeached and convicted for *noncriminal* conduct. It cites statements by several Senators who were anxious to expand their power to remove judges,[3] and purports to set out the text of the blanket charge, Article 7. I find it necessary to call to your attention the fact that the author of the Kelley memorandum has omitted a substantial portion of the language of Article 7—the portion referring to the specific criminal conduct with which Judge Ritter was charged. The omitted language charged Ritter with commission of "high crimes and misdemeanors in office," and expressly incorporated "his conduct as detailed in Articles I, II, III, and IV hereof, and by his income-tax evasions as set forth in Article V and VI hereof." In short, Article 7 did not relate to noncriminal misconduct but served as a summary of the alleged criminal offenses. The full text of the Articles of Impeachment in the *Ritter* case is appended to this letter.

Equally serious omissions occur in the Kelley memorandum's discussion of the impeachments of Judge Swayne in 1905 and Judge Louderback in 1933, both of whom were acquitted by the Senate. Both in the House and in the Senate, the primary defense by Swayne and Louderback was that even if true, the facts alleged did not constitute "an impeachable high crime and misdemeanor as defined in the Constitution of the United States." That the managers of the impeachment proceedings unsuccessfully argued to the contrary is hardly persuasive evidence that they were right. In sum, it appears that the memorandum is largely predicated on the arguments of advocates who lost their cases.

4. The Kelley memorandum does the best it can with the proceedings which have led to impeachment of Federal judges. But it curiously omits the many proceedings in which the House has declined to impeach where misconduct was shown but did not amount to the omission of a grave criminal offense.

In 1914, for example, the Judiciary Committee found that Judge Emory Speer had, among other things "exercised exceedingly poor taste and was guilty of indiscretions unbecoming a high judicial official," had "by his conduct, made his very high and honorable position one to excite the fear and suspicion, rather than to command the respect and confidence of litigants," and had committed other injudicious acts. But it concluded that these and other kinds of misconduct fall "short of impeachable offenses."

Similarly, in 1929 the House Judiciary Committee declined to recommend the impeachment of Judge Grover Moscowitz notwithstanding that the evidence showed that the judge had entered into a business arrangement with a former law partner and had appointed members of a law firm of his former partner to various receiverships, throwing "the court open to criticism and misunderstanding by the uninformed." Absent a violation of law by the judge, impeachment was not available.[4]

In that same year, District Judge Alston G. Dayton was charged with various acts of misbehavior including favoritism toward his son, misuse of services of employees paid by the government, use of his office to further friends' political activities, conflicts of interest in receivership cases, and an anti-labor bias in cases before him. The Judiciary Committee, after an investigation, refused to recommend impeachment although it found that "This evidence shows many matters of individual bad taste on the part of Judge Dayton, some not of that high standard of judicial ethics which should crown the Federal judiciary."

CONCLUSION

The above criticisms of the Kelley memorandum are not intended as personal attacks upon its author. Having explored the materials myself, I know how difficult it is to ascertain just what has led the House or Senate to act in any particular impeachment proceeding. But there are accepted tools for interpreting the Constitution, and it is the Constitution we are interpreting.

We begin with the language of the Constitution itself. Article II, the impeachment provision, speaks only of "Treason, Bribery, and other high Crimes and Misdemeanors." The language suggests that not even all "crimes" are impeachable, for otherwise there would be no need to specify "Treason, Bribery, or high Crimes. . . ." And if some crimes are not impeachable, how can less serious conduct be so regarded?

We examine other internal evidence in the Constitution, such as the provision for trial by jury "of all *crimes*, except in cases of impeachment."

We look to events at the Constitutional Convention, and there the antecedent of Mr. Ford's "good behavior" proposition was rejected on the ground that it would exact too high a price in terms of the independence of the judiciary. We look to the *Federalist Papers* and to the words of men who had been involved in the drafting and ratification of the Constitution. Again, these sources decisively refute the notion that the Founding Fathers contemplated the impeachment of federal judges for conduct not amounting to a violation of clearly defined criminal laws. When the language of the Constitution, the Convention debates, and the words of contemporaries converge on a single conclusion, there is no room for us now to redecide the question decided nearly two centuries ago.

When we turn to past impeachment proceedings, we have—at minimum—an obligation to be fair. Those who argued that impeachment was available only to punish grave criminal offenses prevailed in the Chase case, and prevailed again during the attempt to impeach President Andrew Johnson.[5] As former Justice Curtis summarized Johnson's successful defense, it rested on the proposition "that when the Constitution speaks of 'treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors,' it refers to, and includes only, high criminal offenses against the United States, made so by some law of the United States existing when the acts complained of were done, and I say that this is plainly to be inferred from each and every provision of the Constitution on the subject of impeachment." 1 *Trial of Andrew Johnson*, p. 409.

The arguments of counsel in particular proceedings obviously have to be taken with a grain of salt, as do later writings by the participants. But one does not arrive at truth by resorting to the mutilated text of an article of impeachment—excluding from the quotation key words which are damaging to one's own case. Nor does one arrive at truth by summarizing the defenses available in

[2] A weak source indeed, for of course no Congress, still less any particular set of House Managers or defense counsel, has been licensed to amend the language of the Constitution.

[3] Even Senator Pittman, whose statement the Kelley memorandum relies on, asserted in writing that by Ritter's own admissions he was guilty of the *crimes* of false swearing on his tax return and practicing law while on the bench. He noted that his vote to convict on the blanket charge applied only to certain of the specific counts.

[4] See, also, the 1930 proceeding involving Judge Harry B. Anderson, where no grounds for impeachment were found to exist although the investigation disclosed several matters which the Committee did not approve or sanction.

[5] It should be noted that neither side during that great controversy advanced the notion—crucial to Mr. Ford's position—that impeachment of the President was to be governed by standards different from those applicable to judges. And the *Chase* precedent was successfully argued as governing Johnson's Senate trial.

particular cases—omitting to include a key defense damaging to the proposition one advocates.

Finally, this delicate question of constitutional interpretation cannot be answered in isolation without considering the other constitutional provisions which must be read in harmony with the impeachment clause. Any reading of the impeachment clause which would permit Congress to impeach a judge for conduct not previously defined as a ground for impeachment would clearly violate the *ex post facto* clause of Article I, Section 9. To interpret the impeachment clause to permit impeachment for speeches and writings violates the First Amendment, as counsel for Justice Chase successfully argued in 1805. And to condition judicial tenure upon the ability of a judge to win a popularity contest in the legislature is profoundly subversive of the principle of separation of powers inherent in the very structure of the Constitution itself.

The Kelley memorandum asserts that there is no appeal from Congress' ultimate judgment. If that is so, it underscores the high moral responsibility of Congress in exercising its awesome power under the impeachment clause so as not to infringe other sections of the Constitution.

Violations of the First Amendment, of the *ex post facto* clause, and of separation of powers, and infringement upon the independence of the judiciary, may not trouble those who proffer the Kelley memorandum. But they trouble me greatly, and I cannot sit idly by while these key provisions of our Constitution are trampled. I can understand the temptation of one branch of government to increase its own power, to subject another branch to its dominion. But in understanding this primeval drive, I am not obligated to succumb to it or to stand aside while it subverts the constitutional system which has proven its value over nearly two centuries. In my judgment, this concerted campaign to use the impeachment clause to enforce a temporary legislative majority's notions of what constitutes good behavior is a truly radical attempt to amend our Constitution. This is not the sanctioned method of change. I have great faith that when alerted to what is at stake, Constitutional scholars, the bar, the American people and their elected representatives will reject this radical proposal.

To this end, to alert the public to the nature of what Mr. Ford has proposed, I request that this letter and my May 18 legal memorandum be given the same public exposure which the Kelley memorandum has received. Since neither the May 18 legal memorandum nor this letter touch upon the factual allegations in the impeachment inquiry, there is no reason to accord them confidential treatment, and we do not claim confidential treatment for them.

Yours sincerely,

SIMON H. RIFKIND.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous request, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADAMS, for September 15 through 18, on account of official business.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. HAGAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 30 minutes, on September 15, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUTH) to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous matter:)

Mr. POFF, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. AYRES, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. DENNEY to extend his remarks following consideration of H.R. 3259, today.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania prior to passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 49.

Mr. RYAN to revise and extend his remarks on the bill H.R. 18410.

Mr. RANDALL and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RUTH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHERLE in 10 instances.
Mr. RHODES.
Mr. BERRY.
Mr. WIGGINS.
Mr. HALL.
Mr. ROUSSELOT.
Mr. RIEGLE.
Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.
Mr. BROOMFIELD.
Mr. CRAMER in five instances.
Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT.
Mr. NELSEN.
Mr. MCDADE.
Mr. FINDLEY.
Mr. HOSMER in two instances.
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.
Mr. HORTON.
Mr. SHRIVER.
Mr. CONTE.
Mr. HOGAN.
Mr. DERWINSKI in four instances.
Mr. CAMP.
Mr. SCHMITZ.
Mr. WHALEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CORMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON in 10 instances.
Mr. PODELL in three instances.
Mr. FRASER.
Mr. NATCHER.
Mr. REUSS in six instances.
Mr. LONG of Maryland.
Mr. ANDERSON of California in two instances.
Mr. RODINO.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. MATSUNAGA.
Mr. RYAN in five instances.
Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in two instances.
Mr. DADDARIO in five instances.
Mr. DINGELL in two instances.
Mr. MOORHEAD in four instances.
Mr. MARSH.
Mr. RARICK in six instances.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. POAGE.
Mr. PICKLE in two instances.
Mr. DELANEY.
Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas.
Mr. JONES of Tennessee.
Mr. VANIK in two instances.
Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 5. An act to promote the public welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 437. An act to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, relating to survivor annuities under the civil service retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3822. An act to provide insurance for member accounts in State and federally chartered credit unions and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 16539. An act to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to provide that the Secretary of Transportation shall be a member of the National Aeronautics and Space Council; and

H.R. 16968. An act to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the cost of health benefits insurance, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 15, 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:

2366. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a report of third country transfers of U.S. origin defense articles to which the United States has given its approval under the provisions of section 3(a)(2) of the Foreign Military Sales Act and transfers under the provisions of section 505(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act, for the period of January 1 through June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2367. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other provisions for the fiscal year 1971 (H. Doc. 91–382); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2368. A letter from the President of the United States, relative to the passage of H.R. 18306, increasing U.S. participation in the International Monetary Fund, the World

Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Asian Development Bank (H. Doc. 91–383); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

2369. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting the second annual report of the National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children, pursuant to title VI of Public Law 89–10, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2370. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Coal Research for 1969; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2371. A letter from the Nevada State Director, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, transmitting a notice of continuation of the segregation of certain public lands classified for transfer out of public ownership, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1411–1418; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2372. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit immediate retirement of certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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. For the benefit of all mankind (Rept. No. 91–1446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEED: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 16900 (Rept. No. 91–1447). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 19152. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to require the installation in school buses of restraining devices for the protection of children; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 19153. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide an aid and attendance allowance to any parent entitled to dependency and indemnity compensation who is helpless or blind or a patient in a nursing home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 19154. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to provide hospital and medical care to certain dependents and survivors of veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 19155. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to provide a criminal penalty for shooting at certain birds, fish, and other animals from an aircraft; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 19156. 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.

H.R. 19157. A bill to amend section 5 of the Department of Transportation Act to authorize the National Transportation Safety Board to employ 2,500 investigators to carry out its powers and duties under that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. CELLER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LOWENSTEIN, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REUSS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN):

H.R. 19158. A bill to create a health security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. ECKHARDT, and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 19159. A bill to create a health security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. POLLOCK):

H.R. 19160. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require a longer period of notice before a Federal agency commences any action significantly affecting the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 19161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the status of certain oil well service equipment under subchapter D of chapter 36 of such Code (relating to tax on the use of certain vehicles); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 19162. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to require additional precautionary measures aboard certain aircraft in the interest of the safety of the traveling public; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.R. 19163. A bill to amend the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on Internal Security.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 19164. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research and educational programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HOGAN, and Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin):

H.R. 19165. A bill to amend the act of February 27, 1925, regulating the sale of dairy products in the District of Columbia, to revise the local inspection requirements under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 19166. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to allow for greater expansion of the export trade of the United States, to exclude Bank receipts and disbursements from the Budget of the U.S. Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 19167. A bill to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of horses which are "sored", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. BIAGGI):

H.R. 19168. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to require a longer period of notice before a Federal agency commences any action significantly affecting the environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SNYDER (by request):

H.R. 19169. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, to exempt certain retail or service establishments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SNYDER (by request):

H.R. 19170. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, to exempt certain high wage earners; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WEICKER:

H.R. 19171. A bill to authorize the National Science Foundation to conduct research and educational programs to prepare the country for conversion from defense to civilian, socially oriented research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 19172. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to help cities and communities to develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning and local programs to detect and treat incidents of such poisoning, to establish a Federal demonstration and research program to study the extent of the lead-based paint removal, and to prohibit future use of lead-based paint in Federal or federally assisted construction or rehabilitation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 19173. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for better control of interstate traffic in explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 19174. A bill to regulate the importation, manufacture, distribution, storage, and possession of explosives, blasting agents, and detonators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 19175. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and other laws to provide increased research into, and prevention of, drug abuse and drug dependence; to provide for treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers and drug dependent persons; and to strengthen existing law enforcement authority in the field of drug abuse; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 19176. A bill to provide for the awarding of a Medal of Honor for policemen and a Medal of Honor for firemen; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONES of Tennessee:

H.R. 19177. A bill to exempt from certain deep-draft safety statutes passenger vessels operating solely on the inland rivers and waterways; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 19178. A bill to amend section 18 of the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 to prohibit Federal financial assistance to any airport which permits the use of its facilities by an aircraft registered in a foreign country which fails or refuses to punish aircraft hijackers or to extradite aircraft hijackers to the flag country of the hijacked aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 19179. A bill to adjust the pay of employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 19180. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national urban growth policy, to encourage and support the proper growth and development of our States, metropolitan areas, cities, counties, and towns with emphasis upon new community and inner city development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 19181. A bill to retain coverage under the laws providing employee benefits, such as compensation for injury, retirement, life insurance, and health benefits for employees of the Government of the United States who transfer to Indian tribal organizations to perform services in connection with governmental or other activities which are or have been performed by Government employees in or for Indian communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.J. Res. 1366. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of the Federal Housing Administration's insurance authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROE:

H.J. Res. 1367. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim National Good Grooming Week from November 16, 1970, to November 22, 1970; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. Con. Res. 730. Concurrent resolution urging the Congress to assemble in the Hall of the House for the purpose of expressing its grave concern about the mistreatment of United States and Allied prisoners of war by North Vietnamese and other Communist forces; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. FARBSTEIN, and Mr. HOWARD):

H. Res. 1208. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on the Environment; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Br. Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 19182. A bill for the relief of Stephen C. Yednock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 19183. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wallace S. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 19184. A bill for the relief of Servillano C. Espi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.R. 19185. A bill for the relief or Alispa Rosita Bradley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 19186. A bill for the relief of Jose de Jesus Ornelas-Valdez and Celia Villafana de Ornelas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 19187. A bill for the relief of Lloyd B. Earle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

587. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James R. Johnston, et al., Huron County, Mich., relative to the treatment of Americans who are prisoners of war or missing in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

588. Also, petition of the Board of Selectmen, Brookline, Mass., relative to the hijacking of airplanes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

589. Also, petition of the City Council, Elizabeth, N.J., relative to the hijacking of airplanes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

590. Also, petition of Jayleen Tjoelker, Blair, Wash., et al., relative to appointments to the U.S. Supreme Court and other Federal benches; to the Committee on Judiciary.

591. Also, petition of William R. Wendt, Springfield, Mo., relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—*Monday, September 14, 1970*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our help in ages past, our present strength, and our hope for years to come, whose ear is open to those of humble and contrite heart, hear us in our morning prayer. If we are low in spirit, lift us up. If we are lofty in pride, make us submissive in mind. If we feel feeble in intellect, strengthen us by Thy higher wisdom. If we feel impotent in will, brace us with moral courage and personal righteousness.

Come to us in our individual needs. Come to us in our national needs.

Grant us here a vision of a world that is not yet, but ought to be, and in loyal devotion to its appearing, help us to find joy and peace.

In the coming week grant us Thy help in all our duties and keep us ever faithful to our high calling as servants of all the people.

We pray in the name of the Lord of Life. Amen.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Because the Senate adjourned on Friday, September 11, 1970, without a quorum, the first order of business is to obtain a quorum.

The Chair directs the clerk to call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 291 Leg.]

Aiken	Fong	Nelson
Allen	Fulbright	Packwood
Allott	Gravel	Pell
Anderson	Griffin	Proxmire
Bennett	Gurney	Ribicoff
Bible	Hansen	Russell
Burdick	Harris	Saxbe
Byrd, Va.	Hart	Schweiker
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Scott
Case	Hollings	Smith, Maine
Church	Hughes	Sparkman
Cook	Inouye	Spong
Cooper	Javits	Stennis
Cranston	Long	Stevens
Dole	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dominick	McCarthy	Thurmond
Eagleton	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McGovern	Yarborough
Ellender	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Fannin	Muskie	

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH) is detained on official business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present. The clerk will proceed to call the roll again on Mr. DOMINICK's amendment No. 886 to S. 3418.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.